

1 Diversified Reporting Services, Inc.

2 RPTS GONZALEZ/EUELL/MORRIS

3 HIF133000

4

5

6 MARKUP OF BUDGET RECONCILIATION TEXT

7 TUESDAY, MAY 13, 2025

8 House of Representatives,

9 Committee on Energy and Commerce,

10 Washington, D.C.

11

12

13

14 The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:37 a.m. in  
15 Room 2123, Rayburn House Office Building, Hon. Brett Guthrie  
16 [chair of the committee] presiding.

17

18

19 Present: Representatives Guthrie, Latta, Griffith,  
20 Bilirakis, Hudson, Carter of Georgia, Palmer, Dunn, Joyce,  
21 Weber, Allen, Balderson, Fulcher, Pfluger, Harshbarger,  
22 Miller-Meeks, Cammack, Obernolte, James, Bentz, Houchin, Fry,  
23 Lee, Langworthy, Kean, Rulli, Evans, Goldman, Fedorchak;  
24 Pallone, DeGette, Schakowsky, Matsui, Castor, Tonko, Clarke,  
25 Ruiz, Peters, Dingell, Veasey, Kelly, Barragan, Soto,  
26 Schrier, Trahan, Fletcher, Ocasio-Cortez, Auchincloss, Carter  
27 of Louisiana, Menendez, Mullin, Landsman, and McClellan.

28

29           Staff Present:   Ansley Boylan, Director of Operations;  
30   Byron Brown, Chief Counsel; Clara Cargile, Professional Staff  
31   Member; Marjorie Connell, Director of Archives; Jessica  
32   Donlon, General Counsel; Brian Fahey, Professional Staff  
33   Member; Kristin Fritsch, Professional Staff Member; Andrew  
34   Furman, Professional Staff Member; Seth Gold, Professional  
35   Staff Member; Sydney Greene, Director of Finance and  
36   Logistics; Jay Gulshen, Chief Counsel; Emily Hale, Staff  
37   Assistant; Kate Harper (O'Connor), Chief Counsel; Christen  
38   Harsha, Senior Counsel; Brittany Havens, Chief Counsel;  
39   Natalie Hellman, Professional Staff Member; Heidi High,  
40   Senior Counsel; Annabelle Huffman, Clerk; Calvin Huggins,  
41   Clerk; Megan Jackson, Staff Director; Noah Jackson, Clerk;  
42   Adam Joseph, Digital Director; Daniel Kelly; Press Secretary;  
43   Patrick Kelly, Staff Assistant; Sophie Khanahmadi, Deputy  
44   Staff Director; Alex Khlopin, Clerk; Brayden Lacefield,  
45   Special Assistant; Giulia Leganski, Chief Counsel; John Lin,  
46   Senior Counsel; Molly Lolli (Brimmer), Counsel; Mary Martin,  
47   Chief Counsel; Sarah Meier, Counsel and Parliamentarian; Joel  
48   Miller, Chief Counsel; Ben Mullaney, Press Secretary; Elaina  
49   Murphy, Professional Staff Member; Kaitlyn Peterson, Policy  
50   Analyst; Kristen Pinnock, GAO Detailee; Gavin Proffitt,  
51   Professional Staff Member; Evangelos Razis, Professional  
52   Staff Member; Seth Ricketts, Special Assistant; Jake Riith,  
53   Staff Assistant; Dylan Rogers, Professional Staff Member;

54 Jackson Rudden, Staff Assistant; Chris Sarley, Member  
55 Services/Stakeholder Director; Emma Schultheis, Clerk; Alan  
56 Slobodin, Chief Investigative Counsel; Peter Spencer, Senior  
57 Professional Staff Member; Kaley Stidham, Press Assistant;  
58 James Stursberg, Professional Staff Member; Joanne Thomas,  
59 Counsel; Dray Thorne, Director of Information Technology;  
60 Matt VanHyfte, Communications Director; Katharine Willey,  
61 Senior Counsel; Katie West, Press Secretary; Nick Wooldridge,  
62 Professional Staff Member; Lydia Abma, Minority Policy  
63 Analyst; Hannah Anton, Minority Policy Analyst; Sam Avila,  
64 Minority Health Fellow; Shana Beavin, Minority Professional  
65 Staff Member; Jennifer Black, FDA Detailee; Jacquelyn Bolen,  
66 Minority Counsel; Keegan Cardman, Minority Staff Assistant;  
67 Giancarlo Ceja, Minority ENV Fellow; Timia Crisp, Minority  
68 Professional Staff Member; Parul Desai, Minority Staff  
69 Director; Austin Flack, Minority Professional Staff Member;  
70 Waverly Gordon, Minority Deputy Staff Director and General  
71 Counsel; Tiffany Guarascio, Minority Staff Director; Anthony  
72 Gutierrez, Minority Professional Staff Member; Caitlin  
73 Haberman, Minority Staff Director, ENV; Perry Hamilton,  
74 Minority Member Services and Outreach Manager; Lisa Hone,  
75 Minority Chief Counsel, CMT; Saha Khaterzai, Minority  
76 Professional Staff Member; Elizabeth Kittrie, Minority Health  
77 Fellow; Mackenzie Kuhl, Minority Digital Manager; Una Lee,  
78 Minority Chief Counsel, HE; Gayle Mauser, Minority Health

79 Advisor; Will McAuliffe, Minority Chief Counsel, OI; Dan  
80 Miller, Minority Professional Staff Member; Matt Moore,  
81 Minority Press Assistant; Constance O'Connor, Minority Senior  
82 Counsel; Christina Parisi, Minority Professional Staff  
83 Member; Kristopher Pittard, Minority Professional Staff  
84 Member; Emma Roehrig, Minority Staff Assistant; Kylea Rogers,  
85 Minority Policy Analyst; Phoebe Rouge, Minority FTC Detailee;  
86 Harry Samuels, Minority Counsel; Sanil Harikrishnan, Minority  
87 Press Intern; Michael Scurato, Minority FCC Detailee; Andrew  
88 Souvall, Minority Director of Communications, Outreach, and  
89 Member Services; Medha Surampudy, Minority Professional Staff  
90 Member; Johanna Thomas, Minority Counsel; Hannah Treger,  
91 Minority Intern; Caroline Wood, Minority Research Analyst;  
92 Tuley Wright, Minority Staff Director, ENG; and C.J. Young,  
93 Minority Deputy Communications Director.

94

95           \*The Chair. The committee will come to order.

96           Before we begin, I would like to take a moment to  
97 address the guests in our audience.

98           First of all, thank you all for being here. Thank you  
99 for coming. We think engaged citizens are welcome and a  
100 valuable part of the process. But I do want to remind  
101 everyone that the chair is obligated, under the rules of the  
102 House and rules of the committee, to maintain order and  
103 preserve decorum in the committee room. And I know we have  
104 deep feelings on these issues and that we may not all agree  
105 on everything, but I would just ask that we all abide by the  
106 rules and be respectful for other audience members, our  
107 viewer, and our witnesses. And I appreciate the audience's  
108 cooperation in maintaining order as we have our business  
109 before us.

110           And the chair will now recognize himself for an opening  
111 statement.

112           Good afternoon, everybody, and welcome to today's  
113 markup, which is a rare opportunity to address issues  
114 spanning the full jurisdiction of this committee, from  
115 unleashing American energy to ending costly EV mandates,  
116 advancing American innovation to truly strengthening the  
117 Medicaid program for the most vulnerable Americans, and  
118 improving Americans' access to quality health care.

119           The House Budget Committee has tasked us with

120 identifying 800 billion in savings and new revenue. We have  
121 worked diligently to meet this target by ending wasteful  
122 Green New Deal-style spending, supporting a rapid innovation  
123 of American industry and Federal agencies, and eliminating  
124 the waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicaid that jeopardizes  
125 care for millions of women, children, people with  
126 disabilities, and elderly Americans.

127 To ensure American energy dominance, we will secure our  
128 energy infrastructure by taking the steps to refill our  
129 Strategic Petroleum Reserve, which strengthens our energy  
130 security and supports our national security.

131 In order to support the abundant energy production that  
132 will be necessary to secure our grid and in order to increase  
133 revenue, we will expand the use of user fees to help  
134 streamline the siting and permitting of new oil, gas, carbon  
135 dioxide, and hydrogen pipelines. We can save \$172 billion  
136 over the next 10 years by repealing the burdensome Biden-  
137 Harris Administration regulations, and over 100 billion by  
138 eliminating the EV mandates imposed by the vehicle emission  
139 and CAFÉ standards that have failed to serve the American  
140 taxpayers.

141 And through investments to modernize the Department of  
142 Commerce, we can integrate AI systems to make the Department  
143 more secure and effective. To protect the integrity of this  
144 project we are implementing guardrails that protect against

145 state-level AI laws that could jeopardize our technological  
146 leadership.

147 Our legislation will raise \$88 billion of new revenue  
148 through a historic agreement reauthorizing the FCC Spectrum  
149 Auction Authority, while protecting U.S. national security.

150 The Biden-era inflation has left Americans struggling to  
151 access affordable health care. The issue has been  
152 exacerbated by the decisions of left-leaning state  
153 governments to spend dollars on illegal immigrants. We make  
154 no apologies for prioritizing Americans in need over illegal  
155 immigrants and those who are capable but choose not to work.  
156 Our priority remains the same, strengthen and sustain  
157 Medicaid for those whom the program was intended to serve:  
158 expectant mothers, children, people with disabilities, and  
159 the elderly. We are prepared to stop the billions of dollars  
160 of waste, fraud, and abuse in the Medicaid program by  
161 beginning to rein in the loopholes, by ensuring states have  
162 the flexibility to remove ineligible recipients from their  
163 rolls, and removing beneficiaries who are enrolled in  
164 multiple states. These are all common-sense policies that  
165 will return taxpayer dollars to middle-class families.

166 Medicaid was created to protect health care for  
167 Americans who otherwise could not support themselves, but  
168 Democrats expanded the program far beyond this core mission.  
169 That is why we are establishing common-sense work

170 requirements for capable but not working adults in the  
171 expansion population. Let me be clear. These work  
172 requirements would only apply to able-bodied adults without  
173 dependents who don't have a disqualifying condition,  
174 encouraging them to reenter the workforce and regain their  
175 independence.

176 All of this is part of our effort to strengthen Medicaid  
177 for the people that need it most. When President Trump  
178 delivered his second inaugural address he promised a  
179 revolution of common sense that will launch a generation of  
180 growth, prosperity, and health. This reconciliation bill is  
181 critical to that promise the President and congressional  
182 Republicans made to the American people.

183 Today we bring before the committee a package that  
184 unleashes American energy dominance, advances innovation, and  
185 protects access to care for our most vulnerable. Each of  
186 these is a core part of our effort to re-spark the American  
187 dream, and ensure our country will always be the land of  
188 opportunity.

189 I have no doubt that we will have some robust  
190 discussions today about these proposals. These discussions  
191 are important, and I look forward to using this time to  
192 address the issues that matter most to the American families  
193 we serve. So I thank you all for your hard work as we  
194 continue our work to serve the American people.



195           I now yield five minutes to the ranking member, my  
196 friend from New Jersey, Mr. Pallone.

197           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

198           [Disturbance in hearing room.]

199           \*The Chair. Let me -- the chair -- the committee will  
200 come to order. The chair will advise the audience that  
201 disruption of a congressional business is a violation of law  
202 and is a criminal offense. Please come to order.

203           The chair advises the audience that violations will not  
204 be tolerated, and the violators will be removed from the room  
205 and may be subject to arrest.

206           The committee will come to order. The gentleman from  
207 New Jersey is recognized for his five-minute opening  
208 statement.

209           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do want to  
210 say that, you know, I think hopefully everyone understands  
211 that these demonstrations are -- the people feel very  
212 strongly because they know they are losing their health care,  
213 and the cruelty that comes from the Republican proposal that  
214 makes them lose their health care and their health insurance.  
215 But I would just ask that, to the police -- I don't know if  
216 they are in the room -- that we not arrest people if possible  
217 because many of them are disabled, and I don't want to see  
218 them further hurt with their disability in the process of  
219 being arrested.

220 But for months now, President Trump and congressional  
221 Republicans promised the American people they would not cut  
222 Medicaid benefits or strip away people's health care. In  
223 February President Trump said, and I am quoting, "Medicare,  
224 Medicaid, none of that stuff is going to be touched.'"

225 House Speaker Johnson doubled down on that promise,  
226 stating -- and again, I am quoting -- "The White House has  
227 made a commitment. The President has said over and over we  
228 are not going to touch Social Security, Medicare, or  
229 Medicaid. We have made that same commitment.'"

230 Now, I have to say, Mr. Chairman, those are promises  
231 that Republicans made to the American people, and it is clear  
232 that they have broken that promise. And I just want to  
233 reference on Sunday night, Mr. Chairman, in a Wall Street  
234 Journal interview you actually said that the Republican plan  
235 to trim Medicaid spending -- you were commenting on the  
236 Republican plan to trim Medicaid spending -- and you said,  
237 and I quote, "We are going to go as far as we can go to get  
238 218 votes.'"

239 Well, I think the bottom line is you are going pretty  
240 far here in either trimming or cutting, whatever you want to  
241 call it -- you referred to it as trimming -- Medicaid. You  
242 don't have to take my word for it. The non-partisan  
243 Congressional Budget Office's own analysis shows that at  
244 least 13.7 million Americans will lose their health care

245 coverage as a result of Trump and congressional Republicans'  
246 action.

247         The Medicaid and Affordable Care Act cuts included in  
248 the Energy and Commerce bill will make up at least 8.6  
249 million of that total number, so 8.6 from this bill alone  
250 will lose their Medicaid coverage. And another five because  
251 it is obvious from the reconciliation bill that you are not  
252 going to reauthorize the assistance, if you will, for those  
253 who are on the Affordable Care Act in the marketplace. And  
254 so you add another 5 million and, by the end of the year, we  
255 will have over 15 million Americans who lose their Medicaid.  
256 So you can call it a trim, you can call it a cut, call it  
257 whatever you want. The bottom line is these people are going  
258 to lose their Medicaid. That is why we have so many people  
259 -- that is why there is so many people here today  
260 demonstrating.

261         Now, let me be clear. This is not a moderate bill. I  
262 have heard you and others say this is a moderate bill. It is  
263 not focused on cutting waste, fraud, and abuse. Instead,  
264 Republicans are intentionally taking health care away from  
265 millions of Americans so they can give giant tax breaks to  
266 the ultra-rich who, frankly, don't need them.

267         Medicaid is a lifesaving program that 80 million  
268 Americans count on every day. It provides health care to one  
269 in three Americans and nearly half of all children in the

270 United States. It covers close to half of all births, and is  
271 the largest source of funding for long-term care for seniors  
272 and people living with disabilities. With this bill  
273 Republicans are essentially telling millions of Americans,  
274 gotcha, no more health care for you.

275 I looked at this, and it is very -- it is like -- as if  
276 someone who was disabled walked in the room and I said, gee  
277 -- rather than can I help you, it is like, how can I make  
278 sure that you don't access Medicaid, or you don't access  
279 health care. Well, I will say that maybe you can't fill out  
280 the red tape and the paperwork, but I will make you do it  
281 once a month. And if you miss that, you are not going to get  
282 your health insurance. Well, if you want to sign up for the  
283 Affordable Care Act because you didn't fill out the paperwork  
284 for Medicaid, then you are not going to be eligible for the  
285 Affordable Care Act because we won't let you do that.

286 So everything is being done to make it possible that  
287 people get kicked off so you can save money by not financing  
288 the health care.

289 Now, a lot of us are going to talk about individuals  
290 today, and I would like to talk about my individual from my  
291 district. Her name is Lauren, and she has a daughter named  
292 Danny who is disabled. And Lauren is concerned about how  
293 devastating Medicaid cuts would be for people with  
294 disabilities. She has said, and I am quoting, "Without

295 programs like Medicaid that help them get out of bed in the  
296 morning, they will literally be stuck, or worse, out in the  
297 community, unsafe and victimized.'` Lauren worries that cuts  
298 to Medicaid will take away her daughter's life, and she says  
299 that Danny doesn't deserve that.

300 [Slide]

301 \*Mr. Pallone. That is Lauren on the left. And this is  
302 Danny, her daughter, on the right.

303 And Lauren is right. Danny doesn't deserve this. And  
304 that is why Democrats will fight this cruel bill -- cruelty  
305 is the point -- that will strip health care away from  
306 millions of Americans just so that Republicans can give their  
307 very wealthy friends and large corporations a tax break. It  
308 isn't right, it is cruel. We shouldn't be taking away health  
309 care from all these Americans.

310 And with that I yield back.

311 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back, and  
312 the chair reminds members that, pursuant to the committee  
313 rules, all members' opening statements will be made part of  
314 the record.

315 Are there furthering -- further opening statements?

316 Seeing none on the Republican -- the gentlelady from  
317 Colorado, for what purpose do you seek recognition?

318 \*Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to make  
319 an opening statement.

320           \*The Chair. I now recognize the gentlelady from  
321 Colorado for three minutes for an opening statement.

322           \*Ms. DeGette. For months Republicans have insisted that  
323 they would not cut Medicaid in order to give tax cuts to  
324 billionaires. But here they are today with a bill that would  
325 do irreparable damage to Medicaid and the millions of  
326 Americans it supports. This agenda will kick at least 13.7  
327 million people off of health care coverage, according to the  
328 non-partisan Congressional Budget Office.

329           Medicaid helps our friends and neighbors live healthy,  
330 productive lives. It is for new moms and kids who need extra  
331 attention to their health. It is for working families and  
332 people just trying to make it. And it is for people who are  
333 here, like my constituent and Denver City Councilman Chris  
334 Hines, who is here today.

335           Chris, raise your hand up.

336           Chris relies on Medicaid. Chris was in a crash in 2008,  
337 which left him paralyzed from the chest down and, in the  
338 nomenclature of the Federal Government, totally and  
339 permanently disabled. But Chris is wired to be a doer. He  
340 got coverage through Medicaid and, because of the care and  
341 security it provided him, he had the freedom to go out and  
342 get work.

343           Chris was elected to the Denver City Council in 2019 and  
344 reelected in 2023, and he serves many of my same constituents

345 with distinction. He said to me without Medicaid he simply  
346 would not be able to work, let alone serve his city and  
347 country in the way he does. It gives him the medical,  
348 professional, and financial freedom to take a risk and make  
349 the choices that are best for him.

350 Chris was never looking for a handout, and Medicaid  
351 isn't a handout. It is not a giveaway. Medicaid is the  
352 health care coverage that lets millions of people live their  
353 lives. And here is the thing. Eligibility for Chris is  
354 optional for states. So that is what is threatened as states  
355 tighten their belts in response to the Republicans' misguided  
356 legislation.

357 If you vote to put this legislation forward today, you  
358 are voting to take freedom and security away from people like  
359 Chris. You are going to get more people dependent on the  
360 state, not less. You are going to get more people sick, not  
361 healthier, and you are going to kill jobs and investment in  
362 every single one of our communities at a time when we are  
363 already staring down a recession, thanks to Donald Trump.  
364 And you will do it to give a tax cut to rich people who just  
365 want to be richer.

366 Now, you are going to hear a lot of misinformation from  
367 the other side of the aisle, for example, that people who are  
368 who are undocumented are on Medicaid. That is false.  
369 Federal money does not go in Medicaid to people. You are

370 going to find -- you are going to hear that so many people  
371 are just sitting around, and they need to work. The truth is  
372 only eight percent of Medicaid recipients are in that work  
373 requirement, and most of them in that eight percent can't  
374 find work or are retired.

375 So let's be real. This is disgraceful. Americans  
376 aren't going to go with it. And if you pass this, over 13  
377 million people are going to lose their health care.

378 I yield back.

379 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Any opening  
380 statements?

381 The gentleman from North Carolina, you are recognized  
382 for three minutes for an opening statement.

383 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to  
384 thank all the folks who have joined us here today, and the  
385 public.

386 And I want to send one very clear message: You are  
387 being lied to. The other side is telling you that -- a lot  
388 of things about this legislation. I am not sure they have  
389 read this legislation. Let me tell you what Republicans are  
390 concerned about. Let me tell you what I am concerned about.

391 I got a letter from Melissa from Burlington, North  
392 Carolina. She said, "I depend on Medicaid because I need  
393 medication for'' -- and I won't list her specific disease --  
394 "I cannot work as a substitute teacher due to osteoarthritis



395 in both feet, making standing and frequent walking very  
396 painful. Having Medicaid is a blessing.'` I am here today  
397 to fight for Melissa from Burlington.

398 Christine from Robbins, North Carolina wrote me and  
399 said, "The only person on Medicaid in my house is my special  
400 needs son. Without the Medicaid waiver, CAP/C, we would be  
401 homeless.'` I am fighting for Christine from Robbins.

402 Jennifer from Greensboro, North Carolina wrote me and  
403 said, "We have a disabled daughter'` -- and again, I will  
404 leave out her condition -- "but Medicaid has helped our  
405 family tremendously by giving us the opportunity to give her  
406 the care she deserves.'` We are fighting for that child.

407 Cara, from Moore County, North Carolina wrote me and  
408 said, "I know a lot of families that have children with rare  
409 diseases and conditions who rely on Medicaid. My family is  
410 just one of many. My son, who is now six years old, has a  
411 rare disease. Medicaid has changed my son's life and the  
412 life of my family. He has been able to receive crucial  
413 therapies which will keep him mobile and provide him with  
414 independence.'` I am fighting for that little six-year-old  
415 boy who lives in Moore County, North Carolina, in my  
416 district.

417 That is what this is all about. We just heard the other  
418 side say there are no illegals receiving Medicaid benefits.  
419 Well, according to the Congressional Budget Office, 1.4

420 million illegals are getting in line ahead of the six-year-  
421 old little boy in my district who deserves Medicaid.

422 And the system is going broke, and that means that the  
423 vulnerable among us are going to lose their coverage if we  
424 listen to the other side. We are here to fight for the  
425 vulnerable. We are here to make sure that Medicaid is strong  
426 and secure now and in the future so that Melissa from  
427 Burlington and her family can get what they deserve.

428 That is what this is about, folks. This is not about  
429 one side doesn't want people to get care. One side wants  
430 illegal immigrants -- 1.4 million, according to Congressional  
431 Budget Office -- they want them to get care --

432 \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

433 \*Mr. Hudson. -- in front of the six-year-old boy in my  
434 district, and that is why we are here.

435 And I am tired of being lectured to. It is probably  
436 going to be a long hearing where we are going to be lectured  
437 to, but don't believe the lies. Look at the facts. Read the  
438 bill. We are standing up and fighting for people.

439 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

440 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
441 further opening statements?

442 The gentlelady from Illinois is recognized for three  
443 minutes for an opening statement.

444 [Pause.]

445           \*Ms. Schakowsky. There we go.

446           [Slide]

447           \*Ms. Schakowsky. I want you to meet Santiago. He is a  
448   constituent of mine, and he relies on Social Security. I  
449   want to tell you he is 11 years old, and without the Social  
450   Security that he needs, he -- his life would not be worth  
451   living.

452           And I say to my Republican colleagues, is that your  
453   intention? Do you want Santiago not to have the life that he  
454   needs? I don't understand you. Without that funding,  
455   Santiago would be not here anymore. Do you want him to die?  
456   I don't think so. And so I am asking you, please, that we  
457   have to make sure that his Medicaid is available to him.

458           I want to just say that we are the richest country in  
459   the world at the richest moment in history. Can't we afford  
460   to take care of our families that are living on the edge,  
461   whose parents would be without money if they did not have the  
462   Social Security that they need?

463           I don't understand. I don't understand where you are  
464   coming from. This is life or death. Santiago's life and  
465   death are on your shoulder. And I just want to say that it  
466   is time now to understand, to make sure that the funding is  
467   available. We have to save Social Security. You can do  
468   that. You can make the decision now instead of giving more  
469   money to the wealthiest Americans. That is what will happen.

470 Otherwise, we will be helping the rich get richer and the  
471 poor -- their lives are at stake.

472 Thank you, I yield back.

473 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is -- seeking  
474 an opening statement? The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr.  
475 Joyce, is recognized for three minutes for an opening  
476 statement.

477 \*Mr. Joyce. Thank you, Chairman Guthrie, and thank you  
478 for holding this markup today.

479 In November the American people sent a clear-cut message  
480 that they were done with rampant waste, fraud, and abuse in  
481 our government programs that drain taxpayer dollars for  
482 wasteful programs. This legislation that we are marking up  
483 here today is the first step towards that agenda that we  
484 promise to deliver for the American people.

485 This legislation that we are marking up today does not  
486 address any changes to Social Security. For far too long,  
487 illegal immigrants and able-bodied Americans who can return  
488 to the workforce have been draining funds from the low-income  
489 who need that Medicaid, from pregnant women who rely on  
490 Medicaid, from children who rely on Medicaid, from the  
491 elderly who rely on Medicaid.

492 What we are marking up today is the opportunity to  
493 secure Medicaid for those that Medicaid is intended. The  
494 abuse ends now. We are not addressing Social Security. We

495 are addressing making sure that the Medicaid funds are --  
496 able-bodied individuals are removed from those Medicaid  
497 sources. This bill includes critical legislation that will  
498 stabilize that. It is an important message that should not  
499 be lost on anyone.

500 I support this and, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

501 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone  
502 seeking recognition?

503 The gentlelady from California is recognized for three  
504 minutes for an opening statement.

505 \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

506 This committee yields immense power when it comes to  
507 reconciliation. And in the past we have used that power to  
508 deliver real results. We expanded health care through the  
509 Affordable Care Act. We rescued the economy during COVID.  
510 We lowered drug costs. We made bold investments in clean  
511 energy and climate action through the Inflation Reduction  
512 Act, tangible positive impact. But that is not what we are  
513 doing today.

514 Today my Republican colleagues are trying to ram through  
515 a bill that would slash hundreds of billions of dollars from  
516 Medicaid. Let's be honest about what is happening. No  
517 matter what Republicans say, there is no if about it.  
518 Benefits will be cut.

519 And I have seen this playbook before. Fifteen years ago

520 in this room we debated and passed the Affordable Care Act.  
521 I will never forget the passionate advocates who filled this  
522 room then, and how Republicans looked them in the eyes and  
523 voted against a bill that would provide them lifesaving  
524 health care. Then I watched as Republicans tried again and  
525 again to repeal the Affordable Care Act, and I fought back  
526 every time. And I will fight back just as hard today,  
527 because Republicans that choose to callously ignore the facts  
528 -- but the impact in each of our communities and -- real and  
529 plain to say -- to see.

530 Cuts to Medicaid mean denying care to the most  
531 vulnerable amongst us: seniors in nursing homes, cancer  
532 patients, people with disabilities, and kids, kids here like  
533 Sam.

534 [Slide]

535 \*Ms. Matsui. Sam is 13 years old. He has Down  
536 syndrome, autism, and severe speech disorder. And thanks to  
537 Medicaid, Sam is living a safe, supported, and dignified  
538 life. Medicaid covers his in-home supportive services so Sam  
539 can live at home with his family, and not in an institution.  
540 It provides Sam with services to help him build toward  
541 greater independence. Sam's mom said it best: "Disability  
542 rights are human rights." Medicaid is what allows Sam to  
543 live a life of dignity with his rights intact. If this bill  
544 passes, those rights will be rolled back. The support that

545 helps millions of families like Sam's will be ripped away.

546       Today we will hear Republicans try to defend their bill.  
547 They will tell us their cruel policies exempt kids like Sam,  
548 and pretend that they are reinvesting in services to support  
549 him. But that is simply not true. This bill cuts around  
550 \$800 billion from a health care safety net. It rips massive  
551 holes in states' budgets that are near impossible to fill.  
552 It sets devious paperwork traps to force families like Sam's  
553 to jump through hoops to help -- to get coverage.

554       The math is clear: \$800 billion gouged out of our  
555 health care system means \$800 billion less care to go around.  
556 With this bill Republicans are choosing to rip away health  
557 care and abandon the American people, all to pay for  
558 temporary tax cuts for the wealthy and to keep fueling  
559 corporate greed that is making life harder for everyday  
560 Americans. I am here to fight for these Americans, and I  
561 will be here as long as it takes.

562       I yield back.

563       \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The chair  
564 recognizes anyone on the Republican side seeking recognition.

565       Seeing none, the gentlelady from -- Florida? The  
566 gentlelady from Florida, you are recognized for three minutes  
567 for an opening statement.

568       [Slide]

569       \*Ms. Castor. Thank you.

570           Tony McLaurin is a spirited seven-year-old from Wesley  
571 Chapel, Florida, a part of the world that my colleagues, Gus  
572 Bilirakis and Laurel Lee, know very well, north of Tampa. He  
573 is an athletic kid. He loves to play and watch football with  
574 his father, Ronnie. He loves math and playing video games.  
575 He is sweet and respectful.

576           But last December his mother noticed that Tony didn't  
577 have the same energy. And on the morning of his football  
578 championship banquet she took him to the emergency room  
579 where, after a number of blood tests, he was diagnosed with  
580 leukemia. Since then Tony has been in and out of St.  
581 Joseph's Children's Hospital for chemotherapy, where he will  
582 be ongoing -- undergoing treatment for the next two years.

583           Pauline, his mom, is a fifth-grade teacher, and she had  
584 to quit her job when Tony was diagnosed. Now it is a real  
585 struggle for them to pay their bills on dad Ronnie's  
586 electrician salary. When Pauline was forced to quit her job,  
587 Tony -- and to take care of Tony, the family lost their  
588 health insurance that was tied to her mother's teaching  
589 employer. But thankfully, St. Joseph's helped them enroll in  
590 Medicaid, which covers the whole family and helps provide all  
591 of the chemotherapy that they need. Pauline feels hopeless,  
592 scared, and uneasy about the prospect of losing Medicaid.  
593 She said, "It is not like I have a second option. Medicaid  
594 is the second option.'`



595           Medicaid insures one out of every three children  
596 diagnosed with cancer in the United States. And without  
597 consistent Medicaid coverage, some children with cancer  
598 likely will die. Even a gap in coverage or costly red tape  
599 requirements will cost lives. Studies have shown that  
600 children who experience interruptions in health coverage  
601 before -- during their cancer diagnosis are less likely to  
602 survive.

603           There is a new worry, though, for Pauline and Tony and  
604 the family. See, the priority of the President and  
605 Republicans in Congress is to give a massive tax giveaway to  
606 Elon Musk and billionaires that is going to be paid for by  
607 Medicaid cuts. It is outrageous. And at a time of such  
608 uncertainty, driven by what the President has done and Elon  
609 Musk's heartless actions, when the cost of living is so high,  
610 when cancer research is under attack, the last thing a parent  
611 with a child diagnosed with cancer needs is to worry about  
612 affordable health care.

613           Musk already torpedoed a bipartisan piece of legislation  
614 at the end of the year that would have helped children  
615 diagnosed with cancer by speeding development of new drugs  
616 and treatments. Does he and all of his billionaire buddies  
617 really need more in their bank accounts while kids and the  
618 vulnerable --

619           \*The Chair. Thank you --

620           \*Ms. Castor. -- and families across this country have  
621 to deal with them ripping coverage away?

622           Don't be the committee --

623           \*The Chair. Thank you --

624           \*Ms. Castor. -- that makes it more difficult for our  
625 neighbors to get medical care for children with cancer. Be  
626 the committee that supports --

627           \*The Chair. My friend's time has expired.

628           \*Ms. Castor. -- children like Tony. Affordable,  
629 consistent coverage --

630           \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time has expired.

631           \*Ms. Castor. -- so Tony can return to the sports he  
632 loves, and --

633           \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time has expired.

634           \*Ms. Castor. -- live a fulfilled life.

635           \*The Chair. And I want to remind my colleagues on the  
636 committee that -- House rules, committee rules, to refer to  
637 people by name. So my friend from Florida, my colleague from  
638 Florida, a congressperson, friend from Florida, but calling  
639 each other by individual names is not in accordance with the  
640 House rules. So I appreciate that.

641           And the gentleman from New Jersey wants a couple of  
642 seconds to introduce a friend.

643           \*Mr. Pallone. Well, I will say my friend from New  
644 Jersey or colleague from New Jersey. Senator Booker is here.

645           Thank you for being here, and I know how sincerely you  
646 are concerned about what is happening to Medicaid. Thank  
647 you.

648           \*Ms. DeGette. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Chairman.

649           \*The Chair. The gentlelady will state her  
650 parliamentary --

651           \*Ms. DeGette. I believe under the rules you can mention  
652 someone's name, you just can't address them personally. So  
653 you could say, for example, so and so -- Mr. Bilirakis of  
654 Florida, this person is in his district, but you can't  
655 address him individually. There is nothing in the rules that  
656 says you can't address people by name, that you can't say  
657 their names.

658           \*The Chair. The gentleman from -- our rules person --

659           \*Mr. Griffith. Yes, we had this discussion on the floor  
660 just a few weeks ago, and if you are in the middle of a  
661 debate you cannot address the individual by name.

662           \*Ms. DeGette. That is correct, you cannot -- but you  
663 cannot address your remarks to them by name, but you can say  
664 someone's name, which is all that Ms. Castor did.

665           \*Mr. Griffith. In that case, the gentleman from Texas,  
666 Mr. Roy, was being mentioned by name based on policies that  
667 he advocated. And --

668           \*Ms. DeGette. I don't -- I was not there, so I can't  
669 say.

670           \*Mr. Griffith. I understand. I was, and it was -- I  
671 objected, and --

672           \*Ms. DeGette. We will get a ruling from the  
673 parliamentarian.

674           \*Mr. Griffith. -- it was withdrawn.

675           \*Ms. DeGette. But you can't --

676           \*Mr. Griffith. Yes.

677           \*Ms. DeGette. The gentleman is correct. You cannot  
678 address somebody my name, you have to address your remarks to  
679 the chair. But you can mention another Member of Congress's  
680 name. There is nothing in the rules that say you have to  
681 say, "My friend from Florida'", or, "My friend from  
682 Colorado.'" There is nothing in the rules that says --

683           \*The Chair. Okay, we will take that advice to the  
684 parliamentarian, and we will give you a ruling when we get  
685 that from the parliamentarian.

686           Are there any Republican members seeking recognition?

687           I guess, as we have another Hawaiian member, we will  
688 recognize Mr. Schatz here. Senator Schatz is here, as well.  
689 So thank you.

690           \*Mr. Pallone. Oh, and Tina is here.

691           \*The Chair. Oh, okay, and Senator Smith is here, as  
692 well. Thank you.

693           So is Senator -- excuse me, the senators in the room --  
694 my congressman -- sorry -- my friend from New York, I just --

695 are you -- do you seek recognition?

696 \*Mr. Tonko. Yes, sir.

697 \*The Chair. You are recognized for three minutes --

698 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you.

699 \*The Chair. -- for an opening statement.

700 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

701 [Slide]

702 \*Mr. Tonko. I am here today fighting for people like  
703 Noelle and Nathan, proudly fighting for them. They are  
704 constituents of mine who are raising their family in Albany,  
705 New York. Their 12-year-old daughter, Isla, has a rare  
706 genetic disorder, and has received health care through  
707 Medicaid for almost eight years because of her disabilities.

708 Through Medicaid, Isla is in a program where she has  
709 self-directed care, which means she has a budget for a  
710 caregiver, classes, respite care, and more to best support  
711 Isla and her family. Noelle and Nathan shared with me that  
712 one of their first reactions when they heard about  
713 Republicans' plans was fear of how it could impact Isla's  
714 care. In Noelle's words, "Medicaid changed our life. I  
715 can't imagine what our life would be like without Medicaid.  
716 It is not only the direct impact it has on Isla's quality of  
717 life, but our entire family's quality of life. I know our  
718 story is just one of millions of families who would be  
719 devastated by the loss of Medicaid.'`

720           Nathan added, "On the human level, it has been life-  
721   changing for us. On an economic level, it allows us to work.  
722   To lose it would be awful, not only for our family, but also  
723   for the people we serve through our work.'`

724           They explained to me that, when you have a child with  
725   complex medical needs and disabilities, you are constantly  
726   navigating systems to advocate for your child in education  
727   settings, in healthcare settings, and in dealing with  
728   insurance. Noelle described how, as a parent of a child with  
729   disabilities, you are often pushing through all the red tape  
730   for your child's need to be respected. Let's not add more  
731   red tape for this family.

732           Noelle has described how Medicaid provides Nathan and  
733   her with a breath of relief of thinking about these supports  
734   for Isla as she gets older and enters adulthood. Noelle  
735   shared a friend's sentiment that Isla doesn't need to change  
736   for the world, the world needs to change for Isla. I could  
737   not agree more.

738           Noelle asks members of this committee to rethink these  
739   devastating cuts, and instead provide respect and provide  
740   dignity for families and individuals living with  
741   disabilities. On behalf of Isla and her family and families  
742   like hers across my district, across New York State, and  
743   across our great nation I demand that we reverse course on  
744   all cuts to Medicaid and additional red tape that would hurt

745 so many people.

746 With that, let's say no to lining the pockets of  
747 billionaires and yes to providing access to affordable health  
748 care via Medicaid for so many.

749 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

750 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. And I want to  
751 say I appreciate the -- my colleague's concerns, and we share  
752 them, every example that has been mentioned or the people we  
753 are trying to strengthen Medicaid for. Not one of them will  
754 lose coverage under our bill unless they are able-bodied  
755 workers or they are in the country without a legal presence.

756 So is -- there is no one on the Republican side. The  
757 gentlelady from New York, my colleague from New York is  
758 recognized for three minutes for an opening statement.

759 [Slide]

760 \*Ms. Clarke. Mr. Chairman, I would like to begin by  
761 sharing my story of my constituent, David.

762 This is David, one of the many faces of Medicaid. David  
763 is a 55-year-old Brooklyn resident who has been living with  
764 congestive heart failure since 2016. Once a full-time  
765 worker, his diagnosis sadly forced him to stop working and  
766 rely solely on Medicaid for his health care. His condition  
767 was so severe that during his first visit to the hospital he  
768 remained admitted for nearly a full year.

769 Medicaid covers all aspects of his medical needs,

770 including the daily medications he has to take, regular  
771 cardiac monitoring, and hospital-based care. That extended  
772 hospitalization was entirely covered by Medicaid, and it  
773 saved his life.

774         He was able to receive this lifesaving care at SUNY  
775 Downstate, and some of my constituents are here from SUNY  
776 Downstate in our audience today, a vital hospital in my  
777 district that also heavily relies on Medicaid dollars to  
778 provide high-quality care to their patients, just like most  
779 health care institutions across this nation, from rural to  
780 urban areas. The medical team there provided him with  
781 consistent and high-quality care in a community-based  
782 setting.

783         Without Medicaid, David would lose access to his  
784 medications, to his physicians who have managed his condition  
785 for nearly a year. David clearly said, "If Medicaid is cut,  
786 I will have no way to afford my care. No medication, no  
787 follow-up, no hospital. Without Medicaid, I die  
788 prematurely.'" David's story is a powerful example of how  
789 essential Medicaid is. It is not just policy, but it is a  
790 lifeline for Americans in my district and across the nation.

791         So let's be crystal clear about what is happening here.  
792 We are being asked to sit in this room today and pretend that  
793 gutting Medicaid is somehow a necessary evil and a tough  
794 decision made in the name of fiscal responsibility, but it is



795 not. It is a political choice that my colleagues on the  
796 other side of the aisle are choosing to make. It is a choice  
797 that disproportionately targets low-income communities,  
798 communities of color, immigrants, and working-class families.  
799 It is a choice that will impact hospital systems, especially  
800 in New York, that are still trying to recover from the  
801 devastating impacts of COVID-19. It is a choice that will  
802 strip away lifesaving health care for 17.3 million Americans,  
803 nearly 7 million, or 1 in 3 New Yorkers who rely on this  
804 program.

805 Make no mistake, this Medicaid cut would hit Republicans  
806 and Republican red states the hardest.

807 For months House Republicans have lied about their plans  
808 to cut nearly \$1 trillion from Medicaid. And now the non-  
809 partisan budget -- Congressional Budget Office has confirmed  
810 that their plan will kick millions of people off their health  
811 care. The only winner in the Republican budget scheme are  
812 billionaire donors. And once again, cruelty is the point.

813 With that I yield back.

814 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is anyone  
815 seeking recognition for an opening statement on the  
816 Republican -- seeing none, the gentleman from California is  
817 recognized for three minutes for an opening statement.

818 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to thank  
819 all the people in the audience here today, as well.

820           As we move through this markup today I implore my  
821   colleagues to not lose sight of why we are all here: to  
822   represent our districts, to pass legislation to better our  
823   nation, to protect and improve the lives of our constituents.  
824   And make no mistake, the policies in this big, ugly bill do  
825   the exact opposite.

826           If this bill became law, it would devastate the health  
827   care infrastructure my and all of your constituents rely on.  
828   It would strip health care coverage from millions of our most  
829   vulnerable citizens. And over 42 percent of my constituents  
830   rely on Medicaid -- or Medi-Cal in California -- for their  
831   health insurance, including over 60 percent of children.  
832   According to the Congressional Budget Office, the policies in  
833   this bill would lead to at least 13.7 million people losing  
834   their coverage.

835           But this fight isn't about numbers. This is about real  
836   people. So let's hear from one of those whose lives are on  
837   the line.

838           [Slide]

839           \*Mr. Ruiz. I would like to share the story of a young  
840   constituent of mine, Victoria. Here is Victoria's story in  
841   her own words: "As a resident of the Imperial Valley, a low-  
842   income, rural and underserved region, Medi-Cal or Medicaid is  
843   one of the only ways I have been able to access medical  
844   services. Medi-Cal is the only thing protecting me from the

845 challenges and consequences that come from needing crucial  
846 medical services. As a graduate student, I cannot afford to  
847 leave the country or incur a financial burden just to take  
848 care of my health. Sadly, I feel lucky to be a young woman  
849 because I cannot imagine how much worse potential cuts to  
850 health care funding could adversely impact our most  
851 vulnerable. Health care is non-negotiable, and I refuse to  
852 risk my or my loved ones' lives over budget savings. I am  
853 also not alone in this, as my friends and family and about 90  
854 percent of Planned Parenthood's patients in California rely  
855 on Medi-Cal, our state's version of Medicaid, to afford  
856 reproductive health care. I, along with more than 72 million  
857 Americans, rely on Medicaid for health care, including  
858 essential reproductive health services like birth control,  
859 wellness exams, STI tests and treatment, breast and cervical  
860 cancer screenings, and more. These services and our health  
861 deserve to be a financial priority, so I urge you to defend  
862 Medicaid and our well-being.'`

863       Victoria is not alone, and I urge my colleagues to keep  
864 her story and the stories of so many other Americans,  
865 including your own constituents, in mind as you consider the  
866 legislation before you today. It is a simple choice: strip  
867 health care coverage from our nation's vulnerable in order to  
868 give tax cuts to the wealthy billionaires like Elon Musk, or  
869 protect the constituents you swore an oath to represent, and

870 do not cut Medicaid and take health care away.

871 Thank you, and I yield back the --

872 \*The Chair. The gentleman's --

873 \*Mr. Ruiz. -- remainder of my time.

874 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
875 from -- the other gentleman from California is recognized for  
876 three minutes for an opening statement.

877 [Slide]

878 \*Mr. Peters. Thanks. Thank you. Jesus is one of my  
879 constituents from San Diego. His mother was tragically hit  
880 by a car, leaving her disabled. He manages her medications,  
881 he feeds her, he bathes her, he takes her to doctor's  
882 appointments, and he helps her with physical therapy. But if  
883 these Medicaid effects get cut, this work, this very hard  
884 work will not meet the so-called work requirements  
885 Republicans want to impose. Jesus and his family would have  
886 -- likely have to move out of their home, live separated.  
887 They would likely lose their health care.

888 Mr. Chairman, this committee has no jurisdiction over  
889 taxes, but let's be honest with the American people. Taxes  
890 are the real reason we are here. Over in the Ways and Means  
891 Committee they are marking up what will be one of the most  
892 expensive tax bills in American history.

893 When Republicans originally passed the 2017 Tax Cuts and  
894 Jobs Act, they designed many of the individual and some

895 business tax provisions to expire this year, because back  
896 then Republicans knew making the tax cuts permanent would  
897 cost the United States trillions of dollars in revenue we  
898 desperately need to pay our expenses. Making those tax cuts  
899 permanent now is no less costly.

900 Yes, that is what we are being asked -- we are asked to  
901 do today. The Budget Committee instructed the Ways and Means  
902 Committee to cut taxes by \$4.5 trillion, and asked our  
903 committee to come up with \$880 billion in cuts to make up the  
904 shortfall. That is it. That is what this is about.

905 Now, to do that the bill before us will decimate  
906 Medicaid which provides health insurance annually to nearly  
907 72 million people nationwide in every congressional district  
908 across the country. Cutting health coverage for our most  
909 vulnerable neighbors will not make America healthier, it will  
910 make us sicker.

911 You know, at home I hear from people concerned about the  
912 national debt and deficits. And they say to me, "Hey, Scott,  
913 we have to make cuts to address the deficit." But that is  
914 not what is happening here, because Republicans will continue  
915 to run \$2 trillion annual deficits and we will see the  
916 national grow -- debt grow from 36 to 38 to 40 to \$42  
917 trillion. And they will vote for a \$5 trillion increase in  
918 the debt limit to make this borrowing possible, even though  
919 many of them swore a blood oath that they would never vote to

920 increase the debt. They will enact a budget that will  
921 increase the -- according to the Committee for a Responsible  
922 Federal Budget, will increase the Federal debt by \$37  
923 trillion over the next 30 years.

924       So don't buy the Fiscal Responsibility Act. Republicans  
925 are proposing these painful cuts to programs that help  
926 everyday Americans not to lower our debt, but just so  
927 President Trump can follow through on his campaign promise to  
928 donors. Remember what he said to his donors? He -- quote --  
929 said, "You are rich as hell, and I am going to cut your  
930 taxes.'"

931       When the government borrows more, inflation goes up,  
932 working people suffer at the grocery store, they pay for more  
933 for utilities. Now we are adding taking away their health  
934 care. This is the wrong thing to do, and I urge my  
935 colleagues vote no.

936       I yield back.

937       \*The Chair. I thank -- the gentleman yields back and  
938 the chair now recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan for  
939 three minutes for an opening statement.

940       \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I actually  
941 have to say that my young man from Michigan and his parents  
942 decided that they wanted to drive in today because they cared  
943 so much. So please meet George, who I met this morning, who  
944 was full of energy, and my office somehow survived.

945 [Laughter.]

946 \*The Chair. Welcome, George.

947 \*Mrs. Dingell. Welcome, George.

948 [Applause.]

949 \*Mrs. Dingell. Here is a letter I got from his mom.

950 "Our son George is six and has Down syndrome. We adopted him  
951 at three weeks old. Losing Medicaid would cripple our  
952 family, absolutely destroy us. We have been very lucky until  
953 now because of Medicaid. It has been very instrumental for  
954 our family's ability to survive. My husband and I both  
955 primarily do gig work. Both employed full-time, but we don't  
956 have workplace insurance. It is not super reliable for the  
957 kinds of jobs we do, so we have marketplace insurance. It is  
958 a huge fear that we would lose Medicaid because it is  
959 necessary for our family's lives. The disability world, our  
960 community, is really worried about cuts to Medicaid. The  
961 general narrative right now is one of terror. It is a death  
962 sentence to cut Medicaid. It is intrinsically and undeniably  
963 tied to disability rights injustice in our country. If we  
964 are not serving our most vulnerable children, what are we  
965 even doing as a country? You are leaving families with no  
966 options and putting us in an impossible position. It is so  
967 obvious that they don't care about disabled people or poor  
968 people.' '

969 So they cared strongly enough to come. I met them as

970 the governor and I traveled to Michigan talking to people.  
971 There was a poll this week that shows 83 percent of the  
972 people in Michigan support Medicaid; 2.6 million people get  
973 their health insurance through Medicaid in Michigan,  
974 representing approximately 1 in 4 Michiganders. Medicaid  
975 provides coverage for 38 percent of births in Michigan, 2 in  
976 5 children, 3 in 5 nursing home residents, and 3 in 8  
977 working-age adults with disabilities.

978 And I want to say to my colleagues, Michigan's Medicaid  
979 program is efficient with per-enrollee costs among the 10  
980 lowest in the country. And to all my colleagues who say you  
981 are cutting waste and fraud, Medicaid is 22 percent more cost  
982 effective than any private insurance plan.

983 We have to protect George and other children and seniors  
984 in nursing homes and people with disabilities. And please  
985 don't say you are not going to hurt them, because many things  
986 in this bill are a back-door way of doing so.

987 I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

988 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
989 from Texas is recognized for three minutes for an opening  
990 statement.

991 \*Mr. Veasey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

992 For months, literally months --

993 \*Mr. Crenshaw. A point of order.

994 \*The Chair. I am sorry.



995           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I am next.

996           \*The Chair. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

997           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

998           Look, I just want to respond. Look, I have a young  
999 daughter, and I would be fearful --

1000          \*The Chair. The gentleman -- would you start -- I am  
1001 sorry, you are -- Mr. Veasey was from Texas, too, so I just  
1002 want to clarify I was recognizing Mr. Crenshaw. So I have to  
1003 say his name. It is all right. Mr. Crenshaw is recognized  
1004 for five minutes. Sorry.

1005           [Laughter.]

1006          \*Mr. Crenshaw. Some might say there is too many Texans,  
1007 but I don't think there is enough. I mean, it is a -- at  
1008 least we could agree on that, Mr. Veasey.

1009          Look, I -- just to respond here, I mean, look, I have a  
1010 young daughter. And if she was on Medicaid and we were at  
1011 risk of taking that away from her, I would share that fear.  
1012 The problem with this narrative is that there is no reason to  
1013 have that fear. I think the crime here is scaring someone  
1014 like George.

1015          \*Voice. I have reason to have that fear.

1016          \*Mr. Crenshaw. No, you don't, because --

1017          \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

1018          \*Mr. Crenshaw. Because -- well, I am sorry --

1019          \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

1020           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I am sorry that -- here is my apology to  
1021   you.

1022           \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

1023           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I am sorry that C-SPAN lied to you.

1024           \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

1025           \*The Chair. The gentleman will suspend. The gentleman  
1026   will suspend.

1027           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I am sorry that so many people in the  
1028   media and on the left have lied to you about what is in this  
1029   bill.

1030           George, I want to tell you, you have nothing to worry  
1031   about. Your Medicaid is not going anywhere. I am sorry if  
1032   they flew all the way here from Michigan. I am sorry for  
1033   that. That is not fair for people to be lied to and to be  
1034   scared on purpose for political reasons.

1035           Read the bill. I know it hasn't been out that long, and  
1036   I know it is complicated stuff, but over the next 24 to 28  
1037   hours we are going to go through it all. And I just want to  
1038   say to George and his family, you are going to go home  
1039   feeling a lot better.

1040           Thank you. I yield back.

1041           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The chair  
1042   recognizes the other gentleman from Texas, Mr. Veasey.

1043           \*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, thank you very much.

1044           You are going to hear a lot about lies. Let me tell you

1045 who the biggest liar of them all is. That is Donald Trump.

1046 \*Voice. Yes.

1047 \*Mr. Veasey. Donald Trump promised he wouldn't touch  
1048 Medicaid. That was a lie. My Republican colleagues, my MAGA  
1049 colleagues, swore up and down that they wouldn't touch  
1050 Medicaid. It was a lie.

1051 \*Mr. Griffith. Objection.

1052 \*Mr. Veasey. Now, hold on a second, Mr. Chairman.  
1053 Everybody over here has been hollering about lying, and now  
1054 all of a sudden they are objecting.

1055 \*The Chair. All right, the gentleman will suspend.

1056 \*Mr. Veasey. Come on, now. Come on, now.

1057 \*Mr. Griffith. The objection is a reference to the  
1058 President of the United States --

1059 \*Mr. Veasey. Come on, now. Come on, now.

1060 \*Mr. Griffith. -- in relationship to lying, which is in  
1061 violation of the rules.

1062 \*Mr. Veasey. Come on, now. They have been hollering  
1063 about lying the whole time, and now I am -- I get into my  
1064 spiel, and then they want to make an objection about it?  
1065 Come on.

1066 \*Mr. Griffith. Chairman, lying generally is acceptable;  
1067 lying specifically is not.

1068 \*Mr. Veasey. Come on, now. Come on, now. Come on,  
1069 now.

1070           \*The Chair. All right. The gentleman will suspend. So  
1071 the -- all right.

1072           \*Ms. Clarke. And they have been calling us liars this  
1073 whole time.

1074           \*Mr. Veasey. Can I resume, Mr. Chairman?

1075           \*The Chair. Just one second. All we are saying is  
1076 Members of Congress, members of the Senate, and the President  
1077 are -- in our speech and our debate is protected from  
1078 insults, so we should not use the word "lying" and so forth  
1079 moving forward.

1080           I get it. I have heard it said before.

1081           \*Ms. Barragan. You guys have been saying it the whole  
1082 hearing. You guys have been saying the word "lying" the  
1083 whole hearing. Excuse me, this is ridiculous.

1084           \*The Chair. Your point is -- let's not use the term --  
1085 word "lying" as we talk about each other --

1086           \*Mr. Peters. Mr. Chairman?

1087           \*The Chair. I'm just saying in general I --

1088           \*Mr. Peters. Mr. Chairman?

1089           \*The Chair. My friend from California --

1090           \*Mr. Peters. A point of order.

1091           \*The Chair. Just --

1092           \*Mr. Peters. A point of order.

1093           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for a point of  
1094 order.

1095           \*Mr. Peters. I have a question for you, Mr. Chairman.

1096           \*The Chair. Yes.

1097           \*Mr. Peters. In your opening remarks you talked about  
1098 Joe Biden.

1099           \*Ms. Barragan. That is right.

1100           \*Mr. Peters. So can you explain to me the difference  
1101 there?

1102           \*Ms. Barragan. Yes.

1103           \*The Chair. Okay. I said -- I talked about the Biden-  
1104 Harris policies. I didn't say Biden-Harris lied to the  
1105 American people. I didn't say that. I didn't say anything  
1106 like that. So --

1107           \*Mr. Peters. Your members have called us liars in the  
1108 last 15 minutes.

1109           \*The Chair. I have asked everybody to suspend on the  
1110 word "lying.'" We will go forward.

1111           And so Mr. Veasey, you are recognized to continue,  
1112 unless --

1113           \*Ms. Barragan. Not --

1114           \*The Chair. My friend, you are recognized to continue,  
1115 but let's try not to use the -- you are right, I will admit  
1116 the word "lying'" has been used. It has been brought now as  
1117 a as -- a point of order has been made on that. So let's all  
1118 suspend using the word "lying'" for each other.

1119           So Mr. Veasey, you are recognized.

1120           \*Mr. Veasey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1121           So Donald Trump, my Republican MAGA colleagues, stop  
1122 capping.

1123           [Laughter.]

1124           \*Mr. Veasey. Stop capping to the American public. This  
1125 is a betrayal. Republicans are butchering Medicaid and the  
1126 Affordable Care Act, and they are carving it up so  
1127 billionaires -- so literally, billionaires -- like Musk and  
1128 Bezos and the others can have a tax break. So the good old  
1129 boys can have a tax break. And the people that are out there  
1130 struggling cannot have Medicaid. It is terrible. It is  
1131 arson, and Republicans are the arsonists.

1132           And who are the targets? The targets are children. The  
1133 targets are mothers. The targets are seniors. The targets  
1134 are people with disabilities. The targets are hard-working  
1135 Americans.

1136           And again, \$884 billion. Think about that. Those are -  
1137 - the three people that I just talked about, those  
1138 billionaires? It is so they can have a tax cut. And it is  
1139 so people like Carla, who is a cancer survivor that lives in  
1140 near the district that I represent -- and Carla wants to tell  
1141 you her story. She is someone whose life was saved by  
1142 Medicaid. But I would rather have Carla share her story.

1143           Carla, can you share your story?

1144           \*Voice. Yes. Thank you, Congressman. My name is Carla

1145 Prothro, and I am a seven-year lung cancer survivor and the  
1146 daughter of a World War II veteran who I know would be so  
1147 proud of --

1148 \*The Chair. The gentleman will suspend.

1149 You can't play a recording on a --

1150 \*Mr. Veasey. It is not a recording. It is a live call,  
1151 Mr. Chairman.

1152 \*The Chair. You know we don't allow other people to  
1153 testify --

1154 \*Voice. -- quality of life. I was diagnosed with  
1155 stage --

1156 \*The Chair. The gentleman will --

1157 \*Voice. -- [inaudible].

1158 \*Mr. Veasey. Hold on. Hold on, Carla.

1159 \*Voice. That is not --

1160 \*Voice. Mr. Chairman?

1161 \*The Chair. I know, yes. The gentleman will suspend.

1162 \*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman.

1163 \*The Chair. The gentleman can proceed.

1164 \*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, these are -- can Carla be  
1165 heard, or not?

1166 \*The Chair. Well, the rules do not allow someone to  
1167 speak in your opening time. I am sorry. She cannot be. She  
1168 is not -- that is not in with the rules.

1169 \*Mr. Veasey. Well, I -- Carla, I apologize that they

1170 won't hear from you. I don't know why they didn't want to  
1171 hear from you because --

1172 \*Voice. It is against the rules.

1173 \*The Chair. It is against the rules.

1174 \*Mr. Veasey. -- you are the people. You are the people  
1175 that helped them get elected. And they want to cut you off.  
1176 And I don't understand why they want to cut you off. I don't  
1177 understand why they are afraid to hear from you, and I am not  
1178 sure why now, all of a sudden, they want to ignore voices  
1179 like Carla.

1180 They also probably want to ignore voices like Virginia,  
1181 who lives in Mrs. Cammack's district. She has multiple  
1182 dystrophy. She relies on Medicaid for her home health care.  
1183 She told us that during the lapse in her coverage she  
1184 considered calling 911 just so she could get in and out of  
1185 bed.

1186 These are the type of people that we are betraying, Mr.  
1187 Chairman. I have a lot more stories to tell. There is a lot  
1188 more where that came from, but I am out of time. This is sad  
1189 that we are doing this to the most vulnerable people in our  
1190 country.

1191 I yield back.

1192 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there anyone  
1193 on the Republican side seeking recognition?

1194 Seeing none, the gentlelady from Illinois is recognized



1195 for three minutes for opening statement.

1196       \*Ms. Kelly. It is a shame that the conversation about  
1197 threats to Medicaid continues. These are dark times in our  
1198 country. So let's be clear about what today's markup is and  
1199 isn't about.

1200       This isn't about reducing fraud, waste, or abuse. None  
1201 of us want fraud, waste, or abuse. Yet my Republican -- this  
1202 is about ripping health care away from working families,  
1203 children, seniors, people with disabilities, veterans, and  
1204 pregnant women. Yet my Republican colleagues dismissed --  
1205 and I would say even laughed, because I have seen it today --  
1206 over our concerns over \$800 billion in Medicaid cuts as a  
1207 misunderstanding, just targeting waste, fraud, and abuse.  
1208 But you don't just gut the largest insurer of low-income  
1209 Americans without real harm. Call it what it is:  
1210 abandonment, disinvestment, and pure disregard for human  
1211 life.

1212       [Slide]

1213       \*Ms. Kelly. Let me share with you one of my faces of  
1214 Medicaid: La Rabida, a hospital in my district, takes care  
1215 of kids with complex chronic medical conditions. Ninety  
1216 percent of their patients are covered by Medicaid. One of  
1217 those kids is Cairo. When Cairo was two years old, his  
1218 mother found him nearly unresponsive at daycare. After  
1219 rushing him to the hospital they found bleeding in his brain.

1220 He needed a breathing tube, a tube for feeding, and a shunt  
1221 to drain fluid from his brain. He was extremely sick. They  
1222 discovered he had a genetic condition that leads to abnormal  
1223 blood vessel connections. After spending a month-and-a-half  
1224 in the pediatric intensive care unit, his medical expenses  
1225 reached \$2.5 million.

1226 As a mother and grandmother myself, let me tell you a  
1227 parent will pay any cost to save their child. But as the  
1228 richest country in the world, no loving parent should  
1229 experience crippling medical debt to treat their child. Both  
1230 of his parents worked full-time to support their family of  
1231 five. But because Cairo was under six years old when his  
1232 genetic condition was discovered, he and his siblings could  
1233 stay on Medicaid. With Medicaid he receives 24-hour care,  
1234 including in-home nursing which allows his parents to  
1235 continue working full-time.

1236 His mom said that if he would not -- if it were not for  
1237 Medicaid, he would not be here today. When he arrived at La  
1238 Rabida he was on a ventilator support, had little mobility,  
1239 and could not speak. Now he is completely off the ventilator  
1240 and can walk. Medicaid is a lifeline for him, for his  
1241 families, and for millions of Americans across this country.

1242 In my district alone, over 300,000 of my constituents  
1243 would be at risk of losing their health care, more than any  
1244 other district in Illinois. In Illinois 3.4 million people

1245 are covered by Medicaid. When Illinois implemented Medicaid  
1246 expansion, the uninsured rate dropped by 44 percent between  
1247 2013 and 2015. These demonstrate the significance of  
1248 Medicaid for Illinoisans. These are not just numbers. These  
1249 are real people that will suffer. Thank you.

1250 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. And is there  
1251 any on the Republican side?

1252 Seeing none, the gentlelady from California is  
1253 recognized for five -- excuse me, three minutes for an  
1254 opening statement.

1255 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1256 Under the cover of night, House Republicans proposed the  
1257 largest Medicaid cuts in history, all to pay for tax breaks  
1258 for billionaires. They hope the American people won't notice  
1259 until it is too late. And today in this hearing we should be  
1260 starting with talking about Medicaid and the health care.

1261 For months Republicans told the American people that  
1262 their budget would not cut Medicaid. That is not true. And  
1263 today they continue to say it. Don't believe it. For months  
1264 Republicans hid the truth from their constituents and refused  
1265 to do town halls. If you will not stand up -- if Republicans  
1266 will not stand up, Democrats will.

1267 [Slide]

1268 \*Ms. Barragan. Today we are joined by Sasha. Sasha,  
1269 please stand.

1270           Sasha is a constituent who came from New Jersey's 7th  
1271 district, represented by Congressman Tom Kean. She was born  
1272 with cerebral palsy, and the right side of her body doesn't  
1273 function due to a stroke she had in her mother's womb. Since  
1274 she was seven years old, Sasha has suffered from seizures.  
1275 Her mother, Lana, who is also here, quit her job to care for  
1276 Sasha.

1277           Without Medicaid, Sasha would not have the resources to  
1278 access treatment, medications, or doctor visits to help her  
1279 healthy -- be healthy and independent. Thanks to Medicaid,  
1280 Sasha has thrived as a college student and a Special Olympics  
1281 athlete. Sasha shares, and I quote, "Medicaid is not just a  
1282 health care program. It is a foundation that allows me to be  
1283 an active member of society. It helps me develop  
1284 independence. And one day I hope to contribute back to my  
1285 community and support my mother. Without Medicaid, I fear  
1286 that people like me, people who rely on these services for  
1287 their health, independence, and dignity, will be left  
1288 behind.' '

1289           Yet this monstrous Republican budget leaves millions of  
1290 people behind. This bill cuts Medicaid, plain and simple.  
1291 And it also attacks Medicare, the Children's Health Insurance  
1292 Program, and the health insurance marketplace. It kicks at  
1293 least 13.7 million Americans off of Medicaid and the health  
1294 insurance marketplace.

1295           Under this bill, Sasha could lose everything. Sasha and  
1296 Lana could be buried in red tape, forced to navigate  
1297 burdensome paperwork and eligibility checks. The services  
1298 Sasha relies on -- transportation, personal care, community-  
1299 based support -- could be first on the chopping block when  
1300 states are forced to absorb Medicaid cuts.

1301           Who here is standing up for Sasha and millions of people  
1302 like her? Sasha has asked Congress, "Please think about  
1303 individuals like me when making decisions about the future of  
1304 Medicaid. We cannot afford to lose the essential support  
1305 that Medicaid provides. I respectfully ask you to stand  
1306 against any cuts to this program, and instead protect it so  
1307 that people like me can continue to live and thrive in our  
1308 community.'`

1309           Democrats stand with you, Sasha, in opposing any  
1310 Medicaid cuts. We need just four Republicans to join us. I  
1311 hope we can find them, and I hope one is your Congress  
1312 member.

1313           I yield back.

1314           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back.

1315           Welcome, Sasha.

1316           [Applause.]

1317           \*The Chair. Is any Republican seeking recognition?

1318           Seeing none, oh, the gentlelady from -- I was looking to  
1319 my right -- the gentlelady from North Dakota is recognized

1320 for three minutes for an opening statement.

1321 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1322 I am one of the newest members on this committee, and I  
1323 came here to Washington to help solve problems and try to  
1324 make government work for the people of our country,  
1325 especially citizens who need it the most, people like the  
1326 disabled, elderly, pregnant moms.

1327 I have been shocked to learn some very disappointing  
1328 things about Medicaid since I came here. These are the dirty  
1329 little secrets that many won't talk about, but I want to  
1330 share some of those.

1331 Did you know that able-bodied participants in Medicaid  
1332 expansion receive nine times as much Federal money as  
1333 disabled participants in the traditional population? Nine  
1334 times. The CBO estimates that 4.8 million able-bodied  
1335 Americans will lose their Medicaid coverage simply because  
1336 they don't want to volunteer, work, or go to school for 20  
1337 hours a week, 4.8 million.

1338 [Disturbance in hearing room.]

1339 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. Federal Medicaid spending will grow 25  
1340 percent under this program over the course of the next 10  
1341 years, 25 percent it will grow.

1342 \*The Chair. The gentlelady will suspend.

1343 [Pause.]

1344 \*The Chair. I just want to say to the audience, it is

1345 important that you are all here and participate. We want you  
1346 here. You are part of the process. We want you to be here.  
1347 But we have to proceed, and the rules of the House and the  
1348 law that -- if you are disruptive, you will be removed and  
1349 you are subject to arrest. I am not -- I don't make that  
1350 decision, the Capitol Police does. But -- so let's all  
1351 participate and work together.

1352 And I will -- the gentlelady from North Dakota is  
1353 recognized, will continue.

1354 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1355 Federal Medicaid spending will grow 25 percent over the  
1356 next 10 years under the program we are considering today. It  
1357 will grow 25 percent.

1358 One point four million illegal immigrants are receiving  
1359 Medicaid coverage today, which takes away funding from the  
1360 disabled, senior citizens, and pregnant women. The Federal  
1361 Government pays for 1.6 million people on Medicaid rolls in  
1362 two different states. That is fraud.

1363 Precious dollars in Medicaid are being pocketed by  
1364 Pharmacy Benefit Managers, who keep a portion of the amount  
1365 they are being paid for prescription drugs. That is not  
1366 fair.

1367 Valuable dollars are being diverted to pay for gender  
1368 transition surgeries for minors.

1369 Valuable dollars for Medicaid are being spent on people

1370 who are deceased.

1371 Valuable dollars for Medicaid are being stolen by cyber  
1372 criminals who steal Medicaid numbers for deceased doctors,  
1373 and continue to claim payments on their behalf.

1374 Valuable dollars for Medicaid are being spent on people  
1375 who do not meet the very eligibility requirements established  
1376 by the Democrats in this room.

1377 You know what I think is cruel? I think it is cruel to  
1378 continue defending a program that is not sustainable. I  
1379 think it is cruel to not accept some very reasonable reforms  
1380 that are intended to make this program stronger for the very  
1381 people it was designed to help. Those are the things we are  
1382 considering here.

1383 We want to make this program better, stronger, more  
1384 sustainable, and more targeted to the folks who it is  
1385 intended to help, many of the people in this room and those  
1386 lining the halls. That is the truth of what we are doing  
1387 here today.

1388 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

1389 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, a --

1390 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back, and the  
1391 gentleman from --

1392 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. A point of inquiry.

1393 \*The Chair. Parliamentary?

1394 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Yes.



1395           \*The Chair. State your parliamentary inquiry.

1396           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Well -- said parliamentary,  
1397 but there -- members are leaving for whatever reason, asked  
1398 to be removed because they were speaking. But there are  
1399 empty chairs. As those that are leaving are made to leave,  
1400 can we allow other people who are in the audience to come in  
1401 and fill these empty chairs who came from very far places to  
1402 participate? As they leave, can we invite others to come in?

1403           \*The Chair. I believe they are allowing people in as  
1404 they leave. I haven't seen -- let me inquire. Just a  
1405 second, I will --

1406           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chair, as one of the  
1407 individuals that came to testify --

1408           \*The Chair. I believe they are trying to -- I will find  
1409 out, and we will address that.

1410           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you. Thank you.

1411           \*The Chair. So let me find out. I don't know from  
1412 here. We will -- I will have somebody look into that and get  
1413 an answer back to you. Thank you.

1414           So the gentleman from Florida, the gentleman, my good  
1415 friend from Florida, is recognized for three minutes for an  
1416 opening statement.

1417           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you, Chairman.

1418           It is Ebenezer Scrooge day at the Capitol today, taking  
1419 health care from the poor to fund tax cuts for the rich. I

1420 am sure Scrooge would think this is a very fine plan, a very  
1421 fine plan indeed. Of course, he is a billionaire hedge fund  
1422 manager, and he is thrilled about paying even less in taxes.  
1423 We have a few perspectives that guide us.

1424 First it is my favorite, the ghost of Congress past, the  
1425 115th Congress. You all may remember that, where former GOP  
1426 Congressman Jacob Marley, a frontliner, reminds you how he  
1427 lost his seat, as well as 20 other Republicans because you  
1428 went after Obamacare, kid care, and Medicaid. Twenty seats  
1429 lost and the majority.

1430 Then, of course, there is the ghost of Congress present.  
1431 The Cratchit family, of course, is on Medicaid. They have a  
1432 disabled child, Tiny Tim. There is Ebenezer's beloved Fanny.  
1433 She is on the ACA at 63 years old. And then Fred Scrooge.  
1434 He thinks he is fine because he gets his health care through  
1435 the employer, but we know what is going to happen in the  
1436 future.

1437 You pass this terrible bill and you cut \$715 billion  
1438 from the program. You can't just cut that and not have  
1439 people lose health insurance. We know for a fact 13.7  
1440 million Americans will lose health insurance, including the  
1441 Cratchit family.

1442 Of course, Tiny Tim dies in this scenario. Fanny finds  
1443 out her Obamacare increases by 10,000. And of course, Fred  
1444 Scrooge is shocked that his employer-based health care went

1445 up by 25 percent because people are flooding the emergency  
1446 room because they are sick and they are uninsured.

1447 Of course, this is not some fairy tale. In real life,  
1448 back in my district in Florida's 9th, these are the kids from  
1449 McCoy Elementary. Half the kids in my district are on  
1450 Medicaid. They are on kid care. It is a wildly popular  
1451 program. You can't cut \$750 billion from Medicaid and then  
1452 not have this affect our kids.

1453 [Slide]

1454 \*Mr. Soto. And then I got to go to Providence Assisted  
1455 Living, a nursing home in my district, and met George. He is  
1456 a veteran. He is partially in a wheelchair. Twenty-five  
1457 percent of the seniors in this assisted living facility get  
1458 their coverage through Medicaid.

1459 Don't be a Scrooge. Don't vote for this terrible bill  
1460 that is going to cut Medicaid, cut kid care, cut nursing home  
1461 care, all to fund tax cuts for the rich and powerful.

1462 And with that I yield back.

1463 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
1464 from Alabama is recognized for three minutes for an opening  
1465 statement.

1466 \*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1467 It is interesting, the tactics that are being used here.  
1468 All of us have stated for the record that the people who are  
1469 legally eligible for Medicaid are not going to lose their

1470 Medicaid. We have all got family members, friends. We have  
1471 got people in our districts. We all know these stories,  
1472 people that are depending on Medicaid. And you will not lose  
1473 your Medicaid. Many of the people who have spoken out here  
1474 and had to be removed, they are not going to lose their  
1475 Medicaid.

1476 The interesting thing is --

1477 \*Voice. Prove that we are not going to lose it. You  
1478 will kill me.

1479 \*Mr. Palmer. You will not --

1480 [Disturbance in hearing room.]

1481 \*Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman?

1482 \*The Chair. The gentleman will suspend. I want you to  
1483 be heard, so let's wait until the -- the gentleman is  
1484 recognized.

1485 \*Mr. Palmer. It is unfortunate that people are so  
1486 enraged by the misinformation that they have been given. It  
1487 is a commentary on this Congress and how we treat people.

1488 But one of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle  
1489 pointed out that there was no waste or fraud. CMS reported  
1490 that between 2015 and 2024 there was \$543 billion in improper  
1491 payments. I want the record to show that that is \$543  
1492 billion that could have gone to people who need Medicaid  
1493 coverage, Mr. Chairman, who need medicine, who need  
1494 treatment. There is over 700,000 people in traditional

1495 Medicaid that are on waiting lists because -- particularly in  
1496 the expansion states -- because they are being pushed aside  
1497 because they don't get the high match that the able-bodied  
1498 adults who choose not to work.

1499         And by the way, the -- one of my colleagues said that  
1500 only eight percent of able bodied adults are not working.  
1501 Well, if 92 percent are working, what is your problem with  
1502 work requirements? I mean, if they are already working,  
1503 there is no problem there.

1504         \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

1505         \*Mr. Palmer. And I didn't refer to anybody by name, so  
1506 you don't get a chance to interrupt.

1507         \*Ms. DeGette. Okay.

1508         \*Mr. Palmer. I didn't refer to anybody.

1509         \*Ms. DeGette. A question --

1510         \*Mr. Palmer. I didn't even refer to your state.

1511         So here is the issue. We are trying to save Medicaid.  
1512 And it is interesting, people holding up signs, "Save our  
1513 Medicaid." That is exactly what we are trying to do. I  
1514 said that the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services  
1515 reported this: between 2015 and 2024, \$543 billion in  
1516 improper payments. That is waste and fraud. That is abuse  
1517 of the people who need Medicaid. And there are other reports  
1518 out there that indicate it may be over \$1 trillion. So what  
1519 we are trying to do is make Medicaid work for the people who

1520 are supposed to get it. That is it.

1521 I yield back.

1522 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentlelady  
1523 from Washington?

1524 The gentlelady from Washington is recognized for three  
1525 minutes for an opening statement.

1526 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to  
1527 the people here in the audience today.

1528 [Slide]

1529 \*Ms. Schrier. I am here to tell the story of Ila, this  
1530 four-year-old that you see in this picture. Ila is the  
1531 daughter of Jason and Vanessa. She was born at Kittitas  
1532 Valley Health Care Critical Access Rural Hospital in  
1533 Ellensburg, Washington, situated just east of the Cascade  
1534 Mountains. She was born in March of 2021. Jason told me  
1535 that he had the incredible honor of telling Vanessa, "It is a  
1536 girl," but their joy was interrupted by silence. Ila wasn't  
1537 crying. She wasn't moving. She was pale. The room became a  
1538 flurry of urgent action. Nurses whisked her away. Alarms  
1539 were triggered. Within minutes the labor and delivery room  
1540 was full of people who were responding. Ila was breathing,  
1541 but her oxygen levels were critically low. During delivery  
1542 she had transfused nearly 40 percent of her blood volume back  
1543 to her mother, and she did not have enough blood to stay  
1544 alive on her own.

1545           So KVH sprang into action. They coordinated a transfer  
1546 for higher-level care and reached out to Seattle Children's  
1547 Hospital, which accepted her, of course, and dispatched a  
1548 helicopter. But as is often the case in rural environments,  
1549 nature had the final say. The helicopter was turned --  
1550 forced to turn back due to weather conditions over the  
1551 mountain pass. And undeterred, KVH made different  
1552 arrangements. A fixed-wing aircraft was dispatched from  
1553 Spokane. Meanwhile, the hospital coordinated EMS transport  
1554 to get the air crew and their equipment from the plane to the  
1555 hospital, and they all arrived with one mission: to save  
1556 Isla.

1557           Today she is four years old. She is happy and healthy,  
1558 and this story is a testament to what rural health care can  
1559 do when it is resourced, when it is staffed, and when it is  
1560 supported. It is also a reminder of how close Jason and  
1561 Vanessa came to a very different ending.

1562           Without this rural critical access hospital, Ila might  
1563 not be here today. The same is true for countless other  
1564 families in similar communities across America. There is no  
1565 other hospital in the region that they could have made it to  
1566 in time. It is not uncommon for people in our community to  
1567 deliver a baby on the way to the hospital, and that is how  
1568 far apart healthcare services are in my district and many of  
1569 my Republican colleagues' districts. Cutting Medicaid will

1570 close rural hospitals.

1571 Every child deserves a chance to live, and every family  
1572 deserves access to that care. That is why we must preserve  
1573 Medicaid, because without that support rural hospitals will  
1574 close and access will not be available to patients.

1575 I yield back.

1576 \*Mr. Joyce. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields. Does  
1577 anyone else wish to be recognized for an opening statement?

1578 The gentlelady from Massachusetts is recognized.

1579 \*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1580 It may be easy to sit here in Washington without having  
1581 to face the people who will feel the impact of a bill that  
1582 will strip millions of Americans of their health care  
1583 coverage, easy because you don't have to look at them in the  
1584 eyes or hear their stories. Let's open the doors and allow  
1585 the American people who have stood in line fill the open  
1586 seats, first and foremost.

1587 [Slide]

1588 \*Mrs. Trahan. In the meantime, let me share just one  
1589 story from my district. This is a photo of Philip, a  
1590 resident of Haverhill, Massachusetts. Philip has a  
1591 disability, but that hasn't stopped him from giving back.  
1592 Whether volunteering with Meals on Wheels, training service  
1593 dogs, or caring for animals at a sanctuary, he does all this  
1594 because of Medicaid.



1595           Medicaid funds the programs that help Philip gain  
1596   skills, stay engaged, and remain independent. Medicaid isn't  
1597   just a healthcare program, it is a foundation for  
1598   independence for people with disabilities like Philip who  
1599   want to live their lives with dignity. In Philip's case,  
1600   Medicaid funds Opportunity Works and Community Works, a  
1601   program that helps folks build job skills, engage in  
1602   volunteer work, and participate meaningfully in society.  
1603   These initiatives don't just keep Philip busy. They give him  
1604   purpose. They help him grow, contribute to and connect with  
1605   his community.

1606           But here is why I am telling Philip's story. This bill,  
1607   this "big, beautiful bill," as Donald Trump has described  
1608   it, will slash the Federal Medicaid funding that Philip's  
1609   program depends on. And I know my Republican colleagues will  
1610   say that states should make up for it, but they know that is  
1611   not possible. They know that when funds are cut, it is  
1612   initiatives like these that are always first on the chopping  
1613   block.

1614           So what then happens to Philip? He loses a lot more  
1615   than a routine. He loses access to his community, his sense  
1616   of contribution and his independence.

1617           Mr. Chairman, Philip and millions of Americans across  
1618   our country like him are not fat to be trimmed or waste to be  
1619   rooted out by disingenuous politicians in Washington. They

1620 are hard-working Americans trying to live their lives with  
1621 dignity and make their communities better. There are  
1622 constituents. They need you to vote no on this bill. They  
1623 need you to protect Medicaid. Protect the independence of  
1624 Americans with disabilities. And if you can't do that, at  
1625 least have the courage to look at the American people, people  
1626 like Philip, in the eyes while you take it away.

1627 I yield back.

1628 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. Does anyone else  
1629 wish to be recognized for an opening statement?

1630 The gentlelady from Texas is recognized for three  
1631 minutes.

1632 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1633 Like my Democratic colleagues who have spoken before me,  
1634 I am deeply concerned about the bill that we are considering  
1635 today, a bill that is going to make life harder and not  
1636 better; a bill that is going to make things more expensive,  
1637 not less expensive for all Americans, especially their health  
1638 care, if they can get it at all.

1639 [Slide]

1640 \*Mrs. Fletcher. And it is not just me. The non-  
1641 partisan Congressional Budget Office has found that this bill  
1642 will take away health care from nearly 14 million Americans,  
1643 and those are people who rely on Medicaid, people like Ricky,  
1644 who lives just down the road from me in Texas City in the

1645 14th congressional district of Texas.

1646       Ricky is one of the 4.5 million or so Americans who rely  
1647 on Medicaid to live life on his own. But the wait was years  
1648 long, and this bill will make the wait longer for people like  
1649 him if they can get that assistance at all.

1650       I want to share the life-changing impact that Medicaid  
1651 home health care meant in his words: "I was on the waiting  
1652 list for home and community-based services for five years,  
1653 and I used to live in several large facilities. Once my name  
1654 came up on the waiting list, I called everybody to let them  
1655 know that my name came up on the waiting list. That is when  
1656 I got to move in on my own. So it was my very first time  
1657 living on my own. When my staff came in that next morning,  
1658 she asked me what I wanted to eat. So I scratched my head  
1659 and said, 'So you mean to tell me that I get to choose what I  
1660 want to eat?' And she said yes. And so I had two boiled  
1661 eggs and two pieces of toast that I wanted. In all those  
1662 other facilities I couldn't choose.'"

1663       As Americans we have chosen to invest in our country.  
1664 We have chosen to create programs to help our neighbors and  
1665 further progress and make practical improvements. From roads  
1666 and bridges and infrastructure to education and health care  
1667 and scientific research, these are our choices and we do  
1668 these things because they are essential to liberty and  
1669 freedom and to life in America. We chose to create Medicaid,

1670 and we chose to expand Medicaid access in the Affordable Care  
1671 Act, and we should be proud of what we have done. Medicaid  
1672 makes it possible for so many Americans to live lives of  
1673 meaning with dignity. It matters. It matters for Ricky, and  
1674 it matters for all of us.

1675 And this hearing, this budget begs the question, who are  
1676 we? What kind of society do we want to be? And today the  
1677 House Republicans' answer in this bill is that we want to be  
1678 one that takes away health care from people like Ricky to  
1679 give tax cuts to people like Elon Musk. That is not my  
1680 answer, and it shouldn't be any of our answer. And we are  
1681 able today to talk about why, and I hope that by the time we  
1682 are done debating this bill we can all agree that we can do  
1683 better by and for the American people.

1684 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

1685 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. Does anyone else  
1686 wish to be recognized?

1687 The gentlelady from New York is recognized for her three  
1688 minutes in an opening statement.

1689 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1690 Thirteen point seven million people, thirteen point  
1691 seven million Americans, will be cut off from their health  
1692 care and made completely uninsurable by the bill that  
1693 Republicans are presenting today.

1694 You know, there is a lot that I have been hearing, and I

1695 have been listening to my Republican counterparts here today  
1696 and what they have been saying about this bill. And the math  
1697 is not adding up. They are trying to convince people that  
1698 they are cutting millions of undocumented people from payroll  
1699 -- or from Medicare, acting as though this is what is going  
1700 to save it.

1701 Even by -- even if you believe everything that  
1702 Republicans have said today, one -- they are identifying one  
1703 million -- their claim, which I dispute, but if you believe  
1704 them their claim is that one million undocumented people are  
1705 on Medicaid. So why are they trying to cut 13.7 million  
1706 Americans off their health care?

1707 By the Republicans' own Energy and Commerce tweet this  
1708 morning, their claim is 7.6 million people are somehow  
1709 ineligible for health care. So why are they cutting 13.7  
1710 million Americans off their health care?

1711 They have asked us to read this bill, and we have. This  
1712 bill bans the people that they kick off of Medicaid from even  
1713 buying their own insurance from the Affordable Care Act  
1714 exchange. So once you are kicked off Medicaid, you then  
1715 can't even buy your own health insurance. It increases costs  
1716 for people who they deem eligible and who are low-income, and  
1717 forces them to pay even more. And if you have a private  
1718 insurer, don't worry, you are getting screwed over, too,  
1719 because your healthcare premiums are going to skyrocket from

1720 the disaster that is happening from this bill.

1721 We have done assessments because, if you live in a rural  
1722 community, you are going to be hurt too.

1723 In New York 23, 25 percent of people are on Medicaid in  
1724 this area of upstate New York. Westfield Memorial Hospital  
1725 will be at risk of closure. UPMC Chautauqua is at risk of  
1726 closure. Schuyler Hospital at risk of closure.

1727 California 23, where 46 percent of people are on  
1728 Medicaid. Redlands Community Hospital, at risk of closure if  
1729 this passes. Victor Valley Global Medical Center, Loma Linda  
1730 University Medical Center, all at risk of closure.

1731 Colorado 8, 24 percent of people in this community are  
1732 on Medicaid, and Platte Valley Medical Center will be at risk  
1733 of closure if these cuts pass.

1734 Who do you believe, the people who are trying to cut  
1735 this -- not, by the way, to cut from "undeserving people" to  
1736 give to deserving people, but they are cutting these Medicaid  
1737 care and these Medicaid dollars to pay for tax cuts for Elon  
1738 Musk and billionaires. So this money isn't even going  
1739 towards funding better care for people who are eligible.  
1740 This money is going -- and we are cutting money and health  
1741 care from people and families --

1742 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady's time has expired.

1743 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. -- who are suffering to pay for tax  
1744 cuts for the rich. It is a crime --

1745           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady's time has expired.

1746           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. -- happening in front of the  
1747 American public --

1748           \*Mr. Joyce. Is anyone else wishing to be recognized  
1749 for --

1750           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. - right now.

1751           And I yield back.

1752           \*Mr. Joyce. -- an opening statement?

1753           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Chairman, I seek to be  
1754 recognized.

1755           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman from Massachusetts is  
1756 recognized for his opening statement.

1757           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.  
1758 Chairman, when 13.7 million Americans lose access to health  
1759 care, 13.7 million Americans don't stop getting sick. What  
1760 happens instead is, losing access to primary and preventative  
1761 care, they actually require more health care, and they visit  
1762 the emergency room, and they get care that takes longer and  
1763 is less comprehensive.

1764           And here is what that means for everyday Americans,  
1765 middle class and working class, including those who get  
1766 access to health insurance through their employer. It means  
1767 that their health insurance premiums are going to go up  
1768 because when hospitals provide care to people through the  
1769 emergency rooms, they have to cross-subsidize that by raising

1770 the cost that they charge to commercial payers. So it won't  
1771 just be the 13.7 million Americans who are kicked off health  
1772 coverage who have to pay more out of pocket to get health  
1773 care, it is going to be all Americans who have health  
1774 insurance who will pay more in health insurance premiums.  
1775 This after Donald Trump and Republicans promised that they  
1776 were going to come in and lower prices.

1777         Down the road the middle class and the working class are  
1778 going to be paying more in taxes and through inflation  
1779 because of the \$7 trillion in debt that Republicans are  
1780 adding with this tax cut giveaway to the wealthiest  
1781 Americans. And those Americans who do end up needing  
1782 Medicaid are now going to find that it cannot meet their  
1783 needs.

1784         [Slide]

1785         \*Mr. Auchincloss. My constituent, Ethan Wang, was  
1786 critically injured while swimming in the ocean when he was  
1787 studying abroad in March 2019. The spinal cord injury left  
1788 him paralyzed, needing immediate lifesaving surgeries abroad,  
1789 followed by a medical evacuation back to his home in  
1790 Massachusetts. Then, inexplicably, Ethan's dad, Willis,  
1791 suffered a major stroke just two years later. He also now  
1792 has disabilities, but continues to work as best he can -- I  
1793 am not sure if he meets the Republicans' definition of work,  
1794 but he is working as best as he can.



1795           All of this was possible because of Ethan and Willis's  
1796   determination and support from the Personal Care Attendant  
1797   program operated through the Massachusetts Medicaid program  
1798   known as MassHealth. When these cuts roll down onto the  
1799   states, though, the PCA as well as other flexible programming  
1800   will be under threat. The PCA, which allows people with  
1801   disabilities to stay in their homes so they do not have to  
1802   stay in expensive institutions, may come on to the chopping  
1803   block.

1804           Ethan's and Willis's family never thought that they  
1805   would depend on MassHealth, nor did they seek to, nor did  
1806   they want or ask for a handout. They had an accident, they  
1807   got sick, and they needed access to health care. The Wang  
1808   family is a dual professional household in Newton with three  
1809   healthy boys.

1810           Nobody knows when they will need to rely on Medicaid.  
1811   But when they do, they need it to be strong and sound so that  
1812   it can be a reliable system for families when they need it  
1813   most. Ethan's mom says it best: "We all live on the razor's  
1814   edge of health. And when you need assistance from the state,  
1815   you see the world and our social safety net through fresh  
1816   eyes.'"

1817           I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to  
1818   protect Medicaid and the lifesaving programs that it  
1819   supports.

1820 I yield back.

1821 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
1822 Louisiana is recognized for his opening statement.

1823 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

1824 We have heard so much today. We have been said that  
1825 Democrats can't say the word "lie," only Republicans can say  
1826 "lie." So I am going to say under this plan the Republicans  
1827 are misleading the American people. Their plan is to impose  
1828 \$715 billion in Medicaid cuts which will result in millions  
1829 of Americans losing their health care, destroy our hospitals,  
1830 and close the nursing homes our parents and grandparents rely  
1831 on while blowing up the state's budget, including of my home  
1832 state of Louisiana. Reverse Robin Hood, stealing from the  
1833 poor and giving to the rich in the form of massive tax breaks  
1834 for the wealthiest of the wealthy. These cuts will put  
1835 elderly, the disabled, and our children at risk. Also they  
1836 can give trillions of dollars in tax breaks to billionaires  
1837 and large corporations.

1838 Simply put, this is cruel, inhumane, and wrong.  
1839 Republicans need to know that these are not just numbers on  
1840 paper. These decisions that you make will affect people's  
1841 real lives and the consequences that will hurt them.

1842 Medicaid plays a crucial role in providing lifesaving  
1843 care to millions of Americans in Louisiana, and it is  
1844 essential that we overcome this notion that it is all fraud,

1845 waste, and abuse. We all want to get rid of waste, fraud,  
1846 and abuse. This is not the way to do it. There is not  
1847 enough waste, fraud, and abuse to support \$880 billion in  
1848 cuts. This is massive, and we are misleading the American  
1849 people when we tell them go home, you won't be hurt.

1850 This program makes it harder for people to access health  
1851 care. Smoke and mirrors. You can call it whatever you want,  
1852 but don't take it from me. Hear directly from my  
1853 constituents.

1854 [Slide]

1855 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Katie Corcoran and her son,  
1856 Connor Corcoran, who will be here with us later today, Connor  
1857 John Corcoran was born 18 years ago with a congenital brain  
1858 malformation. His parents were shocked at the news that his  
1859 -- of his diagnosis. His mother Katie -- pregnancy was  
1860 uneventful. At six weeks old, Connor's parents were told  
1861 that his brain malformation was so significant that he would  
1862 need one-on-one care for the rest of his life. He is blind,  
1863 developmentally delayed, and has poor muscle tone, was fed  
1864 through a tube, had numerous types of seizures every day, had  
1865 an under-developed pituitary gland, needed hormone  
1866 replacement medication, had an immune deficiency disorder,  
1867 and is non-verbal.

1868 Cory is a law enforcement officer and Katie is a special  
1869 education teacher, spends most of their time with Connor at

1870 Children's Hospital in New Orleans, as their son's seizure  
1871 and illness turned into life-threatening events. After  
1872 nearly a decade of being on a waiting list for a home and  
1873 community-based disability waiver, Connor was given an  
1874 emergency opportunity of a waiver.

1875         This is a real person. My friends, let's fight for the  
1876 people, not for Trump and Musk.

1877         \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman's time has expired. The  
1878 gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for his opening  
1879 statement.

1880         \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I just want to  
1881 welcome Sasha here.

1882         We are from different parts of New Jersey, but it is  
1883 great to have you here.

1884         \*Voice. Raritan.

1885         \*Mr. Menendez. Oh, Raritan? I am from Jersey City, and  
1886 I appreciate you coming here and sharing your story with us  
1887 because so many people from across New Jersey and across the  
1888 country have shared their story, and it is so important that  
1889 we listen to those stories as we make the decisions that we  
1890 have to make here today.

1891         [Slide]

1892         \*Mr. Menendez. I brought someone from my district who  
1893 couldn't be here in person, but they are here. This is  
1894 Belinda and her son, Kabir.

1895           Her son receives home health care funded by Medicaid.  
1896   He has since he was 13 years old. Since then his home health  
1897   aide, Antoinette, has been like his second mother. Thanks to  
1898   the services that Antoinette provides, Belinda is able to  
1899   work and help provide for her two children. In addition to  
1900   helping with basic needs, Antoinette takes Kabir for walks on  
1901   beautiful days and chats with him about his interests.

1902           Belinda says, "My greatest joy is seeing Kabir smile,  
1903   and knowing he is in good hands.'" And if you look at the  
1904   face of Belinda, that is a mother's love in those eyes. And  
1905   if you look at her son Kabir, that is a smile of someone who  
1906   is well taken care of.

1907           And we know that the conversation we should be having is  
1908   how can we do more for all of you -- for your mom, Sasha.  
1909   That is the conversation we should be having today. Instead,  
1910   we are talking about 13.7 million people losing their health  
1911   care coverage.

1912           And not a single dollar in savings that the Republicans  
1913   are talking about is going to be reinvested in this program.  
1914   So we are not going to make it easier for you to continue to  
1915   have access not just to Medicaid today as we know it, but to  
1916   a better version of it. That is the conversation that  
1917   Democrats want to be having. How do we improve health care,  
1918   whether it is Medicaid, ACA, Medicare? That is the  
1919   conversation that we should be having because, unlike our

1920 friends across the aisle, we have town halls. And no one  
1921 says health care is too affordable. No one says health care  
1922 in this country is too accessible, we have too much of it.  
1923 Not one person in any of our town halls has said that.

1924 So what are we doing here today? To make it harder for  
1925 13.7 million people to get access to health care? To make it  
1926 harder on your family, Sasha?

1927 \*Voice. No.

1928 \*Mr. Menendez. I agree with you. I just hope that  
1929 people across the aisle listen to you, because we need to  
1930 make health care better in this country. We can work on  
1931 Medicaid, but if the work that we are going to do on it is  
1932 going to save money, let's reinvest it in other health care  
1933 programs, not give tax cuts to the people that don't need it,  
1934 not to the people that don't need it. That is why this  
1935 approach by the Republican Party is so misguided. That is  
1936 why we know that when they are running for office they say  
1937 they won't touch Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, but  
1938 today we know that we are cutting Medicaid, and 13.7 million  
1939 people like yourself will suffer. And that is entirely  
1940 unacceptable.

1941 Thank you so much for being here, and I hope I get to  
1942 see you after we are done today. Thank you.

1943 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
1944 California is recognized for three minutes for his opening

1945 statement.

1946 \*Mr. Mullin. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1947 [Slide]

1948 \*Mr. Mullin. These indefensible cuts are more than just  
1949 numbers on a page. These are real people, our constituents  
1950 who are going to be harmed, people like Mark and Heidi and  
1951 their son, 42-year-old son, Corey. When Corey was just three  
1952 years old, he was diagnosed with a disabling form of autism.  
1953 Every day, Corey needs help with basic functions like  
1954 brushing his teeth, bathing, dressing, using the restroom,  
1955 and cooking. He has some language skills, but is very  
1956 limited in his ability to communicate. On weekdays he lives  
1957 in a group home, which is only made possible due to Medicaid  
1958 reimbursements. On weekends he goes home to his parents, who  
1959 provide him with round-the-clock care. Corey is exactly the  
1960 type of person who this essential safety net program was  
1961 designed to help.

1962 I met Corey's father, Mark, at a recent town hall when  
1963 he shared his family's story with the over 400 attendees.  
1964 Mark's story stood out to me. He spoke about how detrimental  
1965 Medicaid cuts would be to his son's dignity and his family's  
1966 ability to care for their son. Mark asked me to share his  
1967 story so that the public understands what the real-life  
1968 impact of Republican cuts to Medicaid will be.

1969 Here is Mark in his own words: "My wife and I are in

1970 our mid-seventies. What will happen to our son if we are not  
1971 there and these cuts to Medicaid go through? My son is 100  
1972 percent disabled. He will never be able to work. The other  
1973 five guys in his group home can't speak. Some of them don't  
1974 have parents. It is going to be devastating, what is going  
1975 to happen to these people.'`

1976 This isn't efficiency. It is utter cruelty to fund tax  
1977 cuts for billionaires.

1978 People, think -- please think about these people like  
1979 Corey in your districts in these families across America  
1980 before voting to kick 13.7 million people off of their  
1981 insurance. And if you do vote to gut Medicaid, I hope you  
1982 are prepared to go home and look your constituents in the eye  
1983 and tell them why.

1984 I yield back.

1985 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
1986 Ohio is recognized for his opening statement.

1987 \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

1988 The decision here is about cutting health care or  
1989 cutting taxes for the super wealthy. That is the assignment.  
1990 That was the assignment that the President and the Speaker  
1991 gave to this committee. They said, "Find 800, \$900 trillion  
1992 -- billion dollars -- so that we can fund all of the tax  
1993 cuts, particularly those for the wealthiest people in the  
1994 country.'`



1995           And to do so -- and I appreciate the chairman's honesty  
1996   -- he said we are going to focus on cutting health care for  
1997   the people who don't need it as much. Or said differently,  
1998   we want to make sure that we are only giving health care to  
1999   the people who need it the most. Who does not need health  
2000   care? Who here or in this country doesn't need health care?

2001           Or the Speaker is saying it is only going to be for  
2002   people with "real disabilities." That is what the Speaker  
2003   said last night. So they are not going to try to figure out  
2004   how to make this more efficient. What they are doing is they  
2005   are going to make decisions about who gets health care, who  
2006   has real disabilities based on how much money they can save.

2007           Here is how they are cutting. They are going to  
2008   increase the cost for low-income people to go see a doctor.

2009           They are going to have all of this red tape and  
2010   paperwork to make it impossible for people who are eligible  
2011   to get the health care -- that is what happened in Georgia  
2012   and Arkansas and Alabama.

2013           They are going to cut subsidies for folks who are  
2014   receiving it as part of the ACA. Five million people are  
2015   going to lose their health care because of it.

2016           They are going to shift the cost to states, and then  
2017   they are going to tell the states you cannot raise money to  
2018   cover the cost through an additional provider tax, so they  
2019   are handing them the ball and then tying both hands behind

2020 their backs.

2021 [Slide]

2022 \*Mr. Landsman. So I have a constituent, Aliyah, who  
2023 gets her health care in Ohio. Yes, she may lose her health  
2024 care because Ohio can no longer pay for all of the care that  
2025 she needs. They are going to end retroactive Medicaid for  
2026 nursing homes. They are going to reduce the minimum number  
2027 of nurses in nursing homes. These are all the ways that they  
2028 are getting to the savings, not at all to do with waste,  
2029 fraud, and abuse.

2030 One of my colleagues said cyber criminals is a big  
2031 issue. Absolutely, cyber criminals is a big issue. If you  
2032 go to the GAO reports, they list all of these examples of  
2033 waste, fraud, and abuse, none of which is in this bill, none  
2034 of which is in this bill. All of all of this waste, fraud,  
2035 and abuse is right here. We could take it up, including  
2036 tackling cyber criminals.

2037 Here is a -- here is the numbers. If you want to not  
2038 cut health care for millions of people, take the top wage  
2039 earners, go from 37 to 39.7 percent. That is \$250 billion.  
2040 Take the corporate rate tax rate back to 28, that is \$1.3  
2041 trillion. Add the minimum -- the billionaire minimum tax,  
2042 that is 500 billion right there. That is \$2 trillion. You  
2043 can invest it in expanding Medicaid. That is what Americans  
2044 need. Otherwise, this is morally bankrupt, politically

2045 disastrous, and it will be deadly for those who are going to  
2046 lose their coverage.

2047 And I yield back.

2048 \*The Chair. [Presiding] The gentleman's time has  
2049 expired, and the gentlelady from Virginia, you are recognized  
2050 for three minutes for an opening statement.

2051 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2052 So today we are here with a mandate from congressional  
2053 Republicans to squeeze our nation's finances into a framework  
2054 that requires devastating cuts, and these cuts are not just a  
2055 line item on a piece of paper. They impact people's lives:  
2056 our friends, our family, our neighbors, our constituents.

2057 Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have  
2058 said that they are only trying to strengthen Medicaid. But  
2059 what they don't tell you is that this bill we take up today  
2060 effectively guts the Affordable Care Act and Medicaid. It  
2061 takes 13.7 million people off of their health insurance. It  
2062 raises health care costs for everybody else. It shifts  
2063 Medicaid costs to the states as they are struggling to fill  
2064 holes in their budgets caused by other funding freezes,  
2065 workforce cuts, and budget cuts.

2066 This bill handcuffs the states' ability to fund their  
2067 share of Medicaid. It will further stress an already  
2068 stressed and under-funded provider network, especially in  
2069 rural areas.

2070 [Slide]

2071 \*Ms. McClellan. And for what? To fund tax cuts for the  
2072 wealthiest few. And as a result, millions of people will  
2073 suffer, people like my constituent Jessica, who was born with  
2074 her umbilical cord wrapped tightly around her neck,  
2075 restricting oxygen and causing brain damage. Now 36 years  
2076 old, Jessica reads at a pre-K level due to the intellectual  
2077 impairment resulting from her traumatic birth.

2078 Jessica and her family rely on Medicaid to pay the bills  
2079 for her doctor's appointments, and a Medicaid waiver allows  
2080 her family to care for Jessica in their home. As her sister  
2081 wrote to me, "We love her and we want to take care of her.  
2082 We didn't want Jessica to end up in a group home. She has  
2083 only known family caring for her. And yes, I am paid a  
2084 salary to keep my sister at home, her home, and take care of  
2085 her. But it is not a handout. Families like mine aren't  
2086 asking for handouts. We are asking for help that allows us  
2087 to provide the best care possible to lighten our loads.'"

2088 Mr. Chairman, my Democratic colleagues and I have shared  
2089 stories with you today about our constituents, the faces of  
2090 Medicaid. On their own, each is a powerful testament to the  
2091 importance of Medicaid, but together they are a glimpse into  
2092 the kaleidoscope of nearly 80 million Americans across the  
2093 country whose health care is in the crosshairs of the cuts in  
2094 this bill we will take up today, all to give tax breaks to a

2095 sliver of the wealthiest Americans.

2096 I urge my colleagues to keep these constituents -- these  
2097 stories in mind as you rush to fund tax cuts for the  
2098 wealthiest few in America.

2099 I yield back.

2100 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentlelady  
2101 from -- I have some -- still on opening statements. So the  
2102 -- are there any further opening statements?

2103 The chair recognizes the lady from Indiana for three  
2104 minutes for an opening statement.

2105 \*Mrs. Houchin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2106 Today we have, unfortunately, heard a lot of  
2107 fearmongering and misleading claims from our colleagues. So  
2108 let's be absolutely clear. For the Americans who truly need  
2109 them, this budget does not cut Medicaid, Medicare, or Social  
2110 Security benefits for the Americans who truly need them. We  
2111 are strengthening and protecting Medicaid for pregnant women,  
2112 children, individuals with disabilities, low-income seniors,  
2113 and vulnerable families. These Americans will continue to  
2114 have access to the care they need and deserve.

2115 What we are doing is eliminating waste, fraud, and abuse  
2116 because safeguarding taxpayer dollars is not heartless, it is  
2117 responsible. We are ending free health care for illegal  
2118 immigrants, stopping payments made on behalf of deceased  
2119 individuals or duplicate enrollees, and halting Federal

2120 reimbursements for transgender surgeries on minors. It is  
2121 not slashing care, it is restoring integrity and ensuring  
2122 Medicaid works for the people it was meant to serve.

2123         And don't just take it from us. Even the New York Times  
2124 published an article this week titled -- even the New York  
2125 Times published an article this week that stated that the  
2126 Democrats' \$13.7 million -- or 13.7 million people losing  
2127 Medicaid claim is false, it is inaccurate. When The New York  
2128 Times is calling out the Democrats for their exaggerating and  
2129 misleading information, it is time to stop the scare tactics.

2130         This budget reflects our commitment to preserving these  
2131 essential programs for future generations, while also  
2132 demanding much-needed accountability in the system. The  
2133 American people want health care that is accessible,  
2134 affordable, and honest, and that is what we are trying to  
2135 deliver.

2136         So let's stick to the facts. Under our plan 1.4 million  
2137 illegal immigrants will no longer get coverage, so the very  
2138 people that the -- my colleagues on the other side of the  
2139 aisle are trying to protect will be protected; 4.8 million  
2140 able-bodied adults choosing not to work or volunteer in their  
2141 communities will be affected; 1.2 million recipients who are  
2142 not eligible will no longer receive coverage. That is  
2143 because we want to protect these programs for the very people  
2144 that have been mentioned today by our colleagues on the other

2145 side of the aisle. We stand with them to protect the program  
2146 for those people.

2147 But the status quo cannot continue. We cannot continue  
2148 to keep spending 90 percent of every dollar on able-bodied  
2149 adults choosing not to work, and only spending 70 percent of  
2150 every dollar on the vulnerable, traditional people, the  
2151 disabled, children, pregnant women, and seniors. It is not  
2152 right. We are trying to fix it, and I urge my colleagues to  
2153 stop the scare tactics.

2154 I yield back.

2155 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentlelady  
2156 from --

2157 \*Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman? Mr. Chairman, I ask  
2158 unanimous consent to place into the record section 401 of the  
2159 Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Reconciliation  
2160 Act that was passed in 1996 that is titled, "Aliens Who Are  
2161 Not Qualified Aliens Ineligible for Federal Public  
2162 Benefits," which says that people, if they are here illegal  
2163 are not -- illegally are not eligible for Medicaid.

2164 \*The Chair. Without objection, so ordered.

2165 [The information follows:]

2166

2167 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

2168

2169           \*The Chair. Is anybody else seeking recognition for an  
2170 opening statement?

2171           The gentlelady from Florida, you are recognized for  
2172 three minutes.

2173           Without objection, so ordered.

2174           \*Mrs. Cammack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you  
2175 to all my colleagues. This is going to be a very, very long  
2176 -- well, possibly 36 hours. With that in mind, I think it is  
2177 just important to lay out that we have heard a lot today in  
2178 the last few hours that is not rooted in reality, because the  
2179 facts tell a much different story.

2180           The posters that our colleagues on the left have held up  
2181 are touching. The stories, they are very emotional. And I  
2182 agree that we want to protect those most vulnerable. As a  
2183 pregnant woman, I want to make sure that pregnant women,  
2184 expectant mothers, have access to resources around the  
2185 country.

2186           Unfortunately, that is not happening in this situation.  
2187 You know, I don't want to say that they are lying, but not a  
2188 single person in those posters is going to be impacted by  
2189 this legislation. Not one, not one. And I encourage you to  
2190 read the bill if you don't believe me. The facts are in  
2191 black and white.

2192           I heard from one of my colleagues that there is just not  
2193 enough waste, fraud and abuse to reform the programs to shore



2194 up resources. Well, I guess math is a problem because I see  
2195 7.6 million different waste, fraud, and abuse cases; 1.4  
2196 million illegals that are currently on the rolls, 1.4; 1.2  
2197 million individuals who are ineligible, an ineligibility  
2198 definition that they created. The left made that definition.  
2199 And by their own definition, these individuals, 1.2 million  
2200 of them, are ineligible for the program. And let us not  
2201 forget the 4.8 million able-bodied adults, healthy adults,  
2202 that choose not to work. They have no children. They have  
2203 no dependents. They choose not to work.

2204 That is 7.6 million individuals, and not one of those  
2205 were on those posters. We all agree we want to protect those  
2206 most vulnerable in our communities. We want to protect the  
2207 disabled. We want to protect pregnant women. We should not  
2208 be diverting resources to those who make the choice not to  
2209 work. That is something we can all agree on.

2210 So I think the facts tell a much different story than  
2211 the fiction that is playing out, and we would all be in a  
2212 better position to shore up these programs and protect them  
2213 if we could just realize that there is fundamental flaws in  
2214 the arguments of my colleagues on the left.

2215 So for the next 36 hours we will continue to point out  
2216 the flaws in their arguments. It is rooted in emotion, and  
2217 that gets clicks. But right now we have 7.6 million  
2218 individuals who should never be on this program. They are

2219 ineligible by their own definitions, by their own standards,  
2220 or they are in this country illegally, or they make the  
2221 choice not to work. For those that need it most, we are  
2222 protecting and fighting for them. That is what we are doing  
2223 here today.

2224 Mr. Chairman, I yield.

2225 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back.

2226 \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman, I would like to enter into  
2227 the record a document from the Congressional Budget Office  
2228 that estimates that the 13.7 million that are going to be  
2229 kicked off of Medicaid -- since there is all these  
2230 allegations that people are going to be kicked off, I would  
2231 like to enter this fact document into the record.

2232 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is -- without objection, so  
2233 ordered.

2234 \*Mr. Hudson. Mr. Chairman, could I reserve an  
2235 objection? Is that -- I am just curious what that analysis  
2236 is of.

2237 \*The Chair. Yes.

2238 \*Mr. Hudson. Is that of the actual bill before us  
2239 today, or is that something else?

2240 \*Ms. Barragan. This is an email from the Congressional  
2241 Budget Office from Sunday, May 11, at 10:34 p.m. after you  
2242 all put out your text in the dark of night.

2243 \*The Chair. Give us a chance to review that, and then

2244 we will accept it once we review it, unless there is an  
2245 issue.

2246 \*Mr. Hudson. My understanding is that is not of the  
2247 bill we are discussing today.

2248 \*Mr. Pallone. No, it is.

2249 \*The Chair. Okay, we will make --

2250 \*Mr. Hudson. I will reserve an objection.

2251 \*The Chair. We will review it.

2252 \*Mr. Fry. Mr. Chair?

2253 \*The Chair. We will review and get back with you, okay?  
2254 Thank you.

2255 \*Mr. Fry. Mr. Chair?

2256 \*The Chair. Yes, the gentleman from South Carolina, you  
2257 are recognized for three minutes for an opening statement.

2258 \*Mr. Fry. Mr. Chair, I just have a unanimous consent to  
2259 enter into the record an article dated two days after their  
2260 letter from the New York Times that says that their 13.7  
2261 million people, their claim is bogus. I request unanimous  
2262 consent to enter that into the record.

2263 \*Mr. Mullin. Mr. Chair?

2264 \*The Chair. Without objection, so ordered.

2265 [The information follows:]

2266

2267 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

2268

2269           \*Mr. Mullin. Mr. Chair, a point of order.

2270           \*The Chair. A point of order? Who -- state your point  
2271 of order.

2272           \*Mr. Mullin. If -- I just -- because I think the math  
2273 is really important, I just -- a point of order on the New  
2274 York Times. The New York Times didn't say there wasn't going  
2275 to be 13.7 million people losing their health care, they said  
2276 in this particular bill it is -- what, somebody help me here  
2277 -- 7.6, so I just want to do the math -- 7.68 --

2278           \*Voice. Eight point six.

2279           \*Mr. Mullin. -- 8.6 plus 5 is what? Somebody help me  
2280 with the math, 8.6 plus 5 is what?

2281           \*Voice. What is his point?

2282           \*Mr. Mullin. Thirteen point seven.

2283           \*The Chair. So just state your point of order.

2284           \*Mr. Mullin. I yield back.

2285           \*The Chair. I understand, I understand your --

2286           \*Mr. Mullin. No, I just -- it is important for people  
2287 to appreciate that if you take the two numbers --

2288           \*The Chair. All right.

2289           \*Mr. Mullin. Thank you.

2290           \*The Chair. Thank you. Is there any other seeking  
2291 recognition for --

2292           \*Voice. It is his time.

2293           \*The Chair. It is your time. The gentleman from -- you

2294 were just -- gentleman from South Carolina, you are  
2295 recognized for three. I just wanted to do your unanimous  
2296 consent request.

2297 For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia --

2298 \*Mr. Griffith. Seeking recognition.

2299 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

2300 \*Mr. Griffith. I yield to the gentleman from Kentucky.

2301 \*The Chair. All right, thank you. I just want to  
2302 address some of the earlier comments.

2303 And while my colleagues on both sides of the aisle have  
2304 brought up -- or issues with people that are -- that have --  
2305 are struggling, and we get that, and that is who we want to  
2306 protect. We have a lot of people in the audience in that  
2307 situation. That is who we want to protect.

2308 So the coverage loss that was discussed comes from able-  
2309 bodied adults choosing not to work. When I say that -- and  
2310 the bill says -- you are exempted from the work requirement  
2311 if you are an Indian or an urban Indian, if you are a  
2312 California Indian, if you are eligible as an Indian for the  
2313 Indian Health Service you are exempted from the work  
2314 requirement.

2315 If you are a parent, guardian, or caretaker relative of  
2316 a disabled individual or dependent child -- this is the bill  
2317 -- you are exempted from the work requirement.

2318 If you are a veteran with a disability rated as total

2319 under section 115, you are exempted from the work  
2320 requirement.

2321 If you are medically frail or otherwise has special  
2322 medical needs, including an individual who is blind or  
2323 disabled, as defined by section 1614, with a substance use  
2324 disorder you are not subject to the work requirement.

2325 With a disabling mental disorder you are not subject to  
2326 the work requirement.

2327 With a physical, intellectual, or developmental  
2328 disability that significantly impairs their ability to  
2329 perform one or more activities of daily living you are not  
2330 subject to the work requirement.

2331 With a serious or complex medical condition you are not  
2332 subject to the work requirement.

2333 Or subject to the approval of the Secretary, any other  
2334 medical condition identified by the state that is not  
2335 otherwise identified under this clause.

2336 So all of the groups that I just read are exempted from  
2337 the work requirement.

2338 The other are -- we do have people that are not in legal  
2339 status on Medicaid. CBO has scored that. There is some  
2340 estimate that future people will not have coverage -- I think  
2341 that is 200,000 -- because of growth that is unrealized.  
2342 That is an estimate on the future, not people currently  
2343 receiving benefits.

2344           And the other are recipients getting benefits who are  
2345 just not eligible, based on the criteria that the other side  
2346 of the aisle voted on during the Affordable Care Act, so --  
2347 if they don't meet the criteria that they established.

2348           And the other five million that was brought up that is  
2349 in another jurisdiction is from a program that during the IRA  
2350 expanded premium tax credits that they had sunset as they  
2351 spent money on other issues. They could have extended that  
2352 longer so this wouldn't be expiring this year, but that was a  
2353 decision that you make within the budget that you have. And  
2354 so that was a decision made by the other side.

2355           So I just want to be clear that we are focusing on the  
2356 people that -- all the list I just read -- that are truly  
2357 struggling, the most vulnerable, and we want Medicaid to work  
2358 for them. And so the coverage loss, as I said, people who  
2359 are choosing not to work -- and I just read you the  
2360 exceptions -- people that are are not legally eligible to be  
2361 on Medicaid based on the criteria that was set previously  
2362 this Congresses and in the Affordable Care Act, and also the  
2363 people that are not here as a legal status. That is the bulk  
2364 of that number.

2365           So I appreciate the time, and I yield back to my friend  
2366 from Virginia.

2367           \*Ms. Castor. Mr. Chairman?

2368           \*Mr. Griffith. I yield back.

2369           \*Ms. Castor. Unanimous consent?

2370           \*The Chair. The time is expired.

2371           \*Mr. Pallone. I have a motion.

2372           \*The Chair. Well, do you have another motion?

2373           \*Ms. Castor. Unanimous consent.

2374           \*The Chair. A unanimous consent request?

2375           \*Mr. Pallone. Oh --

2376           \*The Chair. Will the gentleman state the -- the  
2377 gentlelady, I am sorry.

2378           \*Ms. Castor. I am going to offer, for the record,  
2379 released yesterday from the Center for Children and Families  
2380 from Georgetown University McCourt School of Public Policy, a  
2381 researcher there that has been -- has worked for many, many  
2382 years, Joan Alker, just says in part work requirements are  
2383 included in this bill, as expected. And as I have said many  
2384 times, work requirements don't achieve their intended  
2385 purpose, which proponents claim is to support work, but they  
2386 are very successful in causing eligible people who are  
2387 working or should be exempt to lose --

2388           \*Mr. Griffith. Can you just accept it, or are we going  
2389 to read it, Mr. Chairman?

2390           \*Ms. Castor. I mean, I --

2391           \*The Chair. We are going to accept it.

2392           \*Ms. Castor. I want to make sure that everyone gets the  
2393 bottom line here.



2394           \*The Chair.  Okay --

2395           \*Voice.  It is part of the record.

2396           \*Ms. Castor.  I will say it again.  But they are very  
2397 successful in causing eligible people who are working or  
2398 should be exempt to --

2399           \*The Chair.  All right, thanks.  To that is a unanimous  
2400 request.  Is there any objection?

2401           Without objection, so ordered.

2402           [The information follows:]

2403

2404           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

2405

2406           \*The Chair. Seeing no other recognition for opening  
2407 statements --

2408           \*Mr. Pallone. I have a motion.

2409           \*The Chair. The gentleman has a --

2410           \*Voice. Motion.

2411           \*The Chair. -- motion.

2412           \*Mr. Pallone. Yes, Mr. chairman, I seek recognition to  
2413 make a motion.

2414           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

2415           \*Mr. Pallone. Now that we have finally seen the bill  
2416 text that Republicans have been working on in secret for  
2417 weeks, it is clear that all this bill does is take away  
2418 health care for millions of Americans in order to pay for  
2419 giant tax breaks for billionaires and big corporations. And  
2420 that is not what the American people want, whether they are  
2421 Democrats, Republicans, or independents. They have all  
2422 voiced opposition to cutting or, as you said, trimming  
2423 Medicaid.

2424           And therefore, for that reason, for those reasons, I  
2425 move that the committee adjourn and that we not consider  
2426 these additional changes, cuts, or trim, however you would  
2427 phrase it, to Medicaid. I move that the committee adjourn.

2428           \*The Chair. The motion to adjourn is not debatable. If  
2429 there is no -- there is no discussion.

2430           Therefore, all those in favor say aye.

2431 All opposed, say no.

2432 \*Mr. Pallone. I ask for a recorded vote.

2433 \*The Chair. The gentleman asks for a recorded vote, and

2434 the clerk will call the roll.

2435 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

2436 \*Mr. Latta. No.

2437 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

2438 Mr. Griffith?

2439 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

2440 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

2441 Mr. Bilirakis?

2442 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

2443 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

2444 Mr. Hudson?

2445 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

2446 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

2447 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

2448 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

2449 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

2450 Mr. Palmer?

2451 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

2452 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

2453 Mr. Dunn?

2454 \*Mr. Dunn. No.

2455 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

2456 Mr. Crenshaw?  
2457 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.  
2458 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
2459 Mr. Joyce?  
2460 \*Mr. Joyce. No.  
2461 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.  
2462 Mr. Weber?  
2463 \*Mr. Weber. No.  
2464 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.  
2465 Mr. Allen?  
2466 \*Mr. Allen. No.  
2467 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.  
2468 Mr. Balderson?  
2469 \*Mr. Balderson. No.  
2470 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.  
2471 Mr. Fulcher?  
2472 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
2473 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
2474 Mr. Pfluger?  
2475 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
2476 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
2477 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
2478 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
2479 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
2480 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

2481            \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
2482            \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
2483            Mrs. Cammack?  
2484            \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
2485            \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
2486            Mr. Obernolte?  
2487            \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
2488            \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
2489            Mr. James?  
2490            \*Mr. James.   No.  
2491            \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
2492            Mr. Bentz?  
2493            \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
2494            \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
2495            Mrs. Houchin?  
2496            \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
2497            \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
2498            Mr. Fry?  
2499            \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
2500            \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
2501            Ms. Lee?  
2502            \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
2503            \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
2504            Mr. Langworthy?  
2505            \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.

2506           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
2507           Mr. Kean?  
2508           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
2509           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
2510           Mr. Rulli?  
2511           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
2512           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
2513           Mr. Evans?  
2514           [No response.]  
2515           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman?  
2516           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
2517           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
2518           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
2519           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
2520           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
2521           Mr. Pallone?  
2522           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
2523           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
2524           Ms. DeGette?  
2525           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
2526           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
2527           Ms. Schakowsky?  
2528           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
2529           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
2530           Ms. Matsui?

2531           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
2532           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
2533           Ms. Castor?  
2534           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
2535           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
2536           Mr. Tonko?  
2537           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
2538           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
2539           Ms. Clarke?  
2540           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
2541           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
2542           Mr. Ruiz?  
2543           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
2544           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
2545           Mr. Peters?  
2546           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
2547           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
2548           Mrs. Dingell?  
2549           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
2550           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
2551           Mr. Veasey?  
2552           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
2553           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
2554           Ms. Kelly?  
2555           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.

2556           \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
2557           Ms. Barragan?  
2558           \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
2559           \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
2560           Mr. Soto?  
2561           \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
2562           \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
2563           Ms. Schrier?  
2564           \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
2565           \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
2566           Mrs. Trahan?  
2567           \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
2568           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
2569           Mrs. Fletcher?  
2570           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
2571           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
2572           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
2573           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
2574           \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
2575           Mr. Auchincloss?  
2576           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
2577           \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
2578           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
2579           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
2580           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.



2581 Mr. Menendez?

2582 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

2583 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

2584 Mr. Mullin?

2585 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

2586 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

2587 Mr. Landsman?

2588 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

2589 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

2590 Ms. McClellan?

2591 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

2592 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

2593 Chairman Guthrie?

2594 \*The Chair. No.

2595 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

2596 \*The Chair. Is anyone seeking recognition to answer the

2597 roll call on the Republican side?

2598 Seeing none, any on the Democrat side?

2599 Seeing none, the clerk will report.

2600 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were

2601 24 ayes and 29 noes.

2602 \*The Chair. So the motion fails.

2603 So we will proceed to -- before we do, I just want to

2604 say I was coming in the door just a little while ago, and I

2605 met a young lady who is here on her birthday, and she is --

2606 you are going to wave your hand?

2607           You said this is important enough to be here on your  
2608 birthday. So thank you for being here. I won't say what  
2609 birthday unless you want to say, because you told me, but I  
2610 won't say. But anyway, thank you for being here.

2611           So we are going to do these in four committee prints.  
2612 We learned from doing the Build Back Better, when we had 16  
2613 committee prints. We are only doing four today. And so we  
2614 will do these in four different sections, so the chair calls  
2615 up the committee print Subtitle A, Energy, and asks the clerk  
2616 to report.

2617           \*The Clerk. Title IV, Energy and Commerce, Subtitle A,  
2618 Energy.

2619           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
2620 committee print is dispensed with, and the committee print  
2621 will be open for amendment at any point.

2622           So ordered.

2623           [The committee print follows:]

2624

2625           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

2626

2627           \*The Chair. Is there a discussion or amendments to  
2628 subtitle A?

2629           \*Mr. Pallone. I move to strike the last word.

2630           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for -- okay,  
2631 for what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey seek  
2632 recognition?

2633           \*Mr. Pallone. I move to strike the last word --

2634           \*The Chair. The gentleman is --

2635           \*Mr. Pallone. -- on the underlying bill. Thank you,  
2636 Mr. Chairman.

2637           When we passed the Inflation Reduction Act three years  
2638 ago, Congress took a massive step towards lowering energy  
2639 bills for American families. It was all about affordability,  
2640 trying to lower prices. But if this bill passes today, we  
2641 will wipe out all of that progress by rescinding programs  
2642 that are lowering energy costs and helping to build clean  
2643 energy manufacturing here in America. Also, Republicans can  
2644 give tax cuts to billionaires.

2645           And I have to stress, Mr. Chairman, one of my biggest  
2646 concerns is that when President Trump ran he said -- and he  
2647 said it on Inauguration Day -- I am just going to lower  
2648 prices, I am going to make things more affordable. So many  
2649 things in this bill do just the opposite, whether it is in  
2650 the health care sphere, the energy sphere, the environmental  
2651 sphere, whatever the whatever the -- whatever it is, it is

2652 all about raising prices for the little guy so we can give  
2653 tax breaks to the wealthy.

2654 But not content to gut the Inflation Reduction Act,  
2655 which I already mentioned, Republicans are now going even  
2656 further by creating a mockery of our environmental laws by  
2657 allowing big oil and gas to simply bribe government agencies  
2658 to acquire permits free of scrutiny. It sets up what I call  
2659 a pay-to-play scheme for fossil energy permitting that allows  
2660 polluters to pay \$10 million to the Trump Administration to  
2661 obtain pipeline permits and ignore environmental laws, while  
2662 clean energy gets left behind.

2663 Now, I am not mentioning the others. I think the figure  
2664 is \$1 million for LNG and so on. But the bottom line is you  
2665 pay, and then you don't have to worry about the environmental  
2666 laws. In the case of LNG you don't have to worry about the  
2667 national security laws. In other words, when we allowed LNG  
2668 exports, they are supposed to be reviewed to see not only  
2669 what the environmental implications might be but whether or  
2670 not it is going to raise oil prices. And we know that often  
2671 times exporting of LNG does raise oil prices here in the  
2672 United States. But that is all gone. You just pay your fee,  
2673 a million dollars, 10 million for pipelines, and you don't  
2674 have to worry about any environmental scrutiny.

2675 Now, I will tell you, there are people on my side of the  
2676 aisle who would like to see permitting reform, right? Put

2677 forward the permitting reform program you can. But that is  
2678 not what is going on here. This isn't about permitting  
2679 reform. This is just about saying you just pay your million,  
2680 your 10 million, whatever, and you don't have to worry about  
2681 the permits at all. We will just give it to you. We will  
2682 just give you the permit.

2683 This is a complete dismantling of our energy permitting  
2684 infrastructure in America, vital protections for the public  
2685 interest, clean water, clean air. And not just environmental  
2686 concerns, also to make sure that oil prices don't go up.

2687 So states would lose any say in energy infrastructure  
2688 within the borders, and courts would not be able to address  
2689 any further violations of our weakened laws. This is an end  
2690 goal of Republicans. One set of rules for you, another set  
2691 of rules for them and their billionaire buddies. Simply put,  
2692 it is a disaster.

2693 And like so many other things that we are going to be  
2694 discussing in this bill today, tonight, and tomorrow, all it  
2695 does is raise prices on the little guy. All for what  
2696 purpose? So you can give more tax breaks to billionaires  
2697 like Elon Musk, large corporate interests, and so they don't  
2698 have to pay their fair share of the tax burden.

2699 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I would urge, obviously,  
2700 opposition to the energy section, and I yield back.

2701 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. Is

2702 there further discussion?

2703 \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Peters.

2704 \*The Chair. The gentleman from California is recognized  
2705 for five minutes for discussion on the bill.

2706 \*Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
2707 the last word.

2708 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

2709 \*Mr. Peters. Last Congress my Republican colleagues  
2710 were insistent that we should have an all-of-the-above energy  
2711 policy, one that leverages our natural resources, unleashed  
2712 American innovation, and cut through bureaucratic red tape.  
2713 So I am confused that we are considering a reconciliation  
2714 bill that picks winners and losers and elevates expensive,  
2715 outdated, inefficient sources like coal over cheap, American-  
2716 made energy like solar, wind, and storage.

2717 Why does this bill expedite permitting for natural gas  
2718 pipelines, an undeniably important component of our energy  
2719 system, while completely ignoring transmission lines, without  
2720 which we would not be able to meet a single kilowatt of  
2721 energy demand. Why does this bill provide government-backed  
2722 insurance to coal plants as the President of the United  
2723 States singlehandedly kills hundreds, if not thousands, of  
2724 clean energy jobs across the country by illegally targeting  
2725 projects, some of them already permitted, and weaponizing the  
2726 permitting process.

2727           This entire Congress my Republican colleagues have  
2728   focused, not inappropriately, on our need to build baseload  
2729   power to meet energy demand from data centers, manufacturing,  
2730   and AI. But when they have an opportunity to ensure this  
2731   baseload power can move from where it is generated to where  
2732   it will be used, my Republican colleagues have not only  
2733   chosen to ignore this problem, but are rescinding funds to  
2734   make it easier to build out the energy infrastructure we need  
2735   to reduce costs and keep the lights on.

2736           We need to face reality. We can't build anything in  
2737   America anymore. North America has built about 7 gigawatts  
2738   of interregional transmission since 2014 with less than half  
2739   of that in the United States. In that same timeframe, South  
2740   America has built 22 gigawatts, Europe 44, and China has  
2741   built 260 gigawatts.

2742           While there is a growing bipartisan coalition for  
2743   permitting reform, whether it is forest management, electric  
2744   transmission, or building housing, I have reached across the  
2745   aisle consistently and found success in moving solutions  
2746   forward. And many of us have voiced our desire to work in a  
2747   bipartisan way to make America more energy dominant. And now  
2748   is the time to put our money where our mouth is, and focus on  
2749   durable, common-sense and all-of-the-above policies that  
2750   provide certainty for industry and consumers. But this bill  
2751   doesn't come anywhere close to meeting that moment. It isn't

2752 real permitting reform. It doesn't make us energy dominant.  
2753 And it only makes things more uncertain for industry, for  
2754 Americans, and for our future.

2755         So instead of making it easier to build everything, once  
2756 again we are cutting off our feet in the race to energy  
2757 resilience. This is the definition of picking winners and  
2758 losers, and it is not the way we will receive a resilient,  
2759 energy-abundant future. We need to turn our attention to  
2760 bipartisan solutions that are comprehensive and cover  
2761 everything. This ain't it.

2762         And I yield back.

2763         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone on  
2764 the Republican side seeking recognition for discussion on the  
2765 bill?

2766         \*Mr. Pallone. Debbie?

2767         \*The Chair. Is anyone on the Democrat side seeking  
2768 recognition to speak on the bill -- or the committee print, I  
2769 should say?

2770         Seeing none, are there any amendments?

2771         Oh, the gentlelady from Florida is recognized for --

2772         \*Ms. Castor. Amendment.

2773         \*The Chair. Oh, the gentlelady from Florida -- the  
2774 clerk will -- do you have the amendment? Can we say the  
2775 amendment?

2776         \*The Clerk. Can the gentlelady please specify the



2777 amendment?

2778           \*Ms. Castor. It is an amendment to H.Con. Res. 14. It  
2779 is 62VC2.

2780           \*The Chair. Could you repeat that?

2781           \*Ms. Castor. It is 62VC2.

2782           \*The Chair. Sixty-two VC?

2783           The clerk will report.

2784           \*The Clerk. An amendment offered by Ms. Castor --

2785           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
2786 amendment is dispensed with.

2787           [The amendment of Ms. Castor follows:]

2788

2789           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

2790

2791           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady from Florida is  
2792 recognized for five minutes in support of her amendment.

2793           \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

2794           And for everyone that noticed a very quick shift away  
2795 from health care discussion to energy, I think that is  
2796 intentional. It is part of the intention of releasing the  
2797 details of a bill that rips your health care away on a --  
2798 late on a Sunday night, on Mother's Day, rushing it to  
2799 committee without any hearing. They are trying to do this  
2800 really quick, and we are -- rather than in the light of day  
2801 discuss Medicaid in front of everyone and health care, we are  
2802 going to switch to energy.

2803           But the message is exactly the same, and this is going  
2804 to impact everyone, too. And you better hold on to your  
2805 wallets because they are coming after your electric bills,  
2806 too, to pay for a massive tax giveaway to billionaires like  
2807 Elon Musk and the wealthy and the well-connected because,  
2808 let's face it, American families are being financially  
2809 squeezed right now. But unfortunately, Republicans want to  
2810 make it worse through higher utility bills.

2811           I know that Americans are very concerned about rising  
2812 energy costs, but the Trump Administration now is making it  
2813 worse. Utility companies in at least 19 states have hiked  
2814 rates as much as \$40 per month just since the Trump  
2815 Administration began because of so much of their chaos and

2816 confusion across the agencies. In five months now into this  
2817 Congress, the Republicans have not brought forth a single  
2818 bill to lower energy costs for hard-working American  
2819 families. Instead, what they are offering today is a handout  
2820 to big oil companies and polluters, and the impact will be to  
2821 raise your electric bill.

2822       They also -- when you dig into this bill, they are  
2823 gutting clean air protections, clean water protections, all  
2824 to fund their massive tax giveaway to billionaires. This is  
2825 in stark contrast to what Democrats did a few years ago. We  
2826 actually focused on consumers and on your bottom line. We  
2827 passed energy rebates. We funded help for working-class  
2828 Americans to pay their heating bills or, in my neck of the  
2829 woods, their AC bills.

2830       So what my amendment today says, rather than strike  
2831 right at the heart of what you are doing, let's just analyze  
2832 what is going on here. If you say, Mr. Chairman, that this  
2833 is going to be so good for consumers, you will pass my  
2834 amendment. It will delay any provisions in this bill from  
2835 taking effect until the Energy Information Administration  
2836 studies the impact of the bill and the actions taken so far  
2837 on the Trump Administration so that we can ensure what you  
2838 say. You say, oh, this is going to lower electric bills.  
2839 Nothing in here really proves that. We are all very  
2840 skeptical because time and time again you side with big oil

2841 CEOs and electric utilities and polluters.

2842 I mean, right now just look at what has happened. In  
2843 our -- when we were in charge we passed home energy rebates.  
2844 The bill they have on the floor today will take away the  
2845 training grants that helps make that possible back home.  
2846 Forty-nine states across the country have applied for those  
2847 Department of Energy rebates that will help working-class  
2848 Americans save on their electric bill. But now they want to  
2849 rip those away by not allowing that to happen.

2850 In Florida, my home state, we are supposed to receive --  
2851 my neighbors across the state are supposed to receive about  
2852 \$346 million to help. Wouldn't that help a lot of people  
2853 save on their electric bills, buy food and groceries, afford  
2854 the rising cost of living? Maybe some of the tariff-induced  
2855 price increases? But no, they are -- the Trump  
2856 Administration, Elon Musk with that chainsaw has said, no, we  
2857 are not going to let those monies flow to hard-working  
2858 people. Instead, we are going to create greater chaos.

2859 Democrats also thought it was important to help with  
2860 transmission across the country. Building those big  
2861 transmission lines is an incredible undertaking, as Mr.  
2862 Peters has pointed out. It helps lower electric bills. So  
2863 you know what they do in this bill? They take away the funds  
2864 that would help transmission lines get constructed. You know  
2865 why they are doing this? It is because right now the cost of

2866 cleaner, cheaper energy is very affordable. Solar, wind,  
2867 battery storage, it has created a lot of jobs across the  
2868 country. The big oil companies don't like it, so they are  
2869 willing to say to you, you get to pay more while they get a  
2870 gift and they get a pass. And this helps them in their  
2871 calculation for their big tax giveaway to billionaires.

2872         So you are getting hit a couple of times. You are  
2873 getting hit on your health care, you are getting hit on your  
2874 electric bills. When you look out across the decades ahead,  
2875 if you have kids or grandkids, it is going to be a lot  
2876 hotter. We could use those energy rebates for our AC bills.  
2877 But this bill moving forward is going to cost everybody a  
2878 lot.

2879         So I will yield back, but I am not finished discussing  
2880 this because people need to know about this. You can't rush  
2881 a bill like this with such a large impact through without  
2882 people understanding what it means to them.

2883         I will yield.

2884         \*The Chair. Thank you, the gentlelady yields back. The  
2885 chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio for five minutes to  
2886 discuss the amendment.

2887         \*Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I  
2888 move to strike the last word.

2889         \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

2890         \*Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr.

2891 Chairman, this amendment adds a section to the subtitle  
2892 relating to the impacts on energy costs requiring the Energy  
2893 Information Administration to certify energy costs won't  
2894 increase.

2895         The best way to lower energy prices is expand the use of  
2896 America's abundant energy resources -- gas, oil, coal,  
2897 hydropower -- that provide affordable, reliable power and  
2898 fuels, and not limit those resources to force transmission to  
2899 expensive renewable energy, as the IRA sought to do. The way  
2900 to lower electricity prices is ensure more supply, not less,  
2901 to ensure more generating resources that stay on regardless  
2902 of the weather.

2903         The savings and fees in the subtitle will increase  
2904 energy, not limit it. It will increase the kind of energy we  
2905 need to lower prices and provide for our communities. This  
2906 amendment would forestall this effort. And Mr. Chairman, I  
2907 would urge our members to reject the amendment, and I yield  
2908 back.

2909         \*The Chair. The gentleman, yields back. Is there  
2910 further discussion of the amendment?

2911         The gentlelady from New York is recognized for five  
2912 minutes to discuss the amendment.

2913         \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you. I move to strike the  
2914 last word.

2915         \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

2916           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. And I -- you know, Representative  
2917   Castor's amendment, I think, is a pretty common-sense  
2918   proposal. It is ensuring that none of the partisan  
2919   provisions being discussed today should be implemented until  
2920   we can understand their impacts on monthly energy costs.

2921           Right now everyday Americans are experiencing absolute  
2922   explosions in their monthly energy bills, particularly under  
2923   the Trump Administration. In fact, residents in New York  
2924   City have their electrical bills that are spiking to over  
2925   \$500 a month for a one-bedroom apartment just from this  
2926   January to February. And for some of the folks saying that,  
2927   you know, by "unleashing" gas we can lower these costs, this  
2928   bill that we are marking up today would actually increase gas  
2929   exports by fast-tracking the permitting of new gas exports.

2930           And for folks who make this kind of energy independence  
2931   argument that we need to drill oil and gas so that we are  
2932   using American oil and gas, American oil and gas isn't going  
2933   to American households with some of these provisions. In  
2934   fact, electricity markets across the U.S., while they remain  
2935   heavily reliant on gas, fast-tracking these exports means  
2936   that there is going to be less gas available for Americans  
2937   because we are shipping it abroad. And when global prices  
2938   rise, domestic gas suppliers are either priced out or forced  
2939   to pay the higher international market rates.

2940           And so what -- the amendment that we have before us is

2941 merely asking us to conduct a study on how this -- on how the  
2942 bill will impact monthly energy costs. If the Republican  
2943 claim is that it is going to lower monthly energy costs,  
2944 wouldn't we want to know that?

2945 And I suspect that this study would show that energy  
2946 costs would actually spike under this Republican proposal,  
2947 and perhaps that is the source of some of the opposition and  
2948 heartburn around finding out what impact this is going to  
2949 have on people.

2950 And with that I yield back. Thank you.

2951 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
2952 there any recognition on the Republican side to speak?

2953 Any further discussion? Any further discussion on the  
2954 Democrat side?

2955 The gentlelady from New York, the other gentlelady from  
2956 New York, you are recognized for five minutes.

2957 \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to  
2958 yield to the gentlelady from Florida.

2959 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is -- well, it is your time,  
2960 so --

2961 \*Ms. Castor. I thank my colleague from New York for  
2962 yielding the time.

2963 You know, colleagues, on the day after it became news  
2964 that the President was likely to accept a 747 Boeing jet from  
2965 another country, we have the congressional version right here



2966 of kind of that pay-for-play grifting that is going on, and  
2967 it is right here in the bill because of -- here is what they  
2968 have planned in this bill. It is another big giveaway: For  
2969 a one-time fee of \$1 million, this bill would authorize the  
2970 Department of Energy to approve liquefied natural gas export  
2971 terminals, regardless of the negative impacts on the people  
2972 who live nearby and on your electric bill.

2973 But they didn't stop there. Get this. For \$10 million,  
2974 companies can bypass permitting processes -- clean air, clean  
2975 water, things like that -- and any judicial review for their  
2976 natural gas or other pipelines. I mean, this is not how  
2977 things work in the United States of America. I know that the  
2978 current Administration is not fond of the rule of law, and I  
2979 guess they are trying to change the law to benefit their --  
2980 the big oil companies, and they do this even though it is  
2981 going to cost consumers so much more.

2982 Now, contrast that -- this will really tell you where  
2983 priorities differ -- contrast that with what Elon Musk has  
2984 done to take a chainsaw to firing the entire staff of the  
2985 Low-Income Home Energy Assistance Program, which helps almost  
2986 six million households in America warm and cool their homes.  
2987 That is separate even from the energy rebates I was talking  
2988 about. My neighbors in Florida will lose over \$100 million  
2989 this year because of that, at a time we are paying more on  
2990 our electric bills because utilities -- they get to add on

2991 when we have hurricanes and storms. So we are already facing  
2992 higher costs because of damage from Hurricanes Helen and  
2993 Milton, and now this.

2994 Just yesterday the Trump Administration proposed to  
2995 illegally ignore Congress and court rulings by revoking  
2996 energy and water efficiency standards for more than a dozen  
2997 appliances. This would take the United States back to  
2998 decades-old standards or eliminate them entirely, drastically  
2999 costing consumers and business -- businesses. And as we sit  
3000 here, the Ways and Means Committee is marking up a bill that  
3001 will make life harder for millions of American families that  
3002 are simply trying to make their homes more efficient. They  
3003 might be trying to install solar or batteries.

3004 And remember, this is a difference in priorities. They  
3005 do that to give a massive tax cut to the wealthy and the  
3006 well-connected, while you pay more.

3007 I also want to echo a point that Ranking Member Pallone  
3008 made. All Congress Republicans have held hearings where we  
3009 have heard from people in the electric industry, grid  
3010 operators, utility leaders. They all said that repealing a  
3011 lot of these tax incentives for cleaner, cheaper energy would  
3012 be catastrophic. Take one tiny, little example. Republicans  
3013 want to make it easier to send natural gas overseas while  
3014 making all other sources of energy -- be it wind, solar,  
3015 batteries, or even nuclear energy -- more expensive. Well,

3016 sending all natural gas overseas, as Representative Ocasio-  
3017 Cortez pointed out, will increase prices here in America.  
3018 But we won't have any alternative then, if they send gas  
3019 overseas to fuel our electric system because they will have  
3020 gutted every other option, causing power bills to explode.  
3021 When you have less energy coming onto the grid, your energy  
3022 prices go up. That is not fair.

3023         So just imagine that story 340 million times more as  
3024 costs explode for everyone across the country. That is what  
3025 this bill does. It doesn't do anything to lower your  
3026 electric bill.

3027         If we are serious about addressing this problem, at the  
3028 very least, adopt my amendment. Show your math. No one has  
3029 to call each other you are misleading or not. Just agree to  
3030 do the analysis so the people can understand what is  
3031 happening to their electric bills and why.

3032         I urge support of my amendment and yield back.

3033         \*Ms. Clarke. I yield back, Mr. --

3034         \*The Chair. The gentlelady from New York yields back.  
3035 Is there further discussion on the amendment?

3036         Gentleman from Georgia, for what purpose do you seek  
3037 recognition?

3038         \*Mr. Allen. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how it is, if we  
3039 talk about different states, my State of Georgia has been  
3040 named 12 years in a row as the best state in the country to

3041 do business in or relocate your business, and it is growing  
3042 very rapidly.

3043 Right now, just doing a little research, New York is  
3044 paying about 26.2 cents per kilowatt hour for electricity.  
3045 It is 59 percent higher than the national average, and my  
3046 home state of Georgia is somewhere between \$0.08 and \$0.10,  
3047 depending on the demand.

3048 In Georgia in 2022 and 2023, gasoline was fluctuating  
3049 somewhat, but many times it got as high as \$4 a gallon.  
3050 Today I just looked it up. It is \$2.88 a gallon, and that is  
3051 in less than, like, 90 days.

3052 And I will say that we have -- I mean, that is, you  
3053 know, under the new guidelines that we -- that many of these  
3054 we are codifying into law in this energy policy we passed in  
3055 the last Congress, House bill 1, which was an all-out energy  
3056 solution -- all energy. I have the largest clean energy  
3057 facility in the country in my district, Plant Vogtle. And  
3058 even with the substantial capital cost of that, we are still  
3059 at \$0.08 to \$0.10 a kilowatt hour.

3060 So I don't know where these numbers are coming from, but  
3061 I can tell you costs are decreasing rapidly because you  
3062 cannot reduce costs if you don't have competition. It will  
3063 not work. You can't regulate it. You can't -- it just does  
3064 not work economically. And what we are seeing is a large  
3065 supply meeting demand. If demand exceeds supply, the cost is

3066 going up. That is exactly what we are trying to do in this  
3067 legislation.

3068 And I yield back.

3069 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
3070 further discussion?

3071 Gentleman from Florida, for what purpose do you seek  
3072 recognition?

3073 Oh, you are recognized to speak on the amendment.

3074 \*Mr. Soto. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support  
3075 this amendment and oppose the job-killing, energy cost-  
3076 raising provisions in the underlying reconciliation bill.

3077 We see first an attempt in this section to defund the  
3078 advanced technology vehicle manufacturing provisions in  
3079 50142. You know, Florida now has the second most electric  
3080 vehicles in the nation. And according to CNBC, in 2024, 20  
3081 percent of all new car sales were electric vehicles and  
3082 hybrids. That is a giant figure, and it reminds us that,  
3083 slowly but surely -- or maybe faster than folks even realize  
3084 -- that American consumers are switching over to hybrids and  
3085 electrics in an increasing rate.

3086 And by the way, this advanced technology vehicle  
3087 manufacturing credit has been a boon for the South. In South  
3088 Carolina, Volkswagen is making electric vehicles. AESC,  
3089 battery manufacturing in South Carolina. BMW, EV and battery  
3090 module manufacturing. Redwood Materials, battery recycling.

3091 In Georgia, Hyundai, May 2022, Hyundai reveals plan for a  
3092 \$5.54 billion facility dedicated to electric vehicles and  
3093 battery manufacturing plants. It will create 8,100 jobs.  
3094 North Carolina, Toyota, an electric vehicle plant. Toyota is  
3095 investing \$3.79 billion to establish a battery factory in  
3096 North Carolina.

3097 All these things happened after the Inflation Reduction  
3098 Act was passed, and is helping to make sure that we remain  
3099 competitive. We want to avoid China dumping cheap EVs on our  
3100 market. We ban them from coming in, and we boost our  
3101 domestic manufacturing, and these provisions help with that.

3102 And I do want to mention, you know, gas is down a little  
3103 bit because President Trump tanked the economy. That is why  
3104 demand is down. So if that is the plan, tank the economy so  
3105 that gas is cheaper, that is -- you know, that is a pretty  
3106 extreme measure there.

3107 This is a bad deal for the South, whether it is  
3108 consumers in Florida or whether it is all these high-paying  
3109 jobs going to all these southern states. This is a job-  
3110 killer.

3111 In addition, adding in defunding of interstate  
3112 transmission lines, gosh, I have heard from both sides of the  
3113 aisle how often this is critical so some states can focus  
3114 more on energy production, whether it is nuclear, whether it  
3115 is natural gas, whether it is renewables, and make sure that

3116 that energy can be more efficiently spread across the United  
3117 States. So why in the world would you defund the interstate  
3118 transmission lines? That makes no sense. That will raise  
3119 energy prices. It will prevent efficiencies in the market  
3120 and for different states to specialize in new types of  
3121 energy, whether it is modular nuclear, whether it is  
3122 renewable like solar or green hydrogen that is being  
3123 formulated in Florida.

3124         And then add in the cuts to energy-efficient appliances.  
3125 And I was born in the late 1970s. This program has been  
3126 around since I was a little kid. Why we would have some of  
3127 these efforts to encourage people to continue to buy energy-  
3128 efficient appliances -- the manufacturers like it, the  
3129 retailers like it. And most importantly, American families  
3130 like it. And you don't have to buy it. This is just an  
3131 incentive for folks if they want to use and be -- want to use  
3132 energy-efficient appliances, want to do their part, household  
3133 by household. This is about the freedom to be able to use  
3134 less energy and to be able to be more efficient and protect  
3135 our environment.

3136         And so cutting these popular provisions are unpopular,  
3137 job-killing, and, of course, are going to raise energy costs.

3138         And I yield back, Chairman.

3139         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there a  
3140 discussion of the amendment on the Republican side?

3141           Seeing none, any discussion on the Democrat side?

3142           Seeing no further discussion, the vote occurs on the  
3143 amendment. The gentleman has asked for a roll call vote, and  
3144 the -- and the clerk will call the roll.

3145           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

3146           \*Mr. Latta. No.

3147           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

3148           Mr. Griffith?

3149           \*Mr. Griffith. No.

3150           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

3151           Mr. Bilirakis?

3152           \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

3153           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

3154           Mr. Hudson?

3155           \*Mr. Hudson. No.

3156           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

3157           Mr. Carter of Georgia?

3158           [No response.]

3159           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?

3160           [No response.]

3161           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?

3162           \*Mr. Dunn. No.

3163           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

3164           Mr. Crenshaw?

3165           \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.



3166           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
3167           Mr. Joyce?  
3168           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
3169           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
3170           Mr. Weber?  
3171           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
3172           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
3173           Mr. Allen?  
3174           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
3175           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
3176           Mr. Balderson?  
3177           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
3178           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
3179           Mr. Fulcher?  
3180           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
3181           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
3182           Mr. Pfluger?  
3183           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
3184           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
3185           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
3186           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
3187           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
3188           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
3189           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
3190           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

3191 Mrs. Cammack?  
3192 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.  
3193 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
3194 Mr. Oubernolte?  
3195 \*Mr. Oubernolte. No.  
3196 \*The Clerk. Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
3197 Mr. James?  
3198 \*Mr. James. No.  
3199 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
3200 Mr. Bentz?  
3201 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
3202 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
3203 Mrs. Houchin?  
3204 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
3205 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
3206 Mr. Fry?  
3207 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
3208 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
3209 Ms. Lee?  
3210 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
3211 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
3212 Mr. Langworthy?  
3213 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
3214 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
3215 Mr. Kean?

3216           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
3217           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
3218           Mr. Rulli?  
3219           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
3220           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
3221           Mr. Evans?  
3222           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
3223           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
3224           Mr. Goldman?  
3225           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
3226           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
3227           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
3228           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
3229           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
3230           Mr. Pallone?  
3231           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
3232           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
3233           Ms. DeGette?  
3234           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
3235           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
3236           Ms. Schakowsky?  
3237           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
3238           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
3239           Ms. Matsui?  
3240           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.

3241           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
3242           Ms. Castor?  
3243           \*Ms. Castor.   Yes.  
3244           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
3245           Mr. Tonko?  
3246           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
3247           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
3248           Ms. Clarke?  
3249           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
3250           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
3251           Mr. Ruiz?  
3252           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
3253           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
3254           Mr. Peters?  
3255           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
3256           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
3257           Mrs. Dingell?  
3258           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Yes.  
3259           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
3260           Mr. Veasey?  
3261           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
3262           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
3263           Ms. Kelly?  
3264           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
3265           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.

3266 Ms. Barragan?  
3267 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
3268 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
3269 Mr. Soto?  
3270 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
3271 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
3272 Ms. Schrier?  
3273 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
3274 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
3275 Mrs. Trahan?  
3276 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
3277 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
3278 Mrs. Fletcher?  
3279 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
3280 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
3281 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
3282 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
3283 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
3284 Mr. Auchincloss?  
3285 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
3286 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
3287 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
3288 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
3289 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
3290 Mr. Menendez?

3291           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.  
3292           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
3293           Mr. Mullin?  
3294           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.  
3295           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
3296           Mr. Landsman?  
3297           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
3298           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
3299           Ms. McClellan?  
3300           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.  
3301           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
3302           Chairman Guthrie?  
3303           \*The Chair.   No.  
3304           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
3305           \*The Chair.   How is Mr. Carter of Georgia recorded?  
3306           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia is not recorded.  
3307           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Carter votes no.  
3308           \*The Chair.   Palmer?  
3309           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.  
3310           \*The Chair.   Mr. Palmer?  
3311           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
3312           \*Mr. Palmer.   Palmer votes no.  
3313           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
3314           \*The Chair.   Anyone from the Republican side?  
3315           Anyone from the Democrat side?

3316           Seeing none, the clerk will report.

3317           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were  
3318   24 ayes and 30 noes.

3319           \*The Chair.   The amendment is not agreed to.   Are there  
3320   further amendments?

3321           The gentlelady from New York.

3322           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment  
3323   at the desk labeled 97AU7.

3324           \*Mr. Griffith.   And if I can reserve a point of order,  
3325   Mr. Chair.

3326           \*The Chair.   A point of order has been reserved.   The  
3327   clerk -- do you have the amendment?   The clerk --

3328           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Yes.

3329           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman --

3330           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   It is at the desk.

3331           \*The Clerk.   Could the gentlelady please repeat the  
3332   amendment?

3333           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Sure.   It is 97AU7.

3334           \*The Clerk.   Amendment offered by Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.

3335   Page 29, beginning on line 6, strike paragraph 1.   Add at the  
3336   end the following.

3337           \*The Chair.   Without objection, the reading of the  
3338   amendment is dispensed with.

3339

3340

3341 [The amendment of Ms. Ocasio-Cortez follows:]

3342

3343 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

3344



3345           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady from New York is  
3346 recognized for five minutes in support of her amendment.

3347           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is  
3348 an amendment that I hope we can all be able to support today  
3349 in terms of, at its core, being an anti-corruption amendment.

3350           In my time here in Congress I have participated in  
3351 investigations of large corporations that have poisoned  
3352 communities across the country, whether it was Deloitte and  
3353 3M that dumped PFAS in communities where so many women and  
3354 families dealt with reproductive cancers, whether it was  
3355 other kinds of pipelines near and sited near populated  
3356 communities that then leaked toxic chemicals into water  
3357 supplies. And even in Flint, Michigan, where we saw so many  
3358 children that experienced developmental delays due to  
3359 exposure to lead, a lot of times these communities were  
3360 poisoned due to large corporations that were exploiting  
3361 corrupt loopholes in the law in order to poison the most  
3362 vulnerable communities in America. And I deeply fear that  
3363 there is a loophole and similar provision in this bill.

3364           This bill allows gas companies to pay \$1 million in  
3365 order for their project to bypass the traditional permitting  
3366 process to be just simply deemed in the public interest. In  
3367 fact, this bill also allows natural gas pipeline projects to  
3368 pay a fee of \$10 million to cut the line and also bypass the  
3369 normal permitting process.

3370           Now, I think that it is a bipartisan priority for both  
3371 of us, for all of us, to try to tackle permitting reform.  
3372 But allowing massive corporations to simply cut a check to  
3373 bypass the very real reasons that permitting exists in the  
3374 first place poses a deep and grave danger to people across  
3375 the country. In fact, in New York there was something called  
3376 a Northeast Supply Enhancement project. It was a gas  
3377 pipeline that would have involved putting 17 miles of  
3378 pipeline in New York State's waterways before surfacing in  
3379 Queens, a gas pipeline in waterways. The state determined  
3380 that the pipeline would have significant water quality  
3381 impacts and would -- and could potentially contaminate the  
3382 state's waters with toxins like mercury.

3383           Mercury is a toxic metal that can cause a range of  
3384 health problems, from neurological issues to kidney damage.  
3385 And so, as this project moved through the permitting process,  
3386 environmental experts as well as energy and financial experts  
3387 all agreed that the project was too dangerous to proceed.  
3388 But this bill would have allowed Williams Companies, the  
3389 corporation behind this pipeline, to simply ignore and bypass  
3390 all of that and just pay a fee in order to put gas pipelines  
3391 and site them near highly sensitive water supplies. And this  
3392 isn't something that is just a risk here in New York. It is  
3393 a risk across the country.

3394           And again, I do believe that it is important that we

3395 discuss permitting reform, but to allow all of this to be  
3396 bypassed completely is profoundly dangerous. That is why  
3397 today I am introducing this amendment that requires that the  
3398 inspector general of the Department of Energy certify that  
3399 the bill will not result in increased risks of corruption  
3400 that jeopardize the integrity of our permitting process.

3401 Our permitting processes rely on inputs from energy  
3402 experts, medical experts, and from environmental experts from  
3403 -- as well as local communities who bear the brunt of these  
3404 impacts, but we cannot allow polluters to bribe their way  
3405 around these processes. We have seen families in Flint torn  
3406 apart. We have seen army and naval bases -- families and  
3407 communities around army and naval bases exposed to PFAS that  
3408 have had their lives torn apart. We cannot fast-track  
3409 corruption that allows massive corporations to put people's  
3410 lives at risk.

3411 Thank you, and I yield back.

3412 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there a  
3413 discussion on the amendment?

3414 \*Mr. Latta. Mr. Chairman?

3415 \*The Chair. The gentleman from Ohio, you are recognized  
3416 for discussion of the amendment.

3417 \*Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
3418 the last word.

3419 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

3420           \*Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman,  
3421 this amendment is not necessary. All Federal permitting  
3422 processes will remain intact under these provisions. The  
3423 language explicitly requires each Federal, state, interstate,  
3424 or tribal agency to review the application for the relevant  
3425 Federal authorizations prior to approval. Projections  
3426 utilizing -- projects utilizing this process must comply with  
3427 the underlying statutes, including anti-corruption standards.  
3428 If projects violate the law, FERC maintains its ability to  
3429 revoke permits and licenses it has issued if there are  
3430 violations of the terms and conditions of the permits.

3431           And, Mr. Chairman, I move that the amendment not be  
3432 adopted.

3433           \*The Chair. Will you yield?

3434           \*Mr. Latta. I yield, Mr. Chairman.

3435           \*The Chair. So thanks a lot. So I went to school on  
3436 the Hudson River, we have talked about that. Other than the  
3437 Commonwealth of Kentucky, probably one of the most beautiful  
3438 spots in America, and we want to protect that, too.

3439           And the local laws and state laws have to be followed,  
3440 even with this process. We wanted to make sure. So the  
3441 reason I said that, when I was there in the 1980s you  
3442 couldn't swim in the Hudson River because of what corporate  
3443 America had done, some unknowing, they just didn't realize  
3444 the laws in the -- or didn't -- we didn't know the science

3445 that we know now. But we want to make sure it is protected,  
3446 and we feel that this does do that.

3447 And so I will yield back to my friend from Ohio.

3448 \*Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield  
3449 back the balance of my time.

3450 \*The Chair. Is there further discussion?

3451 The gentlelady from Florida, and then Washington.

3452 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank  
3453 Representative Ocasio-Cortez for offering this very important  
3454 amendment.

3455 It simply says that this will not go into effect until  
3456 the inspector general of the Department of Energy certifies  
3457 that this will not result in an increased risk of corruption  
3458 or pay-to-play. Although I do note that remember Donald  
3459 Trump and Elon Musk fired the inspector general at the  
3460 Department of Energy, so they are already taking the cops off  
3461 the beat.

3462 And what the Republicans want to do in this bill will  
3463 make it worse. This pay-to-play scheme they want to jam  
3464 through through this reconciliation bill will simply sell out  
3465 local communities back home to the highest bidder, all to  
3466 placate big oil companies and their billionaire friends.

3467 Now, I represent a Gulf Coast district in the Tampa Bay  
3468 area. We are still reeling from the damage of Hurricanes  
3469 Helene and Milton. But, you know, we really haven't gotten

3470 over the BP Deepwater Horizon blowout of some years ago,  
3471 where the pollution just spewed out from that deep water well  
3472 for months. Do you remember on TV, it just kept going and  
3473 going? So that seriously impacted the ability of small  
3474 businesses to lure tourists. We haven't industrialized our  
3475 coastline, so the damage was real, and we are getting over --  
3476 we are just kind of recovering from the environmental,  
3477 economic damage.

3478         So now you want to say that neighbors across the Gulf  
3479 Coast who know how dangerous these types of energy  
3480 infrastructure projects are, that we aren't going to have a  
3481 say in it? Because this would force those Gulf Coast  
3482 communities to host dangerous, polluting liquefied natural  
3483 gas export facilities.

3484         And since, Mr. Chairman, you were going back in time,  
3485 you know, before I arrived in Congress and in public service,  
3486 I was an environmental attorney. And what I learned is that  
3487 it is very important to have the community engagement up  
3488 front. It helps you address problems. Often times it helps  
3489 the infrastructure problem -- facility be permitted. You get  
3490 buy-in from the local community, right? There might be jobs,  
3491 there might be other benefits, but maybe not. But you have  
3492 to give them their say and their due process.

3493         It seems like everything right now is about not  
3494 recognizing due process for anyone, and this would strip away

3495 the ability of local communities to have a say when you have  
3496 a new polluting plant running through your own backyard. It  
3497 would gut the normal judicial review by severely limiting who  
3498 can challenge it, all of this without even studying whether  
3499 or not the facilities and those pipelines are in the public  
3500 interest.

3501         And we know that Republicans are scared to do these  
3502 analyses. Why? Because there was analysis done at the end  
3503 of the year by the Department of Energy that talked about  
3504 liquefied natural gas exports. They said -- that analysis  
3505 said, by the Department of Energy, that if we export more of  
3506 our gas, rather than using it here at home, our electric  
3507 bills will go up, plus it will drastically worsen climate  
3508 pollution that is warming the Gulf waters and super-charging  
3509 these storms that also have a significant impact on the  
3510 bottom lines of the families I represent.

3511         And our Energy Committee -- Subcommittee and this  
3512 committee has heard over and over again from energy  
3513 developers of all kinds they need certainty to make long-term  
3514 investments. They need independent regulators who can fairly  
3515 make these assessments about whether or not these projects  
3516 are in the public interest. So this bill is totally radical,  
3517 just strips away any of that certainty, particularly as the  
3518 President works to make energy regulators less independent.

3519         You know, there are significant environmental harms and

3520 health issues when you are trying to ram in a gas export  
3521 polluting facility. But here now, this may not be a gold-  
3522 plated 747, but for just a small fee big oil companies can  
3523 bribe the Trump Administration to get whatever they want.  
3524 This bill would make Republicans, unfortunately, complicit in  
3525 the blatant corruption and insider dealing that we have  
3526 unfortunately come to expect from this Administration.

3527       This bill doesn't create a two-track system. It  
3528 completely alters the way that we review polluting projects  
3529 in America. Instead of focusing on reform, Republicans are  
3530 just attempting to abolish all permitting, do it through the  
3531 back door, grease the skids. It does nothing to lower energy  
3532 costs for hard-working families. So please support her good  
3533 amendment.

3534       \*The Chair. Thanks. The gentlelady yields back. The  
3535 chair recognizes the gentlelady from Iowa for five minutes  
3536 for a discussion of the amendment.

3537       \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

3538       Solyndra.

3539       \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back?

3540       \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. I yield back.

3541       \*The Chair. Okay, the gentlelady yields back. Is there  
3542 further discussion on the amendment?

3543       The gentlelady from California, for what -- oh, the  
3544 gentlelady from Washington asked earlier. The gentlelady



3545 from Washington is recognized for five minutes to speak on  
3546 the amendment. You are next -- or after a Republican.

3547 \*Ms. Barragan. So much for seniority.

3548 \*Mr. Pallone. What did she say?

3549 \*The Chair. Solyndra. Solyndra.

3550 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
3551 strike the last word to support Representative Ocasio-  
3552 Cortez's amendment because this bill currently seeks to  
3553 completely bypass protections for communities and landowners.

3554 And these pay-to-play provisions put not just a thumb,  
3555 but an entire arm -- maybe a body -- on the scale favoring  
3556 oil and gas. It is giant corporations like Shell, BP,  
3557 Chevron, they are the ones that have the wherewithal to pay  
3558 to bypass all -- let me repeat that: all -- permitting  
3559 requirements. This bill is more of the drill, baby, drill  
3560 agenda that we hear every week from our Republican  
3561 colleagues.

3562 Look, I am all for streamlining permitting for energy  
3563 projects to address demand. And energy infrastructure has  
3564 real impacts on our communities. But there is ways to  
3565 streamline permitting and get new energy resources online  
3566 without sidelining solar, wind, nuclear, hydropower, or  
3567 hydrogen projects. Our Senate friends made serious progress  
3568 on a bipartisan bill to do just that the last Congress. But  
3569 this committee wouldn't bring it up for a hearing.

3570 Streamlining permitting is key if we are going to meet  
3571 energy demands. But clean power shouldn't have -- should  
3572 have, excuse me -- clean power should have the same  
3573 opportunity as oil and gas, and we shouldn't be disregarding  
3574 important environmental protections. So I encourage my  
3575 colleagues to support this amendment.

3576 I yield back.

3577 \*Mr. Pallone. Would the gentlewoman yield to me?

3578 [No response.]

3579 \*Mr. Pallone. Would the --

3580 \*Ms. Schrier. Yes. Oh, yes, absolutely. Thank you.

3581 \*Mr. Pallone. You know, I just wanted to point out on  
3582 this amendment that, you know, the gentlewoman from New York,  
3583 Ocasio-Cortez, talked about LNG in particular.

3584 And I am just reading the LNG section, where it says an  
3585 application to export natural gas, right, from the United  
3586 States, a non-refundable charge of \$1 million. And for  
3587 purposes of this section, such a non-refundable charge of \$1  
3588 million -- and I am quoting -- was imposed and collected,  
3589 shall be deemed to be in the public interest, and such an  
3590 application shall be granted without modification or delay.  
3591 And I heard Mr. Latta say there was still some review, but  
3592 this is not -- there is no review. In other words, they  
3593 think that because -- this says if you pay the million, that  
3594 means that the payment of the fee is the public interest,

3595 right?

3596           So rather than review this to see whether or not it is  
3597 going to raise natural gas prices or whether it has any kind  
3598 of environmental implications, in the -- for the public  
3599 interest, that is what the review was for -- this says that  
3600 you pay the million dollars, and that check is in the public  
3601 interest. And therefore, you don't have to do anything and  
3602 there is no further review whatsoever.

3603           So, I mean, I can't think of anything that is more of a  
3604 pay-to-play than that. It is unbelievable.

3605           I will yield back to the gentlewoman.

3606           \*Ms. Schrier. I yield back.

3607           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
3608 further discussion on the Republican side?

3609           The gentlelady from California is recognized for five  
3610 minutes.

3611           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to  
3612 speak in support of this amendment.

3613           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

3614           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

3615           Given the corruption that is at play with this  
3616 Administration right now, there could be nothing more  
3617 important than doing everything that we can to stop the  
3618 corruption, stop the pay-and-play.

3619           I mean, you are talking about an administration that

3620 came in and fired inspector generals. We have heard today  
3621 that this Medicaid -- these Medicaid cuts to millions of  
3622 people are about cutting waste, fraud, and abuse, yet the  
3623 inspector general that was supposed to be overseeing the  
3624 waste, fraud, and abuse in Medicaid was also fired.

3625         So in the interest of talking about Medicaid and what is  
3626 at stake, my constituent, Brian, wrote to me and said, "Dear  
3627 Congresswoman, my name is Brian Gutierrez. I am one of your  
3628 constituents living with spina bifida, a lifelong disability  
3629 that has shaped every part of my journey, but has not defined  
3630 my potential. I am writing to share how Medicaid has been  
3631 the foundation of my survival, my independence, and my  
3632 ability to thrive. For me and millions like me, Medicaid is  
3633 not just a safety net. It is the reason we are alive and  
3634 moving forward. From childhood through adulthood, Medicaid  
3635 has covered the surgeries, specialist care, mobility  
3636 equipment, and ongoing treatments that my condition requires.  
3637 With Medicaid I have access to prosthetics and leg braces  
3638 that allow me to move through the world with dignity. With  
3639 Medicaid I can see the doctors and therapist who help me  
3640 manage the complex and evolving nature of spina bifida.  
3641 These supports don't just keep me stable; they give me the  
3642 freedom to live and work and advocate and participate fully  
3643 in my community.'`

3644         "In April 2024, I was diagnosed with early-stage

3645 colorectal cancer, a terrifying moment that could have  
3646 changed everything. Because of Medicaid I received timely  
3647 and expert care, including a successful endoscopy resection  
3648 that helped me avoid more invasive treatment. Today I am in  
3649 remission. That outcome was only possible because I had  
3650 access to specialists, procedures, and follow-up care without  
3651 delay or denial. Medicaid gave me a fighting chance and I  
3652 took it.'`

3653 "Medicaid also supports the in-home supportive services,  
3654 the IHHS [sic] program, which is vital to my daily life. My  
3655 mother is my primary caregiver and an IHSS worker, providing  
3656 the personal care I need to remain safely and independently  
3657 at home. IHHS [sic] is not just about convenience, it is  
3658 about dignity, autonomy, and the ability to be part of my  
3659 community instead of being isolated in an institution.  
3660 Medicaid's investments in programs like IHHS [sic]  
3661 strengthens families, sustains caregiving, and keeps people  
3662 like me where we belong: at home and in control of our  
3663 lives.'`

3664 "This story is not mine alone. Roughly 55 percent of  
3665 adults with spina bifida rely on Medicaid. In California  
3666 nearly three million people with disabilities depend on it.  
3667 Medicaid is the backbone of our health care system and a  
3668 lifeline for many with disabilities, including seniors and  
3669 working-class families. But that lifeline is now under

3670 attack. The proposed Republican budget resolution includes  
3671 devastating \$880 billion in cuts to Medicaid, which currently  
3672 operates with \$650 billion in Federal funding. These cuts  
3673 would decimate the program, eliminating or reducing essential  
3674 services, ending IHHS [sic] for countless families, forcing  
3675 people out of their homes, and taking away health care from  
3676 those who need it most.'`

3677 "For many of us, these cuts are not abstract numbers;  
3678 they are the difference between stability and crisis, between  
3679 life and death. I am healthy today because Medicaid stood by  
3680 me. I am thriving because I have had consistent, reliable  
3681 access to the care I need. Medicaid makes independence  
3682 possible. It makes survival possible. It makes dignity  
3683 possible. Any threat to Medicaid is a threat to our lives.  
3684 Thank you for your time and your leadership. Sincerely,  
3685 Brian Gutierrez, constituent, spina bifida advocate, and  
3686 Medicaid recipient.'`

3687 And again, how is this related to the amendment? Well,  
3688 inspector generals can help save money. Inspector generals  
3689 can help get out the waste, the fraud, and the abuse. If my  
3690 colleagues cared about that so much, they would have spoken  
3691 up when the inspector general that oversees Medicaid was  
3692 fired.

3693 With that I yield back.

3694 \*The Chair. Thank you. I will just remind the

3695 committee -- I understand at the end you made a connection to  
3696 the underlying amendment, but the subject of the bill or the  
3697 amendment is what we are debating today. So I will remind  
3698 the committee of that.

3699 The --

3700 \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman, I believe that it is  
3701 directly related. It was about inspector generals and about  
3702 cutting waste, fraud, and abuse, and I think that there is a  
3703 relationship with corruption and pay-to-play with what is in  
3704 the bill.

3705 \*The Chair. Thank you. So the chair will now recognize  
3706 the gentlelady from Texas -- or any on the Republican side?

3707 So the gentlelady from Texas is recognized for five  
3708 minutes on the amendment.

3709 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and  
3710 I have a couple of questions about the amendment, so I hope  
3711 that somebody will be able to help me out.

3712 But I guess let me preface my questions by saying that I  
3713 saw these provisions -- obviously, like many other people --  
3714 for the first time in the last 36 hours. And I think  
3715 everybody in here knows I support permitting reform, I have  
3716 supported permitting reform, it is critically important to  
3717 people in my community in Houston, and we have been talking  
3718 about permitting reform for years.

3719 I just double checked with Mr. Peters. This is the

3720 first -- he has been working on it tirelessly. I feel like  
3721 every hearing we have Mr. Peters says we need to do  
3722 permitting reform, and I am right behind him. This is the  
3723 first time I have ever heard you can just pay \$10 million and  
3724 get a permit, you can just pay a million dollars and get a  
3725 permit, you can just pay all this money and you will be  
3726 deemed acceptable. This is not a proposal we have been  
3727 talking about. And frankly, it is pretty surprising to me.

3728 Now, I think we should do our job and do permitting  
3729 reform, and there are a lot of great ideas that we need to be  
3730 exploring. I think everybody here -- hopefully, by now --  
3731 knows I also support LNG exports. And in fact, I have had a  
3732 bill for the last two Congresses to deem in our national  
3733 interest to export LNG to our NATO allies and to Ukraine. I  
3734 have begged this committee to take that bill up because I  
3735 think it is critically important, and I took issue with the  
3736 time of the review in the last administration because I  
3737 thought that that was in our national interest, and I  
3738 continue to think that supporting Ukraine and our NATO allies  
3739 through exporting U.S. LNG is a very good idea.

3740 So I am just surprised to see all these provisions in  
3741 the bill, and so I want to know if maybe counsel can clear up  
3742 the question from the earlier set of questions about whether  
3743 what I read in the summary from the memorandum from the  
3744 majority says that, once the fee is paid under section 41002



3745 -- upon the application and collection of the fee, the  
3746 Secretary of Energy shall deem the application in the public  
3747 interest for national gas exports.

3748 I support natural gas exports, but is that in fact the  
3749 case, that there is no other review?

3750 And likewise, is that also the case with the other  
3751 pipeline permitting that you just pay the fee, and that is  
3752 it? Can counsel answer that question?

3753 \*Counsel. Congresswoman, I think it is following FERC  
3754 review for both of those provisions.

3755 \*Mrs. Fletcher. So it is not automatically deemed in  
3756 the public interest, as defined in the majority memo here?

3757 \*Counsel. Well, it depends on which -- the public  
3758 interest is for a Department of Energy determination, and  
3759 then FERC would continue a review, the normal NEPA review and  
3760 environmental reviews for any construction associated with  
3761 the project.

3762 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay, so the payment of the \$1 million  
3763 deems the application in the public interest at DoE. That is  
3764 the extent of their review, according to this amendment?

3765 \*Counsel. Yes. Under the -- yes, and then it would go  
3766 over to FERC for the normal FERC process.

3767 \*Mrs. Fletcher. So if you paid \$1 million to, say,  
3768 export natural gas to --

3769 \*Counsel. To a non-free-trade --

3770           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Right, to a non-free-trade country like  
3771 Iran, you just pay \$1 million, it is in the national  
3772 interest. Or China, right? I mean, that is -- you pay the  
3773 fee, and it is deemed in the national interest?

3774           \*Counsel. I think there is some limits with sanctions.  
3775 If there are sanctions, it wouldn't apply.

3776           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Is that in the bill text?

3777           \*Counsel. No, that is current law. I am sorry,  
3778 Congresswoman, yes. That is current law.

3779           \*Mrs. Fletcher. And where is that covered in the bill  
3780 text?

3781           \*Counsel. It doesn't. It doesn't. This does not  
3782 affect the current law. This is just providing for the  
3783 natural gas, how it is treated under the Natural Gas Act  
3784 under section 3.

3785           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Well, I think there is still --  
3786 because this proposal that has shown up in the last 36 hours  
3787 has kind of come out of left field, I feel like maybe we need  
3788 to get to the bottom of some of these questions about what,  
3789 in fact, it means to pay this, and this is why this amendment  
3790 is a good idea to make sure that we really vet this and  
3791 understand it.

3792           The other question I have for counsel is in terms of the  
3793 payments, the million-dollar user fee, the \$10 million user  
3794 fee, are there provisions included for how these fees can be

3795 paid? Could -- for example, can you pay these with  
3796 Trumpcoin?

3797 \*Counsel. I think --

3798 \*Mrs. Fletcher. I mean --

3799 \*Counsel. I think it would be how fees are paid now  
3800 under current applications.

3801 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay, so it doesn't exclude Trumpcoin  
3802 as a form of payment?

3803 \*Counsel. The text doesn't make that distinction.

3804 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Well, let's think about that.

3805 I see I have gone over my five minutes, so, Mr.  
3806 Chairman, I will yield back. But I do hope that we will  
3807 continue to assess --

3808 \*The Chair. The gentlelady --

3809 \*Mrs. Fletcher. -- this, and vote in favor of this  
3810 amendment.

3811 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
3812 there further discussion on the amendment?

3813 Seeing none on the Republican, the gentleman from  
3814 California, you are recognized for five minutes for  
3815 discussion of the amendment.

3816 \*Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just -- it  
3817 does occur to me that, as an environmental lawyer, it would  
3818 have been pretty easy just to say, oh, you just pay \$10  
3819 million and you are over, so we are going to put more lawyers

3820 out of work than AI, I think.

3821           Anyway, with that I would like to yield to the  
3822 gentlewoman from New York, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.

3823           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you. I just want us to be  
3824 clear about the provision ahead of us in front of us right  
3825 now.

3826           There are plenty of things that seek permitting that  
3827 need a permit, whether it is solar energy, wind energy, gas,  
3828 oil. If you want to construct something big, you need to go  
3829 through a process of review to seek a permit. This bill says  
3830 to oil and gas -- to fossil fuel companies and fossil fuel  
3831 companies only -- you can pay money. When health care  
3832 experts, environmental experts are saying if you place a  
3833 pipeline here through this community people will get cancer,  
3834 people could get reproductive cancers, people could be  
3835 poisoned, people could be exposed to mercury, lead, there  
3836 could be grave health and environmental factors, an oil and  
3837 gas company can pay \$10 million to waive all of that away, to  
3838 be deemed "in the public interest," even if that pipeline is  
3839 not shown to increase -- to lower energy costs, even if that  
3840 pipeline is shown to increase health or environmental risk  
3841 factors.

3842           And what this amendment does -- the only thing this  
3843 amendment is asking us to do is to say, can the inspector  
3844 general, the watchdog of the Department of Energy, certify

3845 that corruption risks are not increasing to jeopardize the  
3846 integrity of the permitting process? This amendment isn't  
3847 even changing that underlying, very disturbing provision.  
3848 This is saying, can we certify that there is not a risk of  
3849 corruption here? And I am finding that the opposition to  
3850 this is not really being stated.

3851         Additionally, I think also to the ranking member's  
3852 point, in -- just the fact of paying \$10 million makes it  
3853 automatically in the public interest alone. And what happens  
3854 when that \$10 million in the public interest then starts to  
3855 run up against real environmental, health, and other risk  
3856 factors? Which public interest prevails, the check?

3857         And I want to -- you know, I am interested in the  
3858 ranking member's thoughts in reading these provisions on the  
3859 bill, so I am happy to yield to you if you have any thoughts  
3860 on that, Mr. Pallone.

3861         \*Mr. Pallone. Well, it literally says -- I mean, I have  
3862 never heard anything like it, it is so outrageous -- that the  
3863 non-refundable charge shall be deemed in the public interest.  
3864 So I don't know how you can read that other than to say that  
3865 actually paying the fee satisfies the public interest  
3866 criteria. So I have never seen that in any piece of  
3867 legislation in my life where -- in other words, what they are  
3868 saying is it is in the public interest for you to pay. It is  
3869 in the public interest for you to give us \$1 million.

3870           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. So --

3871           \*Mr. Pallone. That is the public interest.

3872           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. So will the ranking member yield  
3873 back?

3874           \*Mr. Pallone. Yes.

3875           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. So we are hearing here right now  
3876 that this bill has carved out a specific industry -- not  
3877 anyone seeking permitting reform, a specific industry, just  
3878 oil and gas -- to just pay to bypass all of the guardrails,  
3879 all of the safety, all of -- any of the rules and guidelines  
3880 to cite anything responsibly. And you can just pay money to  
3881 bypass any concerns around health risks. And for some reason  
3882 there is no corruption risk there?

3883           I mean, I spent six years on the Oversight Committee  
3884 taking on corporate corruption, taking on governmental  
3885 corruption, including on -- bipartisan, on a bipartisan  
3886 basis. I too have never seen anything like this, ever. I  
3887 sat on the Natural Resources Committee, saw and heard  
3888 testimony from tons of people, whether it was from mining,  
3889 whether it is from any other kinds of exposures, kids with  
3890 developmental disabilities that can never be recovered.

3891           And all we are asking for is a certification that risks  
3892 of corruption will not increase from the inspector general  
3893 under the Trump Administration's own Department of Energy.  
3894 That is the only thing that is up here today.

3895           Thank you, and I yield back.

3896           \*Mr. Pallone. I yield back.

3897           \*Mr. Landsman. Mr. Chair?

3898           \*The Chair. The gentlewoman from California [sic]  
3899 yields back. Is there further discussion on the Republican  
3900 side?

3901           Seeing none, on the Democrat side?

3902           \*Mr. Landsman. Mr. --

3903           \*The Chair. Oh, the gentlelady from Massachusetts is  
3904 recognized to speak on the amendment.

3905           \*Mrs. Trahan. I yield to the congresswoman from Texas.

3906           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you so much for yielding, and I  
3907 just have a follow-up because, as my colleague from New York  
3908 was talking, I thought, well, I represent a lot of people who  
3909 work in this business. And to me it also feels like it could  
3910 be a shakedown of the people in the business.

3911           Everyone around here talks about how much money they  
3912 have, so we will just make them pay a lot more to get  
3913 consideration of their permit. If you don't pay the fee, you  
3914 are in trouble. Well, that is not fair to folks, either. So  
3915 I think it is really important.

3916           I also think, for my friends on the other side of the  
3917 aisle, we should easily agree that we can certify -- that we  
3918 should vote for this amendment, make sure that we have vetted  
3919 this concept thoroughly so that it doesn't hurt our

3920 constituents across the board in every state.

3921       And I also think that this is such a risky proposal.  
3922 You know this is headed to the courts. You know there is  
3923 huge litigation risk here. And so I don't know that anybody  
3924 is going to take advantage of this anyway. I don't know  
3925 anybody asking for this sort of system. But certainly, to  
3926 me, in the opposite -- I mean, on the other side it kind of  
3927 feels like a shakedown of the folks who do this work, and you  
3928 shouldn't have to pay \$10 million to get a permit when it is  
3929 in the -- when it is in our national interest. You shouldn't  
3930 have to pay \$1 million to get your permits reviewed.

3931       And I think that, you know, there is more than one way  
3932 to look at this, and I think it is really important that we  
3933 make sure that we are not penalizing people who are  
3934 participants throughout this -- throughout the industry. And  
3935 I think that it is important that we make sure for the  
3936 American people that there is no risk of corruption here. It  
3937 is certainly -- coming up in this way for the first time  
3938 raises a lot of red flags that I think should give everybody  
3939 on both sides of the aisle on this committee pause before  
3940 moving forward to put in this legislation.

3941       And with that I will yield back to the gentlewoman from  
3942 Massachusetts.

3943       \*Mrs. Trahan. I yield back.

3944       \*Mr. Joyce. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields. The



3945 gentleman from Ohio is recognized.

3946 \*Mr. Landsman. Yes, and I move to strike the last word.

3947 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

3948 \*Mr. Landsman. Just a question for the -- for counsel.

3949 In reading this, or by putting it together, appreciating  
3950 the fact that somebody is going to spend \$10 million to get  
3951 something that they wouldn't otherwise get, can you confirm  
3952 that the language is written in a way that there is no risk  
3953 of corruption?

3954 \*Counsel. I don't think that is -- I think that is a  
3955 policy judgment for the members.

3956 \*Mr. Landsman. So there is a policy question here. Is  
3957 that fair to say, this is a policy question?

3958 \*Counsel. Well, the --

3959 \*Voice. It is a policy question, not for counsel to  
3960 answer.

3961 \*Mr. Joyce. That is a policy question, not for counsel  
3962 to answer.

3963 \*Mr. Landsman. So this -- so we are debating a policy  
3964 question.

3965 \*Counsel. Yes.

3966 \*Mr. Landsman. Oh, thank you.

3967 I yield back.

3968 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman?

3969 \*Mr. Joyce. Mr. Carter is recognized.

3970           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I move to strike the last  
3971 word.

3972           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

3973           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Counsel, counsel, can I ask  
3974 you a question, sir?

3975           \*Counsel. Yes. Yes, sir.

3976           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Presumably, a person pays  
3977 this enormous fee, \$10 million, whatever, whatever it is, so  
3978 they don't -- they can bypass permitting, correct?

3979           \*Counsel. That is not correct, sir.

3980           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Then what is correct?

3981           \*Counsel. So the -- under the language, the fee is paid  
3982 and the application -- there is two steps. The application  
3983 is deemed in the public interest for the purposes of export,  
3984 and then the process begins for FERC to review the  
3985 construction of the facility and everything associated with  
3986 the facility and the actual operation of the facility. That  
3987 is where environmental and other considerations come in, and  
3988 this does not affect that.

3989           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So is this not giving an  
3990 unfair advantage to those who can afford to pay \$10 million  
3991 versus those who can't? Because it sounds like if you have  
3992 enough money, you can bypass the rules and pay to play. That  
3993 doesn't sound like a level playing field to me. So help me  
3994 understand what happens to the person that can -- let me ask

3995 the question, you are doing all kind of facial gestures.

3996 \*Counsel. No, I am trying to read this too --

3997 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Okay.

3998 \*Counsel. I am sorry, sir.

3999 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. The person that can stroke a  
4000 check for 10 million versus the person who can't, why is that  
4001 fair, just because this person has more money?

4002 \*Mr. Pallone. Yes --

4003 \*Mr. Joyce. That is not a technical question --

4004 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. That is not a technical  
4005 question?

4006 \*Mr. Joyce. -- that the counsel needs to address.

4007 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I think it is technical. Why  
4008 isn't it? I am trying to determine the difference between  
4009 someone who can pay 10 million and someone who can't, and  
4010 that is pretty technical as far as I am concerned. I want to  
4011 know if operator A has 10 and operator B doesn't, but they  
4012 have the same widgets, why are they not being treated  
4013 equally?

4014 \*Counsel. The way the -- sir, the way that the text is  
4015 written is the Secretary shall, by rule, impose and collect  
4016 for each application to export natural gas from the United  
4017 States to a foreign country in which there is not, in effect,  
4018 a free-trade agreement requiring national treatment for trade  
4019 in natural gas, et cetera, et cetera, shall then be deemed in

4020 the --

4021 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Well --

4022 \*Counsel. Any applicant to a non-free-trade -- for  
4023 export to non-free-trade company will pay the fee. That is  
4024 it.

4025 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So this amendment merely says  
4026 that we want to have the Trump Administration's -- not some  
4027 nefarious or some make-believe person, but an inspector  
4028 general that works for this Administration -- you know, we  
4029 talk a lot about waste, fraud, abuse, and making sure that we  
4030 have provisions to root them out to make sure these things  
4031 are not being done in a nefarious way. This amendment merely  
4032 says let's put a belt and suspenders to make sure that we are  
4033 checking those boxes.

4034 Your smirk is really -- it is a little distracting,  
4035 because I am asking you a legitimate question and you are  
4036 smirking.

4037 \*Counsel. I am not, sir.

4038 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Okay, I am sorry. I  
4039 interpreted it as a smirk. So if it wasn't a smirk, so be  
4040 it.

4041 So help me understand people that are relying on, as it  
4042 has been mentioned over and over again, these issues of  
4043 environmental -- listen, I am from Louisiana. I understand  
4044 the importance of oil exploration. I also understand that we

4045 should reform our permitting. But we should not do so in a  
4046 way that it looks, feels like a pay to play. If you can  
4047 write a big check, you can expedite. So what is the  
4048 difference -- I will go again -- between the person who can  
4049 and the person who can't, just a check?

4050 \*Counsel. I can refer you to the text in that -- of the  
4051 provisions, sir.

4052 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I have read the text. And we  
4053 are all speaking and asking questions that, presumably, you  
4054 are equipped to answer.

4055 And this amendment is being rejected, and I still have  
4056 not found the basis of why. Some will say it is not  
4057 necessary because we already have X and Y. Well, why would a  
4058 belt, suspenders, and a safety net not be appropriate to  
4059 protect the American people?

4060 \*Counsel. Sir, I think that -- I mean, I think that is  
4061 a policy question for the members to decide.

4062 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. All right. I yield.

4063 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
4064 Texas is recognized.

4065 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you. I move to strike the last  
4066 word.

4067 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

4068 \*Mr. Crenshaw. I think we can end with the pearl  
4069 clutching. What we are talking about is a user fee. We all

4070 seem to be comfortable with user fees when it comes to the  
4071 FDA. That is all this is. There are no laws being changed,  
4072 no policies being changed. All of the laws that still govern  
4073 permitting must be followed. That is all that is happening  
4074 here.

4075         And we are talking -- I keep hearing the word  
4076 "corruption.'" Now, depending on how you mean the word  
4077 "corruption'" and how this somehow opens the door for more of  
4078 it, I am not sure. But I might remind everyone that there is  
4079 already laws preventing corruption, however you mean that  
4080 word. There is no reason that those laws would be changed,  
4081 given this new user fee.

4082         I would also point out the hypocrisy from many of my  
4083 colleagues talking about money just being thrown out the  
4084 door. Last time we went through this exercise of  
4085 reconciliation of the Inflation Reduction Act, hundreds of  
4086 billions of dollars went to third-party NGOs, which  
4087 supposedly doled out that money to clean energy projects,  
4088 money we will never really know where it went. And the  
4089 inspector general from the EPA sat in front of this committee  
4090 and told us he had no way of knowing where that was going.  
4091 That sounds a lot to me like corruption. Maybe that is what  
4092 we should be investigating.

4093         I yield back.

4094         \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields.

4095           The gentlelady from Virginia is recognized.

4096           \*Ms. McClellan. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to  
4097 strike the last word.

4098           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady is recognized.

4099           \*Ms. McClellan. So let's be clear. This is not a user  
4100 fee, because when you pay a user fee you still have to go  
4101 through all of the regulatory approvals required for your  
4102 project. That is not what the bill does.

4103           Reading the majority's memo in section 41002, it says,  
4104 notwithstanding any requirements or statutory obligations  
4105 under Federal and state law, including citing environmental  
4106 and safety reviews and permitting, section 41002 requires an  
4107 applicant -- requires an application for a certificate of  
4108 crossing to include a \$50,000 payment, and directs FERC to  
4109 issue the certificate. When you read the actual text of the  
4110 bill, it says on page 4, line 11, "The Commission shall, upon  
4111 payment of the fee in the amount of \$50,000 by a person  
4112 requesting a certificate of crossing, issue such  
4113 certificate.'`

4114           So let's be clear. That is not a user fee. That is you  
4115 pay \$50,000, you get your permit, period, notwithstanding any  
4116 provision of Federal or state law. So you are also saying --  
4117 like, that is not a user fee, okay? That is -- we are  
4118 cutting out -- and this isn't even permitting reform. This  
4119 is you pay \$50,000, you get your FERC permit for this

4120 particular project. No if, and, or but. That is not  
4121 ambiguous. That is clear as crystal, which is not the  
4122 definition of a user fee, which is not even permitting  
4123 reform, other than to say if you got the money you get it.

4124 I yield back.

4125 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentleman from  
4126 Texas is recognized.

4127 \*Mr. Pfluger. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4128 I am a little disappointed in my colleagues on the other  
4129 side of the aisle for not actually reading the Natural Gas  
4130 Act. You all know better. You know, when you read the  
4131 Natural Gas Act, that -- let's just talk about the permitting  
4132 review, first off. It doesn't skip a permitting review. You  
4133 all know this. There is no skipping of this. LNG export  
4134 applications will still go through, and they will always go  
4135 through a rigorous process through FERC. And section 3 of  
4136 the Natural Gas Act is very explicit on this.

4137 So it is false when you say that it is not going to go  
4138 through a process. It does. It will go through a process.  
4139 It will always go through a process. That is current law.  
4140 So this argument that it is not going to go through is  
4141 completely false. The FERC process includes a rigorous  
4142 environmental review, including NEPA. That will still be  
4143 adhered to.

4144 So once again, we have got -- for everybody in the



4145 audience out here -- lies about this process.

4146 \*Ms. Barragan. Objection, objection. He used the word  
4147 "lies" again.

4148 \*Mr. Pfluger. It has been --

4149 \*Ms. Barragan. It is a double standard.

4150 \*Mr. Pfluger. It is a false --

4151 \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman, I move to take it --

4152 \*Mr. Pfluger. These are falsehoods.

4153 \*Ms. Barragan. I want to move --

4154 \*Mr. Pfluger. These are complete falsehoods --

4155 \*Ms. Barragan. I want to move to take his words down.

4156 \*Mr. Pfluger. -- that are not true.

4157 \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman, I think you should gavel  
4158 him down.

4159 \*Mr. Joyce. Ma'am, you are not recognized, ma'am. You  
4160 are not --

4161 \*Ms. Barragan. I would like to take his words down.

4162 \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

4163 \*Ms. Barragan. But you set out the rules not to use  
4164 that word --

4165 \*Ms. Clarke. Bring back the chair.

4166 \*Ms. Barragan. -- we on the Democratic side --

4167 \*Ms. Clarke. Bring back the chairman. This man just  
4168 violated what the chairman --

4169 \*Ms. Barragan. You are not following the rules of the

4170 chair, Mr. Chairman.

4171 \*Ms. Clarke. Bring back the chair.

4172 \*Ms. Barragan. I move to strike and take down his  
4173 words.

4174 \*Ms. Clarke. Bring back the chair.

4175 \*Voice. Order, suspend.

4176 \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman --

4177 \*Mr. Joyce. We are going to suspend.

4178 \*Ms. Barragan. It is ridiculous.

4179 \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, can I just ask something?

4180 \*Mr. Joyce. Yes.

4181 \*Mr. Pallone. We had a sort of unwritten agreement that  
4182 no one was going to use the word "lie.'" So if we could just  
4183 continue with that, I know Mr. August maybe wasn't here when  
4184 that happened.

4185 \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

4186 \*Mr. Pallone. Well, I -- what I am asking you is that,  
4187 rather than take down words, we just agree that from now on  
4188 we are not going to use the word "lie.'" I don't know if  
4189 August was here when we agreed to that, but that was the  
4190 agreement, that we would not refer -- use the word "lie'"  
4191 anymore during the markup.

4192 So if that is okay with everyone, let's just continue.  
4193 No more use of the word --

4194 \*Mr. Pfluger. Mr. Chairman, can we agree to tell the

4195 truth today?

4196 \*Mr. Pallone. You can use "disdain," just not use the  
4197 word "lie." That was the agreement. All right. If you  
4198 don't want to go by the agreement, then we are going to have  
4199 to go back to taking down the word.

4200 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman from Texas is recognized.

4201 \*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you. Let's talk about the public  
4202 interest. Let's talk about what is in the public interest.  
4203 Because again, if you read the Natural Gas Act, section 3 is  
4204 very explicit in the public interest. And it assumes that if  
4205 you are not on a terror watch list, that if you are not Iran,  
4206 Russia, Venezuela, or one of the countries that has been  
4207 deemed to not be in the public interest, that it assumes that  
4208 the Secretary of Energy will automatically approve the export  
4209 of LNG to non-FTA countries. That is the assumption.

4210 And what we saw in the last four years was that there  
4211 was only one administration who didn't think it was in the  
4212 public interest, which is why LNG exports were paused -- only  
4213 one administration in the history of the Natural Gas Act,  
4214 without explanation, that paused LNG exports. So it is  
4215 disappointing to see that we are not actually dealing in  
4216 facts, because the Natural Gas Act is very explicit on both  
4217 the ability to permit with a user fee as well as being in the  
4218 public interest.

4219 Mr. Chairman, I hope --

4220           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Will the gentleman --

4221           \*Mr. Pfluger. -- deal in truth, and --

4222           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Will the gentleman yield for a  
4223 question?

4224           \*Mr. Pfluger. Sure.

4225           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I am curious as to, hearing  
4226 everything that you have put forward, why is it and what is  
4227 the rationale, if there is support for what you all would  
4228 deem a user fee, et cetera, why only single out oil and gas  
4229 companies to have access?

4230           \*Mr. Pfluger. I think I am the wrong person to ask  
4231 that. You can ask the chairman on that question, but --

4232           \*Ms. Barragan. Well, we are all voting on the bill. I  
4233 presume you would be supportive.

4234           \*Mr. Pfluger. To -- I will --

4235           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I presume you support the  
4236 provision.

4237           \*Mr. Pfluger. I will take my time back. To have a  
4238 germane conversation and debate on this particular issue I  
4239 wanted to address two points, and that was the public  
4240 interest and that was also on how the process works to be  
4241 permitted. So I am sure that we will get into that debate.

4242           And by the way, to the gentlelady from New York, I would  
4243 like to invite you to come and see west Texas.

4244           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I love west Texas. I would be

4245 happy to go.

4246       \*Mr. Pfluger. Come see how safe this process is. Come  
4247 see how environmentally secure it is. There are members on  
4248 your side of the aisle who have come and seen it. I want to  
4249 invite you to come out there and see what is happening that I  
4250 think would alleviate a lot of these concerns.

4251       And on the issue of corruption, I associate myself with  
4252 my colleague from Texas, Mr. Crenshaw, on the fact that the -  
4253 - this is a process that is taking in revenue to the Federal  
4254 Government with something that is already deemed to be in the  
4255 public interest in a process that will go through the full  
4256 environmental review in a way that will be expeditious and  
4257 will add more money to the Treasury.

4258       I am glad that my side of the aisle has thought of this,  
4259 and I yield back.

4260       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
4261 Massachusetts is recognized.

4262       \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Chairman. I would like to  
4263 yield my time to the gentlewoman from Virginia.

4264       \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to  
4265 ask counsel a question.

4266       Did you write the majority memorandum for this markup?

4267       \*Counsel. I mean, I have staff. I did contribute to  
4268 the memorandum.

4269       \*Ms. McClellan. Okay. Well, as counsel, you can answer

4270 this. What does "notwithstanding any requirements or  
4271 statutory obligations under Federal and state law'' mean?  
4272 When a court --

4273 \*Mr. Joyce. Can you identify which page number you are  
4274 referencing?

4275 \*Ms. McClellan. I am on page two of the majority  
4276 memorandum. I am sorry, page three, page three. Under  
4277 section 41002, the very first sentence says, "notwithstanding  
4278 any requirements or statutory obligation under Federal and  
4279 state law.''

4280 Is it the interpretation -- I don't know if you wrote  
4281 this part, and if this -- you are not the right person to  
4282 answer this question, then please point me to the right  
4283 person. But is it the understanding of the person that wrote  
4284 that sentence that it is accurate?

4285 \*Counsel. Ma'am, I -- maybe refer -- go to the  
4286 legislative text --

4287 \*Ms. McClellan. Okay.

4288 \*Counsel. -- instead.

4289 \*Ms. McClellan. Let's do that. On page 4, line 11,  
4290 "The Commission shall.''. What does "shall'' mean?

4291 \*Counsel. It shall collect a fee.

4292 \*Ms. McClellan. And if a statute of Congress passed  
4293 says "shall,''' then doesn't that mean, as the memo says,  
4294 notwithstanding any other requirements, "shall'' will happen

4295 once you do what the statute says -- once you pay the fee,  
4296 the Commission shall issue the certificate. Doesn't that  
4297 mean notwithstanding any requirement or statutory obligation  
4298 under Federal and state law?

4299 \*Counsel. I think we will refer to what the statutory  
4300 text says. So the Commission shall, upon payment of a fee in  
4301 the amount of \$50,000 by a person requesting a certificate of  
4302 crossing, issue such person's -- issue to such person such  
4303 certificate of crossing.

4304 \*Ms. McClellan. So do you disagree with what the  
4305 majority memorandum says, section 41002 will do, based on the  
4306 statutory text?

4307 \*Counsel. I am -- I just stick to the text. I don't  
4308 want to comment on the memorandum.

4309 \*Ms. McClellan. Okay. Well, I got a law degree from  
4310 the University of Virginia that I paid a whole lot of money  
4311 for, and it is my interpretation that this is accurate.  
4312 "Shall" means shall, and "notwithstanding any requirement or  
4313 statutory obligation under Federal or state law" means  
4314 exactly that, and that is how a court will interpret it, no  
4315 matter what my non-lawyer colleagues on the other side of the  
4316 aisle think.

4317 I yield back.

4318 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields.

4319 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Chair, I yield back.

4320           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. If there is no  
4321 further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment. The  
4322 gentleman requests a recorded vote. The clerk will call the  
4323 roll.

4324           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

4325           \*Mr. Latta. No.

4326           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

4327           Mr. Griffith?

4328           \*Mr. Griffith. No.

4329           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

4330           Mr. Bilirakis?

4331           \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

4332           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

4333           Mr. Hudson?

4334           \*Mr. Hudson. No.

4335           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

4336           Mr. Carter of Georgia?

4337           [No response.]

4338           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?

4339           [No response.]

4340           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?

4341           \*Mr. Dunn. No.

4342           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

4343           Mr. Crenshaw?

4344           \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.



4345           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
4346           Mr. Joyce?  
4347           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
4348           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
4349           Mr. Weber?  
4350           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
4351           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
4352           Mr. Allen?  
4353           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
4354           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
4355           Mr. Balderson?  
4356           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
4357           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
4358           Mr. Fulcher?  
4359           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher, no.  
4360           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
4361           Mr. Pfluger?  
4362           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
4363           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
4364           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
4365           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
4366           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
4367           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
4368           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
4369           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

4370 Mrs. Cammack?  
4371 [No response.]  
4372 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
4373 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
4374 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
4375 Mr. James?  
4376 \*Mr. James. No.  
4377 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
4378 Mr. Bentz?  
4379 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
4380 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
4381 Mrs. Houchin?  
4382 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
4383 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
4384 Mr. Fry?  
4385 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
4386 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
4387 Ms. Lee?  
4388 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
4389 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
4390 Mr. Langworthy?  
4391 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
4392 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
4393 Mr. Kean?  
4394 [No response.]

4395           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli?  
4396           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
4397           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
4398           Mr. Evans?  
4399           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
4400           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
4401           Mr. Goldman?  
4402           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
4403           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
4404           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
4405           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
4406           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
4407           Mr. Pallone?  
4408           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
4409           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
4410           Ms. DeGette?  
4411           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
4412           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
4413           Ms. Schakowsky?  
4414           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
4415           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
4416           Ms. Matsui?  
4417           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
4418           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
4419           Ms. Castor?

4420           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
4421           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
4422           Mr. Tonko?  
4423           \*Mr. Tonko.   I shall votes yes.  
4424           [Laughter.]  
4425           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
4426           Ms. Clarke?  
4427           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
4428           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
4429           Mr. Ruiz?  
4430           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
4431           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
4432           Mr. Peters?  
4433           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
4434           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
4435           Mrs. Dingell?  
4436           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
4437           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
4438           Mr. Veasey?  
4439           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
4440           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
4441           Ms. Kelly?  
4442           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
4443           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
4444           Ms. Barragan?

4445           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
4446           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
4447           Mr. Soto?  
4448           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
4449           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
4450           Ms. Schrier?  
4451           \*Ms. Schrier.  Aye.  
4452           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
4453           Mrs. Trahan?  
4454           \*Mrs. Trahan.  Aye.  
4455           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
4456           Mrs. Fletcher?  
4457           \*Mrs. Fletcher.  Aye.  
4458           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
4459           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
4460           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.  Aye.  
4461           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
4462           Mr. Auchincloss?  
4463           \*Mr. Auchincloss.  Aye.  
4464           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
4465           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
4466           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.  Aye.  
4467           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
4468           Mr. Menendez?  
4469           \*Mr. Menendez.  Aye.

4470           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
4471           Mr. Mullin?  
4472           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.  
4473           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
4474           Mr. Landsman?  
4475           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
4476           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
4477           Ms. McClellan?  
4478           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.  
4479           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
4480           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mr. Carter recorded?  
4481           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie?  
4482           \*The Chair.   No.  
4483           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
4484           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mr. Carter recorded?  
4485           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia is not recorded.  
4486           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Carter votes no.  
4487           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mr. Palmer recorded?  
4488           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
4489           Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
4490           \*Mr. Palmer.   Palmer votes no.  
4491           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
4492           \*Mr. Joyce.   Does anyone else seek to be recognized to  
4493   be recorded?  
4494           The clerk will report the result.

4495           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
4496 ayes and 28 noes.

4497           \*Mr. Joyce. The amendment is not agreed to. Are there  
4498 any further amendments?

4499           \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Auchincloss has an amendment.

4500           \*Mr. Joyce. For what purpose does the gentleman from  
4501 Massachusetts seek recognition?

4502           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at  
4503 the desk.

4504           \*Mr. Joyce. The clerk will report the amendment.

4505           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman please  
4506 specify his amendment?

4507           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Sorry, Energy\_14UK301.

4508           \*The Clerk. Mr. chairman, could the gentleman please  
4509 repeat that?

4510           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Sorry, 14\_UK3\_01.

4511           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mr. Auchincloss. At  
4512 the appropriate place, insert the following: Section  
4513 protecting American --

4514           \*Mr. Joyce. Without objection, the reading of the  
4515 amendment is dispensed with, and the gentleman is recognized  
4516 for five minutes.

4517           \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Chairman, may I reserve an  
4518 objection?

4519           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman reserves.

4520           Without objection, the reading of the amendment is  
4521   dispensed with, and the gentleman is recognized for five  
4522   minutes in support of his amendment.

4523           [The amendment of Mr. Auchincloss follows:]

4524

4525   \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

4526



4527           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This  
4528 amendment would prevent this act from taking effect until the  
4529 administration returns the tariff levels on energy products  
4530 to their levels on January 19 of this year.

4531           This week's tariff announcements shouldn't fool anyone.  
4532 President Trump creates uncertainty and havoc by raising  
4533 tariffs, and then claims victory when he lowers the tariffs  
4534 that he himself put in place. All this does is extend  
4535 uncertainty for another 90 days.

4536           First, there were no tariffs on energy. Then the  
4537 President slapped a 25 percent tariff on Canada and Mexico.  
4538 Then we decided, oh, wait, it should be 10 percent. Then,  
4539 actually, we decided to comply with our trade agreement with  
4540 them, so energy tariffs with them were at zero. But wait,  
4541 now we put reciprocal tariffs with rates varying for every  
4542 country on the entire world. So nobody knew what the energy  
4543 tariffs were.

4544           And then there was the 25 percent tariff on top of all  
4545 that for steel and aluminum. It got so disastrous for  
4546 business that the grid operators from New England and New  
4547 York had to file emergency petitions at FERC because they  
4548 weren't sure if there even was a tariff on Canadian  
4549 electricity and, if so, how much it was and whose  
4550 responsibility it was to collect it.

4551           We have heard repeatedly from our Republican colleagues

4552 that American "energy dominance" is the goal of this  
4553 Administration, and that this committee is pursuing an all-  
4554 of-the-above energy strategy. But it is all talk. This  
4555 Administration's actions, whether increasing prices for  
4556 American consumers through tariffs or proposing a bill like  
4557 the one we are considering today, will have the opposite  
4558 effect: American energy scarcity and dependance.

4559       Tariffs on key components for new energy construction  
4560 like steel is chilling investment in new projects. We will  
4561 not be able to meet future rising demand from electrification  
4562 and AI data centers if we cripple our ability to build out  
4563 energy generation and transmission. The policies in this  
4564 bill, like gutting the Loan Programs Office that has, as of  
4565 last September, financed a \$44 billion portfolio of energy  
4566 products -- projects and advanced technology manufacturing  
4567 facilities, will further raise prices for consumers and limit  
4568 our ability to build out nuclear, geothermal, and other  
4569 sources of energy to meet future demand.

4570       We can be not -- we cannot have energy dominance when  
4571 tariffs, combined with these policies, are going to  
4572 accelerate rising energy costs and utility bills for our  
4573 constituents. Industry needs certainty and predictability to  
4574 make the kinds of long-term investments the energy sector  
4575 requires. What are they getting instead? In the words of  
4576 one business owner, "I have never felt more uncertainty about

4577 our business in my entire 40-plus-year career.'` That was  
4578 the owner of an energy company whose survey responses were  
4579 published by the Federal Reserve Bank of Dallas in late  
4580 March. Another one wrote, "This is not energy dominance.'`

4581 Returning tariffs to January 19 levels will lower the  
4582 cost of energy inputs, lower energy costs to consumers, and  
4583 provide the market stability necessary to invest in a  
4584 true, all-of-the-above energy strategy, not one where the  
4585 administration and congressional Republicans are picking  
4586 winners and losers.

4587 Congress can put a stop to this reckless economic policy  
4588 whenever Speaker Johnson decides to stand up for our Article  
4589 I responsibilities. He has shown no interest in doing so,  
4590 and actually has actively sought to silence debate on the  
4591 issue. And so this committee must take action.

4592 If you want lower energy prices, this amendment is for  
4593 you. If you want more investment in American energy, this  
4594 amendment is for you. If you want us to be able to beat  
4595 China in the AI race, this amendment is for you. The only  
4596 reason you should oppose this amendment is if you don't want  
4597 any of those things.

4598 I urge my colleagues to support this amendment, and I  
4599 yield back.

4600 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The chair recognizes  
4601 the gentleman from Ohio.

4602           \*Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and strike  
4603 the last word.

4604           \*Mr. Joyce. So recognized.

4605           \*Mr. Latta. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman,  
4606 this amendment adds a new section relating to tariffs. This  
4607 is not pertinent to the underlying purpose of this  
4608 legislation, and I therefore urge the rejection of the  
4609 amendment.

4610           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
4611 Louisiana is recognized.

4612           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I move to  
4613 strike the last word.

4614           \*Mr. Joyce. So recognized.

4615           [Slide]

4616           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I would like to officially  
4617 welcome Katie Corcoran and her son, Connor. They traveled  
4618 all the way from Louisiana to Washington, D.C. to be with us  
4619 here today in this committee room. They braved great odds to  
4620 travel to be here, to leave their lives in Louisiana. They  
4621 are here because they are proof that Medicaid means life.

4622           When Connor was first diagnosed, his physicians warned  
4623 his parents that his life was extremely fragile, and that  
4624 there was a high chance he would not survive childhood. He  
4625 was blind, developmentally delayed, had poor muscle tone, was  
4626 fed through a tube, had numerous types of seizures every day,

4627 had an under-developed pituitary gland, and needed hormone  
4628 replacement medications, had an immune deficiency disorder,  
4629 and was non-verbal.

4630 Medicaid funding and waivers, like the New Opportunities  
4631 Waiver, NOW, grants that Connor received in Louisiana have  
4632 been and continue to be the lifeline for him and his family.  
4633 It provides him with the quality, tailored care that he needs  
4634 at home 24/7 and in his community.

4635 I invited Katie Carter and Connor and their family to  
4636 D.C. because America needs to know what and when you talk  
4637 about cutting Medicaid funding, who you are hurting, the  
4638 faces, the real people, not just names on paper, but real  
4639 people. You are hurting your neighbors, the people you go to  
4640 church with, the people you shop with. You could be hurting  
4641 your own future family members. It is but the -- by the  
4642 grace of God that this could have been any of us. It could  
4643 have been any of us. It just so happened it is the  
4644 Corcorans.

4645 These cuts aren't just numbers. We are all one birth  
4646 away from our own Connor. These are policy decisions that  
4647 will have life-altering consequences for families like Connor  
4648 and Katie's. When you take away their -- theirs and millions  
4649 of others' Medicaid away tonight in this committee, when we  
4650 do this when everyone has gone home late at night, remember  
4651 the people that are here now and the people that have gone

4652 back home are the ones that you are hurting.

4653 I urge you to please take a long look. Look at these  
4654 individuals, look at their families, look into their stories,  
4655 and don't simply tell them go home, it is going to be fine,  
4656 this is not going to impact you when we know that there is no  
4657 way that we are going to come up with \$715 million and it is  
4658 not going to hurt everyday Americans. Yes, it will. And we  
4659 owe it to them to look in their faces and tell them the  
4660 truth. That is what we are attempting to do.

4661 God bless you for your incredible advocacy. Thank you  
4662 for braving the time and the challenge of moving with your  
4663 entire family to be here. Corey, thank you. Thank you.  
4664 Thank you for being here. Thank you for supporting your  
4665 family. We will continue to work on your behalf.

4666 And I urge all my members to imprint in their faces, in  
4667 their brains young Connor. And remember, he is not able to  
4668 fight for himself, but we are able to fight for him.

4669 God bless you, and I yield back.

4670 [Applause.]

4671 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
4672 the gentleman from Texas is recognized.

4673 \*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last  
4674 word.

4675 \*Mr. Joyce. So recognized.

4676 \*Mr. Veasey. You know, one of the things that I wanted

4677 to bring light to and talk a lot about this tariff deal is  
4678 the small businesses, because no one is really talking about  
4679 the small businesses when it comes to these tariffs. There  
4680 has been a lot of talk about how much this is going to cost  
4681 car manufacturers and big ag and other people, but no one is  
4682 really talking about the small business owner.

4683         And there was one gentleman that was featured in the  
4684 Wall Street Journal that said that he was going to have to  
4685 pay a \$9,000 fee for a \$5,500 order. There have been small  
4686 businesses that have employed 5 people, and they have had to  
4687 lay off 1, businesses that have employed 20 people and they  
4688 have had to lay off 3 or 4, businesses saying they are not  
4689 going to be able to get merchandise in, and it is going to  
4690 really put a strain on them, and it is going to be hard on  
4691 them, and it is going to put a lot of downward pressure on  
4692 the economy.

4693         And I wanted to be clear. This is about protecting  
4694 American consumers. The Auchincloss amendment that I am  
4695 talking on here, ensuring that the bill does not worsen the  
4696 burden they are already feeling from high energy costs. If  
4697 this legislation is truly about affordability, then it cannot  
4698 ignore the reality that tariffs, especially those imposed  
4699 without coordination or strategic rationale, can raise prices  
4700 on everything from natural gas to solar panels to the  
4701 critical minerals we need for energy technologies and for

4702 national defense.

4703       This amendment ensures that we are not handing out  
4704 giveaways or pushing regulatory changes at the expense of  
4705 American families, all while tariffs and liberation day, also  
4706 known as liquidation day, quietly drives up costs. We need a  
4707 baseline level of economic honesty here. If we are going to  
4708 overhaul parts of our energy system, let's at least ensure we  
4709 are not doing it under artificial price distortions that make  
4710 it cost to real Americans.

4711       This isn't about -- this is absolutely not about  
4712 partisanship; it is about accountability and economic  
4713 realism. If Republicans want to argue that their energy  
4714 provisions are good for consumers, then they should not have  
4715 a problem making sure that those policies don't kick in while  
4716 import tariffs are artificially inflating prices.

4717       Let's help these small business owners out there that  
4718 are really taking it to the teeth, man, they are hurting. I  
4719 urge my colleagues to make sure that this common-sense  
4720 amendment passes. Let's make sure that this bill does what  
4721 it claims, and doesn't become another backdoor subsidy scheme  
4722 while families in Texas and across the country foot the bill  
4723 during the chaos caused by these tariffs.

4724       Thank you, Mr. --

4725       \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Would you yield?

4726       \*Mr. Veasey. I yield the -- I would like to yield time



4727 to Mr. Carter from Louisiana.

4728 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, thank you, Mr.  
4729 Veasey.

4730 In my haste in introducing the Corcorans, I did not  
4731 recognize Cooper, the big brother who is here to support his  
4732 brother -- or little brother -- big brother or little  
4733 brother?

4734 \*Voice. Little.

4735 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Little brother here to  
4736 support his big brother, along with the family. Cooper,  
4737 thank you for your being here, as well.

4738 Thank you, I yield.

4739 [Applause.]

4740 \*Mr. Veasey. Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of  
4741 my time.

4742 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
4743 California is recognized.

4744 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

4745 What we are seeing here today is a travesty.  
4746 Republicans ran on inflation. They promised to bring down  
4747 costs for American families, but now, once in office, they  
4748 are pushing policies that will do the exact opposite,  
4749 policies that will raise the cost of living for working  
4750 Americans across the country. It is wrong, it is obscene,  
4751 and it is a slap in the face to the families we are here to

4752     serve.

4753             An estimate just last month found that Trump's tariffs  
4754     would cost the average household nearly \$5,000 every single  
4755     year. That is not a rounding error. That is groceries,  
4756     utility bills, gas in the tank, medication for a child with  
4757     asthma. That is \$5,000 a year taken straight out of a  
4758     working-class family's pocket.

4759             And you want to talk about unpredictability? These  
4760     tariffs are completely chaotic. As my colleague, Mr.  
4761     Auchincloss, pointed out, one day they are on, the next they  
4762     are off. One product is hit, another isn't. You have got  
4763     some energy imports exempt from tariffs under USMCA, others  
4764     slapped with a 10 percent rate, and the rest subject to  
4765     whatever so-called reciprocal rate another country decides.

4766             On top of that, we are talking about a blanket 25  
4767     percent tariff on steel and aluminum, key inputs for nearly  
4768     every single clean energy project in the country. This isn't  
4769     strategy, it is whiplash economic policy. It is confusing,  
4770     and it is a green light for corporations to jack up prices,  
4771     whether tariffs are in effect or not. That is what happens  
4772     when you create uncertainty. Corporations hedge their bets,  
4773     and guess who pays the price? The consumer, working  
4774     families, every time.

4775             And what does this mean in practice? It means gas  
4776     prices go up, electricity bills go up, the cost of heating

4777 and cooling in your homes goes up. That is not theory, that  
4778 is reality. It is especially real in places like my district  
4779 in the desert, where utility bills already stretch family  
4780 budgets thin and extreme heat is a matter of life and death.

4781       This bill doesn't fix the problem. It makes it worse.  
4782 It adds more instability to an already volatile situation,  
4783 and it does it at the expense of American families. And  
4784 while our Republican colleagues are doubling down on tariffs  
4785 that make life more expensive, they are also gutting the very  
4786 programs that would help bring costs down and build a  
4787 stronger, more resilient economy, programs that actually put  
4788 America first, that create jobs that move us toward energy  
4789 independence.

4790       Let's talk about one of those programs, the Department  
4791 of Energy Loans Programs Office, the LPO. This is a smart  
4792 and strategic investment in American workers, American  
4793 innovation, and American energy. Since its founding, the LPO  
4794 has supported over \$38 billion in loans. It helped create  
4795 more than 70,000 jobs and backed transformative projects like  
4796 Tesla's first electric vehicle factory and Ford's advanced  
4797 battery facilities. These are jobs that stay in America.  
4798 These are technologies that keep us competitive on the global  
4799 stage.

4800       In my district in the Imperial County, the LPO is  
4801 playing a key role in turning the region into lithium valley.

4802    This region sits atop of the fifth largest known lithium  
4803    reserve in the world, and the LPO is helping unlock that  
4804    potential not with fossil fuels or pollution, but with  
4805    cutting-edge, clean energy technologies.  
4806

4807 AFTER 6:00 p.m.

4808 \*Mr. Ruiz. (Continuing) This is about more than just  
4809 the economy in my district. It is about national security.  
4810 It is about positioning the U.S. as a global leader in the  
4811 battery supply chain, ensuring the batteries that power our  
4812 electrical vehicles and store our renewable energy are made  
4813 right here at home. We are reducing our dependance on  
4814 foreign adversaries like China. We are building the  
4815 infrastructure for the clean energy economy of the future,  
4816 and we are doing it with American workers, American  
4817 resources, and American ingenuity. That is what America  
4818 first should mean.

4819 But instead of doubling down on programs like the LPO,  
4820 Republicans are trying to defund them. And if they succeed,  
4821 we risk losing over \$80 billion in pending clean energy  
4822 projects across the country. These are projects that create  
4823 jobs that stabilize our energy grid, that reduce costs in the  
4824 long term, that help rural communities like those in Imperial  
4825 County work to build a clean energy economy with dignity and  
4826 opportunity.

4827 Let's be clear. Cutting this funding doesn't just stall  
4828 progress, it sends a message that we are stepping back, that  
4829 we are ceding leadership to others like China, and that is  
4830 not something I am willing to accept for my district, for  
4831 California, or for this country. So I strongly support Mr.

4832 Auchincloss's amendment because we need transparency, we need  
4833 consistency, we need economic policies that work for American  
4834 families, not against them.

4835       Let's stop playing the political games with tariffs that  
4836 are hurting people. Let's invest in our future and clean  
4837 energy and innovation and job creation. Let's make lithium  
4838 valley the beating heart of America's energy future, and  
4839 ensure that promises we make to our constituents are promises  
4840 we keep.

4841       I yield back.

4842       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. If there is no  
4843 further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment. The  
4844 gentleman, the ranking member, requests a recorded vote. The  
4845 clerk will call the roll.

4846       \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

4847       \*Mr. Latta. No.

4848       \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

4849       Mr. Griffith?

4850       \*Mr. Griffith. No.

4851       \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

4852       Mr. Bilirakis?

4853       \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

4854       \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

4855       Mr. Hudson?

4856       \*Mr. Hudson. No.

4857           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
4858           Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
4859           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
4860           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
4861           Mr. Palmer?  
4862           [No response.]  
4863           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn?  
4864           \*Mr. Dunn.   No.  
4865           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.  
4866           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
4867           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
4868           Mr. Crenshaw?  
4869           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
4870           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
4871           Mr. Joyce?  
4872           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
4873           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
4874           Mr. Weber?  
4875           [No response.]  
4876           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen?  
4877           \*Mr. Allen.   Allen votes no.  
4878           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
4879           Mr. Balderson?  
4880           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
4881           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.

4882 Mr. Fulcher?  
4883 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
4884 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
4885 Mr. Pfluger?  
4886 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
4887 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
4888 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
4889 [No response.]  
4890 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger?  
4891 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
4892 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
4893 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
4894 [No response.]  
4895 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack?  
4896 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.  
4897 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
4898 Mr. Obernolte?  
4899 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
4900 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
4901 Mr. James?  
4902 \*Mr. James. No.  
4903 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
4904 Mr. Bentz?  
4905 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
4906 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.



4907 Mrs. Houchin?  
4908 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
4909 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
4910 Mr. Fry?  
4911 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
4912 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
4913 Ms. Lee?  
4914 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
4915 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
4916 Mr. Langworthy?  
4917 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
4918 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
4919 Mr. Kean?  
4920 [No response.]  
4921 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli?  
4922 \*Mr. Rulli. No.  
4923 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.  
4924 Mr. Evans?  
4925 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
4926 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.  
4927 Mr. Goldman?  
4928 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
4929 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
4930 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
4931 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

4932           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
4933           Mr. Pallone?  
4934           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
4935           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
4936           Ms. DeGette?  
4937           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
4938           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
4939           Ms. Schakowsky?  
4940           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
4941           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
4942           Ms. Matsui?  
4943           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
4944           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
4945           Ms. Castor?  
4946           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
4947           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
4948           Mr. Tonko?  
4949           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
4950           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
4951           Ms. Clarke?  
4952           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
4953           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
4954           Mr. Ruiz?  
4955           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
4956           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.

4957 Mr. Peters?  
4958 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
4959 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
4960 Mrs. Dingell?  
4961 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
4962 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
4963 Mr. Veasey?  
4964 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
4965 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
4966 Ms. Kelly?  
4967 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
4968 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
4969 Ms. Barragan?  
4970 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
4971 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
4972 Mr. Soto?  
4973 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
4974 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
4975 Ms. Schrier?  
4976 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
4977 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
4978 Mrs. Trahan?  
4979 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
4980 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
4981 Mrs. Fletcher?

4982           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
4983           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
4984           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
4985           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
4986           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
4987           Mr. Auchincloss?  
4988           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
4989           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
4990           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
4991           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.  
4992           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
4993           Mr. Menendez?  
4994           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.  
4995           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
4996           Mr. Mullin?  
4997           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.  
4998           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
4999           Mr. Landsman?  
5000           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
5001           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
5002           Ms. McClellan?  
5003           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.  
5004           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
5005           Chairman Guthrie?  
5006           \*The Chair.   No.

5007           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
5008           \*Mr. Joyce.   Is Mr. Weber recorded?  
5009           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber is not recorded.  
5010           \*Mr. Weber.   Weber votes no.  
5011           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber --  
5012           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Dr. Miller-Meeks recorded?  
5013           \*The Clerk.   -- votes no.  
5014           Dr. Miller-Meeks is not recorded.  
5015           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   Another one bites the dust.   No.  
5016           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
5017           \*Mr. Joyce.   Is there anyone else who wishes to be  
5018   recognized to vote?  
5019           The clerk will report.  
5020           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
5021   ayes and 29 noes.  
5022           \*Mr. Joyce.   The noes have it.   The motion is not agreed  
5023   to.  
5024           Are there any other amendments?  
5025           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Mr. Chairman, I have an  
5026   amendment at the desk, ENV\_GEN\_3.  
5027           \*Mr. Joyce.   Would the gentleman --  
5028           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   I am sorry.  
5029           \*Mr. Joyce.   -- repeat that?  
5030           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   I apologize.   Next title, I  
5031   apologize.

5032           \*Mr. Pallone. He has got the wrong title. You can go  
5033 to this title, but we ask for a recorded vote.

5034           \*Mr. Joyce. I move that the committee do now approve  
5035 and agree to transmit to the House Committee on the budget  
5036 Subtitle A Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations  
5037 Relating to Energy.

5038           A roll call vote has been requested. The clerk will  
5039 call the roll.

5040           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

5041           \*Mr. Latta. Aye.

5042           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.

5043           Mr. Griffith?

5044           \*Mr. Griffith. Aye.

5045           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

5046           Mr. Bilirakis?

5047           \*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.

5048           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.

5049           Mr. Hudson?

5050           \*Mr. Hudson. Aye.

5051           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.

5052           Mr. Carter of Georgia?

5053           [No response.]

5054           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?

5055           [No response.]

5056           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?

5057           \*Mr. Dunn.   Aye.  
5058           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes aye.  
5059           Mr. Crenshaw?  
5060           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   Aye.  
5061           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes aye.  
5062           Mr. Joyce?  
5063           \*Mr. Joyce.   Aye.  
5064           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes aye.  
5065           Mr. Weber?  
5066           \*Mr. Weber.   Yes.  
5067           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes aye.  
5068           Mr. Allen?  
5069           \*Mr. Allen.   Aye.  
5070           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes aye.  
5071           Mr. Balderson?  
5072           \*Mr. Balderson.   Aye.  
5073           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes aye.  
5074           Mr. Fulcher?  
5075           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is aye.  
5076           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes aye.  
5077           Mr. Pfluger?  
5078           \*Mr. Pfluger.   Aye.  
5079           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes aye.  
5080           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
5081           [No response.]

5082           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
5083           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   Yes.  
5084           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes aye.  
5085           Mrs. Cammack?  
5086           \*Mrs. Cammack.   Aye.  
5087           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes aye.  
5088           Mr. Obernolte?  
5089           \*Mr. Obernolte.   Aye.  
5090           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes aye.  
5091           Mr. James?  
5092           \*Mr. James.    Aye.  
5093           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes aye.  
5094           Mr. Bentz?  
5095           \*Mr. Bentz.    Aye.  
5096           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes aye.  
5097           Mrs. Houchin?  
5098           \*Mrs. Houchin.   Aye.  
5099           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes aye.  
5100           Mr. Fry?  
5101           \*Mr. Fry.    Aye.  
5102           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes aye.  
5103           Ms. Lee?  
5104           \*Ms. Lee.    Aye.  
5105           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes aye.  
5106           Mr. Langworthy?



5107           \*Mr. Langworthy.   Aye.  
5108           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
5109           Mr. Kean?  
5110           [No response.]  
5111           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli?  
5112           \*Mr. Rulli.   Aye.  
5113           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes aye.  
5114           Mr. Evans?  
5115           \*Mr. Evans.   Aye.  
5116           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes aye.  
5117           Mr. Goldman?  
5118           \*Mr. Goldman.   Aye.  
5119           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
5120           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
5121           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   Aye.  
5122           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes aye.  
5123           Mr. Pallone?  
5124           \*Mr. Pallone.   No.  
5125           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes no.  
5126           Ms. DeGette?  
5127           \*Ms. DeGette.   No.  
5128           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes no.  
5129           Ms. Schakowsky?  
5130           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   No.  
5131           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes no.

5132 Ms. Matsui?  
5133 \*Ms. Matsui. No.  
5134 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes no.  
5135 Ms. Castor?  
5136 \*Ms. Castor. No.  
5137 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes no.  
5138 Mr. Tonko?  
5139 \*Mr. Tonko. No.  
5140 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes no.  
5141 Ms. Clarke?  
5142 \*Ms. Clarke. No.  
5143 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes no.  
5144 Mr. Ruiz?  
5145 \*Mr. Ruiz. No.  
5146 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes no.  
5147 Mr. Peters?  
5148 \*Mr. Peters. No.  
5149 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.  
5150 Mrs. Dingell?  
5151 \*Mrs. Dingell. No.  
5152 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no.  
5153 Mr. Veasey?  
5154 \*Mr. Veasey. No.  
5155 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes no.  
5156 Ms. Kelly?

5157           \*Ms. Kelly.   No.  
5158           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes no.  
5159           Ms. Barragan?  
5160           \*Ms. Barragan.   No.  
5161           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes no.  
5162           Mr. Soto?  
5163           \*Mr. Soto.   No.  
5164           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes no.  
5165           Ms. Schrier?  
5166           \*Ms. Schrier.   No.  
5167           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes no.  
5168           Mrs. Trahan?  
5169           \*Mrs. Trahan.   No.  
5170           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes no.  
5171           Mrs. Fletcher?  
5172           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   No.  
5173           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes no.  
5174           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
5175           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   No.  
5176           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.  
5177           Mr. Auchincloss?  
5178           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   No.  
5179           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes no.  
5180           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
5181           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   No.

5182           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes no.  
5183           Mr. Menendez?  
5184           \*Mr. Menendez. No.  
5185           \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes no.  
5186           Mr. Mullin?  
5187           \*Mr. Mullin. No.  
5188           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes no.  
5189           Mr. Landsman?  
5190           \*Mr. Landsman. No.  
5191           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes no.  
5192           Ms. McClellan?  
5193           \*Ms. McClellan. No.  
5194           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes no.  
5195           Chairman Guthrie?  
5196           \*The Chair. Aye.  
5197           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes aye.  
5198           \*Mr. Joyce. How is Mr. Carter of Georgia recorded?  
5199           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia is not recorded.  
5200           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Carter votes aye.  
5201           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes aye.  
5202           \*Mr. Joyce. How is Mr. Palmer recorded?  
5203           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
5204           \*Mr. Palmer. Palmer votes aye.  
5205           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
5206           \*Mr. Joyce. How is Dr. Harshbarger recorded?

5207           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger is not recorded.  
5208           \*Mrs. Harshbarger. Harshbarger votes aye.  
5209           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes aye.  
5210           \*Mr. Joyce. Is there anyone else who wishes to be  
5211 recognized to vote?  
5212           \*Mr. Pallone. I don't think so.  
5213           \*Mr. Joyce. The clerk will report.  
5214           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 29  
5215 ayes and 24 noes.  
5216           \*Mr. Joyce. The ayes have it. The motion is agreed to.  
5217           The chair calls up Committee Print Subtitle B,  
5218 Environment, and asks the clerk to report.  
5219           \*The Clerk. Title for Energy and Commerce Subtitle B --  
5220           \*Mr. Joyce. Without objection, the reading of the  
5221 committee print is dispensed with. and the committee print  
5222 will be open for amendment at any point.  
5223           So ordered.  
5224           [The committee print follows:]  
5225  
5226           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*  
5227

5228           \*Mr. Joyce. Is there a discussion on amendments to  
5229 Subtitle B?

5230           For what purpose does the gentleman from New Jersey seek  
5231 recognition?

5232           \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, to strike the last word on  
5233 the subtitle.

5234           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

5235           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

5236           Subtitle B is a radical proposal that would gut critical  
5237 environmental protections and programs, harming the health  
5238 and welfare of all Americans. This print seeks to both  
5239 repeal and rescind unobligated funds for every Environmental  
5240 Protection Agency program included in the Inflation Reduction  
5241 Act.

5242           Republicans also propose to repeal clean vehicle  
5243 standards finalized by EPA and the National Highway Traffic  
5244 Safety Administration, jeopardizing air quality and domestic  
5245 manufacturing, giving a leg up to the fossil fuel industry.

5246           And none of this is a surprise to anybody. The bill  
5247 continues the Republican political obsession with dismantling  
5248 the Inflation Reduction Act. And since the law was enacted,  
5249 they have targeted these climate, clean energy, and public  
5250 health programs with countless sham hearings and so-called  
5251 oversight activities. And they have tried to repeal, re-  
5252 program, and claw back these funds in the bill -- bill after

5253 bill, I should say -- considered by the House.

5254       What is striking is that most, if not all, of the IRA  
5255 funds have already been invested in communities across the  
5256 country, both red and blue states, and they are working. So  
5257 today they are now attempting to undermine landmark programs  
5258 that hold polluters accountable, as well. And programs like  
5259 the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, the Environmental Justice  
5260 block grants, the Methane Emissions and Waste Reduction  
5261 Incentive Program, the Climate Pollution Reduction grants,  
5262 the Clean Ports program, the clean heavy duty vehicles,  
5263 including school busses, all of these now are being  
5264 undermined by this committee print section B.

5265       Now, when Congress passed the IRA we made a critical and  
5266 historic downpayment toward a stable climate and shared  
5267 economic opportunity powered by American-made clean energy  
5268 because we wanted to create a clean future for all. But this  
5269 bill proposes to throw that all away by eliminating the  
5270 environmental protections that keep families and communities  
5271 safe, while doing absolutely nothing to lower energy costs,  
5272 the same -- I will repeat this all night, Mr. Chairman. The  
5273 fact of the matter is that Republicans promised, President  
5274 Trump promised that on day one he was going to reduce prices,  
5275 make things more affordable. And there is nothing in here --  
5276 everything that they do in this print and the rest of the  
5277 prints tonight and the rest of the sections tonight simply

5278 makes things more expensive, not more affordable.

5279 And all of this is in the service of providing tax  
5280 breaks for billionaires for large corporate interests. That  
5281 is why they are doing it, and I think it is outrageous, and  
5282 so I urge my colleagues to oppose this section, as well.

5283 And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

5284 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. Does anyone seek  
5285 recognition to speak on the underlying bill?

5286 \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Tonko.

5287 \*Mr. Joyce. Mr. Tonko is recognized for five minutes.

5288 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the  
5289 last word.

5290 \*Mr. Joyce. So recognized.

5291 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you.

5292 I was proud to serve as the Environment Subcommittee  
5293 chair when the historic investments being targeted today were  
5294 enacted into law. They were an important downpayment to  
5295 reduce pollution while helping us usher in America's next  
5296 great manufacturing renaissance. So I read the Chairman's  
5297 Wall Street Journal op ed with great interest. And regarding  
5298 the energy and environment subtitles, he suggested that this  
5299 proposal is targeting the most reckless parts of the  
5300 Inflation Reduction Act, and that it is ending an agenda that  
5301 "favors wokeness over sensible policy."'

5302 Well, with all due respect, this is complete nonsense,



5303 and when the American people hear about the specific funding  
5304 being cut, they will agree. So maybe someone from the  
5305 majority can explain which of these programs are reckless and  
5306 too woke.

5307         Is it the \$12 million in unobligated funds to reduce air  
5308 pollution in schools? You don't need to be a "climate  
5309 activist crony," to use the chairman's phrase, to want to  
5310 send your children to a safe and yet healthy learning  
5311 environment.

5312         How about DoE money to train contractors that retrofit  
5313 people's homes? Do only radical environmentalists want the  
5314 people coming into their homes to work on electric wiring to  
5315 be properly trained? Of course not.

5316         What about money to upgrade our ports with the latest  
5317 and greatest technologies? Now, we all know that, thanks to  
5318 President Trump's tariffs, there is a lot less activity at  
5319 our ports these days. But looking long term, I know many  
5320 members of this committee want to see their local ports  
5321 modernized and the people that live near those ports to have  
5322 less exposure to harmful air pollution.

5323         The majority is scrounging around to save \$3 million for  
5324 the implementation of the AIM Act, which was signed into law  
5325 by President Trump with strong support from American  
5326 manufacturers. Three million dollars is a small price to pay  
5327 to make certain that American companies lead the world in

5328 next-generation refrigerant technologies and Chinese  
5329 companies aren't able to illegally dump their highly  
5330 polluting products into the U.S.

5331       These are just a few examples. There are plenty more  
5332 common-sense investments being targeted today that are  
5333 creating American jobs and deploying new technologies that  
5334 will indeed reduce pollution. And when you start to list  
5335 them out, you can really see how ridiculous this proposal is.

5336       So the question becomes, if this subtitle results in the  
5337 rescission of funds to reduce air pollution at schools and  
5338 the other things I mentioned, why on Earth would the  
5339 Republicans be doing it?

5340       Well, for one, we know that these funds will be used to  
5341 partially offset yet another round of tax cuts, the benefits  
5342 of which will overwhelmingly go to the wealthiest. We also  
5343 know the energy subtitle includes unconscionable giveaways to  
5344 the fossil fuel industry that will allow them to build  
5345 whatever they want, wherever they want, regardless of how  
5346 many state governments have concerns, how many land owners  
5347 may lose their properties, or how much environmental damage  
5348 might be caused.

5349       These provisions don't exist in a vacuum. President  
5350 Trump is doing everything possible to stop Federal scientific  
5351 efforts to further our understanding of climate change and  
5352 its consequences. But burying our heads in the sand will not

5353 change the basic facts that our changing climate is already  
5354 having tremendous impacts to our national security, our  
5355 economy, our property values, our insurance rates, and so  
5356 much more that is resulting in increasing costs for everyday  
5357 Americans.

5358 History will judge us for having known so much and  
5359 having done so little to mitigate the worst consequences of  
5360 climate change. And future generations will save their  
5361 harshest judgments for those who have actively sought to take  
5362 us backwards. Also, that fossil fuel executives continue to  
5363 reap major profits and billionaires, yes, their tax cuts.

5364 Let's reject these cuts, which will result in more air  
5365 pollution and public health harms at a time when Republicans  
5366 are simultaneously causing nearly 14 million Americans, many  
5367 of the most vulnerable Americans, to lose their health  
5368 insurance.

5369 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

5370 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
5371 California is recognized.

5372 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5373 You know, in our Environment Subcommittee I have often  
5374 said that air pollution is harming many communities. In  
5375 fact, the science has shown that individuals who live in high  
5376 air-polluted communities live, on average, 10 years less than  
5377 individuals who do not live in air-polluted communities.

5378 Children in communities that suffer from high air pollution  
5379 have higher rates of asthma. Seniors have higher rates of  
5380 emergency department visits due to COPD and emphysema  
5381 exacerbations due to poor air quality in their communities.

5382         And all along, we have been hearing their altruism about  
5383 protecting children and seniors from these horrendous  
5384 Medicaid cuts, and this is one example about how those exact  
5385 same populations are going to get hurt by this bill. For  
5386 example, cutting Federal funding for clean air in schools  
5387 will put even more children at risks; cutting funding for air  
5388 monitors will prevent school districts and others from  
5389 adjusting their schedules to protect children.

5390         The science is clear: students exposed to air pollution  
5391 perform worse on tests and have lower attendance. Clean air  
5392 is not just a health issue, it is an education issue and an  
5393 equity issue.

5394         I have treated children in our communities struggling to  
5395 breathe, missing school, and ending up in the emergency  
5396 department just because of the air that they breathe every  
5397 day, programs like CalSHAPE were making real progress  
5398 upgrading outdated ventilation systems, filtering out dust  
5399 and pesticides, and giving our kids a fair shot at a healthy  
5400 education. These are the programs we should be funding, not  
5401 cutting. We have a duty to stand up for these children.  
5402 Cutting air quality investments at schools hurts their

5403 health, their education, and their future, and we must  
5404 protect and expand this funding, not eliminate it.

5405       Every child deserves to breathe clean air at school, you  
5406 know, but in Imperial County, where I represent in the  
5407 Coachella Valley, where I represent and I grew up, our  
5408 students are learning in some of the most polluted air in the  
5409 country. In Imperial County, over 20 percent of children  
5410 suffer from asthma, the highest rate of childhood asthma in  
5411 the State of California, more than double the national  
5412 average. In some schools in the Coachella Valley, that  
5413 number is as high as one in four children.

5414       My district has some of the highest asthma-related  
5415 hospitalization rates in the entire state, but yet you want  
5416 to rescind these fundings. You care about children, but you  
5417 want to take away the fundings to help them breathe clean  
5418 air. You want to take care of children, but you are causing  
5419 an exacerbation of asthma in their childhood. You are  
5420 ruining their ability to learn in school by taking away the  
5421 programs and the fundings for them to have their air monitors  
5422 and create good practices around the area to protect them  
5423 from air pollution.

5424       So I support the amendment, and I urge all my  
5425 colleagues, for the sake of the children in schools and their  
5426 ability to learn in a healthy environment, to support that  
5427 amendment, as well.

5428           And I yield back.

5429           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentlelady from  
5430 Michigan is recognized.

5431           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going  
5432 to offer an amendment, but I want to just say that what this  
5433 bill does is creating total chaos for the auto industry in  
5434 repealing EPA's emission standards for light and medium-duty  
5435 vehicles and NHTSA's Corporate Average Fuel Economy  
5436 standards.

5437           What the domestic auto industry needs now, more than  
5438 anything, is certainty. My priority is to protect American  
5439 jobs, maintain our competitive edge in automotive  
5440 manufacturing, and ensure the United States leads in  
5441 technology and innovation, and that we secede our leadership  
5442 to nobody.

5443           Our policies must reflect the realities on the ground,  
5444 prioritize consumer choice, and offer a practical, ambitious  
5445 path forward. We need harmonized emissions and fuel economy  
5446 standards, and we must preserve the inflation reductions --  
5447 IRA, the IRA's tax incentives to remain globally competitive.  
5448 People can't afford vehicles these days. It is an issue.

5449           A sustainable and unified regulatory approach is crucial  
5450 for supporting innovation and long-term competitiveness in a  
5451 global marketplace, and we need to be the leaders in the  
5452 global marketplace. To remain competitive, the U.S. must

5453 align with the global shift towards hybrids, electric  
5454 vehicles, and down the road who knows what other technology.

5455         Here is a fact. The global marketplace wants EVs, and I  
5456 will be damned if I am going to let China beat us in that  
5457 market. And if we are going to lead, we have got to produce  
5458 them here. At the same time, our policies must meet the  
5459 needs of consumers and workers, ensuring that the transition  
5460 to cleaner vehicles supports U.S. jobs and domestic  
5461 manufacturing. And we are competing with China that  
5462 subsidizes its manufacturing, manipulates its currency, and  
5463 uses slave labor. We need to bring all stakeholders to --  
5464 they want to put us out of business and then take over.  
5465 Well, we cannot let them do it.

5466         And it is our job as policymakers to support our  
5467 domestic industry. We need to bring all the stakeholders to  
5468 the table and find consensus on how to support a strong,  
5469 stable auto industry that keeps the U.S. at the forefront of  
5470 mobility, innovation, and advanced manufacturing -- which, by  
5471 the way, you also took that out, just for the record. The  
5472 administration should be working with labor manufacturers,  
5473 suppliers, dealers, environmental groups, and consumers to  
5474 create achievable rules that support a range of technologies.

5475         I am going to remind everybody -- I know some of you are  
5476 young, some of us are a little more seasoned -- in the 1970s  
5477 this industry lost a decade of competitiveness to Japan

5478 because we weren't ready with the small car market when gas  
5479 prices went up.

5480         We need to innovate, adapt, and build vehicles  
5481 competitively here at home. The global marketplace demands  
5482 EVs and hybrids, and stakeholders need certainty that Federal  
5483 regulations will remain consistent as we transition to  
5484 cleaner vehicles.

5485         And my colleague talked about the asthma in California.

5486         The auto industry has become a ping pong ball for  
5487 everybody, and I -- it is not fair. To remain leaders in  
5488 global auto manufacturing, we need clear and consistent  
5489 government policies, policies that provide certainty, not  
5490 chaos and uncertainty. This means investing in advanced  
5491 manufacturing, securing domestic battery supply chains, and  
5492 protecting the historic EV investments under the IRA.  
5493 Repealing these standards just creates utter and total  
5494 confusion.

5495         The future of the auto industry must be shaped in  
5496 America and driven by American workers. I am committed to  
5497 working with everybody to make this happen, but this is not  
5498 the way to do it in this bill. And I urge my colleagues to  
5499 oppose repealing EPA's emission standards and NHTSA's CAFÉ  
5500 standards.

5501         Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

5502         \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The chair



5503 recognizes the ranking member.

5504       \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted  
5505 to say we have a special Senate guest. She is -- I would --  
5506 I have to be careful because I have my Senator here, but the  
5507 fact that she served for many years on this committee makes  
5508 her very special, more than the other Senators, and that is,  
5509 of course, Senator Lisa Blunt Rochester.

5510       Thank you for being here.

5511       [Applause.]

5512       \*Mr. Pallone. And of course, she is concerned about  
5513 Medicaid. That is why she is here.

5514       Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5515       \*Mr. Joyce. Are there any amendments being offered to  
5516 Subtitle B?

5517       The chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana.

5518       \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Chairman, amendment EV\_GEN\_3.

5519       \*Mr. Joyce. The clerk will report the amendment.

5520       \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. ENV.

5521       \*The Clerk. Could you repeat that?

5522       \*Mr. Joyce. Could you please repeat that amendment?

5523       \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Yes, amendment ENV\_GEN\_3.

5524       \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mr. Carter of  
5525 Louisiana. Page 8, line 1, strike "Repeal" --

5526       \*Mr. Joyce. Without objection, the reading of the  
5527 amendment is dispensed with.

5528           [The amendment of Mr. Carter of Louisiana follows:]

5529

5530       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

5531

5532           \*Mr. Joyce. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
5533 minutes to speak in support of his amendment.

5534           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5535           For more than 50 years the Environmental Protection  
5536 Agency has provided grants that both protect our  
5537 constituents' public health and enhance their environment.  
5538 This is especially true for the Environmental Climate Justice  
5539 Block Grant program, which provides valuable funding that  
5540 serves community centers, environmental rehabilitation  
5541 projects, and public health revitalization initiatives that  
5542 simply wouldn't be possible simple otherwise.

5543           These projects are providing environmental and public  
5544 health benefits in Democratic and Republican districts alike.  
5545 However, in this bill Republicans ruthlessly claw back these  
5546 grants and eliminate this program. For example, in my dear  
5547 friend, Representative -- who has a name just like mine in a  
5548 district in Georgia -- the City of Savannah has taken years  
5549 to develop the 100 Percent Savannah Initiative, a  
5550 collaborative between the city government and community  
5551 members to improve public health, increase economic  
5552 opportunities, and ensure access to critical HVAC services  
5553 for low-income residents. This initiative is in direct  
5554 response to the devastating impacts of natural disasters such  
5555 as hurricanes, flooding, and extreme heat.

5556           The City of Savannah sought Federal assistance, and

5557 received an environmental justice grant from the EPA to  
5558 provide affordable and accessible HVAC services to make sure  
5559 community members would have AC on those 90-plus-degree  
5560 summer days that we often have in the South. This grant  
5561 would have also provided critical workforce training to  
5562 increase the local supply of electricians and skilled workers  
5563 to uplift Savannah's economy. But Republicans are trying to  
5564 get rid of this program entirely.

5565         Let me be clear. Residents of Savannah may die from  
5566 dangerous heat waves without access to critical HVAC systems,  
5567 all so Republicans give tax rich people [sic] big, big, big  
5568 tax breaks. We can't afford this.

5569         This is nothing new. Republicans have been attacking  
5570 these grants in in messaging bills, oversight hearings, and  
5571 harassing letters to grant recipients for years with false  
5572 claims of fraud. They are chomping at the bit to steal the  
5573 funds from poor communities to line the pockets of big money  
5574 donors. They are stealing people's health care while making  
5575 people sicker.

5576         So my amendment will simply ensure environmental and  
5577 climate justice block grants, projects that improve health  
5578 outcomes in low-income communities do not lose critical  
5579 funding under this bill. If Republicans can truly prioritize  
5580 their constituents, they should easily agree with me that  
5581 this funding is valuable and must be protected.

5582 I urge my colleagues to support their constituents and  
5583 support this amendment.

5584 As we know, this has been very helpful to my colleague  
5585 in Georgia who bears my name, Carter, Buddy. This has been  
5586 good. Let's keep it.

5587 I yield.

5588 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The chair recognizes  
5589 the gentleman from Virginia for five minutes.

5590 \*Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. You  
5591 know, the problem with all these amendments are we get into  
5592 big fights over the language. The gentleman's amendment says  
5593 that it can't -- the unobligated amounts rescinded under  
5594 section A may not include amounts awarded to an eligible  
5595 entity for grant used for protecting public health, improving  
5596 health outcomes, or reducing the overall health impacts of  
5597 environmental stressors for low-income households.

5598 The problem is that a lot of these things are used in  
5599 areas where you look at one measure and you say, well, that  
5600 helps the public health outcome, but you look at another  
5601 measure, like when they shut down the coal industry in large  
5602 measure -- not completely, but in large measure -- in my  
5603 district. Public health outcomes got worse because people  
5604 had less money. And the number-one factor for determining  
5605 health outcomes is whether or not folks have income. When  
5606 they don't have income, their public health suffers.

5607           So I don't know how you would ever determine -- I mean,  
5608   the stated purpose might be for these different reasons, but  
5609   in reality, often times the stated purpose is not what  
5610   actually happens on the ground or in the field.

5611           I mean, I recall having discussions with the Obama EPA  
5612   administrator about some of the coal regulations they were  
5613   putting into place, which they would argue was for public  
5614   health, which put a lot of my people out of work. And when I  
5615   also raised the issue that it would raise the cost of  
5616   electricity in my region, which at one time in my lifetime  
5617   was the third lowest in the country and now is extremely  
5618   high, the answer was, well, we have programs to take care of  
5619   those people who can't afford the electricity. But that  
5620   affected health. They couldn't argue it didn't affect  
5621   health, but they didn't include that in their analysis when  
5622   they passed those regulations.

5623           So I think we could get into arguments about this that  
5624   would last all night. Wait, we are probably going to do that  
5625   anyway. But notwithstanding that, I would hope that the  
5626   folks on the committee would vote this amendment down. I  
5627   understand the gentleman is offering it with good intentions,  
5628   but what we are trying to do is to make sure that our  
5629   policies go forward that make sense. And I am not sure a lot  
5630   of these programs do that.

5631           And I am sure that the gentleman -- and we won't get

5632 into it now, but the gentleman from Alabama would be happy to  
5633 talk about some of the things that he is uncovering on the  
5634 Oversight and Investigation Subcommittee.

5635 And with that, and asking everybody to vote no, I yield  
5636 back.

5637 \*Mr. Joyce. The committee will stand in recess until 15  
5638 minutes after the last votes on the floor.

5639 [Recess.]

5640 \*The Chair. [Presiding] The committee will come to  
5641 order.

5642 I believe the last one to speak on the amendment was the  
5643 gentleman from Virginia, so that opens up to a Democrat --

5644 \*Ms. Barragan. Oh, yes.

5645 \*The Chair. -- to be recognized, and I believe the  
5646 gentlelady from California -- well, I have two -- the  
5647 gentlelady from northern California would like to be  
5648 recognized for -- to speak on the amendment.

5649 \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
5650 the last word and speak in support of the amendment.

5651 \*The Chair. The gentlelady from northern California is  
5652 recognized.

5653 \*Ms. Matsui. Mr. Chairman, I have long been a believer  
5654 in the power of local action. When communities can address  
5655 their own needs, they can create meaningful, lasting change.  
5656 And there was a time when the Republican Party shared that

5657 view, so I find it bitterly ironic to see Republicans on this  
5658 committee reaching into the pockets of local communities  
5659 across this country and stealing local funding to pay for tax  
5660 breaks for the wealthiest Americans.

5661         The Community Change Grants were created to support  
5662 local community efforts to reduce pollution and enhance  
5663 resilience, particularly in vulnerable communities most  
5664 affected by extreme weather, flooding, and heat waves. These  
5665 aren't abstract ones and zeros on a Federal balance sheet.  
5666 Much of this funding has already been awarded to local  
5667 community organizations, where it is already supporting  
5668 projects on the ground.

5669         But President Trump and Elon Musk have illegally frozen  
5670 these funds, preventing community organizations from  
5671 accessing their funding so that Republicans here today could  
5672 unlawfully claw back this legally and rightfully-awarded  
5673 funding. I know, because I have a Community Change Grant in  
5674 my district. La Familia Counseling Center received \$18.5  
5675 million to build a community resilience center and a new  
5676 public park, and install cost-saving energy upgrades in  
5677 community homes, while also providing workforce training to  
5678 community members. La Familia has already started  
5679 construction on this project, and has drawn down some of the  
5680 awarded funding, but the Trump EPA prevented La Familia from  
5681 further accessing that funding, despite signing a contract



5682 legally obligating EPA to provide the funding.

5683           And it is not just my district. Republicans are also  
5684 stealing money from their own communities; \$576 million in  
5685 Community Change Grants went to Republican congressional  
5686 districts and to states represented here in this room: \$40  
5687 million went to Georgia, \$18 million to Ohio, \$69 million to  
5688 Texas, \$60 million to Virginia. These are your communities  
5689 that you are taking from.

5690           Rescinding Community Change Grants, as this bill does,  
5691 will strip funding from communities in over half of the  
5692 states represented by my Republican colleagues on this  
5693 committee.

5694           I urge my colleagues to support these important projects  
5695 in your states and vote yes on this amendment.

5696           And I yield back the balance of my time.

5697           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
5698 member on the Republican side seeking recognition?

5699           Seeing none, the gentlelady from southern California is  
5700 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

5701           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. --

5702           \*The Chair. Oh, I am sorry, we have another -- I think  
5703 she had recognition next. Do you want to go, or do you want  
5704 -- I will let you choose.

5705           \*Voice. Have her go first, then --

5706           \*The Chair. I think she had asked for it, and then I

5707 will go the other southern California.

5708 So good, so the gentlelady is recognized.

5709 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to  
5710 strike the last word in support of the amendment.

5711 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

5712 \*Ms. Barragan. At the same time House Republicans try  
5713 to strip health care from millions of Americans, their budget  
5714 will pollute our air and our water.

5715 One of my colleagues asked if we had gone through and we  
5716 looked at the bill or we had read the bill. There is a  
5717 provision in the bill, for those of you who I know are  
5718 waiting for more Medicaid conversation, there is a provision  
5719 in the bill that will repeal and rescind funding to address  
5720 air pollution at schools.

5721 I mean, think about this for a second. There is a  
5722 repeal, and they are going to try to take away money that  
5723 will go to help address air pollution at schools. I mean, we  
5724 are talking about kids. We are talking about children. They  
5725 do not care about the air pollution at schools and that your  
5726 children are inhaling and are being harmed from [sic]. So  
5727 just think about that when you think about health care and  
5728 Medicaid. They don't care about that either, okay? If we  
5729 are going to go after kids at schools and saying, no, you --  
5730 it is okay for you to have dirty air -- which, by the way, is  
5731 going to lead to health problems and which, by the way, is

5732 going to lead to more asthma and respiratory illnesses -- it  
5733 is going to cost us all more money.

5734 But I want to speak about this amendment that my  
5735 colleague has. It also means cuts to clean energy and clean  
5736 water investments that reduce pollution in our communities.  
5737 This harms public health. One program Republicans eliminated  
5738 in this bill is the Environmental and Climate Justice Block  
5739 Grants. Last fall the EPA announced hundreds of grants for  
5740 local projects. Here are just some of the projects that were  
5741 announced.

5742 In Michigan, in Benton Harbor, a \$20 million grant to  
5743 Benton Harbor in Michigan to fund energy efficiency upgrades  
5744 for low-income households to save them money, and a  
5745 renovation of the city's community center. This is in  
5746 Michigan 4, in Representative Huizenga's district. Just  
5747 think about that. There is money for low-income folks to  
5748 help save them money. This administration promised on day  
5749 one to bring down prices, yet they are undoing the very  
5750 things that are going to help people save money. The Trump  
5751 EPA has already tried to cancel it, this project, which the  
5752 mayor said would be a huge blow to the community. This bill  
5753 doubles down and cancels that program.

5754 The next program is in the Speaker's own district,  
5755 Speaker Johnson's district. Even Speaker Johnson applied for  
5756 these grants and for this money to go to his district, as he

5757 should. But even in that district -- he supported the City  
5758 of Minden and Louisiana Tech University's application titled  
5759 -- and I am quoting -- "Empowering Communities with  
5760 Innovative Solutions to Reduce Pollution, Build Climate  
5761 Resilience, and Improve Public Health Project.'" So we  
5762 looked up the proposed project. It would provide -- or I  
5763 should say after Republicans cut this program it would have  
5764 provided -- and I am quoting, "cutting-edge water treatment  
5765 processes to monitor and reduce pollutants in drinking water  
5766 and wastewater.'"

5767 Another project is clean water in rural California.  
5768 This is another Republican district, California 5, where --  
5769 California can relate to the need for clean water in our  
5770 state. The Community Water Center was awarded an EPA grant  
5771 to provide clean water infrastructure for the rural, low-  
5772 income communities of Pajaro and Sunny Mesa and Springfield.  
5773 Representative McClintock represents this area. Without this  
5774 project they will continue to drink unsafe water. Their  
5775 grant has been held in limbo by the EPA administrator, Lee  
5776 Zeldin. Now the environmental justice program that supports  
5777 it is canceled by this bill.

5778 So if Republicans went through each project that is  
5779 funded through the Climate and Environmental Justice Block  
5780 Grants, I think they would find it hard to cut every single  
5781 one of these. And that is because they are not really

5782 interested, they are just looking for places to cut. Why?  
5783 To give tax breaks to billionaires. That is why we are here.  
5784 We are looking for places to cut, whether it is health care,  
5785 whether it is dollars to address air pollution, to give tax  
5786 breaks to the rich.

5787         The truth is that Republican cuts will make our  
5788 communities less healthy, and the cuts will lead to higher  
5789 rates of cancer, to asthma, and hospitalization. Even worse,  
5790 they are tied to a bill with the largest Medicaid cut in  
5791 history which will make it more expensive for Americans to  
5792 get treated for the harm caused by pollution. That is wrong.

5793         I urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican cuts to  
5794 clean energy and environmental justice programs.

5795         And I yield back.

5796         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The chair  
5797 recognizes -- any Republican members seeking recognition?

5798         The gentleman from California, you seek recognition to  
5799 speak on the amendment?

5800         \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you. I speak out in support of this  
5801 amendment, which is against cutting grants to improve  
5802 environmental health in low-income communities.

5803         There has been a repeated attempt by this Republican  
5804 Congress to harm low-income communities in order to give tax  
5805 breaks to billionaires. Republicans are trying to cut  
5806 funding for the Environmental Protection Agency and

5807 environmental justice programs that protect our most  
5808 vulnerable communities.

5809         Let me be clear. Gutting these programs will harm the  
5810 health and well-being of millions of Americans, especially  
5811 those living in low-income neighborhoods, communities of  
5812 color, tribal lands, and rural areas like the ones I  
5813 represent in California's 25th district, and the ones that  
5814 many Republicans on this committee represent.

5815         These programs are not abstract bureaucracies. They are  
5816 lifelines. When you cut funding for the EPA, you cut the  
5817 very people and tools responsible for monitoring air quality,  
5818 cleaning up toxic waste sites, and enforcing laws that  
5819 prevent polluters from poisoning our communities. When you  
5820 defund environmental justice initiatives, you silence the  
5821 voices of low-income and rural communities that have long  
5822 been ignored and over-burdened by pollution, communities that  
5823 already face higher rates of asthma, cancer, birth defects,  
5824 and chronic disease due to environmental exposures.

5825         In the eastern Coachella Valley I represent families who  
5826 live near illegal dumping grounds and outdated water systems.  
5827 I represent children who struggle to breathe because of  
5828 unpaved roads and constant dust and pollution from semi  
5829 trucks on nearby interstates. We have asthma hospitalization  
5830 rates amongst the highest in the state. We need more  
5831 investments in clean energy, not less.

5832           These programs matter. The EPA's Office of  
5833   Environmental Justice helps frontline communities access  
5834   grants to replace diesel trucks, pave roads, remove hazardous  
5835   waste, and monitor industrial pollution. It provides the  
5836   science, technical support, and accountability that these  
5837   neighborhoods need to fight back against a systemic  
5838   injustice.

5839           Slashing these resources would deepen health  
5840   disparities, increase economic hardship, and send a clear  
5841   message that some lives and some communities matter less, and  
5842   we cannot allow that to happen.

5843           Defunding the EPA and environmental justice programs  
5844   would also weaken enforcement of landmark laws like the Clean  
5845   Air Act and Clean Water Act. It would embolden polluters,  
5846   reduce transparency, and shift the burden of proof onto  
5847   already over-burdened families who are too often forced to  
5848   choose between clean air and a place to live.

5849           This is not fiscal responsibility; it is a moral  
5850   failure. Every dollar we cut from these programs today will  
5851   cost us many more in health care expenses, lost productivity,  
5852   and environmental cleanup down the road. But more  
5853   importantly, it will cost us lives.

5854           I came to Congress to be a voice for the voiceless. As  
5855   a doctor, I believe in treating root causes, not just  
5856   symptoms. And the root causes of environmental justice are

5857 systemic disinvestments, policy neglect, and political  
5858 indifference, just like this bill. We must reject any budget  
5859 that tries to balance the books by sacrificing the health of  
5860 poor communities. Instead, we should be expanding  
5861 investments in environmental justice, strengthening  
5862 community-led initiatives, and ensuring that all Americans,  
5863 no matter their income, race, or zip code, have the right to  
5864 breathe clean air, have the right to drink safe water and  
5865 live free from toxic exposure.

5866         So I urge my colleagues to protect and fully fund the  
5867 EPA and environmental justice program. Let's stand on the  
5868 side of health, fairness, and dignity for all.

5869         And I yield back.

5870         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there anyone  
5871 seeking recognition to speak on the amendment?

5872         The gentleman from New Jersey seeks recognition. He is  
5873 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

5874         \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman, and I want to thank  
5875 my colleague Mr. Carter, for offering this amendment.

5876         You know, often when we talk about environmental justice  
5877 our friends across the aisle roll their eyes. They scoff at  
5878 the idea of what is environmental injustice. It is not a  
5879 thing. We don't need to talk about it. So I want to just  
5880 add a little context to it.

5881         Environmental justice initiatives are lifelines for



5882 communities that are at a higher risk of adverse health  
5883 impacts from exposure to pollution and other environmental  
5884 challenges. So in my district the Ironbound section of  
5885 Newark, 25 percent of children living there suffer from  
5886 asthma. That is three times the state average.

5887         And it isn't just their health that suffers. When we  
5888 talk about environmental justice, we are talking about  
5889 children's education. Asthma is the leading cause of  
5890 absenteeism in school-age children, which is why it is so  
5891 obscene that today Republicans want to cut funding that would  
5892 address air pollution at schools. I would just ask the  
5893 American people, like, what part of addressing air pollution  
5894 at schools is controversial? I don't think there is anything  
5895 controversial about.

5896         And this is not just Democratic states or blue states.  
5897 When we talk about environmental justice, we are talking  
5898 about mining-related pollution in Appalachia. We are talking  
5899 about water crises in Alabama and Michigan. We are talking  
5900 about over-burdened communities that exist across the country  
5901 and across party lines.

5902         So speaking about across party lines, another one of our  
5903 Republican colleagues from Oregon has a district that has  
5904 been awarded multiple grants at risk from this reconciliation  
5905 bill that would be saved by my amendment.

5906         You are welcome.

5907           First is the Columbia Gorge Early Learning and  
5908 Resilience Center, located right outside of Portland in a  
5909 rural, low-income community of The Dalles, Oregon. This  
5910 grant-funded project would renovate a 70-year-old school  
5911 building into a community center that protects public health  
5912 and provides valuable resources for local residents. That  
5913 sounds like a home run project to me. The center would  
5914 provide childcare for up to 200 children, create an on-site  
5915 learning laboratory, and provide vocational scholarships for  
5916 students to pursue careers in fields such as engineering or  
5917 agriculture. That is fantastic.

5918           But the same party that claims to be the party of  
5919 families wants to shut down a grant that would help some of  
5920 those families with child care. The irony is staggering.  
5921 This is all while also creating a renewable, energy-powered  
5922 refuge that will protect our most vulnerable residents during  
5923 extreme weather events like wildfires and winter storms.  
5924 When the lights go out and the community needs critical heat  
5925 and services, Republicans turn the other way, even at the  
5926 risk of their own constituents' lives. Unfortunately, the  
5927 \$20 million EPA grant to carry out this valuable mission was  
5928 unjustly and illegally terminated last month.

5929           Similarly, another grant in Oregon, the Chiloquin  
5930 Community Resilience Hub and Municipal Center, would have  
5931 remediated a brownfield site into an emergency shelter,

5932 municipal space, and community education center. We all sat  
5933 here weeks ago and touted the brownfields program as a  
5934 bipartisan program, and yet here we are trying to cut the  
5935 funding for a brownfield site that would serve as a critical  
5936 community hub in a Republican district. The center would  
5937 also provide training and education opportunities for a  
5938 population that lives in a rural and historically underserved  
5939 area. The project was awarded a \$16.3 million EPA  
5940 environmental justice grant -- great job getting that for  
5941 your community -- but it was also illegally and arbitrarily  
5942 canceled last month.

5943         Now Republicans like that congressman from Oregon want  
5944 to get rid of the program entirely. To me, the conclusion is  
5945 clear. Republicans are willing to withhold nearly \$40  
5946 million from one congressional district alone, from his own  
5947 constituents, to give tax breaks to those who need them the  
5948 least.

5949         So in addition to health care, we are not just talking  
5950 about Democratic environmental priorities. We are talking  
5951 about cutting funding for programs that will impact districts  
5952 across the country, and that is why everyone should support  
5953 this amendment to ensure that you bring those dollars home to  
5954 your district.

5955         Thank you, and I yield back.

5956         \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back, and

5957 I will recognize myself to speak on the amendment, and yield  
5958 to my good friend from Virginia.

5959 \*Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just want to  
5960 point out that these provisions that we are talking about  
5961 only apply as far, as this bill is concerned, to the  
5962 unobligated balances. So if a grant was already given, as  
5963 far as this bill is concerned, then that would still be going  
5964 forward.

5965 \*The Chair. So would you yield back to me?

5966 So everyone that was listed, if the grants had been  
5967 awarded as projects or not --

5968 \*Mr. Griffith. If the grant has already been granted  
5969 and the money is obligated, then this -- then our language  
5970 does not affect that.

5971 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Will the gentleman yield?

5972 \*The Chair. The -- yes, it is my time. Yes, I will  
5973 yield.

5974 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

5975 \*The Chair. Yes.

5976 \*Mrs. Fletcher. I just want to clarify. I understand  
5977 the statement to be that this particular legislation doesn't  
5978 deal with the already-obligated funds. But isn't it true  
5979 that the administration is rescinding the grants and pulling  
5980 back the money from the projects like my colleague from New  
5981 Jersey was just explaining?

5982           I know that there have been grants under various  
5983 programs in my community. One, for example, to help build  
5984 sidewalks and tree canopy. It is amazing to think about. In  
5985 my district there is a 17-degree difference in the  
5986 temperature during the summer between the poorest  
5987 neighborhoods and the wealthiest. And they have no trees,  
5988 they have no tree canopy. There is this great program to try  
5989 to build sidewalks, put in trees, and address some of these  
5990 challenges that -- it gets real hot in Houston, and this is a  
5991 really important program. But I know the funds for that have  
5992 been revoked.

5993           And so is the statement that this won't do anything to  
5994 those, but there are still these grants being revoked? Or  
5995 are we trying to preserve those grants in this legislation  
5996 and just -- the already-obligated funds, are we protecting  
5997 those in this?

5998           \*The Chair. Well, this legislation does not take --  
5999 does not close the grants on any obligated funds, and that --  
6000 the executive actions --

6001           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

6002           \*The Chair. My understanding -- and I will yield to my  
6003 friend from Virginia, if you would like to answer that.

6004           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield?

6005           \*Mr. Griffith. I am happy to say that I don't --

6006           \*The Chair. Louisiana, my friend from Virginia, and

6007 then I will yield to you.

6008 \*Mr. Griffith. I don't know what the administration is  
6009 doing, per se, to the specific --

6010 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I can help --

6011 \*Mr. Griffith. -- grants that were mentioned, but I  
6012 would say that this amendment specifically talks about the  
6013 unobligated amounts, as well, so that whether it be the bill  
6014 or the amendment, this action that we take does not impact  
6015 that action that may or may not be going on in the  
6016 administration.

6017 I know it is confusing for folks back home, as well, to  
6018 understand that not -- the administration does not always  
6019 tell us everything they are doing because they are doing so  
6020 many things.

6021 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Will the gentleman yield  
6022 briefly?

6023 \*Mr. Griffith. And while I --

6024 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I will address that.

6025 \*The Chair. I will yield to you in a second. Let him  
6026 finish, yes.

6027 \*Mr. Griffith. I don't have the floor. I have been  
6028 yielded time, so I have to finish and then I yield back --

6029 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Fair enough, sir.

6030 \*Mr. Griffith. -- to the chair.

6031 And so I can't speak for the administration on this.

6032 That is a whole different ball game.

6033 But what we are debating tonight is the bill in front of  
6034 us. And what we are debating right now is the amendment.  
6035 Neither the bill in front of us nor the amendment deal with  
6036 the issues that the gentleman previously raised. And so that  
6037 is why I ask folks to vote no on the amendment and yes on the  
6038 bill.

6039 \*The Chair. Thank you.

6040 The gentleman from Louisiana, I yield to you.

6041 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. And I am happy to have an  
6042 opportunity to address that, because those comments are not  
6043 exactly correct.

6044 If the Administrator Zeldin is successful in terminating  
6045 these critical grant programs in his misguided attempt to gut  
6046 the agency, these grants will be subject to rescission. It  
6047 is very clear. So the notion that it has been awarded, it is  
6048 not going to be impacted, that is a little disingenuous. So  
6049 I want to clear that up for the record.

6050 I yield.

6051 \*The Chair. Thank you. I yield, but -- to the -- back  
6052 to the gentleman from Virginia.

6053 You want to -- okay I will -- do you want to speak, the  
6054 gentleman from Virginia? Go ahead.

6055 \*Mr. Griffith. And what I would say, Mr. Chairman, is  
6056 that that may be true for a future rescission, but we can't

6057 rescind expenditures that have already been obligated.

6058 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Oh --

6059 \*Mr. Griffith. And for purposes of this reconciliation,  
6060 we can't look at the crystal ball and decide what might  
6061 happen in the future.

6062 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. chairman, will you yield?

6063 \*The Chair. Let me finish and --

6064 \*Mr. Griffith. So I would just have to say, Mr.  
6065 Chairman, that, you know, if you wanted to game it out three  
6066 or four steps, the gentleman may be correct at some point.  
6067 We might have this again for a different decision. But as of  
6068 tonight, as of right now, that money is not available to us  
6069 because it has been obligated. If it has been -- if it is  
6070 unobligated at the time of passage, then we would have --  
6071 then that might be a different story. But as of right now  
6072 that is not the case.

6073 \*The Chair. I got 20 seconds.

6074 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Twenty seconds. So I am so  
6075 happy to hear Mr. Griffin [sic] say that money that has been  
6076 appropriated can't be taken back. Would you be willing to  
6077 say that to the Trump Administration who is cutting money  
6078 that this Congress has appropriated --

6079 \*The Chair. Well --

6080 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. -- all over the country? And  
6081 if what you say is correct, then I would love to see that



6082 enforced across the board. We know that isn't the truth.

6083       \*The Chair. My time has expired, and I yield back my  
6084 time. Is there any discussion on the Republican side?

6085       Any on the Democrat side?

6086       Seeing none, there is a -- on the amendment.

6087       Oh, there is a hand. Excuse me, I am sorry, I didn't  
6088 see. The gentlelady from Virginia is recognized for five  
6089 minutes.

6090       \*Ms. McClellan. Yes, I yield to the gentleman from New  
6091 Jersey.

6092       \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you. I thank my colleague from  
6093 Virginia for yielding.

6094       So, I mean, part of this is, to be fair, about looking  
6095 back in terms of where we had gone previously, and the things  
6096 that we were able to do in prior Congresses that have  
6097 benefitted so many Americans across the country in blue and  
6098 red districts. And you are seeing the Administration  
6099 illegally, again, cancel those grants. And so now this bill  
6100 is a continuation of the administration's priorities to gut  
6101 all funding that would go to environmental justice  
6102 initiatives across the country.

6103       Now, you may say, well, you are from New Jersey, so of  
6104 course you care about environmental justice. I do. But when  
6105 you see that money had gone out to places as far as Oregon  
6106 and rural low-income places, you would say to yourself, well,

6107 why are we going to cut potential funding that we could have  
6108 go to benefit rural, suburban, urban districts across the  
6109 country, and create healthier outcomes for all Americans?

6110 And so this bill is a continuation of all the harm that  
6111 this administration has done. That is what we are voting on.  
6112 That is correct. And what my amendment does is say let's  
6113 just stop the harm. Let's just stop the harm. Why are we  
6114 going to continue to target communities and not provide them  
6115 with the resources that they need to create healthier  
6116 outcomes for their residents, including their most  
6117 vulnerable, right? Because in addition to the amendment that  
6118 Mr. Carter offered, there is also the fact that you all want  
6119 to cut funding for air pollution at schools -- study and  
6120 prevent air pollution at schools.

6121 So there is a lot of good that we can do together. This  
6122 bill does none of that. It is a continuation of this  
6123 administration's harmful approach to gutting programs that  
6124 create healthier outcomes for all Americans, again, in rural,  
6125 suburban, urban areas, blue and red districts. That is the  
6126 reason to support this amendment.

6127 I urge all of my colleagues to support Mr. Carter's  
6128 amendment so we can get back on track and start doing things  
6129 that will benefit all of our constituents.

6130 With that I yield back to my colleague from Virginia.

6131 \*Mrs. Fletcher. If there is any time, I will take a

6132 yield.

6133       \*Ms. McClellan. Well, I wanted to use some of it,  
6134 but --

6135       \*Mrs. Fletcher. Go ahead. Go ahead.

6136       \*Ms. McClellan. I just want to -- I know that this bill  
6137 is also not just about taking the unappropriated balances,  
6138 but repealing the program altogether that was supposed to be  
6139 open at least through 2026.

6140       And I know the Trump Administration and some of my  
6141 colleagues on the other side of the aisle don't like the word  
6142 "environmental justice." But what environmental justice is  
6143 designed to do is recognize there are communities in this  
6144 country -- White, Black, mostly low-income, urban, and rural,  
6145 mostly -- where projects, mostly energy projects, were put in  
6146 place with no input from the community. In some communities  
6147 like Charles City County in my district, they have got two  
6148 pipelines. They had two natural gas companies that were  
6149 supposed to come through, and by the time the community found  
6150 out about it they were so far down the path there was little  
6151 they could do to fix it.

6152       That has been happening for probably over a century, and  
6153 these are the same communities that have some of the poorest  
6154 health outcomes in the country. And what the environmental  
6155 justice grants were designed to do is say we recognize that  
6156 the public policy decisions made to put all of these

6157 facilities in communities where the people didn't have the  
6158 resources to fight back or even know it was happening, and  
6159 therefore have higher incidences of asthma and cancer and  
6160 many other things, we are going to invest in those  
6161 communities.

6162         And what this bill effectively does is says, I am sorry  
6163 we screwed you for centuries, and we are going to keep  
6164 screwing you going forward. And that is not justice. And  
6165 that is one area where people in my district and people in my  
6166 colleague from Virginia's district agree on with the Mountain  
6167 Valley Pipeline was we want a say in what comes in our  
6168 communities. And when things are in our communities that  
6169 hurt our health, we want some sort of mitigation. And some  
6170 of these grants went to southwest Virginia to help mitigate  
6171 that, and some of them went to my district to mitigate that.

6172         And we should want to help address centuries of  
6173 injustice in this country that harmed the very people who  
6174 didn't have the power to fight back and stop it. And that is  
6175 what we are trying to do on their behalf, and this bill guts  
6176 this program altogether.

6177         I yield back.

6178         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
6179 from Florida is recognized for five minutes to speak on the  
6180 bill.

6181         \*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield my

6182 time to the representative from Virginia, Mr. Griffith.

6183       \*Mr. Griffith. I thank the gentleman. A couple of  
6184 things that have come up.

6185       One, the amendment deals with the unobligated amounts.  
6186 So when people say things about, well, the future, this  
6187 amendment doesn't do that. And that is what we are debating,  
6188 is this amendment. It doesn't do that. It says the  
6189 unobligated amounts rescinded under section A may not include  
6190 amounts used for et cetera, et cetera, the public health,  
6191 improving health outcomes -- and I addressed that before we  
6192 left -- et cetera.

6193       And then I have heard a lot of discussion about the  
6194 schools in the school programs. And the problem is that,  
6195 thus far, all of that money has gone into not schools, it has  
6196 gone into think tanks to study what they might do someday if  
6197 we appropriate additional money that would then go to the  
6198 schools. So is it really all that valuable?

6199       Because I will tell you that if we really wanted to go  
6200 in that direction, as the chairman of the committee knows, we  
6201 could probably just get our former colleague from West  
6202 Virginia to tell us all about it because he studied it for  
6203 years. We don't need to spend millions of dollars. He can  
6204 tell you what you need to be doing in the schools, if that is  
6205 what the intent is. Instead, we spent all this money -- or  
6206 we spent a lot of money on that, and we are just getting back

6207 the unobligated balances in -- and that is what this  
6208 amendment deals with, and I understand that. But if the  
6209 intent was to go elsewhere, that is not what this amendment  
6210 says, and it is not what this amendment does.

6211 And I thank the gentleman, and I yield my time back to  
6212 the gentleman from Florida.

6213 \*Mr. Bilirakis. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

6214 \*The Chair. Is there further discussion on the  
6215 amendment?

6216 Seeing none on the Democrat side, the gentleman from  
6217 Alabama is recognized for five minutes to speak on the  
6218 amendment.

6219 \*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6220 I try to listen attentively to what my colleagues say  
6221 and try to learn some things, and one of the things that I  
6222 find interesting is that air quality has improved  
6223 dramatically -- I might encourage you to look at the EPA data  
6224 on this to show how much air quality is improved -- yet  
6225 asthma rates have gone up. And I understand the concerns  
6226 about it. My brother has struggled with asthma. But I am  
6227 not sure that you can draw a direct line between air quality  
6228 and an increase in asthma. There may be other factors  
6229 involved here: low-quality housing, trees, a number of other  
6230 environmental factors. I mean, you can look this up yourself  
6231 if you want to. I have heard members try to insinuate that

6232 asthma is caused by pollution, and the research indicates  
6233 that they -- we really don't know what causes it. It could  
6234 be a number of factors.

6235         The other thing is I keep hearing them talk about  
6236 environmental justice. And sometimes that -- I grew up in a  
6237 very rural area. My dad had about an eighth-grade education.  
6238 We -- literally, the first house I lived in didn't have  
6239 indoor plumbing, so I kind of get how it is to live in a  
6240 rural area and not have a whole lot. But I think sometimes  
6241 environmental justice is really a way to keep poor people  
6242 poor.

6243         In Pembroke Township, for instance, in Illinois, the  
6244 environmental justice crowd were insistent that they not get  
6245 a natural gas pipeline. That was -- that township in  
6246 Illinois is 80 percent African American. Jesse Jackson, Al  
6247 Sharpton, and other civil rights leaders went to that city to  
6248 help them get a natural gas pipeline because they needed  
6249 opportunities there. They wanted to give the people who live  
6250 in that town a chance to get better jobs, and they needed a  
6251 natural gas pipeline. And I am happy to announce that  
6252 Reverend Jackson and the others who were engaged in that  
6253 effort were successful in helping them get a natural gas  
6254 pipeline.

6255         So I think there is a lot of ways to look at this, and I  
6256 think we don't need to be discounting the progress that we

6257 have made in air quality. I worked for two international  
6258 engineering companies, one of which was Combustion  
6259 Engineering in the environmental systems division, making the  
6260 very equipment that has benefitted our air quality, the  
6261 precipitators, the flue gas scrubbers. Those are the very  
6262 things that our technology and our economy has allowed us to  
6263 have.

6264 But at the same time, we are trying to create  
6265 opportunity for people to have a good job, to live in better  
6266 housing, to eat better, to get better education. And I just  
6267 think there is a balance here. We all want clean air, we  
6268 want clean water, we want healthy kids, but we also want to  
6269 provide opportunities for the parents to be able to get a  
6270 good job, to help their kids get a good education, to be able  
6271 to live in a clean environment. And I think we kind of get  
6272 to the extremes on this, and we need to take a more sensible  
6273 scientific view of things.

6274 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

6275 \*The Chair. Thank you.

6276 The gentleman yields back. Is there any discussion?

6277 The gentlelady from Illinois is recognized for five  
6278 minutes to speak on the amendment.

6279 \*Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to  
6280 yield my time to the gentleman from Louisiana.

6281 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, ma'am.



6282           Did I hear the member say that environmental justice is  
6283 a way to keep poor people poor?

6284           My God, environmental justice is a way to keep people  
6285 alive, to give people the opportunity and have the audacity  
6286 to want to breathe clean air, and drink clean water, and to  
6287 live in an environment where, yes, they can eat and they can  
6288 have a job, but they can also live.

6289           We can talk about the back-and-forth all day long about  
6290 an amendment, but to suggest that somehow -- rather -- and  
6291 then to invoke Reverend Jesse Jackson or Al Sharpton, that  
6292 somehow because these people went into rural areas and fought  
6293 for people's right to have environmental justice, that  
6294 somehow defame the title of environmental justice, to make it  
6295 somehow a bad word that people are being kept in poverty --  
6296 no. We want people to be enriched.

6297           I have always said co-existence, communities and  
6298 industry co-existing, but only when we have healthy  
6299 communities where people can breathe clean air and drink  
6300 clean water, have the opportunity to work and live and not be  
6301 subject to whether it is cancer or any other ailment that may  
6302 come from prolonged access or exposure to chemicals.

6303           Yes, environmental justice. It is not a bad word. It  
6304 is a word we should all adopt. It is a word that we should  
6305 all fight for, because who doesn't want people to be able to  
6306 live their long lives?

6307           To think that somehow we know better than those people  
6308 who live in the community, oh, we are just trying -- they are  
6309 just trying to keep you poor. No, we are trying to keep them  
6310 healthy and keep them alive.

6311           I am offended by that comment. I am offended to suggest  
6312 that because Reverend Jackson or Reverend Sharpton went in to  
6313 fight, and I and others in this dais who goes out every day  
6314 to fight for the American people and for the people of  
6315 Louisiana to be able to co-exist and to have clean water and  
6316 clean air -- environmental justice is something that everyone  
6317 should be concerned about. Even those people who run the  
6318 plants have to have healthy people to operate the apparatus.

6319           Environmental justice is not a way of keeping people  
6320 poor. Environmental justice is a way of keeping people  
6321 alive. And we should continue in this particular -- out of  
6322 this committee, with so many doctors -- maybe it is not  
6323 asthma, but there are certainly breathing conditions, and  
6324 there are some that would argue -- doctors alike, scientists  
6325 alike, they would argue that, yes, while there may be some  
6326 instances where asthma has gone down, there are instances  
6327 where asthma has gone up. Sometimes it is tied to the  
6328 chemical plant, sometimes it isn't. But we know that there  
6329 are people that have died. We know that there are people who  
6330 are sick. We know that there are people who have conditions  
6331 that they track back.

6332           Listen, we can do better. Air scrubbers, air monitors,  
6333   working with the community. Many of the plants in my state  
6334   have worked with us, and continue to work with us. Some are  
6335   not. Some are violators and they don't always step up and do  
6336   what they are supposed to do. But in this committee we  
6337   should always endeavor to make sure that people understand  
6338   the importance of providing clean air, clean water. And that  
6339   is done by having environmental justice in places where we  
6340   have historically had environmental injustice.

6341           I yield.

6342           \*The Chair. Does the gentlelady from Illinois --

6343           \*Mr. Menendez. Does gentleman yield?

6344           \*The Chair. The gentlelady from --

6345           \*Mr. Menendez. You had a -- I think --

6346           \*The Chair. You had one minute when they -- we reset  
6347   the clock when you yielded, so -- but we will recognize the  
6348   gentleman from New Jersey for --

6349           \*Mr. Menendez. You can give me two, Chairman.

6350           \*The Chair. Yes, to -- the remainder of your time.

6351           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I appreciate my  
6352   colleague for yielding.

6353           But, you know, just to -- for the American people to  
6354   understand how hard the Republicans are spinning right now on  
6355   every single issue, you have heard Republicans say that we  
6356   are cutting funding because it only goes towards studying

6357 what is happening at schools, and not actually doing  
6358 anything. Then you also hear Republicans saying it is not  
6359 conclusive that pollution causes asthma. Well, if it is not  
6360 conclusive, then maybe it is an issue we need to study. If  
6361 it is an issue we need to study, then maybe we should  
6362 appropriate money to study those things. Or we can listen to  
6363 doctors here on the Democratic side who say that air  
6364 pollution definitely contributes to asthma, which I think  
6365 most Americans would agree with, which therefore we can move  
6366 forward with the funding that we have already appropriated  
6367 and not rescind it from all the communities that are looking  
6368 for us to act to make our communities healthier, especially  
6369 for our children.

6370 And with that, I yield back to my colleague from  
6371 Illinois.

6372 \*The Chair. The gentlelady from Illinois yields back, I  
6373 guess.

6374 The gentlelady yields back. Is anyone on the Republican  
6375 side seeking recognition to speak on the amendment?

6376 Is anyone -- the gentlelady from Washington is  
6377 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

6378 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, I  
6379 didn't anticipate speaking on this particular amendment, but  
6380 I think it just -- I finally understand why it is that there  
6381 is so much opposition to the notion of environmental justice

6382 from my Republican colleagues, and I think we just heard it  
6383 from the same person who said follow the science.

6384 I mean, if you look at the science, if you bother to  
6385 look for it, it is a well established that pollution is a  
6386 contributing factor toward asthma, that heavy metals are a  
6387 contributing factor, a major cause of brain damage. And so,  
6388 you know, maybe if you don't look for it, you don't  
6389 understand that there is a relationship. That is why you  
6390 oppose this whole notion.

6391 And I just want to put a finer point on this, which is  
6392 that today we are going to be talking a little bit later  
6393 about how my Republican colleagues want to strip Medicaid  
6394 away from 13.7 million Americans in order to give a gigantic  
6395 tax cut to Elon Musk and other billionaires, and the same  
6396 people who are suffering from pollution-causing chronic  
6397 diseases are the same ones who also rely on Medicaid who will  
6398 then end up in the emergency room with a bad asthma attack  
6399 that will cost so much money. It will make you wait in line  
6400 when you are having a heart attack, and it hurts everybody.

6401 So I want you to think again about standing up for  
6402 people who live in polluted areas, and I want you to think  
6403 really hard about what it means to take Medicaid away from  
6404 13.7 million Americans.

6405 Thank you, I yield back.

6406 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there

6407 anyone seeking recognition to -- amendment on the Republican  
6408 side?

6409 Any more on the Democrat side?

6410 Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote  
6411 occurs on the amendment. A roll call vote has been  
6412 requested, and I -- and the clerk will call the roll.

6413 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

6414 \*Mr. Latta. No.

6415 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

6416 Mr. Griffith?

6417 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

6418 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

6419 Mr. Bilirakis?

6420 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

6421 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

6422 Mr. Hudson?

6423 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

6424 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

6425 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

6426 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

6427 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

6428 Mr. Palmer?

6429 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

6430 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

6431 Mr. Dunn?

6432 [No response.]

6433 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

6434 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

6435 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

6436 Mr. Joyce?

6437 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

6438 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

6439 Mr. Weber?

6440 \*Mr. Weber. No.

6441 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

6442 Mr. Allen?

6443 \*Mr. Allen. No.

6444 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

6445 Mr. Balderson?

6446 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

6447 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

6448 Mr. Fulcher?

6449 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher, no.

6450 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

6451 Mr. Pfluger?

6452 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

6453 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

6454 Mrs. Harshbarger?

6455 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

6456 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

6457 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
6458 [No response.]  
6459 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack?  
6460 [No response.]  
6461 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
6462 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
6463 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
6464 Mr. James?  
6465 \*Mr. James. No.  
6466 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
6467 Mr. Bentz?  
6468 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
6469 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
6470 Mrs. Houchin?  
6471 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
6472 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
6473 Mr. Fry?  
6474 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
6475 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
6476 Ms. Lee?  
6477 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
6478 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
6479 Mr. Langworthy?  
6480 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
6481 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.



6482 Mr. Kean?

6483 \*Mr. Kean. No.

6484 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.

6485 Mr. Rulli?

6486 \*Mr. Rulli. No.

6487 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.

6488 Mr. Evans?

6489 \*Mr. Evans. No.

6490 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.

6491 Mr. Goldman?

6492 \*Mr. Goldman. No.

6493 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.

6494 Mrs. Fedorchak?

6495 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

6496 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

6497 Mr. Pallone?

6498 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.

6499 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

6500 Ms. DeGette?

6501 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.

6502 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

6503 Ms. Schakowsky?

6504 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

6505 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

6506 Ms. Matsui?

6507           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
6508           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
6509           Ms. Castor?  
6510           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
6511           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
6512           Mr. Tonko?  
6513           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
6514           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
6515           Ms. Clarke?  
6516           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
6517           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
6518           Mr. Ruiz?  
6519           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
6520           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
6521           Mr. Peters?  
6522           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
6523           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
6524           Mrs. Dingell?  
6525           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
6526           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
6527           Mr. Veasey?  
6528           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
6529           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
6530           Ms. Kelly?  
6531           \*Ms. Kelly.   Aye.

6532           \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
6533           Ms. Barragan?  
6534           \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
6535           \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
6536           Mr. Soto?  
6537           \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
6538           \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
6539           Ms. Schrier?  
6540           \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
6541           \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
6542           Mrs. Trahan?  
6543           \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
6544           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
6545           Mrs. Fletcher?  
6546           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
6547           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
6548           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
6549           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
6550           \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
6551           Mr. Auchincloss?  
6552           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
6553           \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
6554           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
6555           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
6556           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

6557 Mr. Menendez?

6558 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

6559 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

6560 Mr. Mullin?

6561 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

6562 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

6563 Mr. Landsman?

6564 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

6565 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

6566 Ms. McClellan?

6567 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

6568 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

6569 Chairman Guthrie?

6570 \*The Chair. No.

6571 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

6572 \*The Chair. Is anyone seeking -- how is Dr. Miller-

6573 Meeks recorded?

6574 \*The Clerk. Dr. Miller-Meeks is not recorded.

6575 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

6576 \*The Clerk. Dr. Miller-Meeks votes no.

6577 \*The Chair. Is there anyone else on the Republican side

6578 seeking recognition?

6579 Anyone on the Democrat side?

6580 Seeing none, the clerk will report.

6581 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were

6582 24 ayes and 28 noes.

6583 \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to. Are there  
6584 any further amendments?

6585 For what purpose does gentlelady from Michigan seek  
6586 recognition?

6587 \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have an  
6588 amendment at the desk labeled Environment\_59.

6589 \*The Chair. The clerk will report Environment\_59.

6590 \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mrs. Dingell. Add at  
6591 the end of the section --

6592 \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of amendment  
6593 is dispensed with.

6594 [The amendment of Mrs. Dingell follows:]

6595

6596 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

6597

6598           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
6599 minutes in support of the amendment.

6600           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

6601           My amendment says that the section of this bill that  
6602 repeals the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund, section 42103,  
6603 cannot take effect unless the comptroller general certifies  
6604 to Congress that doing so will not increase costs for  
6605 consumers.

6606           I helped create the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund  
6607 through the Inflation Reduction Act because I believe we have  
6608 a moral obligation and a real economic opportunity to invest  
6609 in clean energy, especially in communities that have long  
6610 been left behind. This doesn't have to be a partisan fight.  
6611 It was designed to leverage private capital, create good-  
6612 paying jobs, and make clean energy financing accessible for  
6613 everyone in every state and every district. If my Republican  
6614 colleagues believe gutting this program won't hurt working  
6615 families or raise their energy bills, then they should have  
6616 no problem supporting this amendment.

6617           I want to be clear about what is happening here. The  
6618 Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund is being targeted for purely  
6619 political reasons. Many of my Republican colleagues have  
6620 been trying to dismantle this program since the day it was  
6621 signed into law. They have tried unsuccessfully to pass  
6622 bills to repeal it three separate times. They have tried to

6623 kill it in the appropriations process, and they have used  
6624 this committee to hold hearing after hearing and waste time  
6625 attacking a program that will produce real results.

6626 I want to be really clear. No one has found any waste,  
6627 fraud, or abuse. There has been no evidence. And believe  
6628 me, if there were any, I would be the first person calling  
6629 for oversight. But instead of facts, what we have seen is a  
6630 coordinated campaign to undermine a program that is set to  
6631 bolster domestic supply chains, create jobs, and lower energy  
6632 bills for hard-working Americans.

6633 Let's talk about what repealing this program really  
6634 means. It means walking away from 40,000 additional jobs per  
6635 year, nearly 11,000 in manufacturing and almost 9,000 in  
6636 construction. It means giving up \$20 billion in wages for  
6637 American workers. It means higher energy bills. And that is  
6638 the reality.

6639 The current unobligated balance of this fund is about  
6640 \$19 million, which is a minuscule amount compared to the  
6641 scale of the full program. That money is there to support  
6642 basic administrative functions, and pulling it back only  
6643 further undermines implementation.

6644 We have seen that -- the Trump Administration's EPA  
6645 freeze funds and launch baseless investigations into the  
6646 program. They have been motivated efforts designed to  
6647 undercut investments that are already putting people to work,

6648 reducing emissions and cutting energy costs. If Republicans  
6649 have their way, they will turn their backs on an estimated  
6650 \$65 billion in new investment flowing into our economy. That  
6651 is what dismantling this program means. I don't think we  
6652 should be okay with that, and I don't think our constituents  
6653 should be, either.

6654       Therefore, I am asking my colleagues to do the  
6655 responsible thing and support this amendment. We should be  
6656 working to try to make this program succeed, not betting  
6657 against it and pulling the rug out under it.

6658       Thank you, and I yield back.

6659       \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
6660 from Virginia is recognized to speak on the amendment.

6661       \*Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. This  
6662 is one of those situations where you just can't make some of  
6663 this stuff up. You just can't.

6664       So we got word that, you know, that this money was in  
6665 flux or in jeopardy somehow. And one of the groups that got  
6666 money was the Appalachian Community Capital, headquartered in  
6667 Christiansburg, Virginia. Well, when news of this broke and  
6668 I got word of it, I happened to be in Christiansburg. My  
6669 daughter lives up there and it is in my district. So I  
6670 looked the address up and went by because this organization,  
6671 Appalachian Community Capital -- and this was a couple of  
6672 weeks ago, so maybe things have changed since then -- but



6673 previously had only received 2.8 million in Federal funds.  
6674 And then, on the way out the door, the Biden Administration  
6675 sent them 500 million.

6676         Now, previously, they had gotten 2.8 million. All of a  
6677 sudden they are getting 500 million. So I thought, well,  
6678 this must be a big operation in my district. So I went by to  
6679 check on it. There is no indication that they are actually  
6680 there.

6681         Now, there is a financial institution there, there is.  
6682 And I suspect that there is a cubicle, or maybe even there is  
6683 an employee -- an employee. The building is not big enough  
6684 to house too many people. And the other institution is  
6685 there, and I am assuming they must share space, but it could  
6686 just be a drop box. But there was no signage. If I didn't  
6687 have the address, I wouldn't have known they were even there.  
6688 And I am giving them the benefit of the doubt and thinking  
6689 there might be somebody there, but there wasn't a sign. And  
6690 in fact, when I didn't see a sign outside I thought, well,  
6691 maybe we ought to check and see if there is a sign on the  
6692 door that we can't see from the parking lot. No, no signage  
6693 whatsoever.

6694         So people question why we are questioning some of this  
6695 stuff, and I can tell you from personal experience I wish  
6696 there was \$500 million coming into my district. I mean, the  
6697 CEO lives in Washington, D.C. of this particular

6698 organization, but you would think if they had a \$500 million  
6699 footprint in my district there would be something to show  
6700 signs of it. Now, they have done a little bit of work in the  
6701 past, and I am not saying that they don't have some validity.

6702 I am just saying to go from 2.8 million in Federal money  
6703 -- their total revenues, I think, were 4.1 previously in a  
6704 previous year, million -- to suddenly go to 500 million, and  
6705 then you take what many of us saw online, where an employee  
6706 of one of the agencies is saying that they were trying to get  
6707 the money out the door so it was kind of like throwing gold  
6708 bars off the Titanic -- it would be fine if I saw that \$500  
6709 million gold bar landing -- actually landing in my district,  
6710 but I got no evidence that it actually has landed there, or  
6711 that the group even has the ability -- in all fairness, I am  
6712 not convinced the group has the ability to parcel out \$500  
6713 million.

6714 And so that is why I have concerns on this one. And  
6715 while, you know, the comptroller general may or may not be  
6716 able to certify that this would not increase costs for  
6717 consumers, I am not sure where all that money is going, and I  
6718 am not sure what they are doing, and I think what we ought to  
6719 be doing is being good stewards of the taxpayers money, and  
6720 we ought to have more accountability. And I know -- and that  
6721 is why they probably can't say a lot about it, but I know  
6722 that -- and I am on the subcommittee, but I know that

6723 Oversight and Investigations is currently looking into this.

6724 But it is of concern, and this is why we are trying to  
6725 get back some of this money because there may have been, in a  
6726 haste of the change of political winds, just to get the money  
6727 out the door to some harbor somewhere. Whether it actually  
6728 is going to do any good or not, it is hard to say. The  
6729 intent may very well be good. But we all know that the road  
6730 is sometimes paved with good intent and goes to destinations  
6731 that we don't want to go to. And I am worried about that,  
6732 and so I think that we should vote no on this amendment.

6733 And Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

6734 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there anyone  
6735 to speak on the amendment?

6736 Mr. -- the gentleman from New York is recognized for  
6737 five minutes.

6738 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the  
6739 last word.

6740 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

6741 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I express my support  
6742 for Mrs. Dingell's amendment.

6743 There is a sad reality faced by many Americans, and this  
6744 dynamic existed long before COVID, President Biden, or the  
6745 enactment of the Inflation Reduction Act. For far too many  
6746 people, energy affordability is a tremendous hardship.

6747 In 2020 during President Trump's first term, the U.S.

6748 Energy Information Administration found that more than a  
6749 quarter of U.S. households reported having difficulty paying  
6750 their energy bills. Millions of people forgo food and  
6751 medicine to pay energy bills.

6752 President Trump campaigned on reducing energy costs by  
6753 one half within his first 18 months in office. And in the  
6754 first few months of his administration we have been going in  
6755 the wrong direction. Initial analysis has found that, since  
6756 President Trump's reelection, utility rates have begun to  
6757 increase across our country. And the Low-Income Home Energy  
6758 Affordability Program, or LIHEAP, helps over one million New  
6759 Yorkers pay their utility bills each year. So anyone serving  
6760 in the House from New York should keep that in mind as we  
6761 address this bill.

6762 But for that sake, all people across this great country  
6763 should pay attention to what LIHEAP means in their individual  
6764 state. It has since -- with the President's budget, it has  
6765 had HHS staffing terminated and been targeted for complete  
6766 elimination by the President's budget. We shouldn't be doing  
6767 anything else that risks putting Americans under greater  
6768 financial stress or eliminating the tools already available  
6769 to alleviate their cost of living challenges. And Mrs.  
6770 Dingell's amendment would do just that, ensuring that GGRF  
6771 funds are only rescinded if the independent comptroller  
6772 general certifies the loss of those funds will not increase

6773 costs on hard-working Americans.

6774         The Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund was designed to help  
6775 the families that are struggling the most with their bills.  
6776 It provides \$27 billion in Federal assistance, with the  
6777 expectation that the non-profit recipients would leverage  
6778 private capital to allow each Federal dollar to maximize its  
6779 impact. Some of the early investments from the program  
6780 include improving energy savings and affordable housing,  
6781 enabling a university to deploy solar panels, and helping  
6782 tribal communities develop energy projects on their lands. A  
6783 recent analysis from the University of New Hampshire  
6784 estimated that GGRF investments will result in some \$52  
6785 billion in energy cost savings to consumers over the next 20  
6786 years and generate enough electricity from the new solar  
6787 projects to power up to 2.2 million homes each year.

6788         Now, we know our electricity system desperately needs to  
6789 grow and have -- and having localized generation through  
6790 community and rooftop solar helps alleviate some of the  
6791 demands for new, large-scale infrastructure which can be  
6792 difficult to permit and to build. All but a small amount of  
6793 administrative funding has been obligated. So I question  
6794 whether this underlying provision has anything but an  
6795 incidental budgetary impact, anyway.

6796         But unfortunately, this program has become a political  
6797 football, with funding being illegally frozen by EPA and

6798 grant recipients being forced into the courts to get the  
6799 Federal Government to uphold its end of the contracts. Today  
6800 Republicans are doubling down on the Trump EPA's efforts to  
6801 withhold funding that is meant to benefit hard-working  
6802 Americans. That is strictly unacceptable. And at the very  
6803 least, we should be confident of the consequences of  
6804 rescinding any GGRF funds before allowing this provision to  
6805 move forward.

6806       You know, this again is an opportunity to line the  
6807 pockets of billionaires at the expense of affordability of  
6808 utility costs for the great many of us. I urge the members  
6809 to support the amendment.

6810       And with that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

6811       \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
6812 from Georgia is recognized for five minutes to speak on the  
6813 amendment.

6814       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

6815       \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

6816       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. You know, Mr. Chairman, not to  
6817 be outdone by my colleague from Virginia, I can do you one  
6818 better. You want to talk about waste, fraud, and abuse? The  
6819 only thing worse than the IRA itself was the Biden  
6820 Administration's implementation of it. That administration  
6821 created a level of waste, fraud, and abuse that we have never  
6822 seen before, never witnessed before. In fact, when you talk

6823 about what it actually did, let's talk about the whole  
6824 picture.

6825         The IRA provided EPA approximately \$100 billion in  
6826 supplemental appropriations, 100 billion. For comparison,  
6827 over the past 10 years EPA's annual budget ranged from about  
6828 8.2 billion to 10.1 billion. In my own state, my home state  
6829 of Georgia, the Biden EPA handed \$2 billion to Power Forward  
6830 Communities, a coalition formed by failed gubernatorial  
6831 candidate Stacey Abrams in April of 2024 under the Greenhouse  
6832 Gas Reduction Fund.

6833         Now, get this -- and this is where I am outdoing my  
6834 colleague from Virginia -- Power Forward Communities received  
6835 this money, even though it was founded just months earlier,  
6836 in late 2023, and never managed anywhere near the grant's  
6837 dollar figure. In fact, it reported just \$100. That is  
6838 right folks, we went from \$100 to \$2 billion, reported just  
6839 \$100 in total revenue during its first 3 months in  
6840 organization. Now, if that is not waste, fraud, and abuse, I  
6841 mean, this is a poster child for waste, fraud, and abuse.

6842         So with all due respect to my colleague from Virginia,  
6843 and he brings up a great example, I got an even better one.

6844         \*Mr. Griffith. But do they have a sign?

6845         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. You know, that is a good  
6846 question.

6847         You know, Mr. Chairman, seriously, giving billions of

6848 dollars to favored organizations to help finance preferred  
6849 energy resources and technologies is not an appropriate use  
6850 of taxpayers' funding. This is waste, fraud, and abuse.

6851 And I yield back.

6852 \*Mr. Menendez. Will the gentleman yield?

6853 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I yield.

6854 \*Mr. Menendez. My understanding, Mr. Carter, is that  
6855 there was \$31 billion that went to Georgia in transportation  
6856 and clean energy investments. I am wondering if you feel the  
6857 whole \$31 billion that went to your state was fraud, waste,  
6858 and abuse, or only the projects that you did not like?

6859 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The projects that I did not  
6860 like?

6861 \*Mr. Menendez. Yes, well, you could -- how about we  
6862 answer the top-line question. Do you believe that all \$31  
6863 billion that went to Georgia and transportation and clean  
6864 energy investments represented fraud, waste, and abuse?

6865 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Is it -- I am sorry, was that  
6866 in this program?

6867 \*Mr. Menendez. Part of the IRA, part of the --

6868 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No, no, no, was it in the  
6869 Greenhouse Gas Reduction --

6870 \*Mr. Menendez. So I recalled you saying the IRA, and  
6871 what a mismanagement of the IRA occurred under the prior  
6872 administration, if I --



6873           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Yes.

6874           \*Mr. Menendez. -- if I recall correctly.

6875           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Yes, you recall correctly.

6876           \*Mr. Menendez. And so --

6877           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. But I am speaking specifically  
6878 now about the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund that tried to  
6879 give a Stacey Abrams, a failed gubernatorial candidate in  
6880 Georgia, \$2 billion when that organization had only been  
6881 formed 3 months before, and had revenues of \$100, \$100.

6882           Mr. Chairman, I am going to yield back.

6883           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The chair  
6884 recognizes the gentleman from California.

6885           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I stand in support  
6886 of this amendment.

6887           The Green [sic] Gas Reduction Fund needs to continue.  
6888 They provide not only exceptional investments for clean  
6889 energy that will help reduce these gas emissions, but they  
6890 also bolster local economies and they help create jobs. The  
6891 GGRF provides 27 billion to finance projects that cut  
6892 greenhouse gas emissions, many of which focus on solar energy  
6893 installation for low-income homes, energy efficiency  
6894 retrofits like better insulation, efficient lighting and  
6895 smart HVAC systems, electrification of buildings and  
6896 transportation.

6897           And these initiatives not only reduce emissions, but

6898 also lower utility bills and increase energy independence for  
6899 communities that have historically lacked access to clean  
6900 energy. In fact, more than half of all clean energy projects  
6901 that have moved forward since the passage of the clean energy  
6902 investments are in districts represented by House  
6903 Republicans: 417 clean energy projects in total located in  
6904 152 congressional districts across the country. Projects in  
6905 these districts will create 210,710 jobs, a majority of the  
6906 national total, and generate more than \$199.89 billion in  
6907 investments.

6908 In fact, in Texas there is 22 projects that created  
6909 18,657 jobs investing over \$10.4 billion. In Georgia there  
6910 is 29 projects creating 17,551 jobs with over \$4 billion in  
6911 investments. In southern South Carolina, 32 projects, 14,192  
6912 jobs, over \$11.5 billion. In fact, in Georgia 1, one my good  
6913 friend, Representative Buddy Carter's district, there is 9  
6914 projects, \$7.8 billion, creating 7,300 jobs.

6915 Now, I don't think that is waste. I don't think that is  
6916 abuse for the good men and women in Georgia 1 who are  
6917 employed by these clean energy projects. I want to fight for  
6918 them, too, so that they can enjoy their livelihoods fighting  
6919 for -- in an industry that is not only providing for their  
6920 families, but also helping keep our environment clean,  
6921 helping reduce greenhouse gas emissions, helping to prolong  
6922 people's lives by reducing pollution, helping to keep kids in

6923 schools in a healthy environment. So that is one of the many  
6924 reasons why we should keep the Greenhouse Gas Reduction Fund  
6925 stable.

6926 And with that I yield back.

6927 \*Mr. Griffith. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back.  
6928 Is there -- Mr. -- the gentleman from Alabama.

6929 I am sorry, I recognize the gentlelady from California  
6930 for five minutes.

6931 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to go  
6932 back to the 500 million from the Appalachian Community  
6933 Capital.

6934 I think, if somebody brought up in committee a project  
6935 in my district that I didn't know anything about, I probably  
6936 would be a little embarrassed, too. So let me tell you why,  
6937 when you go to check to see what big operation is happening  
6938 for \$500 million there wasn't a big operation. Let me tell  
6939 you why. Because this is a green bank. It is a bank. So  
6940 when you go to Wells Fargo and you look at the building, you  
6941 don't say, like, oh, wait a minute, they got \$1 billion, but  
6942 it is not really happening because it is just a building.

6943 So this is actually a bank. It is specifically a green  
6944 bank for rural America. This is trying to make sure rural  
6945 America is including -- included in creating these jobs. And  
6946 this, in particular, \$500 million from the EPA, is -- that  
6947 the green bank was going to use to leverage private capital

6948 to finance an estimated 1.6 billion into 2,000 new energy  
6949 projects that was going to create 13,000 jobs, good jobs, and  
6950 reducing up to 850,000 tons of harmful pollution annually.

6951 So again, this was part of the public-private  
6952 partnership that was going to go to help clean up air  
6953 pollution. But as we know, our colleagues across the aisle,  
6954 they don't even care about kids in schools getting dirty air.  
6955 They are trying to repeal that part of it, too.

6956 So I can understand why somebody would think that they  
6957 don't support it, therefore I am going to repeal it. But  
6958 what is really sad is that this is actually an investment in  
6959 thousands of jobs. It is an investment in new energy  
6960 projects. And again, if somebody doesn't like how dollars  
6961 are spent or they want to make sure there is accountability,  
6962 there is that oversight ability to do that. But just to say,  
6963 well, I showed up, and it wasn't this big operation happening  
6964 there, to me is a little disingenuous, given that this is a  
6965 green bank, and they were in the business to work together  
6966 with public and private partnerships to create these clean  
6967 energy jobs and to create jobs.

6968 And this is the party who says, hey, what about our  
6969 people? What about people that are working in dirty fossil  
6970 fuel jobs, and you include them? You try to include people,  
6971 you try to create jobs, and they are just saying, no, no, no,  
6972 we are just not going to do it.

6973           So with that, I want to yield to my colleague, Debbie  
6974 Dingell.

6975           \*Mrs. Dingell. I just would like to build -- I have  
6976 great respect for both of my colleagues, but neither of you  
6977 have proven any waste, abuse, or fraud.

6978           And I also want to say to you that this is nonsense.  
6979 Just because you didn't like the candidate for Georgia --  
6980 governor in Georgia, she is not the CEO, she is an advisor.  
6981 She never received any money and has never personally gained  
6982 from this funding. There is no proven waste, fraud, or  
6983 abuse. That money has been frozen from the grant because the  
6984 EPA administrator came in and froze the dollars.

6985           But your region has a long history of being -- producing  
6986 energy projects. They are trying to help and create new  
6987 projects. And I get that you don't like the program, but I  
6988 think you have got to be very careful about throwing around  
6989 the words waste, abuse, and fraud unless you can document it.  
6990 And if you can document it, I will be right there with you  
6991 screaming.

6992           I yield back.

6993           \*Ms. Barragan. Do you want the rest of -- okay, I yield  
6994 back.

6995           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. I now  
6996 recognize the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Crenshaw, for five  
6997 minutes.

6998           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to  
6999 strike the last word, and I just want to respond to a few  
7000 issues taken up.

7001           You know, it was said by one of my colleagues that  
7002 environmental justice keeps people down. It was said by  
7003 another that environmental justice saves their lives. I  
7004 mean, I got to say, environmental justice is fundamentally  
7005 about changing our energy infrastructure drastically, which  
7006 therefore changes our ability to prosper.

7007           Justice to me means prosperity. I want to see people of  
7008 all color and all walks of life prospering. I would invite  
7009 you to my district. It is very diverse. My neighborhood is  
7010 very diverse. You might be surprised that I am probably a  
7011 minority in my neighborhood. You know where most of those  
7012 people work? Yes, the energy sector, and they are living  
7013 great, comfortable middle-class lives. My neighbors are  
7014 wonderful, and they work for the energy sector. If we want  
7015 to take that away from them, I am not sure there is any  
7016 justice in that.

7017           I want to talk about a few things we are going to  
7018 discuss throughout this particular provision and I think the  
7019 -- I can't say "lies," but I think falsehoods that are going  
7020 to be said. Let's talk about the Biden tailpipe rule and  
7021 let's talk about the methane tax.

7022           So my colleagues will say that EVs are getting cheaper,

7023 they will save drivers money, and they will reduce carbon  
7024 emissions. Here is reality. In 2022 sticker price data  
7025 showed new EV cost at least 20,000 more dollars than  
7026 comparable gas cars.

7027 Reality: Volvo's own life cycle study found its C40 EV  
7028 is 70 percent more carbon intensive to build than the gas-  
7029 powered Xc40, and you have to drive it 68,000 miles before  
7030 those emissions even break even.

7031 Reality: Manufacturing 1 EV battery means digging up  
7032 500,000 pounds of rock and soil in order to get the critical  
7033 minerals inside.

7034 Reality: EPA's own modern -- own records show modern  
7035 gas cars are already 99 percent cleaner when it comes to  
7036 criteria pollutants than their 1960-era models.

7037 That is pretty -- now the methane tax. Democrats will  
7038 say we need to cut the methane -- we need to have a methane  
7039 tax or a fee in order to cut emissions.

7040 But here is the reality. Since 2005 the U.S. became the  
7041 world's top natural gas producer, and cut our total emissions  
7042 by 18 percent, out-performing every other major economy.

7043 Reality: America now delivers 25 percent of global  
7044 natural gas supply, with cleaner tech and tighter standards  
7045 than places like Russia, Iran, Venezuela, China, proof a tax  
7046 is not required for progress.

7047 Reality: This fee is nothing but a backdoor tax on

7048 domestic production. It kills jobs, it hikes household  
7049 energy bills, and it cedes market share to dirtier, foreign  
7050 gas producers. Again, there is no justice in that.

7051 Again, visit my neighborhood.

7052 Here is the bottom line: Democrats are selling slogans;  
7053 we are delivering receipts. Regulations that jack up costs,  
7054 cripple truckers, and tax clean U.S. gas are not going to  
7055 save the planet, they are just going to sink working  
7056 Americans. There is no justice in doing that. So please,  
7057 let's vote common sense and let's scrap these rules and be on  
7058 with it.

7059 I yield back.

7060 \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman --

7061 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Sorry, I yield to Mr. Morgan --  
7062 Griffith.

7063 \*Mr. Griffith. He yields to me, but we are going to  
7064 freeze the clock for a minute so that a special guest can be  
7065 introduced.

7066 \*Mr. Pallone. Oh.

7067 \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Ranking Member.

7068 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you. I just wanted to mention our  
7069 Democratic Leader, Hakeem Jeffries, is here because of his  
7070 concern over Medicaid.

7071 [Applause.]

7072 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you. Thank you for being here.



7073           \*Mr. Griffith. And now, turning the clock back on,  
7074 thank you for yielding to me.

7075           I would just say to my colleagues, when I talked about  
7076 the institution in Christiansburg, Virginia, in Appalachia, I  
7077 referenced that it was a financial institution. And what was  
7078 there at the building was a financial institution, which is  
7079 why I believe I said that at the time. It is just -- it was  
7080 -- just struck me as odd that an organization that received  
7081 \$500 million did not have the ability to put a taped sign on  
7082 the door. I don't care if it was paper. It wasn't anything,  
7083 nothing that indicated that is where they were located. And  
7084 I thought it was odd when that was their registered office,  
7085 and where they were supposedly getting the money. And I just  
7086 questioned the whole deal.

7087           I don't know the answers. At this time I don't have the  
7088 information, I would say to my colleagues, as to what is  
7089 going on, but it raises lots of questions when the most  
7090 Federal money you have ever received in a single year before  
7091 was 2.8 million, and the most you have ever had in a single  
7092 year, according to your records, is 4.1 million, and all of a  
7093 sudden you receive 500 million. That was the point. The  
7094 huge increase in the expenditure or the money being sent  
7095 there was -- raises all kinds of questions in my mind.

7096           And with that, I will yield back and now recognize the  
7097 gentleman from Florida for five minutes.

7098           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7099           One hundred and eighty-two point seven billion dollars,  
7100           that was the cost of extreme weather events last year for the  
7101           United States. There were \$27 billion extreme weather events  
7102           last year. When you count in the economic damages, it was  
7103           500 billion. The whole IRA over 10 years is less than that,  
7104           and that was the cost to us last year. And so we know  
7105           greenhouse gases make hurricanes more extreme, so why would  
7106           you want to end a fund that tries to reduce that?

7107           Hurricanes have been beating the heck out of the South,  
7108           from Florida to North Carolina, Louisiana to eastern Texas.  
7109           And as far as I can tell, the plan is for you all to increase  
7110           greenhouse gases, end energy efficiency programs, end  
7111           resiliency programs, and eliminate FEMA. I just don't know  
7112           that that makes much sense when we are dealing with over \$182  
7113           billion in damages last year, and God help us as we face  
7114           another hurricane season this year.

7115           We need to be planning for these things in advance, and  
7116           we shouldn't be rejecting funds for our districts that are  
7117           going to help us with long-term projects. A lot of these are  
7118           new institutions that are trying to help, to help both  
7119           households and businesses and the like. And I think that is  
7120           where oversight comes in. Rather than just simply rejecting  
7121           it, looking at how we can make these things better to reduce  
7122           our -- to improve our energy efficiency, reduce our

7123 greenhouse gases, work to reform and improve FEMA, and do  
7124 something to help out with the hurricanes that are hitting  
7125 the southeast every year.

7126       \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

7127       \*Mr. Soto. Sure.

7128       \*Ms. Barragan. I just want to bring up a point to one  
7129 of my colleagues from Texas who just spoke. He was -- he had  
7130 the last time. He wanted to talk about waste, fraud, and  
7131 abuse, and was talking about EVs and, you know, how they cost  
7132 all this money to make and, basically, how they are waste.

7133       Well, I would gather that the Republicans should put in  
7134 a provision to take all the money back from Elon Musk. Of  
7135 course they are not going to do that, because that is their  
7136 best friend right now.

7137       And just to remind my colleagues across the aisle, in  
7138 February of this year it was this President and this  
7139 administration that was going to commit waste, fraud, and  
7140 abuse -- and corruption, I would add -- by the conflicts of  
7141 interest in giving Mr. Musk a \$400 million contract to buy  
7142 his EV cybertrucks. And by the way, I heard no Republicans  
7143 then talking about waste, fraud, and abuse. I see no  
7144 initiative to take all that money back from him. Why?  
7145 Because they are deathly afraid of him. Because that is why  
7146 we are here.

7147       We are here to find money to cut to just give more money

7148 to the billionaires and the billionaires' friends who bought  
7149 this election, because that is what this is about, and that  
7150 is what the American people should take, is they are looking  
7151 for places to cut health care, they are looking for money to  
7152 take back on projects that will go to clean up air pollution  
7153 and air pollution in schools and ports, and to invest in  
7154 clean energy that is going to create jobs. It is to give  
7155 those people money.

7156         So let's stop the front of waste, fraud, and abuse.  
7157 Because if you are only going to speak out when it is  
7158 convenient or, in this case, you won't speak out when it is  
7159 your new friend or somebody who bought the President's  
7160 election, I just think it is quite rich to hear this  
7161 conversation and not point that out.

7162         And with that I yield back.

7163         \*Mr. Menendez. Will you yield -- is it your time?

7164         \*Mr. Griffith. Does the gentleman yield back?

7165         \*Mr. Soto. Yes, I yield to Representative Menendez.

7166         \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

7167         \*Mr. Menendez. I appreciate my colleague yielding. I  
7168 just want to add on to my colleague from California's  
7169 remarks.

7170         We also have to remember that there is a showcase of  
7171 electric vehicles at the White House. So I guess the  
7172 President has poor judgment in what makes a good automobile,

7173 because they were just everywhere. It was -- I mean, it was  
7174 a spectacle. So either the President has poor decision  
7175 making because, as our colleague from Texas said, apparently  
7176 EVs are just a waste of money and not worth producing -- it  
7177 sounds like a little family conversation that the White House  
7178 should have with their special employee, Elon Musk. But at  
7179 least you won't be told that you will be -- how should I say  
7180 this? For drive -- you will not be charged or followed for  
7181 trying to hurt the stock price of Tesla. So at least you  
7182 guys have that going for you, even though you don't believe  
7183 that EVs are good.

7184 And with that I yield back.

7185 \*Mr. Soto. And I yield back, Chairman.

7186 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. I now  
7187 recognize the gentlelady from North Dakota.

7188 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

7189 It is -- as I said earlier, I am one of the newest  
7190 members of this committee, and I came here to try to make a  
7191 difference and make government work better for people.

7192 I spent the previous 12 years as a utility regulator,  
7193 and the last few minutes of this hearing has been a lot of  
7194 talk about how to keep energy costs low for the citizens of  
7195 this country. And my colleagues -- I hope to be friends over  
7196 the course of the next few years -- on the Democrat side have  
7197 put forward one methodology of doing that, and that is by

7198 supporting all these government programs to help keep costs  
7199 low. I know a little bit about keeping energy costs low. In  
7200 my job that was our role, was determining what the rates were  
7201 going to be for the customers in my state for electricity and  
7202 gas service.

7203         And North Dakota has among the lowest rates in the whole  
7204 country. In fact, the last couple of years we had the actual  
7205 lowest rates in the country. I have watched other states  
7206 pursue this approach in different ways, and some, like the  
7207 Democrats to my left, are suggesting, by setting arbitrary  
7208 deadlines for carbon-free electricity, and then having to  
7209 have -- replace existing resources that are providing the  
7210 power, and the customers have to pay for that. Then you  
7211 replace them with taxpayer-funded, weather-dependent  
7212 resources that don't work all the time, so you have to have  
7213 back-up generation. Customers have to pay for that, too.  
7214 That gets baked into the rates. And then you have to build  
7215 the transmission lines to get to the new generation  
7216 resources. Customers have to pay for that, too. It all goes  
7217 into the bills.

7218         And then you have to -- the cost gets so high that you  
7219 have to provide rebates to customers who can't afford them to  
7220 help afford the rates that you have created by all your  
7221 policies. And then you might even bake into those rates  
7222 incentives for others who can afford it -- usually the

7223 wealthier customers -- to buy solar panels, geothermal,  
7224 energy efficiency appliances, all these sorts of things. You  
7225 bake those into the rates, as well. And then you wonder, why  
7226 are energy costs getting so high?

7227         And then you have to turn to the government to provide  
7228 money so people can afford their energy costs, or you could  
7229 take the approach that my state takes -- and we have the  
7230 lowest energy costs in the country -- and you can select your  
7231 resources based on the cost of them and the reliability of  
7232 them. You can let technology, not arbitrary deadlines,  
7233 determine how quickly you replace things, what resources you  
7234 use, and base that on costs. You can reduce the regulatory  
7235 burdens for energy production, and help encourage more  
7236 production because more supply usually reduces costs. You  
7237 can create a business climate that stimulates growth where  
7238 people want to come, where people want to invest. That helps  
7239 bring more resources and reduces costs. You can have low tax  
7240 rates, which also helps increase investment in your state,  
7241 reducing costs for all the people who have to pay them. And  
7242 at the same time, you can do all those things and have the  
7243 highest reliability in the country.

7244         This is not a difference of who cares more about the  
7245 people of this country. It is a difference in philosophy.  
7246 We have a genuine different approach. And in what I just  
7247 laid out when it relates to energy policy, it is proven that

7248 the Republican approach to trying to increase demand, reduce  
7249 the regulatory burden, and bring more energy to the fold is  
7250 going to reduce rates and have a huge, positive impact for  
7251 the citizens of this country, the ratepayers of all classes,  
7252 especially the people on limited incomes.

7253 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

7254 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. I now  
7255 recognize the gentlelady from Texas.

7256 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, thank you so much, and I just  
7257 want to add a little bit to this conversation and agree with  
7258 something my colleague from Florida just said that I was  
7259 thinking about in response to something that my friend from  
7260 West Virginia said earlier.

7261 Mr. Soto, if I can use your name, Mr. Soto mentioned  
7262 that it would be great for us to conduct oversight, and I  
7263 really -- I couldn't agree more. And I was thinking about  
7264 the comments from my colleague from West Virginia [sic] who  
7265 said, look, I saw this grant, I was thrilled, I drove over  
7266 there -- which I think is a great thing to do -- and checked  
7267 things out. And I think that it is important. We should ask  
7268 questions. And I think in this committee we should be asking  
7269 more questions. There is nothing wrong with asking  
7270 questions.

7271 I wish we would ask more questions about what this  
7272 administration is doing to these programs, to these grants,



7273 but I understand there are some new things that were rolled  
7274 out from the Inflation Reduction Act, from Infrastructure  
7275 Investment and Jobs Act. We had so many new grants coming  
7276 our way, we created a whole position in a monthly newsletter  
7277 to inform our community about all these grants rolling out.  
7278 So it is good to ask questions.

7279         And I want to preface my comments with this, because you  
7280 can't believe everything you read on the Internet. I think  
7281 we all know that, and it probably bears repeating. You can't  
7282 believe everything you read on the Internet. But I was  
7283 really interested in the story we were hearing from our  
7284 colleague from West Virginia, so I looked up the Appalachian  
7285 Community Capital Bank, Community Capital, just to see what  
7286 it is. And I just want to correct a couple of things in the  
7287 record.

7288         Again, it is on the Internet. We can verify this more  
7289 later, but it says Appalachian Community Capital is a  
7290 Community Development Financial Institution, a CDFI, lending  
7291 intermediary that raises capital for its members to fund  
7292 small businesses in rural communities in Appalachia. ACC has  
7293 over 35 members that collectively manage more than \$2 billion  
7294 in assets supporting economic development.

7295         And I looked a little bit further. And again, this is  
7296 just on their website and on the map for the Green Bank for  
7297 Rural America. It operates in 582 counties in Appalachia,

7298 including in Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Kentucky,  
7299 Tennessee, and Alabama, it looks like from the map, not every  
7300 county -- but across those states. And their mission, and  
7301 they say it here, is that they are investing in coal-impacted  
7302 communities for the benefit of the entire country. And they  
7303 say when coal-impacted communities succeed, the rest of the  
7304 country is made stronger. And that is why these investments,  
7305 like the ones from the Green Bank for Rural America, are  
7306 critical in leveling the economic playing field.

7307         So this is the application they made to the Biden  
7308 Administration. This is what funded that \$500 million grant  
7309 that our colleague was talking about. I think it absolutely  
7310 makes sense to ask these questions, but I also think we  
7311 should look at their answers and not just look at the  
7312 physical building and see that there is not a lot there.

7313         As I said before, I hope we will do more of that with  
7314 the grants we are seeing rescinded because I mentioned one in  
7315 my community already, but there were more. There are more  
7316 under this program that are being rescinded. And as I  
7317 understand it, we are only talking about the unallocated  
7318 funds there. But if they cancel those grants, they are going  
7319 to go back into the unallocated pot. And so we are going to  
7320 lose the money that our communities are already expecting.

7321         And so I think we could have a few more oversight  
7322 hearings. I can't wait. I am on the Oversight Subcommittee

7323 on this committee, and I think that is absolutely something  
7324 that we, as Members of Congress should do.

7325 Too often in the last 100-plus days we as members of  
7326 Congress, have ceded our authority to the White House and to  
7327 this administration, told them -- some of our members have  
7328 told them, that is okay, they don't have to spend the money  
7329 we appropriated because that is just advisory. That is not  
7330 the law. Well, we all know it is the law. We debate it, we  
7331 vote on it, we send it to the Senate. They pass it, we send  
7332 it to the President, the President signs it into law. And  
7333 yet we are saying we don't have to -- you don't have to  
7334 follow that, that is okay. You don't have to fund these  
7335 grants. You can, you know, do whatever you want.

7336 And even in that sort of CR that wasn't really a CR gave  
7337 the White House tremendous authority. We shouldn't be ceding  
7338 that authority. That is not what we were sent here to do.  
7339 This is a separate branch of the government. It is the first  
7340 branch -- I think everybody here knows and should remember --  
7341 Article I branch of government. We make the laws, and the  
7342 executive is there to make sure that they are executed.

7343 And so let's get back to that. Let's exercise our  
7344 oversight authority. Let's exercise our legislative  
7345 authority. Let's do permitting reform. Let's do the stuff  
7346 that we know we can, should, and must do for the people that  
7347 we represent. And let's go back to conducting oversight over

7348 this administration. It has raised a lot of questions in the  
7349 last 100 days, and we are best positioned to get those  
7350 answers.

7351 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

7352 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Do I see  
7353 anyone on the Republican side?

7354 If not, I recognize the gentleman from California, Mr.  
7355 Peters.

7356 \*Mr. Peters. Thank you so much --

7357 \*Mr. Griffith. Five minutes.

7358 \*Mr. Peters. -- Mr. Chair. Excuse me. Someone  
7359 mentioned methane, so I have to weigh in when they say that.

7360 My colleague from Texas, who shall not be named, I  
7361 guess --

7362 [Laughter.]

7363 \*Mr. Peters. I am disappointed to see the majority  
7364 eliminate funding for small businesses to save money, reduce  
7365 their pollution, keep our air and water clean. I am also  
7366 disappointed to see them effectively kick the can down the  
7367 road on implementing a common-sense methane regulation that  
7368 we passed in the Inflation Reduction Act.

7369 Let's be clear. Reducing fugitive emissions from oil  
7370 and gas operations is one of the fastest and most effective  
7371 ways to protect public health and keep America's energy  
7372 sector globally competitive. Methane is a greenhouse gas

7373 with a global warming potential of more than 80 times higher  
7374 than carbon dioxide over a 20-year period, and even small  
7375 leaks can erase the tremendous benefits of burning gas as  
7376 compared to coal with respect to carbon dioxide or other  
7377 dirty sources.

7378         Unfortunately, methane regulations have been caught in a  
7379 cycle of constant change. The Obama Administration passed  
7380 rules. The Trump Administration repealed the rules. The  
7381 Biden Administration took office, worked to reinstate  
7382 safeguards, establish a market-based approach -- methane to -  
7383 - reduction, and to drive innovation. And now we are looking  
7384 at that being repealed, as well.

7385         Let's be -- first, let's be clear about what the methane  
7386 fee and what it is not. It is not a tax on energy  
7387 production. It only targets the largest polluters. And  
7388 these are the polluters, people who are emitting, and it is  
7389 designed to encourage companies to capture more methane  
7390 rather than venting or leaking it. It is a smart, targeted  
7391 approach that incentivizes modernization and efficiency.

7392         The methane fee also demonstrates to consumers, who want  
7393 clean gas, and our global competitors that American natural  
7394 gas is the cleanest and most efficient on the market. Not  
7395 addressing this would only hurt the American industry by  
7396 injecting regulatory uncertainty into the market back and  
7397 forth, back and forth, making us less competitive in an

7398 international market that increasingly values cleaner gas as  
7399 a customer matter.

7400         So many of the biggest energy companies support strong  
7401 methane rules and urged us not to repeal these common-sense  
7402 rules because they know reducing waste and consistency of  
7403 regulation over time makes business sense. A rescission of  
7404 these funds and elimination of the methane fee would undercut  
7405 the responsible producers who invested in cutting-edge  
7406 methane detection and capture technologies to make their  
7407 businesses cleaner and more efficient.

7408         So let's also not forget the impact on consumers. When  
7409 methane is wasted there is revenue lost, and ultimately that  
7410 that translates into higher costs for American families. The  
7411 bill before us today would only incentivize outdated  
7412 practices that contribute to pollution and energy waste,  
7413 drive up long-term costs, and expose consumers and companies  
7414 to price uncertainty.

7415         Eliminating Federal support for compliance, moving the  
7416 goalpost a decade down the road doesn't solve problems; it  
7417 creates them. It is apparently -- it is increasingly  
7418 apparent that American liquefied natural gas exports,  
7419 particularly to our allies, depend on strong policies to  
7420 address methane pollution.

7421         The only viable solution, in my view, is bipartisan  
7422 legislation that gets us out of administrative rulemaking,

7423 acknowledges the reality, and commits to industry standards  
7424 that ensure the cleanest, most efficient natural gas  
7425 production. We need long-term solutions, and investing in  
7426 monitoring and compliance to reduce unnecessary methane  
7427 emissions is critical. So I urge my colleagues to stand with  
7428 responsible energy producers and American consumers. We  
7429 can't afford to be short-sighted. Let's keep America  
7430 competitive, protect our environment, ensure affordable  
7431 energy for all. And this bill takes us in the wrong  
7432 direction on methane, so I urge you to oppose it.

7433 And I yield back.

7434 \*Mr. Pallone. Would the gentleman yield to me for a  
7435 minute?

7436 \*Mr. Peters. Yes, I yield to the --

7437 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

7438 \*Mr. Peters. -- ranking member.

7439 \*Mr. Pallone. I just want to remind everybody that, you  
7440 know, this was a program that was put together with industry,  
7441 and it was done so that they were actually allocated funding  
7442 so they could upgrade their facilities and have less methane  
7443 emissions. And the only reason for the fee was if -- it was  
7444 sort of a penalty -- if they didn't upgrade and use the  
7445 funding that we were giving them to actually improve the  
7446 situation. And it was done with industry. You know, at the  
7447 time there were really no objections to the program.

7448           It makes absolutely no sense to repeal this, to repeal  
7449   the funding, to postpone the fee and whatever is being done  
7450   here. Everybody liked it, but I guess that doesn't matter.  
7451   But I just wanted to make that point.

7452           I yield back to the gentleman.

7453           \*Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Pallone.

7454           I would also just say, you know, it was the head of  
7455   Exxon, the head of Cheniere, the major companies that said  
7456   please don't reverse these rules because we need certainty in  
7457   order to make investments. So I think we are going in the  
7458   wrong direction for the environment, but also for American  
7459   business and competitiveness. And I am sorry about that.

7460           And I yield back.

7461           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone  
7462   on the Republican side -- Mr. -- the gentleman from Alabama,  
7463   Mr. Palmer.

7464           \*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We have gone all  
7465   over the place with this discussion on this amendment.

7466           In regard to the Green New Deal bank and the 20 billion  
7467   that was sent out in the last few weeks of the Biden  
7468   Administration, my colleagues have mentioned a couple of the  
7469   more egregious examples. There is another one, revenue for  
7470   the Climate United Fund was \$550,000, Mr. Chairman, in 2023.  
7471   But they got almost \$7 billion. Now, let me put that in  
7472   perspective. That is 12 -- almost 13 percent -- 13 times,



7473 not percent, 13 times more than their revenue in 2023. In  
7474 the case of the Appalachian Community Capital, that was a 178  
7475 percent increase.

7476 I mean, now, I am not a banker, but I have had to deal  
7477 with the bank, and you have to put up collateral if you get a  
7478 loan. And one of my colleagues across the aisle mentioned  
7479 that this was a bank, but it was administered by the EPA.  
7480 And as far as I know -- and I could be wrong, but I don't  
7481 know of any bankers, I don't know that they set up a bank and  
7482 operated under the rules of a bank. There are capital  
7483 requirements, collateral requirements in order to get a loan,  
7484 and generally a loan of that size would require somewhere  
7485 north of 70 percent collateral.

7486 So I am not making any accusations against anybody, but  
7487 I think it should raise some serious concerns for oversight  
7488 here, and we are going to do that. I could go on down the  
7489 list of some of these just unheard-of amounts of money going  
7490 to organizations that it is questionable whether or not they  
7491 have the capacity to do that.

7492 And then we got into extreme weather. I pulled up --  
7493 you know, I like to study these things, and I pulled up some  
7494 information here, and the -- I think it is the last report  
7495 from the international -- Intergovernmental Panel on Climate  
7496 Change. It is their annual report number six. And it says  
7497 there is low confidence in most reported long-term multi-

7498 decadal to centennial trends in tropical cyclone frequency or  
7499 intensity-based metrics. So again, you can't say that we  
7500 have got more hurricanes, or that they are more intense over  
7501 the long trend, and you have to look at the whole trend.

7502         The other thing -- point that I want to raise here is my  
7503 colleague -- I think some of my colleagues might have  
7504 misunderstood when I mentioned Reverend Jackson and Reverend  
7505 Sharpton and what they were doing in Pembroke Township in  
7506 Illinois. They were not arguing for environmental justice.  
7507 They were arguing for a natural gas pipeline for that  
7508 community, which they were successful in getting, and the  
7509 community was very grateful for that.

7510         The other thing I want to talk about, though, is the  
7511 Inflation Reduction Act. Now, I know there are certain words  
7512 that we can't use, but that was clearly mistitled. That was  
7513 never an inflation reduction act. The claims were made that  
7514 it would reduce Federal deficits by around 300 billion over a  
7515 10-year period, but that actually resulted in 1.9 trillion  
7516 being added to the Federal deficit, and increased inflation.  
7517 And even some of the people on the left admit that this bill  
7518 was mistitled, and that the projections were clearly  
7519 inaccurate.

7520         But I think when you say that it is going to reduce  
7521 Federal deficits by 300 billion and you miss it by 2.2  
7522 billion, it raises some serious questions about the

7523 credibility of the people making those projections. And  
7524 again, you know, I am going to be very careful in the words  
7525 that I choose to use here. We have heard some fairly  
7526 reckless words being thrown around here that I just think  
7527 that we need to take a long, hard look at it.

7528 And I would like to enter this into the record. This is  
7529 an article that lays out some of the problems with the IRA.  
7530 With that -- if -- without objection?

7531 \*Mr. Weber. Will the gentleman yield?

7532 \*Mr. Griffith. Without objection.

7533 [The information follows:]

7534

7535 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

7536

7537           \*Mr. Palmer. I will yield to the gentleman.

7538           \*Mr. Weber. I thank the gentleman, and I agree with you  
7539 the IRA was a travesty. All these EVs that they want to  
7540 spend all this money on, all these subsidies. But the good  
7541 news is there was a survey out the other day that said 90  
7542 percent of all EVs are still on the highways today, and the  
7543 other 10 percent made it home safely.

7544           I yield back.

7545           [Laughter.]

7546           \*Mr. Palmer. I yield.

7547           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields. I recognize the  
7548 gentleman from New Jersey for five minutes.

7549           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I speak in support  
7550 of the amendment, but also, since we are back on the subject  
7551 of the Inflation Reduction Act, there is a couple of thoughts  
7552 I just want to share with the committee.

7553           The IRA brought us billions of dollars to states across  
7554 the country. Some of the top states for new clean energy  
7555 jobs following the IRA are Georgia, South Carolina, Nevada,  
7556 Kansas, New Mexico, Arizona, and North Carolina. Yet my  
7557 Republican colleagues have shared their view consistently  
7558 that the IRA's investments in American workers are a slush  
7559 fund. It has been said that it was a travesty. That is  
7560 probably why every Republican voted against the IRA.

7561           But over \$100 billion in IRA funds have gone to

7562 Republican districts to generate clean, green, good-paying  
7563 jobs. So to any of my colleagues across the aisle who  
7564 represent districts that have received IRA funding, if those  
7565 funds were wasteful, tell me why your districts accepted  
7566 them. Tell me why you all were at the ribbon cuttings. And  
7567 I am sure -- because you all strike me more as Facebook  
7568 people and Instagram people -- it was probably on your  
7569 Facebook pages that you were there at the ribbon cutting that  
7570 was funded by IRA money.

7571         So finally, let me ask you this, because it is now  
7572 getting late so we should probably be honest with each other,  
7573 if those funds were wasteful, why not just give them back?  
7574 You are trying to, you know, plug a huge hole by cutting  
7575 health care to the American people. Just give us the money  
7576 back. It was wasteful. You didn't vote for it. Your  
7577 districts --

7578         \*Mr. Palmer. Will the gentleman yield?

7579         \*Mr. Menendez. I am not going to yield. Maybe in a  
7580 second.

7581         But if those projects are wasteful, if it was a  
7582 travesty, then why are you holding that money in your  
7583 district? You should be ashamed of it. You should want to  
7584 give it back to the Federal Government so we can plug the  
7585 hole that you are currently trying to plug with cuts to  
7586 Medicaid, the ACA, taking health care away from millions of

7587 people so you could fund tax cuts for those who absolutely do  
7588 not need it.

7589 And at the end of the day, the Federal Government gets  
7590 some dollars back, that is helpful, and you can tape together  
7591 the ribbons for the next ribbon cutting that you won't have  
7592 because we are not passing anything here and this  
7593 administration cuts all the programs that we have previously  
7594 passed. So you can just put that in a closet for when  
7595 Democrats are back in the majority.

7596 Thank you, and I yield back.

7597 \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

7598 \*Mr. Menendez. Oh, sorry.

7599 \*Ms. Barragan. Oh, thank you. I just want to make a  
7600 just a quick comment.

7601 One of my Republican colleagues on this committee from  
7602 the State of Georgia who will be unnamed even came to me and  
7603 said, hey, would you help us on this? This is IRA money. I  
7604 want a company in my district to get more money. So how  
7605 about we go and fix some of the IRA so companies in my  
7606 district can get it, too?

7607 So what my colleague just brought up is so true. It is  
7608 them going to the ribbon cuttings, them taking the dollars  
7609 when they want, and then just saying, hey, let's repeal  
7610 everything else now, by the way, because we need to find  
7611 money for the billionaires and our friends to give them tax

7612 cuts. So it is happening right on this committee, and the  
7613 hypocrisy is just so big. But since we can't name names, we  
7614 won't do that anymore.

7615       Okay, with that I yield back to Mr. Menendez.

7616       \*Mr. Menendez. I yield back.

7617       \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. The  
7618 gentleman from Ohio.

7619       \*Mr. Latta. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield my  
7620 time to the chair.

7621       \*Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much.

7622       So this is one of those subjects where I think about my  
7623 mother. My mother was a civics teacher. The role of a  
7624 congressperson has two different hats, and probably more than  
7625 that, but two major hats they wear. One is to decide if  
7626 legislation is good and if that legislation is something they  
7627 ought to vote for. And the second hat -- and that is the one  
7628 where all the Republicans voted against a particular bill  
7629 that was previously mentioned -- and the second role is that  
7630 of an ombudsman. Once the bill is passed and signed into  
7631 law, and as long as it is still the law of the land, it is  
7632 also the obligation of a congressman to advocate for their  
7633 district to get the money, even if they didn't agree with the  
7634 money in the first place, to get the money for their  
7635 district.

7636       So it is always very confusing, and I actually wrote a

7637 column, which -- if you all want it, just let me know and we  
7638 will send it to you -- wrote a column on this explaining that  
7639 there are two roles to a congressional person. One is the  
7640 legislation.

7641 But once passed, even if you disagreed with the  
7642 underlying purpose, if there is something in that legislation  
7643 that can benefit your district or that you think ought to  
7644 come to your district, whether you agreed with the underlying  
7645 principle or not, whether you think the money should be spent  
7646 or not, you have an obligation as the ombudsman role of a  
7647 congressman, to advocate for your district and do everything  
7648 you can to bring those resources to your district, because  
7649 the money is going to get spent somewhere. And if it is  
7650 going to be spent in one of 435 districts, you want to see  
7651 that you get your fair share.

7652 And that is why you sometimes get these disagreements,  
7653 where you voted against the legislation but you advocate for  
7654 your district after the legislation is passed. That does not  
7655 mean that you cede the ability on future legislation to act  
7656 the legislator role and still oppose the spending of that  
7657 money. And here endeth the civics lesson, and I will yield,  
7658 if she wants the time, to Ms. Houchin of Indiana if she would  
7659 like the remainder of my time.

7660 Or you can wait and get your own time.

7661 \*Mrs. Houchin. Mr. Chairman, I was going to yield to



7662 the gentleman, Mr. Palmer.

7663 \*Mr. Griffith. All right. I yield to Mr. Palmer, then.

7664 \*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You know, we  
7665 just keep hearing all this talk about tax cuts for  
7666 billionaires and all that stuff. And, you know, my  
7667 colleagues have forgotten two very important things.

7668 One, the vast majority of the tax cuts went to middle-  
7669 class Americans. And if this tax cut expires, they are going  
7670 to be the hardest hit. Now, you -- I know there is some math  
7671 challenge over there, but that is a problem that we can try  
7672 to work through.

7673 But the other point I want to make is that when it comes  
7674 to billionaire support, in the last election there were 135  
7675 that were actively involved. Eighty-three of them supported  
7676 the Democratic candidate, Ms. Harris. That 61.5 percent  
7677 Fifty-three -- fifty-two supported the Republican candidate,  
7678 Mr. Trump. That is that is 37.5 percent. So -- and then,  
7679 among the millionaires, it was 57 percent supported  
7680 Democratic candidates. So, you know, I really think, when it  
7681 comes to the ratios and who is being backed by billionaires  
7682 and millionaires, I think that is a bigger problem for my  
7683 colleagues across the aisle.

7684 And I will be happy to get the information on how the  
7685 tax cuts impacted the middle class by income brackets, and I  
7686 will share that a little bit later.

7687 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

7688 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back, and I yield  
7689 back and now recognize -- do you have anybody, anybody on the  
7690 Democrat side wishing to speak?

7691 \*Mr. Pallone. No.

7692 \*Mr. Griffith. Seeing none, is anyone on the Republican  
7693 side wishing to speak?

7694 Seeing none, we will now move to the measure.

7695 \*Mr. Pallone. A roll call.

7696 \*Mr. Griffith. A roll call vote has been requested, if  
7697 we will take a roll call vote on the amendment by the  
7698 gentlelady from Michigan.

7699 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

7700 \*Mr. Latta. No.

7701 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

7702 Mr. Griffith?

7703 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

7704 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

7705 Mr. Bilirakis?

7706 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

7707 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

7708 Mr. Hudson?

7709 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

7710 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

7711 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

7712           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.  
7713           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
7714           Mr. Palmer?  
7715           \*Mr. Palmer. No.  
7716           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.  
7717           Mr. Dunn?  
7718           [No response.]  
7719           \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?  
7720           [No response.]  
7721           \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce?  
7722           \*Mr. Joyce. No.  
7723           \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.  
7724           Mr. Weber?  
7725           \*Mr. Weber. No.  
7726           \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.  
7727           Mr. Allen?  
7728           \*Mr. Allen. No.  
7729           \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.  
7730           Mr. Balderson?  
7731           \*Mr. Balderson. No.  
7732           \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.  
7733           Mr. Fulcher?  
7734           \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
7735           \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
7736           Mr. Pfluger?

7737           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
7738           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
7739           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
7740           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
7741           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
7742           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
7743           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
7744           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
7745           Mrs. Cammack?  
7746           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
7747           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
7748           Mr. Obernolte?  
7749           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
7750           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
7751           Mr. James?  
7752           \*Mr. James.   No.  
7753           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
7754           Mr. Bentz?  
7755           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
7756           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
7757           Mrs. Houchin?  
7758           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
7759           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
7760           Mr. Fry?  
7761           \*Mr. Fry.   No.

7762           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
7763           Ms. Lee?  
7764           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
7765           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
7766           Mr. Langworthy?  
7767           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
7768           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
7769           Mr. Kean?  
7770           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
7771           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
7772           Mr. Rulli?  
7773           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
7774           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
7775           Mr. Evans?  
7776           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
7777           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
7778           Mr. Goldman?  
7779           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
7780           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
7781           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
7782           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
7783           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
7784           Mr. Pallone?  
7785           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
7786           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.

7787 Ms. DeGette?  
7788 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
7789 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
7790 Ms. Schakowsky?  
7791 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
7792 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
7793 Ms. Matsui?  
7794 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
7795 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
7796 Ms. Castor?  
7797 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
7798 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
7799 Mr. Tonko?  
7800 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
7801 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
7802 Ms. Clarke?  
7803 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
7804 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
7805 Mr. Ruiz?  
7806 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
7807 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
7808 Mr. Peters?  
7809 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
7810 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
7811 Mrs. Dingell?

7812           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
7813           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
7814           Mr. Veasey?  
7815           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
7816           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
7817           Ms. Kelly?  
7818           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
7819           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
7820           Ms. Barragan?  
7821           \*Ms. Barragan.  Aye.  
7822           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
7823           Mr. Soto?  
7824           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
7825           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
7826           Ms. Schrier?  
7827           \*Ms. Schrier.  Aye.  
7828           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
7829           Mrs. Trahan?  
7830           [No response.]  
7831           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher?  
7832           \*Mrs. Fletcher.  Aye.  
7833           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
7834           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
7835           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.  Aye.  
7836           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

7837 Mr. Auchincloss?  
7838 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
7839 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
7840 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
7841 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
7842 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
7843 Mr. Menendez?  
7844 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
7845 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
7846 Mr. Mullin?  
7847 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
7848 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
7849 Mr. Landsman?  
7850 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
7851 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
7852 Ms. McClellan?  
7853 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
7854 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
7855 Chairman Guthrie?  
7856 \*The Chair. No.  
7857 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
7858 \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Crenshaw?  
7859 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Crenshaw votes no.  
7860 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
7861 \*Mr. Griffith. Is there anyone else?



7862           Seeing none, anybody on the Democrat side?

7863           All right, the clerk will report the roll.

7864           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23  
7865 ayes and 29 noes.

7866           \*Mr. Griffith. The amendment fails. Are there any  
7867 additional amendments to this particular title?

7868           We have one from the gentleman from New Jersey. Will  
7869 the clerk -- would the gentleman help the clerk figure out  
7870 which amendment that is?

7871           \*Mr. Menendez. Sure, Mr. Chair. I have an amendment at  
7872 the desk. My amendment is titled Environment\_49.

7873           \*Mr. Griffith. Forty-nine?

7874           \*Mr. Menendez. Yes, sir.

7875           \*The Clerk. Environment\_49, an amendment offered by Mr.  
7876 Menendez. Strike section 42106 --

7877           \*Mr. Griffith. I would say dispense with the reading of  
7878 the amendment, but that is the amendment.

7879           [The amendment of Mr. Menendez follows:]

7880

7881           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

7882

7883           \*Mr. Griffith. So Mr. Menendez is recognized, the  
7884 gentleman from New Jersey, for five minutes.

7885           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak today  
7886 in support of my amendment that would strike the section of  
7887 this bill that repeals and rescinds funding for reducing air  
7888 pollution at schools.

7889           We have an administration that claims to be promoting an  
7890 agenda that will make our nation healthier and serve American  
7891 families. But the bill we are marking up today does the  
7892 opposite. It threatens bare-minimum protections to keep our  
7893 families healthy and safe.

7894           As a father and a legislator, there is nothing more  
7895 important to me than protecting our nation's children. When  
7896 parents send their kids to school, the last thing that they  
7897 should be worried about is the air in their classroom -- air  
7898 in their children's classrooms making their children sick.  
7899 But indoor air pollutants pose serious health risks:  
7900 coughing, inflammation, allergic reactions, and respiratory  
7901 illnesses.

7902           Those risks aren't just bad for children's health, they  
7903 also affect educational outcomes. Nearly 1 in 13 American  
7904 school children has asthma, which is a leading cause of  
7905 chronic disease-related school absenteeism. Breathing poor  
7906 quality air at school makes that absenteeism worse. One  
7907 study found a significant decline in children's English and

7908 math scores for every increase in particulate matter in their  
7909 school's air.

7910 Democrats recognize that this is completely  
7911 unacceptable. That is why the IRA created tools to address  
7912 this challenge. The program Republicans are trying to  
7913 eliminate in this bill helps reduce air pollution in schools.  
7914 It helps school districts build resiliency and renovate  
7915 buildings so children breathe cleaner, better quality air,  
7916 something we should want for all of our children.

7917 Republicans voted against the authorization for this  
7918 program three years ago, and they are doubling down on it  
7919 now. Today they want to eliminate that program and claw back  
7920 funding that Congress already set aside for it. So I would  
7921 like my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to explain  
7922 to me and to the American people how gutting a program to  
7923 reduce air pollution in schools is addressing waste, fraud,  
7924 and abuse. How is it making the air our children breathe --  
7925 how is -- excuse me -- how is making the air our children  
7926 breathe dirtier promoting government efficiency? How is  
7927 making children sick supporting American families?

7928 This issue should be common sense. It should be  
7929 straightforward. It should be bipartisan. Children's  
7930 health, the air that they breathe for eight hours per day,  
7931 five days per week should be non-negotiable. Unfortunately,  
7932 this administration and Republicans are abandoning their

7933 responsibilities to protect America's families and America's  
7934 school children.

7935 I urge all my colleagues to continue to protect air  
7936 quality in our schools and support my amendment.

7937 And so I have three minutes, and I am here and not in  
7938 New Jersey. Today my daughter Olivia had her dance recital.  
7939 My wife told me it went very well, which means that she gets  
7940 all of her talent from her mom. So with that let's keep her  
7941 and all of her classmates and all of your kids and neighbors'  
7942 schools' air clean.

7943 Thank you, and I yield back.

7944 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. I recognize  
7945 myself for the five minutes.

7946 We previously argued about this section in a previous  
7947 amendment. I think we covered it fairly well.

7948 I am glad that Olivia's recital went well. It is one of  
7949 the things that folks back home don't always realize is that  
7950 we have families, too. And no matter which side of the aisle  
7951 you are on, you are missing something, and it is not always  
7952 easy. And sometimes your kids are okay with it, and  
7953 sometimes they aren't. But I hope that she is all right with  
7954 you being here tonight. I do think what we are doing is  
7955 important, even when we don't agree.

7956 I did -- I will repeat some of what I said before in  
7957 that no schools are actually losing any money. Most of this

7958 -- or all of this money went to planning organizations and  
7959 folks trying to figure out things, and that data is already  
7960 out there. So I didn't have any problem with this, and it is  
7961 kind of one of those deals where it is all hat and no cattle.

7962 I yield back. Does anyone else wish to be recognized on  
7963 the Democrat side?

7964 The ranking member of the Environment Subcommittee, Mr.  
7965 Tonko, five minutes.

7966 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Now I speak in  
7967 support of Representative Menendez's amendment.

7968 You know, it has been suggested that these funds, some  
7969 initially 50 million in total, won't actually be helping our  
7970 schools. It may even be down to about 12 million now that is  
7971 remaining in the account. But, look, if we look at -- we can  
7972 easily imagine that many of our schools need an environmental  
7973 shot in the arm. And while 50 million won't solve that  
7974 problem, there is opportunity, ample opportunity, that would  
7975 allow EPA to provide technical assistance and develop best  
7976 practices so that facility managers could put together a plan  
7977 of action.

7978 We are looking for efficiency. This is a great way to  
7979 do it. Have planners put together the plan that makes the  
7980 most sense that can enable them to then go forward and take  
7981 the next steps to find the resources to implement those  
7982 plans. These well-informed decisions would do a lot to

7983 improve our schools.

7984         And, you know, we look at the science of clean schools,  
7985 and making certain that children's experiences are as best as  
7986 they can be. Air quality has been looked at from many, many  
7987 samplings and studies out there. There is ample evidence  
7988 that improving schools' indoor air quality dramatically  
7989 improves students' academic performance. It enables them to  
7990 raise those test scores and reduce the amount of sick days  
7991 that keep them from attending school. And at least one study  
7992 estimated that with the high-quality air purifiers in the  
7993 classroom, we can see a reduction of class size -- it is  
7994 equivalent to a reduction of class size by some 30 percent.

7995         So there is great stuff we could do here. This scraping  
7996 away -- the amount of money from this fund away from our  
7997 children I think is really neglectful. But I get it. You  
7998 are looking to scrape all sorts of dollars together to amass  
7999 that total you need to line the pockets of billionaires. But  
8000 why does that have to come at the expense of our children?  
8001 Why does it have to come at the expense of 13.7 million  
8002 individuals who will be knocked off the Medicaid opportunity?

8003         So with that I yield back, and encourage everyone to  
8004 support this amendment.

8005         \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone  
8006 on the Republican side wish to speak?

8007         Seeing no hands, I now turn to the gentleman from

8008 California for five minutes.

8009           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This is one of  
8010 those cruel and dumb attempts by Republicans to cut funding  
8011 for schools in need in order to find the funds to give  
8012 billions of dollars to billionaires. I support this  
8013 amendment to prevent that from happening. We need to keep  
8014 the funding for schools to address pollution.

8015           I mentioned earlier in my previous remarks how pollution  
8016 does, in fact, affect students learning capacity, and it also  
8017 affects their days in school. In other words, there is more  
8018 missed days in school. And in fact, it is hard to study and  
8019 learn when you have frequent asthma exacerbations and can't  
8020 breathe. So let me tell you a story about how this funding  
8021 is important.

8022           Back in October of 2019 there was a mulch fire in an  
8023 industry called the Sun Valley Recycling Center in Thermal,  
8024 California, right next to a set of schools. This industry,  
8025 this company, was not following industry standards, and there  
8026 was a fire that polluted the air. And, you know, these mulch  
8027 fires, you can't just go in and turn them off, they simmer  
8028 and they last. And this one lasted for several weeks. And  
8029 there was reported about 25 students from Desert Mirage High  
8030 School, they reported smoke-related health issues, with 14  
8031 visiting the emergency department for respiratory problems.  
8032 In the middle school and the elementary school there, they

8033 were evacuated due to proximity to the fire and smoke  
8034 exposure, evacuated alongside all the other students.

8035         This was a serious problem in a very under-resourced  
8036 school district. And because of this, they applied for  
8037 funding and received air monitors. Because if it is not a  
8038 fire -- because this is not an isolated incident, fires like  
8039 these are becoming all too common in the eastern Coachella  
8040 Valley, a region already burdened by some of the worst air  
8041 quality in the nation. And time and again, its students,  
8042 many of them from low-income farm-worker families, are hit  
8043 the hardest. So when smoke from fires or the dust from the  
8044 surrounding Salton Sea fills the air, students experience  
8045 severe asthma flare-ups and respiratory distress, lost  
8046 instructional time due to school closures, or health-related  
8047 absences, stress, fear, and a sense of being unheard as their  
8048 neighborhoods and classrooms become zones of environmental  
8049 harm.

8050         And that fire wasn't just an environmental event; it was  
8051 an educational and a public health emergency. And it  
8052 underscored the urgent need for investments in clean air  
8053 infrastructure in and around schools like high-efficiency  
8054 HVAC systems, real-time air quality monitoring, and stronger  
8055 land use protections to keep hazardous operations away from  
8056 residential and school zones.

8057         My colleague says that he has cleared his conscience



8058 because this money does not take away these funds. This  
8059 money rescinds future potential grants to address high  
8060 schools like Desert Mirage High School and other high schools  
8061 throughout our nation and throughout our members' districts  
8062 that suffer from similar environmental hazards and toxins and  
8063 air pollution. And this fund will help those schools, but  
8064 they want to make those funds not available for those  
8065 students, and that is just wrong. It is morally wrong. It  
8066 is the wrong policy. It is only going to increase costs,  
8067 increase emergency department visits, decrease students'  
8068 aptitude in school.

8069 And so I urge everybody to please vote for this  
8070 amendment, protect this funding for the schools that need  
8071 them to protect their students' air quality so they can  
8072 continue going to school in a healthy environment, get the  
8073 grades, and live a healthy, productive life.

8074 With that I yield back.

8075 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. Do I see  
8076 anyone else wishing to speak?

8077 Seeing none --

8078 \*Mr. Pallone. We will have a roll call.

8079 \*Mr. Griffith. There has been a roll call requested,  
8080 and we would require roll call. Thank you. Let's go ahead  
8081 and vote on the amendment.

8082 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

8083           \*Mr. Latta.   No.  
8084           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.  
8085           Mr. Griffith?  
8086           \*Mr. Griffith.   No.  
8087           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
8088           Mr. Bilirakis?  
8089           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.  
8090           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.  
8091           Mr. Hudson?  
8092           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.  
8093           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
8094           Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
8095           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
8096           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
8097           Mr. Palmer?  
8098           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
8099           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
8100           Mr. Dunn?  
8101           [No response.]  
8102           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
8103           [No response.]  
8104           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce?  
8105           [No response.]  
8106           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber?  
8107           \*Mr. Weber.   No.

8108           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
8109           Mr. Allen?  
8110           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
8111           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
8112           Mr. Balderson?  
8113           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
8114           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
8115           Mr. Fulcher?  
8116           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
8117           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
8118           Mr. Pfluger?  
8119           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
8120           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
8121           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
8122           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
8123           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
8124           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
8125           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
8126           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
8127           Mrs. Cammack?  
8128           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
8129           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
8130           Mr. Obernolte?  
8131           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
8132           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.

8133 Mr. James?  
8134 \*Mr. James. No.  
8135 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
8136 Mr. Bentz?  
8137 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
8138 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
8139 Mrs. Houchin?  
8140 [No response.]  
8141 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry?  
8142 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
8143 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
8144 Ms. Lee?  
8145 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
8146 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
8147 Mr. Langworthy?  
8148 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
8149 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
8150 Mr. Kean?  
8151 \*Mr. Kean. No.  
8152 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.  
8153 Mr. Rulli?  
8154 [No response.]  
8155 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans?  
8156 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
8157 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.

8158 Mr. Goldman?  
8159 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
8160 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
8161 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
8162 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.  
8163 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
8164 Mr. Pallone?  
8165 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
8166 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
8167 Ms. DeGette?  
8168 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
8169 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
8170 Ms. Schakowsky?  
8171 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
8172 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
8173 Ms. Matsui?  
8174 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
8175 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
8176 Ms. Castor?  
8177 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
8178 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
8179 Mr. Tonko?  
8180 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
8181 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
8182 Ms. Clarke?

8183           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
8184           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
8185           Mr. Ruiz?  
8186           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
8187           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
8188           Mr. Peters?  
8189           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
8190           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
8191           Mrs. Dingell?  
8192           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
8193           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
8194           Mr. Veasey?  
8195           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
8196           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
8197           Ms. Kelly?  
8198           [No response.]  
8199           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan?  
8200           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
8201           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
8202           Mr. Soto?  
8203           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
8204           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
8205           Ms. Schrier?  
8206           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
8207           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.

8208 Mrs. Trahan?  
8209 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
8210 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
8211 Mrs. Fletcher?  
8212 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
8213 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
8214 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
8215 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
8216 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
8217 Mr. Auchincloss?  
8218 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
8219 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
8220 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
8221 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
8222 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
8223 Mr. Menendez?  
8224 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
8225 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
8226 Mr. Mullin?  
8227 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
8228 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
8229 Mr. Landsman?  
8230 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
8231 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
8232 Ms. McClellan?

8233           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

8234           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

8235           Chairman Guthrie?

8236           \*The Chair.   No.

8237           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

8238           \*Mr. Griffith.   Mr. Crenshaw?

8239           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.

8240           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

8241           \*Mr. Griffith.   The gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr.

8242   Joyce.

8243           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce is not recorded.

8244           \*Mr. Joyce.   Joyce votes no.

8245           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.

8246           \*Mr. Griffith.   The gentlelady from Indiana, Mrs.

8247   Houchin.

8248           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. --

8249           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.

8250           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.

8251           \*Mr. Griffith.   Do we have anybody else on the

8252   Republican side?

8253           Anybody on the Democrat side?

8254           All right, seeing none, the clerk will report the roll.

8255           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23

8256   ayes and 28 noes.

8257           \*Mr. Griffith.   The amendment is not agreed to.



8258 Are there any additional amendments?

8259 Seeing none, I will turn the chair over to the chair.

8260 \*The Chair. [Presiding] You want a roll call? I  
8261 figured you did.

8262 All right, if there is no further discussion -- okay, if  
8263 there is no further discussion, no further amendments, all  
8264 right, I move that the committee do now approve and agree to  
8265 transmit the House committee -- to the House Committee on the  
8266 Budget Subtitle B, Budget Reconciliation Legislative  
8267 Recommendations Relating to Environment.

8268 A roll call vote has been requested, and the clerk will  
8269 call the roll.

8270 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

8271 \*Mr. Latta. Aye.

8272 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.

8273 Mr. Griffith?

8274 \*Mr. Griffith. Aye.

8275 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

8276 Mr. Bilirakis?

8277 \*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.

8278 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.

8279 Mr. Hudson?

8280 \*Mr. Hudson. Aye.

8281 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.

8282 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

8283           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Aye.  
8284           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes aye.  
8285           Mr. Palmer?  
8286           \*Mr. Palmer.   Aye.  
8287           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
8288           Mr. Dunn?  
8289           [No response.]  
8290           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
8291           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   Aye.  
8292           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes aye.  
8293           Mr. Joyce?  
8294           \*Mr. Joyce.   Aye.  
8295           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes aye.  
8296           Mr. Weber?  
8297           \*Mr. Weber.   Aye.  
8298           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes aye.  
8299           Mr. Allen?  
8300           \*Mr. Allen.   Aye.  
8301           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes aye.  
8302           Mr. Balderson?  
8303           \*Mr. Balderson.   Yes.  
8304           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes aye.  
8305           Mr. Fulcher?  
8306           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is aye.  
8307           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes aye.

8308 Mr. Pfluger?  
8309 \*Mr. Pfluger. Aye.  
8310 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes aye.  
8311 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
8312 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. Aye.  
8313 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes aye.  
8314 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
8315 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Yes.  
8316 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes aye.  
8317 Mrs. Cammack?  
8318 \*Mrs. Cammack. Aye.  
8319 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes aye.  
8320 Mr. Obernolte?  
8321 \*Mr. Obernolte. Aye.  
8322 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes aye.  
8323 Mr. James?  
8324 \*Mr. James. Aye.  
8325 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes aye.  
8326 Mr. Bentz?  
8327 \*Mr. Bentz. Aye.  
8328 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes aye.  
8329 Mrs. Houchin?  
8330 \*Mrs. Houchin. Aye.  
8331 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes aye.  
8332 Mr. Fry?

8333           \*Mr. Fry.   Aye.  
8334           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes aye.  
8335           Ms. Lee?  
8336           \*Ms. Lee.   Aye.  
8337           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes aye.  
8338           Mr. Langworthy?  
8339           \*Mr. Langworthy.   Aye.  
8340           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
8341           Mr. Kean?  
8342           \*Mr. Kean.   Aye.  
8343           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes aye.  
8344           Mr. Rulli?  
8345           \*Mr. Rulli.   Aye.  
8346           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes aye.  
8347           Mr. Evans?  
8348           \*Mr. Evans.   Aye.  
8349           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes aye.  
8350           Mr. Goldman?  
8351           \*Mr. Goldman.   Aye.  
8352           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
8353           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
8354           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   Aye.  
8355           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes aye.  
8356           Mr. Pallone?  
8357           \*Mr. Pallone.   No.

8358           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes no.  
8359           Ms. DeGette?  
8360           \*Ms. DeGette.   No.  
8361           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes no.  
8362           Ms. Schakowsky?  
8363           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   No.  
8364           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes no.  
8365           Ms. Matsui?  
8366           \*Ms. Matsui.   No.  
8367           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes no.  
8368           Ms. Castor?  
8369           \*Ms. Castor.   No.  
8370           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes no.  
8371           Mr. Tonko?  
8372           \*Mr. Tonko.   No.  
8373           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes no.  
8374           Ms. Clarke?  
8375           \*Ms. Clarke.   No.  
8376           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes no.  
8377           Mr. Ruiz?  
8378           [No response.]  
8379           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz?  
8380           [No response.]  
8381           \*The Chair.   Mr. Ruiz?   Yes.  
8382           \*Mr. Ruiz.   No.

8383 [Laughter.]  
8384 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes no.  
8385 Mr. Peters?  
8386 \*Mr. Peters. No.  
8387 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.  
8388 Mrs. Dingell?  
8389 \*Mrs. Dingell. No.  
8390 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no.  
8391 Mr. Veasey?  
8392 \*Mr. Veasey. No.  
8393 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes no.  
8394 Ms. Kelly?  
8395 \*Ms. Kelly. No.  
8396 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes no.  
8397 Ms. Barragan?  
8398 \*Ms. Barragan. No.  
8399 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes no.  
8400 Mr. Soto?  
8401 \*Mr. Soto. No.  
8402 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes no.  
8403 Ms. Schrier?  
8404 \*Ms. Schrier. No.  
8405 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes no.  
8406 Mrs. Trahan?  
8407 \*Mrs. Trahan. No.

8408           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes no.  
8409           Mrs. Fletcher?  
8410           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   No.  
8411           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes no.  
8412           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
8413           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   No.  
8414           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.  
8415           Mr. Auchincloss?  
8416           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   No.  
8417           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes no.  
8418           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
8419           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   No.  
8420           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes no.  
8421           Mr. Menendez?  
8422           \*Mr. Menendez.   No.  
8423           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes no.  
8424           Mr. Mullin?  
8425           \*Mr. Mullin.   No.  
8426           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes no.  
8427           Mr. Landsman?  
8428           \*Mr. Landsman.   No.  
8429           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes no.  
8430           Ms. McClellan?  
8431           \*Ms. McClellan.   No.  
8432           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes no.

8433 Chairman Guthrie?

8434 \*The Chair. Aye.

8435 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes aye.

8436 \*The Chair. Is anyone seeking to answer the roll?

8437 Seeing none on the Republican side, are there any on the

8438 Democrat side?

8439 Everyone is recorded?

8440 The clerk will report.

8441 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were

8442 29 ayes and 24 noes.

8443 \*The Chair. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed

8444 to.

8445 The chair calls up the committee print Subtitle C,

8446 Communications, and asks the clerk to report.

8447 \*The Clerk. Title IV, Energy and Commerce, Subtitle C,

8448 Communications. Part one --

8449 \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the print

8450 is dispensed with, and the committee print will be open for

8451 amendment at any point.

8452 So ordered.

8453 [The committee print follows:]

8454

8455 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

8456



8457           \*The Chair. Is there a discussion on -- or there is  
8458 discussion on Subtitle C. For what purpose does the  
8459 gentleman from New Jersey seek recognition?

8460           \*Mr. Pallone. I move to strike the last word on the  
8461 underlying title.

8462           \*The Chair. You are recognized for five minutes.

8463           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8464           For nearly three years House Democrats have worked  
8465 together with Republicans on this committee to restore the  
8466 Federal Communications Commission Spectrum Auction Authority  
8467 and direct the revenues raised to fund bipartisan projects.

8468           \*The Chair. Will the gentleman suspend? Let's let the  
8469 room come to order. The gentleman has a right to be heard.

8470           Please proceed.

8471           \*Mr. Pallone. In that Spectrum Auction Authority, the  
8472 idea was to direct the revenues raised to fund bipartisan  
8473 priorities to enhance security and connectivity. And that  
8474 was the case until this January, when the Republicans gave up  
8475 on our efforts to instead chase partisan goals like funding  
8476 tax breaks for billionaires and large corporate interests,  
8477 and I am disappointed that my Republican colleagues are  
8478 choosing this partisan path.

8479           In shaping the spectrum provisions before us,  
8480 Republicans have abandoned their commitments to fund critical  
8481 public safety upgrades with spectrum auction proceeds.

8482 Spectrum is a public resource of which the government is a  
8483 steward, so it is only reasonable to think that revenues  
8484 raised by its sale or lease should fund priorities that serve  
8485 the public interest. But instead, my Republican colleagues  
8486 have made a conscious choice that the \$88 billion in spectrum  
8487 revenue raised by their legislation is better spent on tax  
8488 cuts for billionaires than on upgrading 911 systems to  
8489 benefit first responders -- and our all of our constituents,  
8490 actually -- in times of emergency.

8491       If this bill becomes law, Mr. Chairman, it will set back  
8492 efforts to upgrade 911 centers for a decade or more. Much of  
8493 the legislation before us today is cruel, but Republican  
8494 omission of funding for lifesaving public safety  
8495 communications instead to -- in order to line the pockets of  
8496 the wealthy -- during Police Week, no less -- is particularly  
8497 shameful, in my opinion. So I look forward to supporting  
8498 proposals from my Democratic colleagues to right these wrongs  
8499 in amendments.

8500       And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

8501       \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there anyone  
8502 on the Republican side seeking recognition for discussion,  
8503 anyone?

8504       The gentlelady from California is recognized -- the  
8505 gentlelady from northern California is recognized for five  
8506 minutes to speak on the underlying bill.

8507           \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
8508 the last word.

8509           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

8510           \*Ms. Matsui. Spectrum has historically been a  
8511 bipartisan issue in Congress. It should remain so. And we  
8512 should, as a bipartisan matter, make thoughtful, balanced  
8513 decisions when it comes to a spectrum pipeline, one that  
8514 promotes innovation and recognizes we need the right mix of  
8515 unlicensed, shared, and licensed spectrum. Yet today my  
8516 Republican colleagues are ramming through a reconciliation  
8517 bill that tosses this careful bipartisan approach in the  
8518 trash.

8519           This isn't a serious attempt to help American families.  
8520 It is a cash grab, funneling tens of billions in auction  
8521 revenue into tax breaks for corporations. These auction  
8522 proceeds should be invested in the public good, upgrading 911  
8523 systems, expanding broadband, and connecting every American,  
8524 not tax cuts for the ultra-rich. Instead, through  
8525 reconciliation, Republicans are delaying the lifesaving  
8526 emergency response upgrades and tossing aside the chance to  
8527 make broadband truly affordable and accessible.

8528           And when President Trump is already turning independent  
8529 agencies like the Federal Communications Commission into his  
8530 personal lap dog, this bill does nothing to prevent conflicts  
8531 of interest and ensure that spectrum decisions are grounded

8532 in facts and law. Without proper safeguards, these decisions  
8533 will choke competition, kill innovation, and destabilize  
8534 billions in existing spectrum investments.

8535         We must be careful when opening up spectrum bands to new  
8536 uses. The stakes are simply too high to get this wrong.  
8537 Take the CBRS band, a shared spectrum band critical to  
8538 national security and 5G innovation. Key American  
8539 industries, consumers, and schools rely on CBRS for  
8540 connectivity, smart manufacturing, precision agriculture, and  
8541 other innovative uses with technology developed by U.S.-based  
8542 equipment manufacturers. They have already invested heavily  
8543 in innovations using CBRS, and any change should be very  
8544 carefully considered.

8545         Jamming a bill through that could kick all current users  
8546 off the CBRS band when we have had only 36 hours to review  
8547 texts and only 1 spectrum hearing this Congress is reckless  
8548 and risk causing real harm. U.S. national security,  
8549 competition, manufacturing, and jobs are on the line. We  
8550 should be pursuing bipartisan spectrum policy based on facts,  
8551 analysis, and full stakeholder input, not half-baked  
8552 policies.

8553         Our consumers, businesses, and Federal agencies all  
8554 stand to benefit when we effectively use our spectrum  
8555 resources. That is why I have long championed thoughtful  
8556 approaches like the National Spectrum Strategy, which teed up

8557 a slew of bands for study, and gathers input from  
8558 stakeholders across industry, public interest, and the  
8559 government to ensure an all-of-the-above approach, including  
8560 licensed, unlicensed, and shared spectrum. And it is why I  
8561 urge my Republican colleagues to work with us to pass  
8562 comprehensive spectrum legislation that has substantial  
8563 bipartisan buy-in, not jammed through a partisan giveaway  
8564 that enriches the one percent that everyone else -- at  
8565 everyone else's expense.

8566 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my  
8567 time.

8568 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
8569 there any people seeking to speak on the Republican side?

8570 None? We have -- the gentlelady from Illinois is  
8571 recognized for five minutes to speak on the bill.

8572 \*Ms. Kelly. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last  
8573 word.

8574 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

8575 \*Ms. Kelly. I am deeply concerned with this Republican-  
8576 crafted budget resolution for Subtitle C, dealing with  
8577 communications, where my colleagues on the other side of the  
8578 aisle plan to use spectrum auction proceeds to fund President  
8579 Trump's tax cuts for billionaires and large corporations.  
8580 Simply put, it makes no sense to auction spectrum to help pay  
8581 for large tax breaks for the super-wealthy. Instead of using

8582 the funds from spectrum auction proceeds on the wealthy,  
8583 Congress should invest this money in ways that benefit local  
8584 communities and public interest objectives.

8585 In addition to my concerns regarding the uses of  
8586 spectrum auction proceeds, I am worried about the cost of  
8587 Internet services. There is no denying that the expiration  
8588 of the Affordable Connectivity Program, or ACP, poses a  
8589 significant challenge for low-income households that depended  
8590 on it to afford Internet services. Unlicensed spectrum  
8591 technologies such as WiFi has provided connectivity across  
8592 all income levels, due to its wide distribution and  
8593 deployment. We have seen schools and libraries utilize WiFi  
8594 to help connect their students and patrons. And while WiFi  
8595 can help with the affordability issue, other technologies  
8596 like Citizens Broadband Radio Service, or CBRS, have  
8597 delivered new 5G network capacity, connecting rural areas and  
8598 spurring precision agriculture. Protecting CBRS and ensuring  
8599 greater use of its rural communities supports rural economic  
8600 growth and access to fundamental services like education and  
8601 health care.

8602 Lastly, beyond the concerns I have already addressed,  
8603 the reconciliation bill contains a broad ban on states  
8604 enforcing their own state laws regulating artificial  
8605 intelligence, artificial intelligence systems, for a full  
8606 decade, depriving them of the ability to prohibit practices

8607 that harm Americans.

8608 I urge my colleagues to oppose the so-called AI and  
8609 Information Technology Modernization Initiative that would do  
8610 nothing but allow big tech to deploy dangerous technologies.

8611 Thank you, and I yield back.

8612 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
8613 further discussion on the bill?

8614 Seeing none, are there any amendments?

8615 The gentleman from Louisiana, for what purpose do you  
8616 seek recognition?

8617 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I have an  
8618 amendment at the desk titled Comm4\_XML.

8619 \*The Chair. The clerk will report.

8620 \*The Clerk. Comm4, an amendment to the committee print  
8621 for Subtitle C, offered by Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Page 4,  
8622 after line 22, insert the following. Section --

8623 \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
8624 amendment is dispensed with.

8625 [The amendment of Mr. Carter of Louisiana follows:]

8626

8627 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

8628

8629           \*The Chair. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
8630 minutes in support of the amendment.

8631           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My  
8632 amendment would add the text of the bipartisan Next  
8633 Generation 911 Act to the Republican budget reconciliation  
8634 legislation before us today, and fully fund the program using  
8635 the proceeds from future spectrum auctions.

8636           Because of technological advances in telecommunications  
8637 over the past 50 years, Americans can communicate today in  
8638 ways not even contemplated when 911 systems were first  
8639 created. We take the capability to send texts and video  
8640 messages in an instant or stream live over the Internet for  
8641 granted, yet we haven't always had those tools. We use these  
8642 tools with our friends, our loved ones every day, yet we are  
8643 not able to use them contacting 911 when it matters most.  
8644 Hundreds of millions of calls are made to 911 across the  
8645 United States each year. However, most Americans may not be  
8646 aware that 911 call centers lack modern 21 century -- 21st  
8647 century communication infrastructure.

8648           Each of us has a device in our pocket with extraordinary  
8649 capabilities, unimaginable when the first 911 call was  
8650 placed. Yet because our 911 systems are stuck in the past,  
8651 our first responders are unable to utilize the tools we take  
8652 for granted in this digital age. Nine one one operators are  
8653 trained to give excellent, step-by-step instructions to



8654 callers for every emergency manageable -- imaginable. This  
8655 -- the problem is that every day there are new emergencies  
8656 beyond our imagination.

8657         In the Next Generation 911 environment, the ability to  
8658 send multimedia or transmit to live video to first responders  
8659 in route to an emergency is an extraordinary step for public  
8660 safety. For example, firefighters can map out the best point  
8661 of entry while in route based on pictures and videos of a  
8662 burning building, and have a plan before they even arrive on  
8663 the scene. EMTs can coach Good Samaritans, helping someone  
8664 in cardiac arrest, adjusting their instructions before what  
8665 they see in real time.

8666         It also enables the text to 911, which is crucial in  
8667 situations that do not allow for someone in danger to place a  
8668 call and speak, like in instances of domestic violence where  
8669 discretion is paramount. The applications are limitless.  
8670 When seconds are the difference between life and death, our  
8671 constituents and first responders who put themselves in  
8672 harm's way to save lives should have the best possible tools.  
8673 This gives us that opportunity to have the best possible  
8674 tools so when our individuals are putting their lives on the  
8675 line, we should give them the very best of what our  
8676 technology has to offer.

8677         I can think of no other better way of funding it than  
8678 using these spectrum funds, and I am sure taking this

8679 language that is literally lifted from our bipartisan bill  
8680 from this committee would make perfect sense that, if we  
8681 can't agree on anything today, this is one that we certainly  
8682 can agree on.

8683 I yield.

8684 \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

8685 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I yield, yes.

8686 \*Ms. Barragan. I just want to speak in support of this  
8687 amendment, and I can think of no other way to spend dollars  
8688 in this kind of a system.

8689 I also want to take a moment to apologize to all of the  
8690 people who came today to talk and to hear about Medicaid,  
8691 because you showed up, and you are here, yet this committee  
8692 is not having the health portion of this hearing until after  
8693 10:00 p.m. And it reminds me of the hour when they released  
8694 the text for the actual bill in the dark of night after 10:00  
8695 p.m. And it is really shameful that we have not had this  
8696 part of the hearing moved up so that you all could be here,  
8697 because we have had scores and dozens of people showing up  
8698 and coming on this issue who have had to leave, children who  
8699 have had to leave, and advocates who have had to leave. So I  
8700 want to apologize to you. How shameful it is that this  
8701 committee is waiting until after 10:00 p.m. to do it. And we  
8702 know it can be done, because in the past in this committee,  
8703 when we want, we move bills around and we move topics around

8704 to make sure that they are done.

8705 And with that, I yield back to Mr. Carter.

8706 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Chairman, I yield.

8707 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. The  
8708 chair recognizes, Ms. -- Dr. -- Mr. Hudson for five minutes  
8709 to speak on the amendment.

8710 \*Mr. Hudson. I wish to speak against the amendment.  
8711 Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

8712 It is no secret our 911 technology is outdated. Some  
8713 systems are even half a decade old. Next Generation 911 is a  
8714 top priority for this committee and for me, as chairman of  
8715 the Subcommittee on Communications and Technology. That is  
8716 why I want to make sure that we can continue this on a  
8717 bipartisan basis.

8718 In places like my own district this technology is  
8719 already being deployed. I think it is important that we make  
8720 sure we have an accurate number of dollars to appropriate for  
8721 this technology, considering the last cost estimate for 911  
8722 deployment we have is from 2018. Given the mixed deployment  
8723 across the country, there is no doubt the number we need to  
8724 appropriate has changed, and I want to get this right.

8725 I want to thank the gentleman who offered this amendment  
8726 for his commitment to this issue, and I believe he is  
8727 sincere, and I have appreciated working with him on it.

8728 And I commit to you that I will work with you going

8729 forward, because modernizing our 911 technology is a top  
8730 priority of mine as the chairman of the subcommittee, and  
8731 getting it done outside of reconciliation ensures the  
8732 quickest delivery.

8733 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

8734 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. Is  
8735 our speakers on the -- Dr. -- the gentleman from California,  
8736 Mr. Ruiz -- I have to call you by name because you have a lot  
8737 of Californians.

8738 So Mr. Ruiz, you are recognized for five minutes.

8739 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise today in  
8740 strong support of this amendment.

8741 I congratulate my colleague, Congressman Hudson, for  
8742 having NextGen 911 in his district. I don't have it in my  
8743 district.

8744 As an emergency physician, I have witnessed firsthand  
8745 the critical importance of timely emergency care. I have  
8746 seen first responders wheel patients into the ER during the  
8747 most harrowing moments of their lives. In those moments,  
8748 every single second counts. That is why this amendment is so  
8749 important. It would fund long-overdue upgrades to our public  
8750 safety communications system through the Next Generation 911  
8751 program. Even shaving a few seconds off emergency response  
8752 times can mean the difference between life and death, between  
8753 permanent disability during a stroke or full recovery.

8754           This isn't -- this issue isn't hypothetical for my  
8755 constituents. In recent months part of my district  
8756 experienced 911 outages. We can't wait. Residents in crisis  
8757 couldn't get through to emergency services at all. That is  
8758 not just a failure of infrastructure, it is a failure to  
8759 protect lives.

8760           And yet, during National Police Week, when we should be  
8761 honoring our first responders, my Republican colleagues are  
8762 pushing legislation that would prevent vital modernization  
8763 because of, instead of using the spectrum auction funds to  
8764 modernize outdated 911 systems, which they can easily do  
8765 that, they are using it to give billions of dollars of tax  
8766 cuts to billionaires, and it is deeply contradictory to  
8767 praise law enforcement while advancing policies that make  
8768 their jobs harder and their response time slower at the same  
8769 time their reconciliation plan proposes slashing over seven  
8770 hundreds of billions of dollars from Medicaid.

8771           Thirteen point seven million people will no longer have  
8772 health insurance. They will have no care, meaning they will  
8773 get sicker and they will be calling 911 more to go to the  
8774 emergency department. And to add insult to injury, those  
8775 hospitals or emergency departments, especially in rural  
8776 areas, are at risk of closing.

8777           And for years expanded access to affordable care has  
8778 allowed under-resourced communities, rural communities to

8779 seek help from doctors instead of emergency rooms. But if  
8780 this bill becomes law, the progress will be undone. People  
8781 will wait until it is too late, call 911, and end up in  
8782 overcrowded ERs, receiving more expensive, less effective  
8783 care.

8784 So Democrats are offering a solution to get faster  
8785 response times, to get patients to the emergency room sooner,  
8786 and this amendment would improve emergency response times,  
8787 support our first responders, and save lives. Meanwhile,  
8788 Republicans are advancing a bill that will result in more 911  
8789 calls, more hospital closures, and more preventable deaths.

8790 And let's be clear. This legislation will make  
8791 Americans sicker, and leave them with fewer options for care.  
8792 If we are going to force 911 and first responders to fill the  
8793 gaps left by gutted health care, the least we can do is give  
8794 them the most effective tools they need to do their jobs.

8795 So I urge my colleagues to support this amendment in  
8796 honor of National Police Week to fund Next Generation 911,  
8797 protect public health, and truly honor our first responders  
8798 not just in words, but in action.

8799 I yield back.

8800 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone on  
8801 the Republican side seeking recognition on the amendment?

8802 Dr. Miller-Meeks, and then I will come back to --

8803 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I was just

8804 wondering if the gentlewoman from California was calling for  
8805 a vote.

8806 \*The Chair. Oh --

8807 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. If she wanted to move things  
8808 faster.

8809 \*The Chair. Do you want to yield back? Do you want to  
8810 yield the time to the gentleman from Alabama?

8811 \*Ms. Barragan. Are you asking me from California?

8812 [No response.]

8813 \*Ms. Barragan. Yes?

8814 \*The Chair. Yes, I think so.

8815 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Yes, ma'am. Are you calling for a  
8816 vote?

8817 \*Ms. Barragan. No, I am calling for your committee --  
8818 you guys are in charge, you decide what topics are going to  
8819 go -- that you move up the health care first.

8820 This is a totally intentional thing you are doing to  
8821 make sure health care doesn't happen before 10:00 p.m. You  
8822 have the power to do it. So you -- I know you want to vote  
8823 to move things along because you want to just skip --

8824 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Call for the vote.

8825 \*Ms. Barragan. -- and go as late as possible, but you  
8826 all have the power to --

8827 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. I reclaim my time.

8828 \*Ms. Barragan. -- do it. You know you have the power.

8829           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. I reclaim my time --

8830           \*Ms. Barragan. Okay --

8831           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. -- and call for the vote.

8832           \*Ms. Barragan. But for the record, this is Republicans'  
8833 doing.

8834           \*The Chair. Okay, do you yield to the gentleman from  
8835 Alabama is what you -- oh, you want your own time now? Are  
8836 you good?

8837           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. I reclaim my time. I yield to the  
8838 gentleman from -- Mr. --

8839           \*The Chair. Alabama?

8840           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Yes.

8841           \*Mr. Palmer. All I was going to say was 911, the first  
8842 call, was made in the town that I was born in. And it wasn't  
8843 because I was born there.

8844           \*The Chair. Was it Hackleburg?

8845           \*Mr. Palmer. The first 911 call was made in Haleyville,  
8846 Alabama.

8847           \*The Chair. Haleyville was Robert Aderholt's hometown.  
8848 All right. Okay, do you yield back?

8849           Anyone on the -- Mr. -- the gentleman from Florida is  
8850 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

8851           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you, Chairman. I appreciate  
8852 Representative Carter bringing forward this key bill.  
8853 Billions in telecom spectrum auction dollars should be



8854 reinvested in Next Generation 911 systems, not billionaire  
8855 tax cuts.

8856       You know, we heard already about how Florida gets hit  
8857 pretty hard with hurricanes. My district got hit very hard  
8858 with Irma and Ian, and Helene and Milton just hit Tampa Bay  
8859 pretty hard, as well. But you would be surprised to know  
8860 that we have a dry season in central Florida in the early  
8861 spring. And so we actually had wildfires this past couple  
8862 months, 275 acres, a brush fire, as well as a 600-acre fire  
8863 near St. Cloud, Florida just these past couple of weeks. And  
8864 we do a lot of maintenance and controlled burns of our  
8865 forests.

8866       And so I visited the St. Cloud Police Department  
8867 yesterday, and met with 911 operators. Their systems are  
8868 antiquated. They need more investment. One of the 911  
8869 operators was even affected personally by the fires. And so,  
8870 as we are looking at these investments from telecom spectrum  
8871 that will generate billions of dollars, it should go right  
8872 back into spectrum-related issues like 911 systems so that we  
8873 can protect our constituents.

8874       And I yield back.

8875       \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
8876 further discussion on the amendment?

8877       Seeing none --

8878       \*Mr. Pallone. Roll call.

8879           \*The Chair. -- if there is no further discussion, the  
8880 vote occurs on the amendment. A roll call has been  
8881 requested. The clerk will call the roll.

8882           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

8883           \*Mr. Latta. No.

8884           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

8885 Mr. Griffith?

8886           \*Mr. Griffith. No.

8887           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

8888 Mr. Bilirakis?

8889           \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

8890           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

8891 Mr. Hudson?

8892           \*Mr. Hudson. No.

8893           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

8894 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

8895           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

8896           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

8897 Mr. Palmer?

8898           \*Mr. Palmer. No.

8899           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

8900 Mr. Dunn?

8901 [No response.]

8902           \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

8903 [No response.]

8904           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce?  
8905           [No response.]  
8906           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber?  
8907           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
8908           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
8909           Mr. Allen?  
8910           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
8911           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
8912           Mr. Balderson?  
8913           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
8914           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
8915           Mr. Fulcher?  
8916           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
8917           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
8918           Mr. Pfluger?  
8919           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
8920           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
8921           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
8922           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
8923           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
8924           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
8925           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
8926           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
8927           Mrs. Cammack?  
8928           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.

8929           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
8930           Mr. Oubernolte?  
8931           \*Mr. Oubernolte.   No.  
8932           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
8933           Mr. James?  
8934           \*Mr. James.   No.  
8935           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
8936           Mr. Bentz?  
8937           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
8938           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
8939           Mrs. Houchin?  
8940           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
8941           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
8942           Mr. Fry?  
8943           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
8944           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
8945           Ms. Lee?  
8946           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
8947           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
8948           Mr. Langworthy?  
8949           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
8950           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
8951           Mr. Kean?  
8952           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
8953           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.

8954 Mr. Rulli?  
8955 \*Mr. Rulli. No.  
8956 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.  
8957 Mr. Evans?  
8958 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
8959 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.  
8960 Mr. Goldman?  
8961 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
8962 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
8963 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
8964 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.  
8965 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
8966 Mr. Pallone?  
8967 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
8968 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
8969 Ms. DeGette?  
8970 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
8971 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
8972 Ms. Schakowsky?  
8973 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
8974 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
8975 Ms. Matsui?  
8976 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
8977 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
8978 Ms. Castor?

8979           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
8980           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
8981           Mr. Tonko?  
8982           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
8983           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
8984           Ms. Clarke?  
8985           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
8986           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
8987           Mr. Ruiz?  
8988           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
8989           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
8990           Mr. Peters?  
8991           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
8992           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
8993           Mrs. Dingell?  
8994           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
8995           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
8996           Mr. Veasey?  
8997           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
8998           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
8999           Ms. Kelly?  
9000           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
9001           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
9002           Ms. Barragan?  
9003           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.

9004           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
9005           Mr. Soto?  
9006           \*Mr. Soto.   Aye.  
9007           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
9008           Ms. Schrier?  
9009           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
9010           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
9011           Mrs. Trahan?  
9012           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.  
9013           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
9014           Mrs. Fletcher?  
9015           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
9016           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
9017           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
9018           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
9019           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
9020           Mr. Auchincloss?  
9021           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
9022           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
9023           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
9024           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.  
9025           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
9026           Mr. Menendez?  
9027           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.  
9028           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.

9029 Mr. Mullin?

9030 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

9031 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

9032 Mr. Landsman?

9033 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

9034 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

9035 Ms. McClellan?

9036 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

9037 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

9038 Chairman Guthrie?

9039 \*The Chair. No.

9040 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

9041 \*The Chair. How is Dr. Joyce recorded?

9042 \*The Clerk. Dr. Joyce is not recorded.

9043 \*Mr. Joyce. Joyce votes no.

9044 \*The Clerk. Dr. Joyce votes no.

9045 \*The Chair. Is anybody on the Republican side?

9046 How is -- anybody on the Democrat side?

9047 No? Seeing none, the clerk will report.

9048 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were

9049 24 ayes and 28 noes.

9050 \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.

9051 Are there further amendments?

9052 The gentlelady from New York, for what purpose do you

9053 seek recognition?



9054           \*Ms. Clarke. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the  
9055 desk labeled Comm9.

9056           \*The Chair. Comm9. The clerk will report.

9057           \*The Clerk. Comm9, an amendment to the committee print  
9058 for Subtitle C, offered by Ms. Clarke.

9059           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
9060 amendment is dispensed with.

9061           [The amendment of Ms. Clarke follows:]

9062

9063           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

9064

9065           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
9066 minutes in support of the amendment.

9067           \*Ms. Clarke. My amendment would take a small amount of  
9068 the money you all are confiscating today to further enrich  
9069 billionaires and put it towards lessening the impact of  
9070 President Trump's price hikes on everyday people.

9071           Specifically, my amendment would put spectrum auction  
9072 proceeds toward re-establishing a broadband affordability  
9073 program that would lower costs for families across the  
9074 country. The truth is the spectrum that my Republican  
9075 colleagues are seeking to auction off today does not belong  
9076 to them, it belongs to the American people. Proceeds should  
9077 be reinvested for the public good, and not used exclusively  
9078 to pay for tax cuts for their billionaire friends.

9079           Funding a program to help make broadband affordable is  
9080 now needed -- is needed now, perhaps more than ever. The  
9081 Affordable Connectivity Program brought millions of Americans  
9082 online. But despite its success, Republicans allowed the  
9083 funding for the program to lapse last year. As a result,  
9084 many of the nearly 23 million ACP families saw their Internet  
9085 bills go up. Those who could not afford to pay were  
9086 disconnected entirely.

9087           Little did we know at the time this would be one of the  
9088 first of many Republican price hikes families would have to  
9089 face. In fact, at every opportunity they get, Republicans

9090 seem determined to increase costs and widen the digital  
9091 divide. Last week the President announced his plans to  
9092 unilaterally repeal the Digital Equity Act and claw back the  
9093 money Congress appropriated to implement it. Digital Equity  
9094 Act programs were designed to provide devices and training to  
9095 folks across the country, including seniors, veterans, people  
9096 with disabilities, and those living in rural areas to help  
9097 them get online.

9098       Also, right now the Trump Administration is purposefully  
9099 delaying broadband build-out projects under the BEAD program,  
9100 even though shovels could have been in the ground across the  
9101 country months ago. Republicans seem poised to effectively  
9102 roll back the requirement that providers that take BEAD money  
9103 provide an affordable service plan.

9104       Republicans voted in the Senate last week to forever  
9105 repeal an FCC program that would provide WiFi hotspots to  
9106 school children. This is a travesty, considering how many  
9107 students from low-income households have come to rely on  
9108 WiFi. It is almost like they look back at photos of children  
9109 doing homework at fast food restaurants or in library parking  
9110 lots during the pandemic and think, hmm, those go back to the  
9111 good old days. Is that what they mean when they say make  
9112 America great again?

9113       I don't see it that way at all. We must continue the  
9114 incredible progress we have made to close the digital divide

9115 and finish the job. Study after study shows consistently  
9116 efforts to close the digital divide must address the high  
9117 cost of Internet service. I urge all members of this  
9118 committee to support my amendment which would finally provide  
9119 some relief to people in this country facing Donald Trump's  
9120 price hikes.

9121 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

9122 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
9123 discussion, further discussion?

9124 The gentleman from North Carolina, you are recognized to  
9125 speak on the amendment.

9126 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I rise to speak  
9127 against the amendment.

9128 The Affordable Connectivity Program was originally  
9129 established as a temporary program to ensure that Americans  
9130 could afford to stay connected if they were suddenly laid off  
9131 during the COVID-19 pandemic. It expired when the money ran  
9132 out, and well after Americans were back at work post-  
9133 pandemic.

9134 To set the record straight, the Federal Government  
9135 already has a program to ensure that low-income Americans can  
9136 afford service, the Lifeline program within the Universal  
9137 Service Fund, which is managed by the Federal Communications  
9138 Commission.

9139 Second, starting ACP using spectrum proceeds would

9140 ultimately harm the very people it seeks to help. This is  
9141 only a temporary solution. Spectrum proceeds will run out,  
9142 and then all the families that relied on the subsidy will be  
9143 left without it again.

9144 Last Congress Democrats complained about 23 million  
9145 households losing their ACP subsidy, and now they want to do  
9146 it again. Without a permanent funding source, providers will  
9147 not want to participate because of the burdensome process of  
9148 enrolling subscribers only for the program to go away within  
9149 a few years.

9150 Third, this amendment does nothing to reform ACP to  
9151 address eligibility or the waste, fraud, and abuse that we  
9152 saw rampant in the program. Under ACP we saw people with  
9153 enormous incomes -- even lobbyists here in D.C. -- qualify  
9154 for the ACP. That is not how this program should support.

9155 I will also note that, as much as Democrats claim to  
9156 miss that program, they controlled both the Senate and the  
9157 White House last Congress and couldn't agree on a proposal  
9158 that could keep ACP funded. Congress should not restart the  
9159 ACP until we can all agree on reforms to the program and have  
9160 a dedicated, permanent funding source for any program to help  
9161 our most vulnerable populations participate in the 21st  
9162 century economy. And we are happy to work with our friends  
9163 on the other side of the aisle on changes, but this is not  
9164 the vehicle for those discussions.

9165           My colleague also mentioned the BEAD program. I will  
9166 tell you, the BEAD program, a lot of money. Not one penny  
9167 has been spent to lay one inch of fiber, though. We need to  
9168 get that money deployed, and I have offered a solution, a  
9169 bipartisan solution called Speed the BEAD, and I would  
9170 encourage my colleagues to take a look at that.

9171           And finally, this charge again -- you know, you are  
9172 entitled to your own opinions, but you are not entitled to  
9173 your own facts. The other side keeps claiming that we want  
9174 to give tax hikes to billionaires. But I will point out that  
9175 the tax policies we hope to extend affect middle-class  
9176 Americans. In fact, in the author of this amendment's own  
9177 district, New York 9, the average family will see a tax  
9178 increase if we don't extend these tax cuts of \$2,302 per  
9179 family. That is a lot of money. That is real money for  
9180 working families.

9181           One of my colleagues earlier made the same charge from  
9182 California. I mentioned that the average California taxpayer  
9183 would see a 20 percent tax increase if we don't extend the  
9184 2017 tax cuts for the middle class. In fact, a family of 4  
9185 in California making \$95,000 -- that is the median income --  
9186 would see a \$2,142 tax increase, on average. That is real  
9187 money. And 4.6 million California families would see their  
9188 household Child Tax Credit cut in half; 85 percent of  
9189 California taxpayers would see their guaranteed deduction cut

9190 in half; 3.1 million small businesses in California would be  
9191 hit with a 43.4 percent tax increase; 56,821 family-owned  
9192 farms in California will see their death tax exemption cut in  
9193 half. This is real damage to real working families.

9194 In fact, if you look at the tax brackets, if you look at  
9195 the lower tax bracket of \$15,300 for a single person -- I am  
9196 sorry, \$12,150 -- their tax rate would go from 10 percent to  
9197 15 percent. The tax bracket at \$49,425 of income would see  
9198 their tax rate go from 12 percent to 15 percent. These are -  
9199 - this is real pain for real working families out there.

9200 So this charge that we are trying to have these tax cuts  
9201 for rich people, I am not going to use the L word because we  
9202 are not allowed to use that, I will just quote another famous  
9203 Californian who said, "It is not that they are wrong, it is  
9204 that what they know for certain just isn't so.'`

9205 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back.

9206 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
9207 from California, Mr. Perry -- Peters, not Perry -- Peters is  
9208 recognized.

9209 [Pause.]

9210 \*The Chair. Mr. Peters.

9211 \*Mr. Peters. Can you go to Mr. Auchincloss first? I  
9212 didn't realize -- I never get called on that fast, so --

9213 \*The Chair. I am sorry, what did you -- go to --

9214 \*Mr. Peters. Can you come back to me, please?

9215           \*The Chair. Okay, Mrs. Dingell from Michigan. Are you  
9216 seeking recognition?

9217           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike  
9218 the last word.

9219           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

9220           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9221           I am very supportive of Representative Clarke's  
9222 amendment. The spectrum auction program has raised over \$230  
9223 billion since 1994, and has long enjoyed bipartisan support  
9224 for funding public safety and connectivity initiatives. As  
9225 co-chair of the 5G Caucus, I know how critical it is that we  
9226 continue investing in infrastructure, spectrum policy, and  
9227 innovation to maintain America's leadership in wireless  
9228 technology.

9229           We have made tremendous progress since the passage of  
9230 the Infrastructure Investment and Jobs Act. But let's be  
9231 clear, this work is far from done. Affordability remains the  
9232 number-one reason that people don't have high-speed Internet  
9233 access at home. A recent survey found that 63 percent of the  
9234 adults said their Internet bills had increased in the past  
9235 year, and one in five say that these price increases have  
9236 caused them to downgrade, switch, or cancel service. Every  
9237 time a family must make that choice, we are moving in the  
9238 wrong direction for this country.

9239           I was beyond disappointed when my Republican colleagues



9240 allowed the Affordable Connectivity Program to run out of  
9241 money last year. ACP connected to 23 million families, and  
9242 was the most successful broadband affordability program in  
9243 history. Representative Clarke's amendment rights that  
9244 wrong, and the timing couldn't be better.

9245       According to one report, President Trump's reckless  
9246 trade policies will increase costs for 5G wireless equipment,  
9247 ultimately leading to higher prices for consumers. But these  
9248 trade policies could significantly slow down our deployment  
9249 of 6G networks, putting us at risk of losing our global  
9250 technology -- technological race with China, something I  
9251 think we should all be unwilling to do.

9252       At the same time, we should be concerned about spectrum  
9253 provisions in the underlying bill that jeopardize innovation  
9254 and economic competitiveness. In Michigan the CBRS band  
9255 supports advanced manufacturing, and it powers private 5G  
9256 networks and auto manufacturing facilities. Eliminating  
9257 access to this shared spectrum would directly threaten these  
9258 deployments. And with no viable alternative band to shift  
9259 to, this will harm competition and consumers.

9260       The bill also risks limiting access to unlicensed  
9261 spectrum like the six gigahertz band, which enables campus-  
9262 wide WiFi at the University of Michigan, supporting over tens  
9263 of thousands of students, faculty, and staff. And I am sure  
9264 that that is the same at universities across the country.

9265           To maintain our leadership and close the digital divide,  
9266 we must drive down costs and get back on track so that  
9267 everyone in this country gets connected to cutting-edge  
9268 Internet access.

9269           I thank Representative Clarke for offering this  
9270 important amendment which would lower costs for consumers,  
9271 and I urge all of my colleagues to support it. That is what  
9272 President Trump promised, that we would lower costs for  
9273 consumers.

9274           Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

9275           \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back.  
9276 The gentlelady from Florida is recognized for five minutes to  
9277 speak on the amendment.

9278           \*Mrs. Cammack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to  
9279 speak in opposition to this amendment and, quite frankly,  
9280 want to join my colleague, Representative Hudson, to reject  
9281 the claims made by our colleagues on the left.

9282           Forty-two billion dollars, forty-two billion dollars was  
9283 allocated in the previous administration. Not a single  
9284 family or business was connected to the Internet. Not one,  
9285 not one. And I represent a district that is exceptionally  
9286 rural. And let me tell you, there was a lot of hope that  
9287 there was going to be connectivity. It never came. So I  
9288 reject the notion that now, all of a sudden, you guys care  
9289 about connecting Americans to broadband when you had four

9290 years and Congress, really, to do it, but you didn't.

9291           And I had to stop counting once we hit over 100, because  
9292 over 100 times tonight, in the last 8 hours, it has been said  
9293 by our colleagues on the left that this entire package is  
9294 about tax breaks for billionaires.

9295           I would like to ask unanimous consent to enter into the  
9296 record a non-partisan -- a report from the non-partisan Joint  
9297 Committee on Taxation that just came out that shows that  
9298 those making between 30,000 and \$80,000 annually would pay 15  
9299 percent less in taxes under the Republican plan. Those  
9300 aren't billionaires.

9301           \*The Chair. Without objection, so ordered.

9302           [The information follows:]

9303

9304           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

9305

9306           \*Mrs. Cammack. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9307           Those are not billionaires. That is working-class  
9308 American families. Show me in the text where billionaires  
9309 are getting a tax break. I will wait. We will be here all  
9310 night. I can go through every single one of the districts  
9311 that are represented here tonight, and every time someone  
9312 objects to making these tax cuts permanent, that is them  
9313 saying they want their constituents to pay more, they want  
9314 families to pay more. They want to cut the family credit  
9315 deduction in half. That is a fact. You cannot argue the  
9316 facts.

9317           And so I reject this amendment, and I reject the notion  
9318 that this package, which is designed to support working  
9319 Americans across this country, is about tax breaks for  
9320 billionaires because, again, it would be false.

9321           With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield.

9322           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
9323 from California, Mr. Perry.

9324           \*Mr. Peters. Mr. Peters.

9325           \*The Chair. Peters, I said that twice now. I  
9326 apologize.

9327           \*Mr. Peters. That happened the first week I was here.  
9328 They confused me with Mr. Perry, but --

9329           \*The Chair. I am sorry I said that again.

9330           \*Mr. Peters. I am obviously not the same person.

9331           \*The Chair. I don't know why I said that. I know  
9332 better. I apologize, my apologies.

9333           \*Mr. Peters. No, no, don't worry about it. I just want  
9334 to address my friend from North Carolina's discussion about  
9335 the tax burden.

9336           You know, first of all, this is the bill that the  
9337 Republicans wrote in 2017. They designed it to expire in  
9338 2017. This is by design because it costs a lot of money to  
9339 extend them, and they knew that then, they know that now.  
9340 But let's just talk about part of it.

9341           One of the parts of it would take the top marginal rate  
9342 and restore it back to 39.6 percent from 37 percent. Just  
9343 that change would generate -- according to the Penn Wharton  
9344 budget model, allowing the top marginal tax rate to return  
9345 from 37 to 39.6 percent would yield \$402 billion in new  
9346 revenue, 400 -- that is almost half of what we are trying to  
9347 get out of here, just that change.

9348           Now, are those people these small families, middle-class  
9349 people? No. That marginal rate doesn't even start until you  
9350 make \$609,000 as a single person or 731,000 as a married  
9351 person. Those are not people who can't afford an extra two  
9352 bucks per \$100 starting at that level because it is a  
9353 marginal rate. That doesn't mean that all your income is  
9354 taxed at 39.6, just the part above that.

9355           So the bill can be split up. It doesn't have to all be

9356 re-enacted at once. Some parts you made permanent, the  
9357 business tax reduction, the corporate tax. Actually, I  
9358 thought 35 percent was too high. But even Dave Camp, the  
9359 Republican chair of the Ways and Means Committee, all he ever  
9360 asked for was 24 percent, and you all put it down to 21  
9361 percent. That is \$400 billion right there, more than I think  
9362 Republicans were even asking for back then. So there is room  
9363 to adjust this without hurting those middle-class people.

9364       The other thing I would just mention, too, is the tax  
9365 gap. Do you know we don't even invest in getting -- in  
9366 collecting the taxes that people are owed [sic]? So without  
9367 changing one tax rate, a recent study out of Stanford, every  
9368 dollar the IRS spends auditing complex enterprises help us --  
9369 helps us claw back 20 bucks in revenue the Federal Government  
9370 should be collecting under Federal law. The tax gap right  
9371 now, in 2022, was \$696 billion. All we have to do is collect  
9372 that money.

9373       And we know we have to invest in the IRS. And you know  
9374 what Republicans are doing? Apparently, that is too much of  
9375 a law enforcement thing for them. They are pulling back.  
9376 They have already defunded \$20 million of the money we  
9377 invested to try to make IRS better -- not just collecting  
9378 taxes from rich people who aren't paying them, but that is  
9379 what the tax gap is -- what did I say, \$696 billion? It is  
9380 also trying to help people with their refunds and

9381 administration.

9382 I mean, so let's just not pretend that this is some  
9383 monolithic thing that has to be extended all at once, because  
9384 there is parts of it we could turn out.

9385 And by the way, if we continue to do this without  
9386 addressing the annual budget deficit, which is now \$2  
9387 trillion a year, the budget deficit is going to go from 36 to  
9388 38 to 40. Who is going to pay for that? You think we are  
9389 not increasing that deficit by letting that deficit balloon?  
9390 You don't think we are increasing taxes on middle-class  
9391 people? We sure as hell are.

9392 So what I don't want to hear is that this is some yes-  
9393 or-no decision, we can't split this up into the good parts  
9394 and the bad parts. I think the people over here would work  
9395 with you on keeping taxes low for truly middle-class people.  
9396 People over here like the Child Tax Credit. But you are  
9397 telling me you can't go from 37, or from -- to 39.6 on people  
9398 who are really, really wealthy to help our country? I don't  
9399 buy that at all, don't buy it at all. And it is fiscally  
9400 irresponsible, and it is one of the reasons we are sitting  
9401 here cutting 13 million people off of health care.

9402 I yield back.

9403 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. The  
9404 chair recognizes -- is any Republican member seeking  
9405 recognition?

9406           The gentlelady from Indiana, for what purpose -- is  
9407 recognized to speak on the amendment.

9408           \*Mrs. Houchin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

9409           We have heard a lot in the last several minutes about  
9410 BEAD. I just want to comment that I concur with the Chairman  
9411 Hudson, telecom subcommittee chair, on his comments with  
9412 respect to the BEAD program. Thanks to the Biden  
9413 Administration's mismanagement, we are still waiting for the  
9414 largest broadband investment in our nation's history to  
9415 connect a single home.

9416           The Biden Administration added unnecessary and costly  
9417 requirements on labor and climate change, and unlawfully  
9418 forced the states to regulate broadband plans. Even liberals  
9419 like Ezra Klein and Jon Stewart agree that the Biden  
9420 Administration mismanaged this program. They recently hosted  
9421 a podcast criticizing the Democrats cumbersome regulations  
9422 and processes for BEAD. Not a single dollar for BEAD has  
9423 gone out under President Biden.

9424           We need to reform BEAD to eliminate the unnecessary  
9425 Biden regulations that made broadband deployment more  
9426 expensive, burdensome, and unattractive. Committee  
9427 Republicans are ready to do this. Subcommittee Chairman  
9428 Hudson has introduced the Speed for BEAD Act, which I am a  
9429 proud cosponsor. This will eliminate costly requirements and  
9430 prohibit rate regulation, and ensure that all technologies



9431 are able to participate so that we can finally connect every  
9432 home.

9433 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

9434 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there a  
9435 recognition -- the gentleman from California, Dr. Ruiz, is  
9436 recognized for five minutes.

9437 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support this  
9438 amendment which would use Spectrum Auction Authority revenue  
9439 to fund broadband affordability programs, or the BEAD  
9440 program.

9441 The BEAD program brings over \$1.8 billion to California  
9442 to deploy broadband infrastructure to the hardest-to-reach  
9443 communities, including the eastern Coachella Valley and  
9444 underserved areas across Imperial County. In parts of my  
9445 district, particularly in rural and agricultural areas, over  
9446 25 percent, 1 out of 4 households, either lack Internet  
9447 access or rely on slow, unreliable service. That digital  
9448 divide is unacceptable in the 21st century.

9449 Access to affordable, high-speed Internet is a modern-  
9450 day essential, just like electricity or running water.  
9451 Students in the eastern Coachella Valley often have to do  
9452 homework in parking lots or fast food restaurants to get  
9453 WiFi. The BEAD program gives these kids the tools to  
9454 succeed, no matter their zip code. And for our farm worker  
9455 families, tribal communities, and low-income households,

9456 high-speed Internet means access to telehealth, online  
9457 classes, remote jobs, and connection to vital services.

9458       This is also about public safety and infrastructure.  
9459 High-speed broadband enables better coordination for  
9460 emergency alerts, disaster response, and deployment of modern  
9461 technologies like NextGen 911.

9462       So again, you know, we tried, but you all refused to use  
9463 spectrum auction funds for upgrading our 911 systems. Now we  
9464 are imploring you to support this amendment to use spectrum  
9465 auction funds to help fund the broadband affordability  
9466 programs. If anything -- if we learned anything from the  
9467 pandemic, we learned that many of us rely on broadband for  
9468 telehealth, for school, for commerce. And so let's continue  
9469 to improve broadband, especially in rural and under-resourced  
9470 communities.

9471       And with that, if anybody would like my time, I could  
9472 yield. Otherwise -- I will yield some time to Mr. Soto.

9473       \*Mr. Soto. Thank you so much. So we are going to do  
9474 this on BEAD again, huh?

9475       Forty-two billion to bring rural broadband. All 50  
9476 states have their plans approved already. All 50 states  
9477 plans are approved already. President Trump has been in  
9478 office for over 100 days. He has done nothing, nothing. How  
9479 many more days does he have to be president before maybe your  
9480 constituents get wise about this, they start to realize that

9481 it is him, that it is you all not doing anything on this.

9482 \*Mr. Ruiz. I have two minutes left on my time.

9483 \*Mr. Soto. We would rather all of our constituents have  
9484 these BEAD programs deployed and get them Internet access,  
9485 rather than sitting here for four-plus months and being  
9486 persnickety about this and that and this and that. The plans  
9487 are approved. Have the Trump Administration deploy the  
9488 money. We have done it. We could all sit here together and  
9489 talk about how this is a bipartisan victory.

9490 I have rural areas. Most people in this room have rural  
9491 areas. This argument is getting old, and older by the day.

9492 And I yield back to the gentleman.

9493 \*The Chair. The gentleman will --

9494 \*Mr. Soto. It is his.

9495 \*Mr. Ruiz. And I yield to Mr. Carter.

9496 \*The Chair. Okay.

9497 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. You know, I am a real-life  
9498 example of a BEAD program that was stopped in its tracks.  
9499 Everything done, all of the studies, everything in place.  
9500 Louisiana was ready to go. The Trump Administration halted  
9501 it. So don't say that nothing has happened. Don't say that  
9502 nothing could happen. Louisiana is a perfect example of a  
9503 state that did everything right under a Democratic governor  
9504 and completed under a Republican governor. You can't blame  
9505 it on parties.

9506           Republican and Democrat both recognized that this is a  
9507   great program. Our Republican governor, Jeff Landry, hailed  
9508   and heralded this program, and was ready to go. It was  
9509   halted within moments of completion and ready to be on its  
9510   way to do just what it was supposed to do, and that is to lay  
9511   fiber and to provide connectivity to rural communities  
9512   throughout Louisiana. And this administration stopped it  
9513   with no good reason.

9514           I yield.

9515           \*Mr. Ruiz. And with that I yield back my time.

9516           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
9517   from Florida is recognized to speak on the amendment.

9518           \*Mr. Bilirakis. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield my  
9519   time to Mr. Hudson, the chairman of the subcommittee.

9520           \*Mr. Hudson. Well, thank you. I am excited. I mean,  
9521   this is great, that we have got bipartisan agreement that we  
9522   need to get BEAD funds out. And I -- I mean, I believe in  
9523   the sincerity of my colleagues, Mr. Ruiz and others.

9524           I have a bill called Speed for BEAD, and I would love  
9525   for you all to get on and work with me on it. I mean, we can  
9526   get this money out the door fast, and I think we ought to for  
9527   the very reasons each of you have articulated very, very  
9528   well.

9529           There is a new have and have-nots in society, and it is  
9530   the people that have access to broadband and those who don't.

9531 And, you know, I will be honest with you, a lot of folks  
9532 wanted me to kill the BEAD program. I went the different  
9533 direction. I went to the Speed the BEAD program as the name  
9534 of my bill, because the need is so dire out there in our  
9535 rural communities in particular. But even in some urban  
9536 communities we have got areas that don't have access.

9537 And I just asked my colleagues, please cosponsor the  
9538 bill. Please work with me. We can get this -- we could  
9539 actually get this bill into law quicker than the  
9540 reconciliation bill. And so let's do it.

9541 I yield back.

9542 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
9543 from Florida?

9544 \*Mr. Bilirakis. I yield back.

9545 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentlelady  
9546 from California, Ms. Barragan, is recognized for five minutes  
9547 to speak on the amendment.

9548 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I almost don't  
9549 know where to start. There is so many things that just  
9550 transpired.

9551 Why don't we start with who is going to benefit from the  
9552 taxes conversation that my colleague from Florida, who is  
9553 saying, oh, all these Californians, all these middle-income  
9554 people. The Center on Budget and Policy Priorities put out a  
9555 chart -- and I wish I had it printed -- that said House

9556 Republican tax plan bestows enormous tax cuts on the wealthy,  
9557 does little -- oh, I don't have this, it is not this one yet  
9558 -- does little for low and moderate-income families. And it  
9559 basically shows the top 1 percent would get \$64,770. The  
9560 bottom 20 percent, guess how much they get in tax cuts?  
9561 Ninety bucks. So when you talk about giving the tax cuts to  
9562 the rich, that is what we are talking about. It is just  
9563 making sure that people at the top get the biggest benefit  
9564 and, in some cases, of course, even skirt the whole rules  
9565 altogether.

9566 But I want to speak in favor of this amendment, Mr.  
9567 Chairman. This committee is being asked to make a choice, a  
9568 choice about who we serve, and this is where my chart comes  
9569 in. Spectrum auctions are projected to generate \$88 billion  
9570 for the Federal Government. That is a staggering amount of  
9571 money that we should use to invest in public safety, digital  
9572 equity, and essential services for the American people.

9573 But if you take a look at what they are going to do with  
9574 the \$80 billion, like, AI deployment, funds for Elon Musk and  
9575 his billionaire friends, it is like this much. You see that?  
9576 Of all this amount of money, right, you think you would be  
9577 investing in, like, actual technology. But you know why they  
9578 are doing this? They are doing it because they got to find  
9579 the money to pay for the tax cuts for the rich and the  
9580 wealthy and the billionaires, so they could take more private

9581 jet flights.

9582       They think it is funny, but it is true. And it is also  
9583 the reason why Medicaid is being cut. It is why they are  
9584 throwing millions of people off of health care.

9585       And so, yes, we have to make a choice. What are House  
9586 Republicans doing? Tax cuts for billionaires and personal  
9587 favors for Elon Musk. They want to use the Federal dollars  
9588 to pay for the tax cuts, while working families struggle to  
9589 pay for groceries, for rent, and Internet service. They want  
9590 to funnel 500 million directly into the pockets of Elon Musk  
9591 and his billionaire tech allies under the guise of deploying  
9592 artificial intelligence across the Federal Government. There  
9593 is no demonstrated need for this, no public demand, just a  
9594 payday for the rich.

9595       Spectrum auction revenue comes from the sale of public  
9596 assets and should be invested in public priorities. So how  
9597 should we use it? Well, we could fund the Next Generation  
9598 911 program to update our nation's aging 911 system so that  
9599 first responders can respond quickly and accurately when  
9600 lives are on the line. Every second counts in an emergency,  
9601 and this funding could mean the difference between life and  
9602 death. Unfortunately, our Republican colleagues just voted  
9603 down an amendment that would do just that.

9604       Now, we should make Internet access affordable for low-  
9605 income communities and expand broadband in rural and tribal

9606 communities. These investments are needed to overcome  
9607 barriers to keep people from accessing education, good jobs,  
9608 and critical health care. There is a troubling pattern here.  
9609 House Republicans do nothing while the Trump Administration  
9610 destroys broadband programs left and right.

9611         So we talk about the BEAD program. The BEAD program was  
9612 set to start building broadband infrastructure months ago,  
9613 but Republicans have needlessly paused program implementation  
9614 while they work to divert funds to Elon Musk's Starlink. Not  
9615 only is this unethical, but it also will deny rural  
9616 communities access to affordable and reliable Internet  
9617 infrastructure that they desperately need.

9618         And here is another interesting pattern, if you haven't  
9619 heard it. A minute ago, oh, the Biden Administration was so  
9620 quick to hurry up and get money out the door they did it  
9621 recklessly. Now the Biden Administration didn't get money  
9622 out enough -- quick enough on BEAD, right, because they had  
9623 all these regulations.

9624         This is just -- like, listening to this, it has to be  
9625 confusing for the American public. It is certainly confusing  
9626 for me, and it is totally inconsistent.

9627         I strongly support Representative Clarke's amendment,  
9628 but I doubt any Republicans here today will vote for this  
9629 strong, smart policy. Why not? Because it clearly doesn't  
9630 align with Republican priorities of higher prices and favors



9631 for Elon Musk and other billionaires.

9632 Let's be clear. We shouldn't serve billionaires. We  
9633 should serve the American people.

9634 And with that I ask that we support the amendment.

9635 I yield back.

9636 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
9637 discussion from members on the Republican side?

9638 Seeing none, on the Democrat side?

9639 The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for five minutes  
9640 to support --

9641 \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike  
9642 the last word.

9643 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

9644 \*Mr. Landsman. I support Representative Clarke's  
9645 amendment and the truth is I think we all would. I think  
9646 there is bipartisan support for taking the spectrum proceeds  
9647 and investing back into the system, whether it is NextGen 911  
9648 or access to the Internet for low-income families. If we  
9649 were up to our own devices, if it was on us, I suspect  
9650 everyone would support this amendment. We wouldn't spend \$88  
9651 billion of spectrum proceeds to pay for tax cuts that  
9652 absolutely, overwhelmingly benefit the wealthiest people in  
9653 this country.

9654 The only reason we are having this debate is because the  
9655 assignment from Republican leadership and President Trump was

9656 we want to pass tax cuts, tax cuts that overwhelmingly  
9657 support the wealthiest Americans. And you all have to find  
9658 800, \$900 billion in cuts, and so you went to health care and  
9659 about \$700 billion in cuts there, taking \$88 billion from  
9660 spectrum proceeds -- again, to pay for these tax cuts.

9661         So it has come up. So on the tax cuts themselves, as  
9662 one of my colleagues mentioned, the top 1 percent gets about  
9663 \$64,000 versus the bottom 20 percent, which is around 90  
9664 bucks. So if you look at that, you know, in terms of daily  
9665 relief, those making \$50,000 will receive \$0.72 per day.  
9666 Those who are making \$1 million or more will see their  
9667 wallets padded by \$223 a day. That is 310 times more money,  
9668 310 times more money for millionaires than middle-class  
9669 families making \$50,000 a year. Of the tax relief, 20  
9670 percent of the bill goes to the top 1 percent; 40 percent of  
9671 the bill goes to top 5 percent, which means the vast majority  
9672 of tax relief in this bill goes to the top 10 percent. So  
9673 that means 90 percent of folks aren't seeing the majority of  
9674 the benefits here.

9675         If it were up to us, if you all didn't have this  
9676 assignment, I think in this room -- but across the board --  
9677 we would have bipartisan support for tax cuts, for working  
9678 families, for middle-class families, for farmers, for small  
9679 businesses paid for not by adding a dollar to the debt, or  
9680 taking any money from people's health care, or stealing from

9681 the spectrum auction revenues. We would require those at the  
9682 top to pay all their taxes.

9683 As one of my colleagues mentioned that if you just take  
9684 the top marginal income tax rate and you let that expire,  
9685 that is anywhere between 250 to \$400 billion. If you take  
9686 the top -- the corporate tax rate from 21 to 28, not even  
9687 where it was 5 years ago, that is \$1.3 trillion.

9688 There are proposals that would require a minimum tax for  
9689 billionaires. That minimum tax produces \$500 billion,  
9690 meaning that if you just do those things requiring the folks  
9691 at the top to pay more in taxes -- not all of their taxes,  
9692 just more in taxes -- you would be able to pay for all of  
9693 the tax cuts for working people, small businesses, farmers.  
9694 Nobody would lose their health care. We would be able to  
9695 invest all of the auction dollars in NextGen 911 and  
9696 affordable, you know Internet for families all over the  
9697 country, and no one would lose their health care.

9698 And with that I yield back.

9699 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
9700 further discussion on -- the gentlelady from Virginia is  
9701 recognized for five minutes.

9702 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

9703 As I listened to the Republican complaints about the  
9704 delays in the BEAD program, those complaints are inconsistent  
9705 with their desire to avoid waste, fraud, and abuse. Those

9706 complaints ignore how broadband networks are actually  
9707 regulated and get deployed.

9708         For decades Congress left it to the states to come up  
9709 with the details for oversight of -- for the infrastructure  
9710 deployment for all communications networks. BEAD was no  
9711 exception. Congress charged the states to run the grant  
9712 program and to run the challenge process, and the states were  
9713 all over the map. Some, like Virginia, had established  
9714 broadband offices that were already providing and  
9715 infrastructure deployment grants through the competitive  
9716 bidding process with local government partnering providers --  
9717 with providers. But most states did not. They didn't have a  
9718 broadband office, they didn't have a process. They needed  
9719 time to get that going, hire staff, educate local governments  
9720 and providers, particularly the smaller providers and smaller  
9721 localities who weren't used to applying for these type of  
9722 grant programs.

9723         Official state and local activities have to comply with  
9724 open government and notice requirements to allow public input  
9725 so the public knows what is in the plan. And to the extent  
9726 these states didn't have an open process for the broadband  
9727 deployments and setting up the broadband office, that would  
9728 be a problem that could lead to waste, fraud, and abuse.

9729         Now, Federal dollars need to be spent and should be  
9730 spent to expand broadband to areas that are unserved. That

9731 means that you need to know where is served. That is why,  
9732 first, to avoid waste, we said you are going to use these  
9733 Federal funds for unserved areas and said, okay, we need to  
9734 figure out where they are, so we are going to have the FCC  
9735 create a broadband map.

9736         The FCC had to create a process for that, a public  
9737 process with input from every -- all the stakeholders. And  
9738 then the providers had to provide their data, and make sure  
9739 they did it in a way that protected competitively sensitive  
9740 data or national security infrastructure information. They  
9741 needed to set up a process for that. And the whole purpose  
9742 of this map process was to make sure we are not over-building  
9743 -- i.e. wasting Federal money -- building broadband networks  
9744 that were already served. All of that took time.

9745         Then you had to have a challenge process, because what  
9746 the maps show wouldn't necessarily account for projects that  
9747 were in the pipeline but not in the ground. That challenge  
9748 process took time.

9749         So all of this was not just the Biden Administration  
9750 sitting around saying, hmm, I have got this pot of money, I  
9751 am just going to sit on it, it was we need a process in place  
9752 to make sure that, when we use Federal funds, we don't waste  
9753 it, there is no fraud, and there is no abuse.

9754         Well, now we have done all that. Now all the states'  
9755 plans have been approved. We are ready to go. And the Trump

9756 Administration comes in and says, whoa, whoa, whoa, whoa, we  
9757 want to change the rules. Even though Congress said these  
9758 broadband networks have to be scalable and reliable, now the  
9759 new administration said, well, we want to use the least cost  
9760 technology, ignoring the fact that the places that are not  
9761 connected are the most expensive to connect to, and you need  
9762 to make sure that the technology you use is scalable and  
9763 reliable. But now they want to change the rules that all of  
9764 these plans were built on, and so you got to start the plan  
9765 process over.

9766         So we are ready to go. Now you are going to take the  
9767 time to restart the process all over again, and yet you  
9768 complain that it took so long, even though the reason it took  
9769 so long was to avoid waste, fraud, and abuse for Federal  
9770 funds to be used to deploy broadband to connect the people  
9771 that have been waiting to be connected.

9772         I yield back.

9773         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
9774 further discussion?

9775         Seeing none -- there is -- the gentleman from New Jersey  
9776 is recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

9777         \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I speak in support  
9778 of the amendment. I also wanted to follow up with my  
9779 colleague from Ohio's comments regarding how these tax cuts  
9780 disproportionately benefit the wealthiest in America.

9781           Our colleague from Florida said that she would wait all  
9782   night to hear how that would be the case, and so I just  
9783   wanted to leave the floor open, but to just repeat the facts.

9784           Under a straight TCJA extension, the top 0.01 percent --  
9785   so not even the 1 percent -- the 0.01 percent of earners  
9786   would receive 10 percent of the benefits from these  
9787   extensions. The top one percent of earners would receive a  
9788   quarter of the benefit from these extensions. The top 4  
9789   percent of earners would receive 45 percent of benefits from  
9790   extending the TCJA. So clearly, it disproportionately  
9791   impacts the top earners.

9792           I know Ways and Means is similarly in a markup, but as  
9793   my colleague from Ohio said, as you go through from the top  
9794   earners down you see that the top 1 percent would see a  
9795   roughly \$64,000 benefit from the proposed tax language, 99 to  
9796   -- 99 percent would receive 10,000, and it gets lower and  
9797   lower as you go down the economic brackets.

9798           So while there may be beneficial tax treatment to some  
9799   of our lower and middle-class neighbors, the bill  
9800   disproportionately impacts and benefits the top earners. So  
9801   since it was asked how that is the case, we just wanted to  
9802   lay out the facts as we understand them for our colleagues  
9803   across the aisle who had raised the question.

9804           With that I yield back.

9805           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any

9806 further discussion on the amendment?

9807 \*Mr. Pallone. We want a roll call.

9808 \*The Chair. Seeing none, if there is no further  
9809 discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment. A roll call  
9810 has been requested. The clerk will call the roll.

9811 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

9812 \*Mr. Latta. No.

9813 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

9814 Mr. Griffith?

9815 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

9816 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

9817 Mr. Bilirakis?

9818 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

9819 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

9820 Mr. Hudson?

9821 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

9822 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

9823 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

9824 [No response.]

9825 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?

9826 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

9827 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

9828 Mr. Dunn?

9829 [No response.]

9830 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?



9831 [No response.]

9832 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce?

9833 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

9834 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

9835 Mr. Weber?

9836 \*Mr. Weber. No.

9837 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

9838 Mr. Allen?

9839 \*Mr. Allen. No.

9840 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

9841 Mr. Balderson?

9842 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

9843 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

9844 Mr. Fulcher?

9845 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.

9846 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

9847 Mr. Pfluger?

9848 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

9849 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

9850 Mrs. Harshbarger?

9851 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

9852 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

9853 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

9854 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

9855 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

9856 Mrs. Cammack?  
9857 [No response.]  
9858 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
9859 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
9860 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
9861 Mr. James?  
9862 \*Mr. James. No.  
9863 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
9864 Mr. Bentz?  
9865 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
9866 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
9867 Mrs. Houchin?  
9868 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
9869 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
9870 Mr. Fry?  
9871 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
9872 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
9873 Ms. Lee?  
9874 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
9875 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
9876 Mr. Langworthy?  
9877 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
9878 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
9879 Mr. Kean?  
9880 \*Mr. Kean. No.

9881           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
9882           Mr. Rulli?  
9883           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
9884           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
9885           Mr. Evans?  
9886           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
9887           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
9888           Mr. Goldman?  
9889           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
9890           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
9891           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
9892           [No response.]  
9893           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak?  
9894           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
9895           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
9896           Mr. Pallone?  
9897           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
9898           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
9899           Ms. DeGette?  
9900           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
9901           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
9902           Ms. Schakowsky?  
9903           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
9904           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
9905           Ms. Matsui?

9906           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
9907           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
9908           Ms. Castor?  
9909           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
9910           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
9911           Mr. Tonko?  
9912           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
9913           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
9914           Ms. Clarke?  
9915           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
9916           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
9917           Mr. Ruiz?  
9918           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
9919           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
9920           Mr. Peters?  
9921           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
9922           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
9923           Mrs. Dingell?  
9924           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
9925           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
9926           Mr. Veasey?  
9927           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
9928           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
9929           Ms. Kelly?  
9930           \*Ms. Kelly.   Aye.

9931           \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
9932           Ms. Barragan?  
9933           \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
9934           \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
9935           Mr. Soto?  
9936           \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
9937           \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
9938           Ms. Schrier?  
9939           \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
9940           \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
9941           Mrs. Trahan?  
9942           \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
9943           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
9944           Mrs. Fletcher?  
9945           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
9946           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
9947           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
9948           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
9949           \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
9950           Mr. Auchincloss?  
9951           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
9952           \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
9953           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
9954           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
9955           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

9956 Mr. Menendez?  
9957 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
9958 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
9959 Mr. Mullin?  
9960 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
9961 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
9962 Mr. Landsman?  
9963 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
9964 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
9965 Ms. McClellan?  
9966 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
9967 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
9968 Chairman Guthrie?  
9969 \*The Chair. No.  
9970 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
9971 \*The Chair. Mr. Carter?  
9972 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia is not recorded.  
9973 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Carter votes no.  
9974 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
9975 \*The Chair. Mr. Crenshaw?  
9976 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.  
9977 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
9978 \*The Chair. Mrs. Cammack?  
9979 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.  
9980 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.

9981           \*The Chair. Anyone here to be recorded on the  
9982 Republican? Anyone on the Democrat side?

9983           Seeing none, the clerk will report.

9984           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were  
9985 24 ayes and 29 noes.

9986           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.

9987           \*Mr. Pallone. Matsui is next.

9988           \*The Chair. Are there further amendments? For what  
9989 purpose does the gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui, seek  
9990 recognition?

9991           \*Ms. Matsui. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the  
9992 desk.

9993           \*The Chair. State your amendment.

9994           \*Ms. Matsui. It is Comm8.

9995           \*The Clerk. Comm8, an amendment to the committee  
9996 print --

9997           \*The Chair. The clerk will report the amendment.

9998           \*The Clerk. Comm8, an amendment to the committee print  
9999 for Subtitle C, offered by Ms. Matsui. At the end of  
10000 Section --

10001           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
10002 amendment is dispensed with.

10003

10004

10005

10006           [The amendment of Ms. Matsui follows:]

10007

10008       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

10009



10010           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
10011 minutes in support of the amendment.

10012           \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment  
10013 seeks to ensure that, before we auction any spectrum, our  
10014 country's cabinet secretaries have received sufficient  
10015 cybersecurity training consistent with our government's  
10016 established security protocols, including on the use of  
10017 commercial messaging apps like Signal and Telemessage for  
10018 official purposes.

10019           Two weeks ago we had a subcommittee hearing on one of  
10020 the most -- on one of the worst hacks in U.S. history: Salt  
10021 Typhoon. A Chinese state-sponsored hacking group breached  
10022 the networks of at least nine American telecommunications  
10023 companies. These hackers stole Americans' call records and  
10024 targeted audio and text from high-profile individuals,  
10025 including people tied to the Trump Administration.

10026           Communications networks are the backbone of modern life,  
10027 which makes them ripe targets for attack. Salt Typhoon  
10028 should have been a wake-up call. They and other advanced  
10029 cyber attackers remain an active threat to Americans and our  
10030 national security. Yet the Trump Administration is busy  
10031 learning the wrong lessons, slashing our cyber defenses and  
10032 turning a blind eye to its own senior officials' cyber  
10033 malpractice.

10034           As one of his earliest acts in office, President Trump

10035 fired the Cyber Safety Review Board, cutting the  
10036 investigation into Salt Typhoon off at its knees. At last  
10037 month's hearing the former director of the Cyber Threat  
10038 Intelligence Integration Center confirmed that cutting off  
10039 the Salt Typhoon investigation this early short-changes our  
10040 national security by limiting our ability to get a full  
10041 picture from the intelligence community, law enforcement, and  
10042 the victim networks of how to improve our defenses.

10043 My Republican colleagues like to talk tough about  
10044 protecting America against foreign adversaries, but talk is  
10045 cheap. They refuse to hold this administration accountable  
10046 for compromising classified government information,  
10047 information that in the wrong hands could put American lives  
10048 in danger.

10049 President Trump has already weakened the United States'  
10050 ability to respond to and prepare for attacks on our critical  
10051 infrastructure. His administration is taking a wrecking ball  
10052 to our Federal cyber workforce, including plans to slash the  
10053 Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Agency, or CISA, by nearly  
10054 40 percent. And President Trump's latest budget proposal  
10055 would continue this carnage by CISA's cutting funding by  
10056 nearly half a billion dollars. This is not about trimming  
10057 the fat, but about crippling America's capability to defend  
10058 against malicious cyber actors.

10059 And to make matters worse, President Trump continues to

10060 stand by senior officials who broke security protocol.  
10061 President Trump is defending the indefensible, rallying  
10062 behind the blunders of his Secretary of Defense, who has  
10063 engaged in repeated security failures, including leaking  
10064 classified war plans to his wife and brother over an  
10065 unsecured Signal chat and reusing using compromised  
10066 passwords.

10067         Likewise, until a couple of weeks ago, the President was  
10068 standing blindly by his national security adviser, and  
10069 continues to stand by countless other senior officials who  
10070 use Signal and personal Gmail accounts to conduct sensitive  
10071 government business. These are not people who inspire  
10072 confidence that they will follow even basic cybersecurity  
10073 practices, much less guard our country's most sensitive  
10074 secrets.

10075         And it is not just embarrassing, it is dangerous. The  
10076 world is watching. Bad actors are ready to take advantage of  
10077 this administration's gross incompetence. Rather than  
10078 calling out this administration's security failures, my  
10079 Republican colleagues are sitting there -- sitting here today  
10080 trying to strip Americans of their health care and take away  
10081 the ability of our states to ensure the safe use of  
10082 artificial intelligence.

10083         Our nation's security depends on our top leaders, but  
10084 the Trump Administration seems to be woefully ignorant of

10085 basic security protocols. It is time for the Trump  
10086 administration to get its house in order and get serious  
10087 about protecting our communications infrastructure.

10088 For all these reasons I urge my colleagues to vote for  
10089 this common-sense amendment. With that I yield back the  
10090 balance of my time.

10091 \*Mr. Joyce. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields. The  
10092 gentleman from North Carolina is recognized.

10093 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you. I rise to speak in opposition  
10094 to this amendment.

10095 Last month Ms. Matsui and I held a hearing in the  
10096 Communications and Technology Subcommittee about the  
10097 importance of secure communications. Our committee led the  
10098 way to secure our mobile networks by passing the Secure and  
10099 Trusted Communications Act into law. We take threats to the  
10100 security of our communications infrastructure seriously.

10101 Our adversaries target our communication networks daily.  
10102 That is why secure communication platforms for our government  
10103 officials is crucial. However, this amendment has more to do  
10104 with politics than our national security, and I would just  
10105 pledge to all the members of this committee, Republicans and  
10106 Democrats, as chairman of the subcommittee I am happy to work  
10107 with anyone in good faith to improve the security of our  
10108 networks, of our communication platforms.

10109 But I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I

10110 yield back.

10111       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. Is there any further  
10112 discussion on the amendment?

10113       The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized.

10114       \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10115       This amendment is a step to move the country in the  
10116 right direction. We are currently facing an unprecedented  
10117 number of threats to our wireless networks from foreign cyber  
10118 hackers who are often backed by China, Russia, North Korea  
10119 and Iran. Most recently, this past fall, the U.S.  
10120 experienced a devastating Chinese state-sponsored attack on  
10121 these networks, known as Salt Typhoon, that targeted top  
10122 Democratic and Republican officials, showing that this is not  
10123 an issue that only impacts one party, but all Americans.

10124       While we often hear that there is bipartisan support for  
10125 defending our country against cyber threats, especially when  
10126 these threats involve matters of national security, I remain  
10127 deeply concerned about the ways that the Trump  
10128 Administration, including Elon Musk and DOGE, have been  
10129 weakening our country's cybersecurity defense system without  
10130 any pushback from congressional Republicans. Indeed, over  
10131 the last 100-plus days Musk and DOGE have been haphazardly  
10132 and indiscriminately cutting and slashing experienced public  
10133 servants, including our cyber workforce.

10134       Taken together, these actions have weakened our country

10135 and jeopardized American families' most sensitive personal  
10136 data by making it easier for foreign adversaries to access  
10137 it. This amendment begins to solve this problem.

10138 Making more spectrum available for commercial use is  
10139 important. But if we do not have the right people in place  
10140 to ensure that the wireless networks we use every single day  
10141 are safe and secure, then we are only harming ourselves.  
10142 With their recent actions, the Trump Administration is  
10143 clearly leaving us vulnerable to attack, yet my Republican  
10144 colleagues continue to stay silent on this critical matter.

10145 The truth is Republicans cannot continue to say that  
10146 they take threats from foreign actors seriously when the  
10147 Trump Administration is slashing our cyber workforce and  
10148 allowing unauthorized DOGE employees to access data on  
10149 demand. Very recently there was a Elon Musk press avail of  
10150 all the DOGE staffers that he has. Perhaps none is more well  
10151 known than big balls. Yet a Reuters exclusive states that  
10152 DOGE staffer big balls provided tech support to cyber crime  
10153 ring, records show. So clearly, if we don't have more  
10154 oversight of who is accessing this incredibly sensitive  
10155 information, then all Americans should be worried and calling  
10156 on their representatives, both Democrats and Republicans, to  
10157 take this issue more seriously than our colleagues across the  
10158 aisle are.

10159 For all these reasons, I urge my colleagues to support

10160 this worthwhile amendment, to help this country get back on  
10161 track, to make sure that we are building out our cyber  
10162 workforce and protecting the Americans that we are tasked  
10163 with protecting here in Congress.

10164 Thank you, and I yield back.

10165 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. Is there any further  
10166 discussion on the amendment?

10167 \*Mr. Pallone. We want a roll call.

10168 \*Mr. Joyce. Seeing none, the vote occurs on the  
10169 amendment. The gentleman requests a recorded vote, and the  
10170 clerk will call the roll.

10171 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

10172 \*Mr. Latta. No.

10173 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

10174 Mr. Griffith?

10175 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

10176 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

10177 Mr. Bilirakis?

10178 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

10179 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

10180 Mr. Hudson?

10181 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

10182 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

10183 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

10184 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

10185           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
10186           Mr. Palmer?  
10187           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
10188           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
10189           Mr. Dunn?  
10190           [No response.]  
10191           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
10192           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
10193           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
10194           Mr. Joyce?  
10195           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
10196           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
10197           Mr. Weber?  
10198           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
10199           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
10200           Mr. Allen?  
10201           [No response.]  
10202           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson?  
10203           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
10204           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
10205           Mr. Fulcher?  
10206           [No response.]  
10207           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger?  
10208           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
10209           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.



10210 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
10211 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
10212 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
10213 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
10214 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
10215 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
10216 Mrs. Cammack?  
10217 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.  
10218 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
10219 Mr. Obernolte?  
10220 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
10221 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
10222 Mr. James?  
10223 \*Mr. James. No.  
10224 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
10225 Mr. Bentz?  
10226 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
10227 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
10228 Mrs. Houchin?  
10229 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
10230 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
10231 Mr. Fry?  
10232 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
10233 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
10234 Ms. Lee?

10235           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
10236           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
10237           Mr. Langworthy?  
10238           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
10239           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
10240           Mr. Kean?  
10241           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
10242           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
10243           Mr. Rulli?  
10244           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
10245           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
10246           Mr. Evans?  
10247           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
10248           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
10249           Mr. Goldman?  
10250           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
10251           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
10252           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
10253           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
10254           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
10255           Mr. Pallone?  
10256           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
10257           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
10258           Ms. DeGette?  
10259           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.

10260           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
10261           Ms. Schakowsky?  
10262           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
10263           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
10264           Ms. Matsui?  
10265           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
10266           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
10267           Ms. Castor?  
10268           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
10269           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
10270           Mr. Tonko?  
10271           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
10272           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
10273           Ms. Clarke?  
10274           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
10275           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
10276           Mr. Ruiz?  
10277           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
10278           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
10279           Mr. Peters?  
10280           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
10281           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
10282           Mrs. Dingell?  
10283           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
10284           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

10285 Mr. Veasey?

10286 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

10287 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

10288 Ms. Kelly?

10289 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

10290 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

10291 Ms. Barragan?

10292 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.

10293 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.

10294 Mr. Soto?

10295 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

10296 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.

10297 Ms. Schrier?

10298 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

10299 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

10300 Mrs. Trahan?

10301 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

10302 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

10303 Mrs. Fletcher?

10304 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.

10305 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

10306 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

10307 [No response.]

10308 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss?

10309 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.

10310           \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
10311           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
10312           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
10313           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
10314           Mr. Menendez?  
10315           \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
10316           \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
10317           Mr. Mullin?  
10318           [No response.]  
10319           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman?  
10320           [No response.]  
10321           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan?  
10322           \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
10323           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
10324           Chairman Guthrie?  
10325           \*The Chair. No.  
10326           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
10327           \*Mr. Allen. Allen, no.  
10328           \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.  
10329           \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
10330           \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
10331           \*Mr. Joyce. How is Mr. Landsman recorded?  
10332           \*Mr. Landsman. Yes.  
10333           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes yes.  
10334           \*Mr. Joyce. How is Mr. Mullin recorded?

10335           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin is not recorded.

10336           \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

10337           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

10338           \*Voice. Ask if you are recorded.

10339           \*Mr. Tonko. Alex.

10340           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Am I recorded?

10341           \*The Clerk. The -- Ms. Ocasio-Cortez is not recorded.

10342           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Oh. Aye, please.

10343           \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

10344           \*Mr. Joyce. The clerk will report the results.

10345           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24

10346 ayes and 29 noes.

10347           \*Mr. Joyce. The amendment is not agreed to. Are there  
10348 further amendments?

10349           The gentlelady from Virginia will report her amendment.

10350           \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an  
10351 amendment at the desk titled Comm13.

10352           \*Mr. Joyce. The clerk will report the amendment.

10353           \*The Clerk. Amendment to the Committee print for  
10354 Subtitle C, offered by Ms. McClellan of Virginia. At the end  
10355 of Section 43101, insert the following.

10356           \*Mr. Joyce. Without objection, the reading of the  
10357 amendment is dispensed with.

10358

10359

10360 [The amendment of Ms. McClellan follows:]

10361

10362 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

10363

10364           \*Mr. Joyce. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
10365 minutes in support of her amendment.

10366           \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10367           This amendment would ensure that the proceeds from any  
10368 spectrum licensing or allocation, including the auction  
10369 authorized under this bill, would not line the pockets of the  
10370 president, government officials, or special government  
10371 officials like Elon Musk or their family members.

10372           This amendment ensures that these proceeds would not  
10373 benefit any entity that the president, a government official,  
10374 a special government official, or their family has an  
10375 ownership in would profit from the sale of this public asset.

10376           This amendment also would ensure that the FCC does not  
10377 collude with the president or other government officials to  
10378 influence the outcome of their legal battles.

10379           No one should use their position in government to enrich  
10380 themselves or their family members, yet we have seen the  
10381 President and Elon Musk in particular do just that since  
10382 coming into office. Whether it is accepting the gift of a  
10383 luxury plane from Qatar or other questionable payments from  
10384 foreign officials in violation of the emoluments clause and  
10385 numerous ethics rules, or turning the South Lawn of the White  
10386 House into a Tesla showroom, or opening an FCC investigation  
10387 of 60 Minutes three months after the President filed a  
10388 lawsuit against them, or whether it is reports of the



10389 controlling Paramount shareholder asking her lawyers to  
10390 settle the lawsuit with the President to increase the FCC's  
10391 chances of approving a merger, or whether it is changes to  
10392 the BEAD program that would benefit Starlink, or whether it  
10393 is any other action that benefits any of the companies that  
10394 Elon Musk currently has government contracts with, with  
10395 agencies that he is actively engaged in firing workers or  
10396 cutting their funding, all of this shows a disturbing pattern  
10397 of corruption and self-dealing in the first and second Trump  
10398 Administrations that should give everyone pause.

10399         The FCC was established as an independent expert agency,  
10400 not a tool of political retaliation, intimidation, extortion,  
10401 or bribery. Spectrum is a limited public resource, and its  
10402 proceeds should be used for the public good. And we have had  
10403 many discussions today about ways that that funding can be  
10404 used to invest in our communications infrastructure, to  
10405 invest in its cybersecurity, to invest in Next Generation 911  
10406 deployment. They should not -- spectrum auction proceeds  
10407 should not be used to line the pockets of government  
10408 officials, their families, or the ultra-wealthy.

10409         And fighting corruption in the Federal Government  
10410 shouldn't be a partisan issue because, whether it is this  
10411 President or a future president, this special employee named  
10412 Elon Musk or some in the future, we should ensure that the  
10413 FCC, in taking official actions or in selling public assets,

10414 does so for the public benefit and not for the benefit of  
10415 government officials and their families.

10416 Thank you, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

10417 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The chair  
10418 recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina.

10419 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I speak in  
10420 opposition to this amendment.

10421 You know, I am honestly a little bit at a loss because I  
10422 am not sure if this is our jurisdiction, and this seems to be  
10423 a politically motivated amendment.

10424 I mean, if you want to have a serious conversation about  
10425 this, I am happy to have a conversation, but this seems like  
10426 a politically motivated amendment. I mean, I agree with Ms.  
10427 Barragan. If we are going to do -- if we are not going to  
10428 have a serious, substantive discussion of this title, let's  
10429 move on and get to health care. But I oppose this amendment  
10430 because I think it is very political.

10431 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. Is there any further  
10432 discussion on the amendment?

10433 \*Ms. Castor. You know, I think I do. I think I do.

10434 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady is recognized.

10435 \*Ms. Castor. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10436 Ms. McClellan, I want to thank you for offering this  
10437 amendment. Here we are, in the dead of night, as there are  
10438 so many important things to talk about, about how powerful

10439 special interests want to rip health care away from almost 14  
10440 million Americans. You know, maybe rating the spectrum, all  
10441 of these invisible radio frequencies we rely on that are  
10442 there to serve the public, maybe that doesn't quite raise --  
10443 you know, it is not why a lot of people are sitting here in  
10444 the audience for this debate tonight.

10445 But this really does highlight the cronyism that is  
10446 going on right now because I remember very well we had a  
10447 committee meeting just a few weeks ago. We were talking  
10448 about spectrum, how important it is to keep it as a public  
10449 good.

10450 You know, Mr. Soto was absolutely right. When you are  
10451 in an area that suffers a lot of catastrophes, updating 911  
10452 is very important, so spectrum -- going to that modernization  
10453 is very important.

10454 But you have now touched on a particular point in  
10455 cronyism because I remember sitting in that hearing that we  
10456 had in Communications Subcommittee the day we were talking  
10457 about the broadband funding that is supposed to go out across  
10458 the country. And lo and behold, what popped up at that time  
10459 was Elon Musk coming in to cancel those funds that are  
10460 supposed to go out across the country to help people access  
10461 WiFi over broadband. And the reason this article probably  
10462 popped up via an algorithm is because Elon Musk said, "I am  
10463 going to cancel those dollars that have been appropriated by

10464 Congress'' that you explained very well why -- the process of  
10465 getting that out without any waste, with proper oversight.

10466 But see, Elon Musk has his eye on those dollars because  
10467 he has another company that doesn't rely on fiber, and fiber  
10468 is the most important thing you can do for a community to  
10469 attach them to the Internet. See, Elon Musk has kind of this  
10470 satellite Starlink company. And boy, he would love to get  
10471 his hands on those millions of dollars.

10472 So you have a few things going on here. You have taking  
10473 the public spectrum and using it, selling it to fund tax cuts  
10474 for the wealthy and well-connected. And then you have, yes,  
10475 cronyism, Elon Musk having his eye on those dollars that are  
10476 supposed to go provide fiber all across America, rural and  
10477 urban alike. And yet I think we all need to be aware of what  
10478 they plan to do to target these dollars to their cronies  
10479 along the way.

10480 So I will yield back to you, but I just want to thank  
10481 you for filing this amendment. It is an important amendment.

10482 I am going to -- Ms. McClellan, I am going to send her  
10483 my time.

10484 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Ms. Castor, or -- I can't  
10485 say your name -- the gentlewoman from Florida.

10486 The FCC is squarely within this committee's  
10487 jurisdiction. Spectrum auctions are clearly within this  
10488 committee's jurisdiction.

10489           At our oversight plan markup, I offered another  
10490 amendment to talk about ensuring -- as part of our oversight  
10491 duties, we would make sure that the FCC wasn't being  
10492 weaponized against the President's perceived political  
10493 enemies. And one of the ways the FCC is being weaponized is  
10494 to also put pressure on entities that are involved in  
10495 litigation with the President, which I am very concerned  
10496 about.

10497           And I agree with my colleague from Virginia. I would  
10498 add to the duties that we have. He mentioned two. One of  
10499 our duties is oversight. And as part of our oversight  
10500 responsibilities, we need to look at the fact that a man who  
10501 has been given the keys, effectively, to the kingdom, who is  
10502 accessing all kinds of sensitive government data, who is  
10503 firing people when he doesn't even know what they do, who is  
10504 canceling government contracts, who is deciding what should  
10505 get funded and what shouldn't, at the same time has multiple  
10506 companies that have government contracts with agencies  
10507 including the FCC through Starlink and, as you heard, would  
10508 directly benefit from the changes that the Secretary of  
10509 Commerce wants to make to the BEAD program.

10510           And all this amendment does is say, when we sell a  
10511 public asset in spectrum, we are going to make sure that it  
10512 is not used to line Elon Musk's pocket, President Trump's  
10513 pocket, or any other government employee or their family

10514 today or in the future.

10515 I yield back.

10516 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentlelady from  
10517 California is recognized.

10518 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I didn't  
10519 expect to speak, but since my name was evoked [sic] -- and I  
10520 think inappropriately -- because my colleague Mr. Hudson  
10521 said, "I agree with Ms. Barragan that this is political."'  
10522 That is actually the opposite of what I was saying. I was I  
10523 was talking about the --

10524 \*Mr. Hudson. Would the -- would you yield?

10525 \*Ms. Barragan. No, I am going to respond --

10526 \*Mr. Hudson. You are quoting me incorrectly. Would you  
10527 yield?

10528 \*Ms. Barragan. -- invoking my name, and making my  
10529 point, and that is --

10530 \*Mr. Hudson. Would the gentlelady yield?

10531 \*Ms. Barragan. -- Let me finish my remarks.

10532 This has to be an amendment that is necessary. And it  
10533 may seem political to you, but just look at what is going on  
10534 in the world today. Just today the President stepped on the  
10535 plane that was given to him from Qatar. I mean, seriously,  
10536 guys?

10537 This whole amendment is about not benefiting the  
10538 President of the United States. By the way, President Trump

10539 said -- and I am quoting -- when pressed about the jet, "Only  
10540 stupid people reject gifts.'" This was the President's  
10541 comments today.

10542         So why do we need this amendment? For this very reason.  
10543 The corruption that is happening right now with this  
10544 administration and dead silence on the other side. So, yes,  
10545 does it feel political because it is your President doing the  
10546 corruption? I could see why that would be uncomfortable.

10547         I also want to quote this NPR article from May 7, "How  
10548 Trump Family Business Ventures Stand to Directly Benefit the  
10549 President.'" "The Trump family businesses, including their  
10550 crypto company, are capitalizing on the President's position  
10551 and creating unprecedented conflicts of interest.'"

10552         So why do we need this amendment? Come on. Do you even  
10553 have to ask? It is so obvious, the corruption that is  
10554 happening at the highest levels of government with this  
10555 administration. How do you just stand silent and say nothing  
10556 about that, and then question why this amendment is even  
10557 needed?

10558         I mean, frankly, it is a sad day in America when you  
10559 need this amendment, when you need an amendment that says  
10560 that a president is not going to benefit or that officials  
10561 aren't going to benefit, but that is where we are today and  
10562 what is happening in America.

10563         So I just want to make sure that my name being invoked

10564 was not invoked in the "Well, I agree with Ms. Barragan that  
10565 this is political'' was really taken out of context.

10566 And so with that I just --

10567 \*Mr. Hudson. Would the gentlelady yield?

10568 \*Ms. Barragan. My colleague, Robin Kelly, would like a  
10569 moment.

10570 \*Mr. Hudson. Would the gentlelady yield?

10571 \*Ms. Barragan. In a second.

10572 \*Ms. Kelly. After me.

10573 \*Mr. Hudson. Facts don't matter.

10574 \*Ms. Kelly. I just wanted to make the comment that  
10575 Representative McClellan is one of the most thoughtful,  
10576 brilliant legislators, and she is very new to this committee,  
10577 but I am so glad that she is on it and that she is a Member  
10578 of Congress. And to say what she is doing is political when  
10579 you clearly said, whether it is this president or the future  
10580 president, which you know will probably be a Democrat --

10581 [Laughter.]

10582 \*Ms. Kelly. -- that -- so really, I just wanted to  
10583 speak up about that. And this is very necessary, as my  
10584 colleague said, because of what is going on. It is a shame  
10585 that we have been pushed to have to have an amendment like  
10586 this, but it is very necessary. And again, whether it is a  
10587 Democrat, Republican, that does not matter. We just need to  
10588 do the right thing. We need to be lawful, and we need not



10589 make money off of the presidency or our cronies or how kids  
10590 make money, either.

10591 I yield back to my colleague from California.

10592 \*Ms. Barragan. And I yield to Mr. Hudson.

10593 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, I appreciate that. The -- what  
10594 I said that I agreed with you is that you said we ought to  
10595 move on to health care and have that discussion. And my --  
10596 what I -- the point I said was, if we are not going to have a  
10597 substantive discussion on this title, let's move on to the  
10598 next title.

10599 \*Ms. Barragan. Okay. So this is again taking my words  
10600 out of context. I did not say let's move on. Like, let's  
10601 skip over this. What I said -- and let me reiterate -- it is  
10602 shameful, shameful, shameful, shameful that Republicans are  
10603 in control, decided to put Medicaid and health care last. We  
10604 are now after 11:30 p.m. And why is it happening? Because  
10605 Republicans don't want it to happen during the day, when  
10606 people are up, when people are watching TV. They want the  
10607 crowd to thin out. And we have seen, by the way, the crowd  
10608 thin out because people are here with kids, they are here  
10609 with disabled kids because this is a life-and-death  
10610 situation.

10611 So if you are going to characterize what I say, at least  
10612 get it right, please. Because it is offensive to me and it  
10613 is, frankly, offensive to the people in this crowd who have

10614 come out here to advocate for Medicaid and their rights and  
10615 their health care, okay?

10616 Again, you all made the decision. Republicans made the  
10617 decision not to talk about health care first. They could  
10618 have started with that at 2:00. They could have done it at  
10619 the second topic. They didn't do it, and they clearly are  
10620 leaving it until the end.

10621 With that I yield back.

10622 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. Is there any  
10623 further discussion?

10624 \*Mr. Pallone. We ask for a roll --

10625 \*Mr. Joyce. Seeing none, a vote will occur, and there  
10626 is a request for a roll call vote. The clerk will call the  
10627 vote.

10628 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

10629 \*Mr. Latta. No.

10630 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

10631 Mr. Griffith?

10632 [No response.]

10633 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis?

10634 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

10635 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

10636 Mr. Hudson?

10637 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

10638 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

10639 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

10640 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

10641 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

10642 Mr. Palmer?

10643 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

10644 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

10645 Mr. Dunn?

10646 [No response.]

10647 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

10648 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

10649 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

10650 Mr. Joyce?

10651 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

10652 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

10653 Mr. Weber?

10654 \*Mr. Weber. No.

10655 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

10656 Mr. Allen?

10657 [No response.]

10658 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson?

10659 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

10660 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

10661 Mr. Fulcher?

10662 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.

10663 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

10664 Mr. Pfluger?  
10665 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
10666 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
10667 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
10668 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
10669 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
10670 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
10671 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
10672 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
10673 Mrs. Cammack?  
10674 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.  
10675 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
10676 Mr. Obernolte?  
10677 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
10678 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
10679 Mr. James?  
10680 \*Mr. James. No.  
10681 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
10682 Mr. Bentz?  
10683 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
10684 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
10685 Mrs. Houchin?  
10686 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
10687 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
10688 Mr. Fry?

10689           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
10690           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
10691           Ms. Lee?  
10692           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
10693           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
10694           Mr. Langworthy?  
10695           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
10696           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
10697           Mr. Kean?  
10698           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
10699           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
10700           Mr. Rulli?  
10701           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
10702           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
10703           Mr. Evans?  
10704           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
10705           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
10706           Mr. Goldman?  
10707           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
10708           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
10709           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
10710           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
10711           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
10712           Mr. Pallone?  
10713           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.

10714           \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
10715           Ms. DeGette?  
10716           \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
10717           \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
10718           Ms. Schakowsky?  
10719           \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
10720           \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
10721           Ms. Matsui?  
10722           \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
10723           \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
10724           Ms. Castor?  
10725           \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
10726           \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
10727           Mr. Tonko?  
10728           \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
10729           \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
10730           Ms. Clarke?  
10731           \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
10732           \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
10733           Mr. Ruiz?  
10734           \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
10735           \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
10736           Mr. Peters?  
10737           \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
10738           \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

10739 Mrs. Dingell?  
10740 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
10741 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
10742 Mr. Veasey?  
10743 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
10744 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
10745 Ms. Kelly?  
10746 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
10747 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
10748 Ms. Barragan?  
10749 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
10750 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
10751 Mr. Soto?  
10752 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
10753 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
10754 Ms. Schrier?  
10755 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
10756 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
10757 Mrs. Trahan?  
10758 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
10759 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
10760 Mrs. Fletcher?  
10761 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
10762 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
10763 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

10764           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.

10765           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

10766           Mr. Auchincloss?

10767           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.

10768           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

10769           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

10770           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.

10771           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

10772           Mr. Menendez?

10773           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.

10774           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.

10775           Mr. Mullin?

10776           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.

10777           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.

10778           Mr. Landsman?

10779           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

10780           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

10781           Ms. McClellan?

10782           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

10783           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

10784           Chairman Guthrie?

10785           \*The Chair.   No.

10786           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

10787           \*Mr. Allen.   How is Allen --

10788           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen is not recorded.



10789           \*Mr. Allen.   Allen votes no.

10790           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.

10791           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mr. Griffith recorded?

10792           \*Mr. Griffith.   Griffith votes no.

10793           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.

10794           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the result.

10795           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
10796 ayes and 29 noes.

10797           \*Mr. Joyce.   The amendment is not agreed to.   Are there  
10798 further amendments?

10799           For what purpose does the gentleman seek recognition?

10800           \*Mr. Pallone.   Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the  
10801 desk that is titled Comm19, C-o-m-m-19.

10802           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the amendment.

10803           \*The Clerk.   Amendment to the Committee print for  
10804 Subtitle C, offered by Mr. Pallone.   Page 6, strike line 4 --

10805           \*Mr. Joyce.   Without objection, the reading of the  
10806 amendment is dispensed with.

10807           [The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]

10808

10809           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

10810

10811           \*Mr. Joyce. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
10812 minutes in support of the amendment.

10813           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

10814           The Republicans want to impose a 10-year ban on states'  
10815 ability to enforce their own laws protecting consumers from  
10816 harms caused by artificial intelligence and automated  
10817 decision-making systems. And let me be clear, this is an  
10818 unprecedented giveaway to big tech. This 10-year enforcement  
10819 ban will allow big tech to run roughshod over American  
10820 consumers, including our children and teens whose lives at  
10821 school and at home are increasingly intertwined with AI  
10822 models and automated decision-making systems.

10823           Last Congress, at the request of big tech, Republicans  
10824 refused to move a bipartisan, comprehensive privacy bill that  
10825 would have provided important guardrails on the use of  
10826 consumers' personal information by AI systems. By contrast,  
10827 states across the country have been working hard to protect  
10828 their residents from harmful uses of AI. They have enacted  
10829 laws that protect consumers' privacy, prohibit the use of AI  
10830 to commit financial fraud and to steal elections, prohibit  
10831 algorithmic bias in housing and credit, prohibit harmful uses  
10832 of facial recognition technology, and protect consumers from  
10833 AI systems that put their mental health and physical safety  
10834 at risk.

10835           Now, Congress, in my opinion, should be learning from

10836 the work done by the states. We should be working to enact  
10837 Federal laws that protect consumers from the negative  
10838 consequences of poorly understood AI models and badly-  
10839 designed, automated decision-making systems, but instead the  
10840 House Republicans are leaving American consumers, and  
10841 especially our children, at the mercy of big tech and their  
10842 powerful and invasive algorithms while the Republicans in  
10843 Congress sit on their hands.

10844 If this provision becomes law, states will be powerless  
10845 to respond to harmful uses of artificial intelligence and  
10846 automated decision-making systems for the next decade. And  
10847 that includes threats we know exist today and threats that we  
10848 cannot currently imagine that arise over the next 10 years.  
10849 My amendment would strip the ban from the legislation before  
10850 us today, and I strongly urge my colleagues to vote for this  
10851 amendment and stop this big tech giveaway.

10852 I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

10853 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman --

10854 \*Mr. Pallone. Did you want my time or -- no?

10855 I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

10856 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
10857 California is recognized.

10858 \*Mr. Obernolte. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last  
10859 word in opposition to the amendment.

10860 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

10861           \*Mr. Obernolte. Mr. Chairman, let me start with the  
10862 things we agree on. And I appreciate the gentleman from New  
10863 Jersey's comments on the topic. I noticed that the amendment  
10864 he has offered does not strike the first part of this title,  
10865 which is to appropriate \$500 million to the Department of  
10866 Commerce for the purpose of using artificial intelligence to  
10867 modernize Federal Government, and I am hoping that, in  
10868 choosing to strike the second part of the title and not the  
10869 first part of the title, it means that we are in agreement  
10870 about how important this is.

10871           This funding will bring the same gains in productivity  
10872 and efficiency that AI has brought to the private sector to  
10873 Federal Government. It will allow our Federal employees to  
10874 do their jobs more efficiently, and it will make us better  
10875 stewards of taxpayer money and allow us to provide better  
10876 customer service to our constituents, so I am glad we agreed  
10877 on that much.

10878           But the second part of this title is equally important,  
10879 because it is safeguards that investment by imposing a  
10880 moratorium. And let me explain why that moratorium is so  
10881 important to safeguard the investment. Right now there are  
10882 over 1,000 bills on the topic of AI regulation pending in  
10883 state legislatures across the country. Imagine how difficult  
10884 it would be for a Federal agency that operates in all 50  
10885 states to have to navigate this labyrinth of regulation when

10886 we potentially have 50 different states going 50 different  
10887 directions on the topic of AI regulation. And in fact, this  
10888 is exactly the same circumstance that we are putting private  
10889 industry in as they attempt to deploy AI.

10890 And the gentleman was talking about the potential  
10891 hazards of AI, which I completely agree with. But Article I  
10892 of the U.S. Constitution gives the ability to regulate  
10893 interstate commerce exclusively to this body, to the  
10894 Congress, not to the states. And so much of this deployment  
10895 of AI is obviously interstate commerce.

10896 Now, no one is suggesting that AI should be unregulated.  
10897 I certainly don't believe that. I don't think anyone on this  
10898 dais believes that. But the appropriate body for doing that  
10899 regulation is the U.S. Congress. And colleagues, we have the  
10900 ability to do this.

10901 Last year I had the honor of chairing the House Task  
10902 Force on Artificial Intelligence, along with my co-chair,  
10903 Congressman Ted Lieu, and we had 24 very talented and engaged  
10904 Members, 12 from both sides of the aisle. And we had 25  
10905 hearings last year, we spent hundreds of hours on this topic,  
10906 and we came up with, in December, a proposed Federal  
10907 regulatory framework for AI. It is 270 pages long. We made  
10908 over 60 key findings and 85 different recommendations. And  
10909 colleagues, this was unanimously approved by all 24 members  
10910 of our task force. It was approved by the minority leader

10911 and his staff. It was approved by the Speaker and his staff.

10912       You should have seen what was on the cutting-room floor.

10913 These 270 pages are what we can all agree on. And we have an

10914 entire chapter in this report on the topic of preemption. So

10915 what I think needs to happen is that Congress needs to get

10916 its act together and codify some of the things in this

10917 report, and that will enact a Federal regulatory framework

10918 that establishes an appropriate balance between protecting

10919 American consumers from harm while simultaneously allowing

10920 innovation to thrive. Because, colleagues, if we don't do

10921 this, the people that we are hurting the worst is the

10922 entrepreneurs.

10923       If you are a Google -- I mean, the assertion by the

10924 gentleman was that this is a giveaway to big tech. Let me

10925 tell you, if you are Google, you might not like regulation,

10926 but you have got buildings full of lawyers that can help you

10927 deal with it, even if it is 50 different states regulating in

10928 different directions. The people who can't deal with that

10929 are two people in a garage somewhere trying to start the next

10930 Google, and those are the people that we need to be concerned

10931 about.

10932       So colleagues, I urge you to vote against this

10933 amendment. I think a moratorium is appropriate, and then

10934 that will allow us a little bit of runway to get our job done

10935 and regulate this at the Federal level.

10936           And let me just say in closing here that the states, the  
10937 governors of the various states, agree with me. So just  
10938 tonight Governor Polis of Colorado, who has enacted some of  
10939 the furthest-reaching legislation, state legislation on AI  
10940 regulation, said he thinks this moratorium is a good idea.  
10941 And red state governors have said it, too. And let me submit  
10942 to you, when you have got governors from red states and blue  
10943 states saying this is not something states ought to be doing,  
10944 the Federal Government ought to be doing this, we should  
10945 listen to them.

10946           So I urge rejection of this amendment. And once we get  
10947 this passed, please, let's get together and let's enact a  
10948 Federal regulatory framework for AI. Because the only way we  
10949 could do something durable is if we do it together. It has  
10950 got to be bipartisan.

10951           I yield back.

10952           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
10953 California, Mr. Peters, is recognized.

10954           \*Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is a close  
10955 call for me.

10956           I would say to my colleague, Mr. Obernolte, I believe  
10957 very much that this is an issue that requires Federal action.  
10958 I think preemption is appropriate. Just as I said in the  
10959 context of privacy, I think there should be one standard. My  
10960 problems with this amendment are two: one is we don't have a

10961 standard that we are offering, and I think the moratorium is  
10962 too long, we, we should be able to do it in a much shorter  
10963 period of time.

10964 So I want to just indicate that I will support this  
10965 amendment, but I am very interested in working with you and  
10966 the rest of Congress to get on top of this, to get a privacy  
10967 standard here, to get an AI regime in place, and I will  
10968 certainly support preemption, because I do believe one  
10969 standard is the right standard.

10970 And I yield back.

10971 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentlelady from  
10972 California, Ms. Matsui, is recognized.

10973 \*Ms. Matsui. I move to strike the last word.

10974 California not only has been an engine of AI innovation,  
10975 but my state has also been a national leader in ensuring we  
10976 balance innovation and competition with transparency and  
10977 common-sense safeguards. To stall any state or local  
10978 legislative progress on artificial intelligence for a decade  
10979 is a slap in the face to American consumers. Not allowing  
10980 the states to provide common-sense safeguards to promote AI  
10981 safety, transparency, and non-discrimination leaves consumers  
10982 vulnerable to the harms that AI, when left unchecked, can  
10983 cause to their health, their jobs, their education, and  
10984 ultimately, their lives.

10985 For example, California requires consent before using a



10986 deceased person's likeness, an AI-generated replica. There  
10987 is no Federal protection that does this. California law also  
10988 helps students prepare for the jobs of the future by  
10989 incorporating AI literacy in their education. At the moment  
10990 there is no Federal program that supports this. And there  
10991 are other AI bills in the pipeline that would help  
10992 Californians, from ensuring safe, generative AI use on our  
10993 critical infrastructure to guaranteeing that insurance  
10994 companies disclose AI use on decisions that impact consumer  
10995 applications and claims.

10996         The U.S. should be leading in the global race for AI  
10997 dominance. If we don't lead, others will. However, we can't  
10998 shoot ourselves in the foot by stopping the good work that  
10999 states have done and will continue to do.

11000         We in Congress should also be working towards tailored  
11001 and consensus-driven legislation that empowers the use of AI.  
11002 As we do so, the example of what has worked and what has not  
11003 worked in states will provide critical insight. I urge my  
11004 colleagues not to deny us that insight, and not deny our  
11005 states the right to foster innovation by providing critical  
11006 safeguards for rapidly-evolving technologies.

11007         We have done great bipartisan work in this committee  
11008 before, and I hope we can continue to do so, not jam through  
11009 a provision that rolls back the progress our states have made  
11010 to protect consumers and advance responsible AI development.

11011 I yield back.

11012 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentlelady from  
11013 Florida is recognized.

11014 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11015 Well, colleagues, this is a shocking surprise addition  
11016 to the billionaire tax-giveaway package. I guess we  
11017 shouldn't be so surprised, however, because the big tech  
11018 companies have had all too much power here in Washington,  
11019 D.C. I have watched for many years as they have blocked our  
11020 efforts to pass a privacy law so that you are not constantly  
11021 surveilled and your data, personal private data, not gathered  
11022 and used against you and sold to data brokers. I have  
11023 watched for years as we have tried to protect kids online,  
11024 whether that is their own privacy through the Children's  
11025 Online Privacy Protection Act, or maybe it is the way they  
11026 design apps, you know, we tried to do a design code or the  
11027 Kids Online Safety Act. Tech companies, with the help of the  
11028 Speaker, blocked that last year, even though it passed the  
11029 Senate in a bipartisan way.

11030 But, boy, this one takes the cake, a 10-year moratorium  
11031 to on states that they can't do anything to keep the citizens  
11032 of their states safe from some of the malign influences of  
11033 artificial intelligence. Well, I thought -- and people are -  
11034 - they are sending in letters on this, and I thought I would  
11035 just read a few of them.

11036           Encode and FairPlay says, "AI companies would get  
11037 exactly what they want: no rules, no accountability, and  
11038 total control. Bills addressing deep fakes, modernizing  
11039 state child sexual abuse, material laws, hypersexualized AI  
11040 companions, social media recommendation algorithms,  
11041 protections for whistleblowers, and more. It ties lawmakers'  
11042 hands for a decade, sidelining policymakers and leaving  
11043 families on their own as they face risks and harms that  
11044 emerge with this fast-evolving technology.'`

11045           Here is one from Common Sense Media: "At a time when  
11046 parents and kids are looking to their elected lawmakers for  
11047 reasonable guardrails for safe AI use, and when states are  
11048 beginning to take thoughtful action, the U.S. House Energy  
11049 and Commerce Committee is instead considering legislation to  
11050 put industry interests over our kids' safety. Consumer  
11051 reports says the language would prohibit the enforcement of  
11052 laws already passed by many states and would prohibit the  
11053 enforcement of future AI protections. Congress has long  
11054 abdicated its responsibility to pass laws to address emerging  
11055 consumer protection harms.'`

11056           Issue One says preemption -- "its extremely  
11057 consequential decision that deserves robust, transparent  
11058 debate, not a blank check for the tech companies tucked into  
11059 the reconciliation package.'`

11060           That is what this is. We have had no hearings on a 10-

11061 year moratorium, this gift to big tech. And we have to pass  
11062 this Pallone amendment to rein in these abuses.

11063 I yield back.

11064 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentlewoman  
11065 from Florida, Ms. Lee, is recognized.

11066 \*Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

11067 And colleagues, it is important for us to understand  
11068 what this provision brings to bear for our government and the  
11069 future of how we conduct business and provide services to the  
11070 American people.

11071 First, again, this will allow us to invest in our  
11072 government infrastructure in a way that brings modern  
11073 technology to our Federal workers, allows us to utilize, to  
11074 analyze, to understand our data, and to bring efficiency, the  
11075 same efficiencies that we are all using in our personal lives  
11076 that are being used in the private sector, to bring that to  
11077 government to increase our capacity and the type of services  
11078 and the way in which we can provide them to the American  
11079 people.

11080 Second, moratorium. I agree wholeheartedly that the  
11081 concept of preemption is something that we should consider  
11082 carefully and thoroughly. But this is precisely the type of  
11083 use case where it is warranted. Artificial intelligence, as  
11084 we all know, is revolutionizing sectors across America. To  
11085 create a patchwork of regulatory schemes from amongst the 50

11086 states will absolutely stifle innovation and growth and the  
11087 ability of companies across the spectrum, whether large or  
11088 small, to comply, and to continue to innovate, and to  
11089 continue to keep America as the leader when it comes to  
11090 artificial intelligence.

11091       Most particularly, just as Chairman Obernolte pointed  
11092 out, the largest of the companies, the big tech companies,  
11093 those are the ones who will be most able to comply with the  
11094 patchwork of regulations from 50 different states. The ones  
11095 who will not are the small companies, the innovators, the  
11096 ones who are going to bring us the technology of tomorrow  
11097 that we don't even anticipate today. It is those companies  
11098 that we most need to ensure are equipped to continue their  
11099 important work. That is how we stay a leader in this  
11100 technology.

11101       So for these reasons, I do believe that this is the  
11102 moment that preemption is appropriate. If there was ever  
11103 something affecting interstate commerce, certainly it is  
11104 this. And also, this is how we ensure not only that we are  
11105 meeting the needs of the American people, but we also are  
11106 ensuring that we are not impeding continued progress and  
11107 innovation in the field of artificial intelligence.

11108       And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield the balance of my  
11109 time to Mr. Obernolte.

11110       \*Mr. Obernolte. I thank the -- my colleague and member

11111 of the AI Task Force for yielding just to mention a few of  
11112 the things that have been talked about.

11113         First of all, the length of the moratorium. To be  
11114 clear, no one wants this to go on for 10 years. I would be  
11115 overjoyed if six months from now we were presenting together  
11116 a bill that established an appropriate level of preemption  
11117 and codified a Federal regulatory framework. But as anyone  
11118 that served on the task force on either side of the aisle  
11119 will tell you, the landscape of all the different power  
11120 players in artificial intelligence is very complex. And no  
11121 matter what is done, there will be winners and losers. The  
11122 moratorium has to be long enough to make it clear to  
11123 everybody that the Federal regulatory system is the only game  
11124 in town when it comes to interstate commerce, and that is why  
11125 the moratorium needs to be longer.

11126         Another thing that has been said is the -- it has been  
11127 asserted that AI is largely unregulated now. As we make  
11128 clear in our report, that is absolutely not true. In fact,  
11129 what we are all advocating for is an embrace of sectoral  
11130 regulation. And our sectoral regulators already have most of  
11131 the authorities they need to regulate within their sectoral  
11132 spaces. In fact, the FDA has already approved over 1,000  
11133 permits for the use of AI in medical devices, which is just  
11134 about the highest-risk use case that you could come up with  
11135 for AI. So we -- our regulators are already on the case. We

11136 need to back them up with a Federal regulatory framework, but  
11137 we have got a little bit of runway to do that.

11138 And the third and last point I wanted to make is that  
11139 preemption here is not going to be total. There is room for  
11140 the states to innovate in this space. And we devote an  
11141 entire chapter of our task force report to the issue of  
11142 preemption because it is very complex.

11143 And I apologize, we have had it out electronically since  
11144 December. We will get a copy of this on everyone's desk. It  
11145 has taken four months to navigate the Office of Government  
11146 Printing. We probably needed some AI for that, but we will  
11147 make sure everyone has a copy of this.

11148 But what we need is a Federal framework that establishes  
11149 some guardrails for where regulation is preempted as  
11150 interstate commerce to the Federal Government and, outside of  
11151 those guardrails, where the states are free to be the  
11152 laboratories of democracy that they are. And I think that we  
11153 are very capable of passing that and establishing that in a  
11154 way that makes everyone happy.

11155 I yield back.

11156 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The chair recognizes  
11157 the gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko.

11158 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the  
11159 last word.

11160 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

11161           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you. I support the amendment by Mr.  
11162 Pallone.

11163           A 10-year ban, really? AI isn't just transforming our  
11164 economy, it is reshaping our society, our rights, our  
11165 workforce, and even our grasp of the truth. But while the  
11166 risks grow more urgent by the day, the Federal Government has  
11167 failed to meet the moment. In fact, it has done the  
11168 opposite. Instead of leading, this administration and  
11169 Republicans in Congress are bowing to pleas of Big Tech to  
11170 enact weak AI policy that will preempt stronger state  
11171 efforts.

11172           In my home state of New York, lawmakers have introduced  
11173 bills that recognize the urgent threat of unregulated AI that  
11174 take steps to protect civil rights and promote transparency.  
11175 These state bills confront threats like algorithmic  
11176 discrimination head on so AI can't be used to deny people  
11177 jobs, loans, or public benefits simply because the systems  
11178 were built and trained on biased data.

11179           State action is not a roadblock to progress. It is the  
11180 driver of progress. That is how we got clean air laws,  
11181 privacy protection, and civil rights. Strong regulation is  
11182 not about stifling innovation. It is about safeguarding  
11183 communities from potential harm like bias, like  
11184 discrimination, and the erosion of fundamental rights.

11185           I introduced a bill this Congress to protect Americans



11186 from the weaponization of AI by sports betting companies. In  
11187 the absence of Federal action on gambling regulation,  
11188 lawmakers at the state level are pursuing their own. For  
11189 example, an Illinois state senator took a provision directly  
11190 from my bill, the SAFE Bet Act, that would prohibit  
11191 sportsbooks from using AI to track their customers' habits,  
11192 offer personalized promotions to keep betting, or create  
11193 gambling products like micro bets.

11194         If Republicans successfully infringe upon states' rights  
11195 to protect their constituents with this moratorium, sports  
11196 books will continue running wild, experimenting on their  
11197 consumers and fueling gambling addiction -- gambling  
11198 addiction, which has the highest rate of attempted suicide of  
11199 any addiction.

11200         While we sit here all night to rip health care away from  
11201 nearly 14 millions of Americans, why not also turbocharge the  
11202 next public health crisis?

11203         I have no doubt AI can deliver major benefits to  
11204 Americans, but AI is just a tool, and the use of AI is not  
11205 inherently good. In fact, there is already plenty of  
11206 evidence of people with bad intentions using AI to take  
11207 advantage of and harm Americans. If this is the type of  
11208 policy being proposed by Republicans, after everything we  
11209 have heard about the development of AI in recent years, it  
11210 gives me no confidence that we will rise to the challenge of

11211 protecting everyday Americans who are facing a world where  
11212 supercomputing power is being used against them and their  
11213 interests, often unknowingly. That is wrong, and it is clear  
11214 at a time when the FTC's independence is under attack we  
11215 shouldn't be taking our state regulators off the beat.

11216 So I urge members to strike this provision and start an  
11217 actual, transparent conversation just about how to develop  
11218 safeguards to ensure everyday Americans are indeed the  
11219 beneficiaries and not the victims of AI.

11220 With that, Mr. Chair.

11221 \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Tonko, would you yield to me?

11222 \*Mr. Tonko. The gentleman from New Jersey.

11223 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you. You know, I listened to my  
11224 colleagues on the Republican side, and I -- you know, I just  
11225 can't believe what I am hearing.

11226 Look, in the last Congress we had agreement, a  
11227 consensus, bipartisan, on a comprehensive privacy bill that  
11228 would have had some of these safeguards or guardrails, or at  
11229 least been a start, and the House leadership killed it,  
11230 right, told everybody on the Republican side not to support  
11231 it, so it was dead. Now you are telling me, oh, now, you  
11232 know, don't worry, Congress and the Republican majority are  
11233 going to pass these guardrails, and they are going to do  
11234 this. I have absolutely no reason to believe that, based on  
11235 what happened in the last Congress.

11236           Then you talk about the agency that can do it. I think  
11237   you are talking about the FTC. Well, I don't know how they  
11238   are going to do anything. They fired the Democrats, and they  
11239   were the ones that were the more -- probably the ones that  
11240   were the most interested in actually doing this.

11241           So what are we talking about here? I mean, let's be  
11242   honest. There is no way in the world that this Congress is  
11243   going to pass Federal legislation. There is no way in the  
11244   world that the FTC, the way it is constituted, is going to do  
11245   anything about this.

11246           And then you say this is preemption. Preemption is when  
11247   you pass legislation and the legislation preempts the states.  
11248   This is an absolute prohibition. There is no preemption  
11249   here. There is no legislation here. There is no regulation.  
11250   There is no nothing. This is just a giveaway to big tech and  
11251   we are left with nothing, and the states now can't even do  
11252   anything because they are prohibited. It is not a preemption  
11253   issue.

11254           I yield back to the gentleman from New York.

11255           \*Mr. Tonko. And I yield back, Mr. Chair.

11256           \*Mr. Joyce. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from  
11257   Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky.

11258           \*Ms. Schakowsky. As someone who has worked very hard to  
11259   try and protect consumers from big tech, it is important to  
11260   understand the United States Congress has done zero to rein

11261 in big tech. And so when people find that their private  
11262 information is being used in order to bring -- to help the  
11263 tech companies to be able to do what they wish with  
11264 consumers' information, all these years we have done zero to  
11265 say that there ought to be something.

11266 And so now we are talking about AI. Okay, that seems to  
11267 be, according to a -- we had a number of leaders that talked  
11268 about the potential dangers of AI. This is not just great  
11269 work that can be done, but it can also be going into the work  
11270 that people want to protect for themselves. And it is just  
11271 outrageous that we have done nothing all these years, and now  
11272 something is going to ask -- is going to last for years, that  
11273 these companies can do whatever they want. It is just  
11274 amazing to me that we have not taken one step to rein in big  
11275 tech when it comes to protecting privacy of any sort, and  
11276 consumers are being -- and children are being exploited.

11277 We need to understand what is available to us in order  
11278 to make sure that the use of big tech is reined in, and I --  
11279 it is just amazing that we have done zero year after year  
11280 after year. And now we are saying years can go by and  
11281 nothing has been -- is going to being done -- is -- will be  
11282 done, excuse me, by big tech and AI.

11283 I yield back.

11284 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentlelady from  
11285 New York, Ms. Clarke, is recognized.

11286           \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
11287 the last word.

11288           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady is recognized.

11289           \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you. I support Ranking Member  
11290 Pallone's amendment to strike the moratorium on artificial  
11291 intelligence regulations at the state level.

11292           We are talking about 2035 here, the year 2035. Are you  
11293 kidding me? As a member of the House Bipartisan Task Force  
11294 on Artificial Intelligence, I cannot support this 10-year  
11295 moratorium on state AI laws. That is just out of control.  
11296 It is nothing more than yet another unconscionable way to --  
11297 for big tech to -- giveaway to Big Tech at the expense of  
11298 consumer rights.

11299           Pausing AI regulations for 10 years is extremely  
11300 dangerous, given the rapid proliferation of AI technology.  
11301 We don't know what AI will be capable of a year from now, let  
11302 alone a decade from now. And while we in Congress absolutely  
11303 must pass Federal data privacy legislation and a framework,  
11304 regulatory framework for artificial intelligence, it is  
11305 short-sighted and foolish to prevent states from stepping in  
11306 to protect their citizens in the meantime. That is crazy. I  
11307 can't even believe that we are sitting here debating this.

11308           Let me be clear. No one stands to benefit from this  
11309 provision other than Donald Trump's big tech billionaire bros  
11310 and our adversaries. What do you think, China and all these

11311 other countries are just going sit there like, okay, you  
11312 know, time out? No, they are deploying weapons against us.  
11313 What kind of madness is going on this morning?

11314 It does not protect consumers from the potential for  
11315 harm. It does not save taxpayers a dime. In fact, it blocks  
11316 any potential recourse any American citizen may have to hold  
11317 big tech accountable. The message from Republicans  
11318 supporting this provision and this farce of a bill overall is  
11319 clear: They would prefer millions of Americans be kicked off  
11320 their health care plans just to put more money in the pockets  
11321 of the billionaire class. It is shameful.

11322 I urge my colleagues to reject this nonsense. And even  
11323 if you don't know anything about tech, understand that we are  
11324 not protected as a nation, we have done nothing to advance  
11325 the privacy that is required to set a platform for us to be  
11326 protected. So I urge my colleagues to reject this nonsense.  
11327 People sound really smart over there. But let me tell you,  
11328 10 years of a moratorium, 2035, can you imagine that? I  
11329 don't even want to tell you how old I am going to be then.

11330 [Laughter.]

11331 \*Ms. Clarke. With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

11332 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentleman from  
11333 Florida, Mr. Soto, is recognized.

11334 \*Mr. Soto. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

11335 A 10-year ban on state AI laws. What could possibly go

11336 wrong? If you were to want to launch a reboot of The  
11337 Terminator, this ban would be a good starting point.

11338       The states got the ball rolling on these AI laws. And I  
11339 agree, Congress should be acting to do something about it.  
11340 But as our ranking member, Frank Pallone, mentioned, Internet  
11341 privacy is a perfect example. It has been several terms, and  
11342 it keeps getting killed by Republican leadership. And then  
11343 states have stepped up, including Florida, to finally pass  
11344 Internet privacy laws. No one wants 50 laws. How do we  
11345 solve the problem? Congress should pass basic AI  
11346 protections. But since that is probably not going to happen,  
11347 what will actually happen if this passes is absolute  
11348 lawlessness, and so I couldn't in good conscience do anything  
11349 but support your great amendment.

11350       I yield back.

11351       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The chair recognizes  
11352 the gentlelady from Massachusetts, Mrs. Trahan.

11353       \*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to  
11354 strike the last word.

11355       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady is recognized.

11356       \*Mrs. Trahan. So very soon this committee will be  
11357 debating the biggest cuts to Medicaid in our nation's  
11358 history, cuts that will strip health insurance from over 13  
11359 million Americans, all to pay for tax cuts that  
11360 disproportionately benefit the wealthiest in our country.

11361           Now, Republicans will say that they are not cutting  
11362 Medicaid, that they are simply implementing sensible work  
11363 requirements. But please stay skeptical. Republicans are  
11364 implementing cumbersome requirements because added paperwork  
11365 will lead to less compliance and ultimately less people  
11366 enrolled, conveniently giving them enough space to fill the  
11367 pot for their super-rich friends.

11368           A group of friends that we should note is headlined by  
11369 the same big-tech CEOs who stood behind President Trump on  
11370 Inauguration Day, a group of friends who will say they want a  
11371 Federal privacy policy, a national AI framework, while  
11372 spending millions of dollars to make sure those bills never  
11373 see the House floor.

11374           A ban on state regulations of AI for 10 years shows  
11375 where Republicans' loyalty is to Big Tech and the wealthy.  
11376 Dismantling state's regulations on technology amounts to a  
11377 financial windfall of epic proportions, consistent with tax  
11378 cuts for the rich that the Ways and Means Republicans marked  
11379 up today. This provision absolves companies of any  
11380 responsibility to protect consumers from the harms of AI. It  
11381 is also drafted so broadly as to implicate states' privacy  
11382 and online safety laws directly harming our kids.

11383           Simply put, this provision, this single paragraph that  
11384 is snuck into a massive budget bill, would undermine digital  
11385 rights duly provided to millions of Americans by their state



11386 legislatures. States have taken the lead in regulating  
11387 technology while Congress has stalled out amidst a barrage of  
11388 endless lobbying. If privacy and kids' online safety are any  
11389 indication, this Congress will not pass meaningful,  
11390 comprehensive regulation of AI.

11391         And I ask my colleagues, what gives you so much optimism  
11392 that Congress can pass meaningful protections for AI,  
11393 privacy, or online safety? You claim that states have  
11394 created a patchwork of regulation. Why do you think that  
11395 state lawmakers have done that? Do you think they want to be  
11396 legislating on difficult questions of technology policy? No,  
11397 no, state lawmakers have stepped up because their Federal  
11398 counterparts, we, have consistently failed to act. Americans  
11399 are fed up, and instead they are asking state legislatures to  
11400 protect them and their kids online.

11401         Make no mistake, this provision is a product of big tech  
11402 lobbying. Companies including Meta and Google have long  
11403 asked for it, and trade associations for big tech rejoiced  
11404 when Republicans included it in this bill because what this  
11405 provision represents is the biggest gift to the tech industry  
11406 in its history. Put in context, however, this ban on tech  
11407 regulation is not just bad policy, it is morally bankrupt.

11408         We can work together on modernizing our systems,  
11409 leveraging our data and our analytics. But Mr. Chairman,  
11410 think about it. Republicans are effectively eliminating

11411 requirements on technology companies to make their products  
11412 safe and trustworthy while at the same time adding  
11413 requirements for Americans to receive lifesaving health care.

11414       Under their bill, Americans will have to jump through  
11415 hoops and complete mounds of paperwork to prove that they are  
11416 working. Technology companies, on the other hand, won't have  
11417 to show their work at all. This handout for big tech and  
11418 ultra-wealthy tech barons in the same reconciliation bill  
11419 that guts health care for millions is what people hate about  
11420 Washington. It is lopsided and it is insulting.

11421       If Republicans had chosen to start this hearing with the  
11422 faces and stories of who they are advocating for, you  
11423 wouldn't see everyday Americans like us Democrats held up.  
11424 We would be looking at posters of Elon Musk, Mark Zuckerberg,  
11425 and Jeff Bezos. Requirements, compliance, and paperwork for  
11426 busy, working-class Americans, but not for billionaire big  
11427 tech donors. That is the Republican way, according to this  
11428 legislation.

11429       But I would love to be proven wrong, so vote yes on the  
11430 amendment.

11431       I yield back.

11432       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentleman from  
11433 New Jersey, Mr. Menendez, is recognized.

11434       \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support  
11435 Ranking Member Pallone's amendment.

11436           The breadth of state laws that the Republican ban would  
11437   make unenforceable laws that protect consumers against  
11438   algorithmic bias, discrimination, and other factors in health  
11439   care, housing, and more is staggering. Republicans are  
11440   trying to fundamentally undercut essential protections for  
11441   consumers in all aspects of their lives, from health to  
11442   elections to housing.

11443           A few significant examples of laws that states would be  
11444   prohibited from enforcing for the next decade: laws in at  
11445   least five states that Republican members of this committee  
11446   hail from, including the chair's home state of Kentucky,  
11447   prohibit AI deepfakes in elections: laws in Utah require the  
11448   use of AI to be disclosed to consumers and regulate the use  
11449   of AI chatbots for mental health treatment: states have laws  
11450   to ensure AI is created and used in a safe and trustworthy  
11451   manner: at least 17 states have privacy laws that address  
11452   profiling and automated decision-making: laws in at least 10  
11453   states ensure that self-driving cars follow the rules of the  
11454   road and operate safely. This is by no means a list of every  
11455   state law that would be unenforceable for the next decade  
11456   under this ill-considered provision.

11457           What Republicans deride as a patchwork of AI laws is  
11458   really a clear expression of need for guardrails governing  
11459   the diverse and numerous harms that can result from the  
11460   careless deployment of powerful artificial intelligence and

11461 automated decision-making systems.

11462       My Republican colleague from California said that there  
11463 was overwhelming support from folks in different states.  
11464 Earlier today the National Conference of State Legislatures  
11465 sent us a letter. It reads, "On behalf of the National  
11466 Conference of State Legislatures, the bipartisan organization  
11467 representing the legislatures of our nation's states,  
11468 territories, commonwealths, and Washington, D.C., we are  
11469 writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed 10-  
11470 year moratorium on state artificial intelligence legislation  
11471 including in the Energy and Commerce Committee's  
11472 reconciliation measure. We urge the committee to remove this  
11473 language, as this amendment does, from the bill. This  
11474 provision is an infringement on states' authority to  
11475 effectively legislate in this rapidly evolving and  
11476 consequential policy domain.'" That seems like the states  
11477 are not on board with what the bill strives to do.

11478       And Chairman Guthrie, I would just note that the staff  
11479 chair on the National Conference of State Legislatures, also  
11480 from Kentucky. So as you are considering how you vote, a lot  
11481 of Kentucky happening here.

11482       And the last thing I would say is the two most important  
11483 things that we have to deal with as a country right now are  
11484 artificial intelligence and cybersecurity.

11485       Artificial intelligence, this bill wants to strip states

11486 of their right to legislate around AI. But we have seen this  
11487 administration, with respect to cybersecurity, take the power  
11488 away from the Federal Government and put it back in the  
11489 states' and municipalities' hands, which we know is  
11490 dangerous. So it is confusing to hear on the two most  
11491 important issues Republicans would take two different  
11492 approaches on AI, which I agree is a big -- is a giveaway to  
11493 big tech. They are saying no, no, let's keep it at the  
11494 Federal Government, a 10-year moratorium on what states can  
11495 do.

11496 Cybersecurity, right, which makes us more vulnerable --  
11497 and we already have a Federal system, infrastructure in  
11498 place, they are allowing the administration to say, no, no,  
11499 no, states and municipalities are responsible. It literally  
11500 makes no sense.

11501 And if you are still considering how you are going to  
11502 vote across the aisle, I just want to say Georgia from our  
11503 office, who covers the committee, celebrated her birthday at  
11504 the stroke of midnight, so it would be really phenomenal just  
11505 to give us a nice little gift here, a birthday gift. So I  
11506 hope you will consider that for all the additional  
11507 substantive reasons that I have covered in my four minutes.

11508 With that I yield back.

11509 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The chair recognizes  
11510 the gentlelady from Washington, Dr. Schrier.

11511           \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. chairman. I am going to  
11512 be voting for this amendment, just because I feel like what  
11513 is in this bill -- and I am just going to read this to you  
11514 here -- this is outrageous.

11515           It says that no state or political subdivision may  
11516 enforce any law or regulation regulating artificial  
11517 intelligence models, artificial intelligence systems, or  
11518 automated decision systems during the 10-year period  
11519 beginning on the date that this act is passed.

11520           I mean, I just can't imagine. This is a gift to big  
11521 tech. It is terrible for all of us. I just want you to  
11522 think about the fact that we have had essentially no  
11523 regulation on social media, and how that has turned out for  
11524 us and our kids. This committee this Congress has not even  
11525 been able to pass the Kids Online Safety Act. That is  
11526 nothing compared to taking this on. I mean, AI is the most  
11527 potent technology with unimaginable potential benefit and  
11528 unimaginable potential danger. We do need Federal  
11529 regulation.

11530           Mr. Obernolte showed us a big book of agreed-upon good  
11531 ideas for how to get started with regulating AI. So why  
11532 aren't we taking that up? Like, wouldn't that seem to be the  
11533 first order of business to take on? But we are not.  
11534 Instead, we are voting on stupid stuff like Gulf of America.  
11535 You know, we ought to be taking this up seriously. It is the

11536 biggest issue of our time. And you are kicking the can down  
11537 the road 10 years on any regulation.

11538         So I think what we need to do is vote yes on this  
11539 amendment, trash this part of the bill, get our butts in  
11540 gear, and get that bill regulating artificial intelligence,  
11541 because the danger posed to not just our children but to all  
11542 of us -- frankly, to the entire world -- is really serious.  
11543 So I encourage my friends, my colleagues to vote yes on this  
11544 amendment and get rid of this absurd and outrageous part of  
11545 the bill.

11546         \*Mr. Joyce. Are you yielding?

11547         \*Ms. Schrier. I will now yield to my friend and  
11548 colleague, Lizzie Fletcher from Texas.

11549         \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Representative Schrier. I  
11550 want to associate myself with your comments, with the  
11551 excellent comments from Congresswoman Trahan and all my  
11552 colleagues on this side of the aisle. And I think we are all  
11553 scratching our heads at this 10-year moratorium as we talk  
11554 about just the rapid pace at which things are happening.

11555         You know, I have seen times in the past where somebody  
11556 said let's do one year so we get have incentive to get the  
11557 bill done and get it to the President's desk to be signed  
11558 into law. Like, there are ways that you are trying to give  
11559 Congress incentive to legislate. This doesn't do any of  
11560 that.

11561           And I can't help but wonder as I read this -- I guess  
11562 this is a question maybe for counsel. I understand on  
11563 decisions that I think are very important that we will be  
11564 coming to later the President has said repeatedly he thinks  
11565 so many issues are issues for the states. And in fact, as I  
11566 understand it, this -- I don't know what happened to the  
11567 party of states' rights. That is not my view, but what  
11568 happened to states' rights here?

11569           Can anyone explain to me the -- can you explain,  
11570 counsel, what the -- where the states' rights are in this  
11571 proposal?

11572           \*Counsel. Thank you for the question, ma'am. That  
11573 appears to be a policy question.

11574           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Mr. Chairman, can you enlighten  
11575 us as to how this comports with the policy of the Republican  
11576 Party to support states' rights?

11577           Mr. Chairman?

11578           Oh, I was looking at Mr. Joyce, but I could also look at  
11579 Mr. Guthrie.

11580           \*The Chair. [Inaudible.]

11581           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, I just had a question. I mean,  
11582 looking at this amendment, a 10-year moratorium on -- Mr.  
11583 Menendez went through a lot of the work that states have done  
11584 to regulate AI to stop the harms that are affecting their  
11585 citizens in the absence of action from this committee. And I



11586 have heard repeatedly from folks on this committee, folks in  
11587 the Congress, and the President himself that Republicans  
11588 believe in states' rights, and that many important decisions,  
11589 like whether and when to bear children, should be left to the  
11590 states. So why are we having a 10-year moratorium on states'  
11591 ability to legislate around AI?

11592       \*The Chair. Well, so there -- clearly, our founding  
11593 fathers -- and I agree -- we clearly have interstate  
11594 commerce. So any time that an economic activity includes  
11595 more than one state, it is just difficult to have this  
11596 patchwork of state laws in an industry like AI because the  
11597 data centers are someplace, people use it all over the  
11598 country.

11599       And so what we want to do, and do it in a bipartisan  
11600 way, because -- that is what Mr. Obernolte said, because it  
11601 is -- it has to be sustainable, is that we have a single  
11602 standard for AI across the country, and we have to do our  
11603 work on that. I am not saying we have, I am saying that we  
11604 will, and we are going to hopefully find a solution. But if  
11605 we continue to have a patchwork of state laws -- because our  
11606 big concern -- we have had a lot of hearings on energy that  
11607 are required for AI and we have had a lot -- we -- and we  
11608 have to also get the policy right.

11609       And so that is what we want to do. We want to have the  
11610 opportunity to make sure, as we -- as our Federal Government

11611 uses AI, we protect our taxpayer dollars in doing this by  
11612 having this moratorium. But we know we have to have a  
11613 national standard.

11614 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, Mr. Chairman, I really appreciate  
11615 that answer. I mean, it sounds to me like this is a policy  
11616 decision, and it also -- you know, I agree with you that  
11617 there should be Federal guarantees and Federal laws, and that  
11618 is what we are here to do. And certainly, I think on our  
11619 side of the aisle you will find a lot of agreement. But I  
11620 hope it doesn't take us 10 years to do this. That is five  
11621 Congresses from now. And so I really think we should  
11622 consider this amendment, get to work.

11623 I am happy to work in a bipartisan way on this very  
11624 important work regulating AI, and I will yield back to  
11625 Congresswoman Schrier. Thank you.

11626 \*Ms. Schrier. And, you know, before I yield back I just  
11627 want to say this is not just a big giveaway to big tech, this  
11628 is a huge giveaway to big insurance that is currently  
11629 using --

11630 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady's time is --

11631 \*Ms. Schrier. -- using AI to deny people services.

11632 \*Mr. Joyce. Your time has expired.

11633 \*Ms. Schrier. I yield back.

11634 \*Mr. Joyce. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from  
11635 New York, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.

11636           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman,  
11637 and I just want to revisit a question with counsel quickly,  
11638 following up on my colleague from Texas's question.

11639           Would instituting -- this is a -- we are -- sorry. With  
11640 respect to a 10-year moratorium on state policy changes with  
11641 respect to AI, instituting this moratorium where there  
11642 previously was not one, this is a policy change, correct?

11643           \*Counsel. Yes, ma'am. This is a policy change.

11644           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you very much.

11645           Now, following up on that, I want to speak to the AI  
11646 task force report that was held up earlier. You know, the  
11647 last two years we spent, really, a remarkable and fascinating  
11648 amount of time on the AI task force, and it was genuinely a  
11649 wonderful experience. It was a rare experience of bipartisan  
11650 legislators coming together, tackling some of the most  
11651 fascinating questions with respect to AI, with respect to the  
11652 frontiers of our technology.

11653           We spent two years discussing everything from public  
11654 investments in large language models, the national labs, to  
11655 how we protect victims of child -- you know, sexually  
11656 exploitative materials. And this was thoughtful. Democrats  
11657 and Republicans came together. We identified several -- many  
11658 different policy areas where we actually had agreement,  
11659 despite many areas where we had disagreement. And after two  
11660 years we could not pass nearly any of it, any of it.

11661           And in the absence of that action, in those two years,  
11662 people committed suicide from their interactions with AI  
11663 chatbots. Children, one in eight teenagers and kids, had a  
11664 friend or someone that they knew become victim to falsely  
11665 generated, sexually exploitative materials. We had people  
11666 whose privacy was violated by AI platforms.

11667           And so, in the inaction of Congress, states decided to  
11668 act. States are passing legislation to protect people's  
11669 privacy. States are protecting -- states are providing  
11670 action -- are pursuing action to try to protect people --  
11671 thank you very much. And in fact, we have several examples  
11672 here.

11673           Last year Utah passed a law to force AI chatbots to  
11674 protect the private information of people seeking mental  
11675 health care and disclosed if they were paid to advertise any  
11676 products. That would be gone.

11677           This month, New York passed a law to require chatbots to  
11678 include a protocol for detecting self-harm expressions and  
11679 directing users to real resources. That would be wiped out.

11680           Facial recognition technology that uses AI to identify  
11681 people against large and mostly unregulated databases, where  
11682 these AI -- particularly some that are used sometimes in  
11683 pursuit of law enforcement -- falsely identifying people  
11684 disproportionately, these algorithms falsely identify Black  
11685 Americans and Americans of color, and identify them and

11686     accuse them falsely of committing crimes.

11687             Last year big health and -- or recently big health  
11688     insurers have been using AI to deny care claims to patients.  
11689     And last year California passed a law requiring that health  
11690     care providers actually retain the ultimate responsibility of  
11691     whether or not a patient receives care, and that they can't  
11692     just knock that off and blame an algorithm for denying people  
11693     their cancer treatments, denying people other kinds of  
11694     treatments due to AI algorithms.

11695             All of these protections are protections that Congress  
11696     refuses to take up, refuses. And so states are taking up  
11697     this responsibility. The idea that we would ban people from  
11698     being protected from these abuses for 10 years -- and we have  
11699     seen the AI lobby. And Palantir and Peter Thiel and Elon  
11700     Musk and the force of their lobby here in Washington, D.C.  
11701     will ensure that action continues to not be taken. Let  
11702     states protect people. And a moratorium is a deeply  
11703     dangerous idea at this moment.

11704             Thank you, and I yield back.

11705             \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The chair  
11706     recognizes the gentlewoman from Virginia, Ms. McClellan.

11707             \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

11708             I graduated law school one year after Congress passed  
11709     the telecom act of 1996, and I remember running into a member  
11710     of the committee who asked, well, what are you doing now?

11711 And I said, well, I am trying to figure out what you meant  
11712 when you passed the telecom act, because my first job was as  
11713 an outside counsel to GTE, implementing it. And he said,  
11714 well, when you figure it out, let me know.

11715 And in the process of implementing the telecom act, I  
11716 learned words matter. I learned that courts interpret the  
11717 plain meaning of the words that Congress uses. I learned  
11718 that when you put a list of exceptions in place and you  
11719 exclude things, courts assume you did that intentionally.

11720 And yes, Congress regulates interstate commerce, but AI  
11721 is not just interstate commerce. AI is an application used  
11722 across all of our systems.

11723 In 2018 I attended a legal conference where an expert  
11724 was explaining megatrends and all the different effects, and  
11725 he talked about AI. And he predicted, in 2018, the ability  
11726 of AI to create fake news will outpace the ability of AI to  
11727 detect it. In 2018. And the more he talked about AI in  
11728 2018, he scared the living daylights out of me. At that  
11729 point I was both a regulatory lawyer and a state legislator.  
11730 And I won't tell you literally what I said, because you might  
11731 strike my words. But listen, HS was involved. None of our  
11732 systems are ready for AI. This was 2018. This body had its  
11733 first AI hearing in 2023. The House.

11734 Now, meanwhile, in 2018 China had a plan for global  
11735 dominance in AI by 2030.

11736           Since then AI has been used across a wide variety of  
11737 things that states do regulate, like law enforcement, like  
11738 insurance, like education, like crimes. And AI is used in  
11739 all of those. And this moratorium says no state or political  
11740 subdivision thereof may enforce any law or regulation  
11741 regulating artificial intelligence, et cetera, et cetera. It  
11742 doesn't say regulating the creation of, it doesn't say  
11743 regulating the development of, not the sale of. Any. So if  
11744 a state wants to regulate how law enforcement can use AI to  
11745 surveil its citizens, it can't. If a state wants to regulate  
11746 how AI is used in the education system, it can't. If a state  
11747 wants to regulate how to punish -- how to change its laws to  
11748 address the use of AI to commit crimes in a way that the  
11749 state law doesn't account for now, it can't.

11750           Any law is broad, and the exemptions are very, very  
11751 narrow. And what you are doing is saying for 10 years, while  
11752 Congress does nothing -- oh, by the way, we have already  
11753 said, the President has said everything having to do with  
11754 education needs to go back to the states, and I don't have  
11755 time to go through everything else the President or my  
11756 colleagues on the other side of the aisle have said the  
11757 states can do -- you are handcuffing the states' and  
11758 localities' ability to regulate how AI will be used and the  
11759 very things that they do have the power to regulate.

11760           And by the time Congress acts -- because I have been

11761 here almost three years now. And if you, after doing this  
11762 task force, as the gentlewoman from New York said, where  
11763 there was broad agreement and you can't pass anything out of  
11764 that, you are not going to be able to regulate every aspect  
11765 of how AI is going to be used at the state and local level in  
11766 10 years. And in the meanwhile, AI runs rampant, and we are  
11767 not ready for it.

11768 And, you know, science fiction sometimes comes true. A  
11769 lot of stuff from Star Trek now exists. Well, I certainly  
11770 hope that Terminator --

11771 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady's time has expired.

11772 \*Ms. McClellan. -- or Ultron don't. And we need to be  
11773 careful.

11774 I yield back.

11775 \*Mr. Joyce. The chair recognizes the gentleman from  
11776 Texas, Mr. Pfluger.

11777 \*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to hand  
11778 it to my colleague from California.

11779 Before I do, I would like to ask the ranking member. Is  
11780 it the Democrat position that you do not want a Federal  
11781 standard for AI?

11782 \*Mr. Pallone. Would -- no, I would very much like to  
11783 see a Federal standard.

11784 \*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you.

11785 \*Mr. Pallone. I just don't think that this -- the



11786 Republican majority is ever going to do it, and I think that  
11787 you are --

11788 \*Mr. Pfluger. I will take the time, thank you very  
11789 much. And I will hand it to my colleague.

11790 I yield to Mr. Obernolte from California.

11791 \*Mr. Obernolte. Thank you very much, my colleague from  
11792 Texas, for yielding.

11793 First of all, I want to say how much I have enjoyed this  
11794 colloquy tonight. The passion and the interest that everyone  
11795 has shown on this topic gives me some optimism that Congress  
11796 is actually capable of acting on this. So I want to thank  
11797 everyone for their engagement.

11798 Just to be clear, I want to take us back up to 30,000  
11799 feet. The purpose of this title is to appropriate \$500  
11800 million for the Federal Government to use AI to modernize and  
11801 make more efficient Federal Government operations. And it is  
11802 nonsensical to do that if we are going to allow 1,000  
11803 different pending bills in state legislatures across the  
11804 country to become law. It would be impossible for any agency  
11805 that operates in all the states to be able to comply with  
11806 those regulations. So I would like to ask a question of  
11807 counsel just to clarify that issue.

11808 My understanding is that the purpose of this provision  
11809 is to spend \$500 million to modernize Federal IT and  
11810 cybersecurity systems. To be clear, the moratorium is a

11811 necessary term and condition to execute the primary purpose  
11812 of the provision. Is that correct?

11813 \*Counsel. That is correct.

11814 \*Mr. Obernolte. All right. Thanks for clearing that  
11815 up, because I think there was some confusion.

11816 There was some talk about national security. That is  
11817 something that worries me a lot. That is something that we  
11818 touched on in the task force. We had a whole hearing on it,  
11819 and there is an entire chapter in our task force report on  
11820 it. Competition with China is very real. China is bent on  
11821 establishing dominance in this space. But let me say this.  
11822 To have 1,000 different state regulations on AI is the  
11823 fastest way to secure Chinese domination of AI, right? That  
11824 would be a barrier to the use of AI within the United States,  
11825 which is exactly what China wants.

11826 Another one of my colleagues -- in fact, a couple of  
11827 them -- have brought up privacy as kind of a warning sign  
11828 where Congress has failed to act to establish a Federal  
11829 privacy standard. I completely agree. But the issue of  
11830 privacy is an illustration of the reason why we need this  
11831 moratorium. Because if we had this moratorium, the states  
11832 wouldn't have gotten out ahead of us on data privacy, and we  
11833 would have had an opposite situation there where we would  
11834 have established that Federal standard. And I would  
11835 encourage anyone who is upset about it -- and I am one of

11836     them, because I voted for APRA last year -- you know, let's  
11837     get together and fix that problem.

11838             You know, to the letter from the National Council of  
11839     State Legislatures, well, I am shocked that they would oppose  
11840     our moratorium. That is like asking my two-year-old grandson  
11841     if he should get to regulate what he has for dinner. I mean,  
11842     he will tell you yes, but it is not necessarily wise to give  
11843     him that power.

11844             And then, you know, lastly, you know, we have been  
11845     talking about the fact that Congress has not actually been  
11846     able to do this yet. It is not because we haven't tried. As  
11847     it was pointed out, we spent an entire year last year working  
11848     through a bipartisan task force to come up with a proposal  
11849     that we think everyone could agree with. That was just in  
11850     December. There hasn't been any legislative oxygen in this  
11851     chamber yet to get going on this. But I am hopeful, with the  
11852     backing of some of the people in this room, that we can get  
11853     working on this.

11854             And lastly -- and a couple of my colleagues, including  
11855     the author of this amendment, have expressed skepticism that  
11856     this Republican majority can pass meaningful AI regulation.  
11857     And you know what? We can't, not alone. Neither can you.  
11858     The only way this gets done is on a bipartisan basis because  
11859     we have companies out there making billion-dollar decisions  
11860     on research and development and procurement, and what they

11861 want the most is some certainty about what the rules are  
11862 going to be, and we need to give them that certainty. The  
11863 most destructive thing is if there is fear out there that  
11864 every few years, as the winds of political fortune shift, the  
11865 rules governing the use of AI completely change. We can't  
11866 allow that, colleagues.

11867         So please, let's work together over the next few months  
11868 to pass something into law. And you know what? I hope that  
11869 this moratorium only lasts that few months, and we replace it  
11870 with something that makes clear what the rules of preemption  
11871 are. But until then, this moratorium is necessary, and I  
11872 urge opposition to the amendment.

11873         I yield back.

11874         \*Mr. Pfluger. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

11875         \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from  
11876 California, Dr. Ruiz, is recognized.

11877         \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I share in  
11878 Congressman Obernolte's optimism that we can get something  
11879 done with AI. I disagree with a 10-year moratorium on any  
11880 states enforcing their regulations on AI or consumer  
11881 protections on AI, and I have reason to.

11882         I am reading from this AP news article that actually  
11883 happened -- was published on October 25, 2024. It is  
11884 entitled, "An AI chat box pushed a teen to kill himself, a  
11885 lawsuit against its creator alleges.'" So there was a 14-

11886 year-old boy who used a chatbot for a relationship, and he  
11887 openly discussed his suicidal thoughts and shared his wishes  
11888 for a pain-free death with the bot named after the fictional  
11889 character Daenerys Targaryen from the television show "Game  
11890 of Thrones.'" That chat box relationship was "in highly  
11891 sexualized conversations'" in this young adolescent's  
11892 relationship.

11893         On February 28, the boy told the bot that he was "coming  
11894 home,'" and it encouraged him to do so. The bot encouraged  
11895 him to do so. "I promise I will come home to you. I love  
11896 you so much, Danny,'" the boy told the chat box. "I love you  
11897 too,'" the bot replied. "Please come home to me as soon as  
11898 possible, my love.'" The boy said, "What if I told you I  
11899 could come home right now,'" he asked. "Please do, my sweet  
11900 king,'" the bot messaged back. Now, this was after the boy  
11901 was talking about potentially killing himself. And just  
11902 seconds after the character AI bot told him to "come home,'"  
11903 the teen shot himself, according to the lawsuit filed this  
11904 week by his mother of Orlando, Florida.

11905         In addition to that, a 2023 report by Thorn revealed  
11906 that 11 percent of American children aged 9 to 17 were aware  
11907 of peers using AI to create nude images of other minors.

11908         Additionally, 15 percent of high school students  
11909 reported encountering deepfake images depicting peers in  
11910 sexually explicit contexts.

11911           In 2023 the National Center for Missing and Exploited  
11912 Children's cyber tipline received approximately 4,700 reports  
11913 concerning AI-generated child sexual abuse material. By  
11914 October 2024 the organization was fielding about 450 such  
11915 reports monthly. Experts caution that these figures may be  
11916 under-reported due to the increasing realism of AI-generated  
11917 images, making them difficult to distinguish from actual  
11918 photographs.

11919           In May 2025 the FBI revealed it has opened  
11920 investigations into 250 individual -- affiliated with 764 --  
11921 and other online networks of predators who befriend minors  
11922 and other vulnerable people and coerce them to create  
11923 sexually explicit material and commit acts such as harming  
11924 themselves or animals. They use AI to generate images.

11925           So this is why we can't wait. This is why we need to  
11926 put a halt to states implementing their protections, their  
11927 consumer protections against AI. This is why we can't wait.  
11928 What is the numbers going to be in 10 years from now, when  
11929 these atrocious crimes are happening right now? That is why  
11930 I support the amendment.

11931           And I yield back my time.

11932           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. If there is no  
11933 further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment.

11934           \*Mr. Pallone. A roll call.

11935           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman requests a recorded vote.

11936     The clerk will call the roll.

11937             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta?

11938             \*Mr. Latta.   No.

11939             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.

11940             Mr. Griffith?

11941             \*Mr. Griffith.   No.

11942             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.

11943             Mr. Bilirakis?

11944             \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.

11945             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

11946             Mr. Hudson?

11947             \*Mr. Hudson.   No.

11948             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.

11949             Mr. Carter of Georgia?

11950             \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.

11951             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

11952             Mr. Palmer?

11953             [No response.]

11954             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn?

11955             [No response.]

11956             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?

11957             \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.

11958             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

11959             Mr. Joyce?

11960             \*Mr. Joyce.   No.

11961           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
11962           Mr. Weber?  
11963           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
11964           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
11965           Mr. Allen?  
11966           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
11967           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
11968           Mr. Balderson?  
11969           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
11970           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
11971           Mr. Fulcher?  
11972           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
11973           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
11974           Mr. Pfluger?  
11975           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
11976           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
11977           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
11978           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
11979           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
11980           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
11981           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
11982           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
11983           Mrs. Cammack?  
11984           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
11985           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.



11986 Mr. Obernolte?  
11987 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
11988 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
11989 Mr. James?  
11990 \*Mr. James. No.  
11991 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
11992 Mr. Bentz?  
11993 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
11994 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
11995 Mrs. Houchin?  
11996 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
11997 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
11998 Mr. Fry?  
11999 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
12000 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
12001 Ms. Lee?  
12002 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
12003 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
12004 Mr. Langworthy?  
12005 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
12006 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
12007 Mr. Kean?  
12008 \*Mr. Kean. No.  
12009 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.  
12010 Mr. Rulli?

12011           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
12012           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
12013           Mr. Evans?  
12014           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
12015           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
12016           Mr. Goldman?  
12017           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
12018           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
12019           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
12020           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
12021           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
12022           Mr. Pallone?  
12023           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
12024           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
12025           Ms. DeGette?  
12026           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
12027           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
12028           Ms. Schakowsky?  
12029           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
12030           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
12031           Ms. Matsui?  
12032           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
12033           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
12034           Ms. Castor?  
12035           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.

12036           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
12037           Mr. Tonko?  
12038           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
12039           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
12040           Ms. Clarke?  
12041           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
12042           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
12043           Mr. Ruiz?  
12044           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
12045           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
12046           Mr. Peters?  
12047           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
12048           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
12049           Mrs. Dingell?  
12050           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
12051           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
12052           Mr. Veasey?  
12053           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
12054           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
12055           Ms. Kelly?  
12056           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
12057           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
12058           Ms. Barragan?  
12059           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
12060           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.

12061 Mr. Soto?

12062 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

12063 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.

12064 Ms. Schrier?

12065 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

12066 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

12067 Mrs. Trahan?

12068 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

12069 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

12070 Mrs. Fletcher?

12071 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.

12072 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

12073 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

12074 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

12075 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

12076 Mr. Auchincloss?

12077 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.

12078 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

12079 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

12080 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.

12081 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

12082 Mr. Menendez?

12083 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

12084 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

12085 Mr. Mullin?

12086           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.

12087           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.

12088           Mr. Landsman?

12089           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

12090           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

12091           Ms. McClellan?

12092           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

12093           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

12094           Chairman Guthrie?

12095           \*The Chair.   No.

12096           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

12097           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mr. Palmer recorded?

12098           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer is not recorded.

12099           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.

12100           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.

12101           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the result.

12102           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24

12103   ayes and 29 noes.

12104           \*Mr. Joyce.   The amendment is not agreed to.

12105           Are there any further amendments?

12106           \*Mr. Pallone.   I want a recorded vote on that title.

12107           \*Mr. Joyce.   I move that the committee do now approve

12108   and agree to transmit to the House Committee on the Budget

12109   Subtitle C, Budget Reconciliation Legislative Recommendations

12110   Relating to Communications.   A roll call vote has been

12111 requested. The clerk will call the roll.

12112 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

12113 \*Mr. Latta. Aye.

12114 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.

12115 Mr. Griffith?

12116 \*Mr. Griffith. Aye.

12117 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

12118 Mr. Bilirakis?

12119 \*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.

12120 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.

12121 Mr. Hudson?

12122 \*Mr. Hudson. Aye.

12123 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.

12124 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

12125 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Aye.

12126 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes aye.

12127 Mr. Palmer?

12128 \*Mr. Palmer. Aye.

12129 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes aye.

12130 Mr. Dunn?

12131 [No response.]

12132 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

12133 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Aye.

12134 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes aye.

12135 Mr. Joyce?

12136           \*Mr. Joyce.   Aye.  
12137           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes aye.  
12138           Mr. Weber?  
12139           \*Mr. Weber.   Aye.  
12140           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes aye.  
12141           Mr. Allen?  
12142           \*Mr. Allen.   Aye.  
12143           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes aye.  
12144           Mr. Balderson?  
12145           \*Mr. Balderson.   Aye.  
12146           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes aye.  
12147           Mr. Fulcher?  
12148           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is aye.  
12149           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes aye.  
12150           Mr. Pfluger?  
12151           \*Mr. Pfluger.   Aye.  
12152           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes aye.  
12153           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
12154           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   Aye.  
12155           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes aye.  
12156           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
12157           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   Aye.  
12158           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes aye.  
12159           Mrs. Cammack?  
12160           \*Mrs. Cammack.   Aye.

12161           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes aye.  
12162           Mr. Obernolte?  
12163           \*Mr. Obernolte.   Aye.  
12164           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes aye.  
12165           Mr. James?  
12166           \*Mr. James.   Aye.  
12167           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes aye.  
12168           Mr. Bentz?  
12169           \*Mr. Bentz.   Aye.  
12170           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes aye.  
12171           Mrs. Houchin?  
12172           \*Mrs. Houchin.   Aye.  
12173           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes aye.  
12174           Mr. Fry?  
12175           [No response.]  
12176           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee?  
12177           \*Ms. Lee.   Aye.  
12178           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes aye.  
12179           Mr. Langworthy?  
12180           \*Mr. Langworthy.   Aye.  
12181           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
12182           Mr. Kean?  
12183           \*Mr. Kean.   Aye.  
12184           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes aye.  
12185           Mr. Rulli?



12186           \*Mr. Rulli.   Aye.  
12187           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes aye.  
12188           Mr. Evans?  
12189           \*Mr. Evans.   Aye.  
12190           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes aye.  
12191           Mr. Goldman?  
12192           \*Mr. Goldman.   Aye.  
12193           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
12194           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
12195           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   Aye.  
12196           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes aye.  
12197           Mr. Pallone?  
12198           \*Mr. Pallone.   Votes no.  
12199           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes no.  
12200           Ms. DeGette?  
12201           \*Ms. DeGette.   No.  
12202           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes no.  
12203           Ms. Schakowsky?  
12204           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   No.  
12205           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes no.  
12206           Ms. Matsui?  
12207           \*Ms. Matsui.   No.  
12208           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes no.  
12209           Ms. Castor?  
12210           \*Ms. Castor.   No.

12211           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes no.  
12212           Mr. Tonko?  
12213           \*Mr. Tonko.   No.  
12214           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes no.  
12215           Ms. Clarke?  
12216           \*Ms. Clarke.   No.  
12217           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes no.  
12218           Mr. Ruiz?  
12219           \*Mr. Ruiz.    No.  
12220           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes no.  
12221           Mr. Peters?  
12222           \*Mr. Peters.   No.  
12223           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes no.  
12224           Mrs. Dingell?  
12225           \*Mrs. Dingell.   No.  
12226           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes no.  
12227           Mr. Veasey?  
12228           \*Mr. Veasey.   No.  
12229           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes no.  
12230           Ms. Kelly?  
12231           \*Ms. Kelly.    No.  
12232           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes no.  
12233           Ms. Barragan?  
12234           \*Ms. Barragan.   No.  
12235           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes no.

12236 Mr. Soto?

12237 \*Mr. Soto. No.

12238 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes no.

12239 Ms. Schrier?

12240 \*Ms. Schrier. No.

12241 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes no.

12242 Mrs. Trahan?

12243 \*Mrs. Trahan. No.

12244 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes no.

12245 Mrs. Fletcher?

12246 \*Mrs. Fletcher. No.

12247 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes no.

12248 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

12249 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. No.

12250 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.

12251 Mr. Auchincloss?

12252 \*Mr. Auchincloss. No.

12253 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes no.

12254 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

12255 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. No.

12256 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes no.

12257 Mr. Menendez?

12258 \*Mr. Menendez. No.

12259 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes no.

12260 Mr. Mullin?

12261           \*Mr. Mullin.   No.

12262           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes no.

12263           Mr. Landsman?

12264           \*Mr. Landsman.   No.

12265           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes no.

12266           Ms. McClellan?

12267           \*Ms. McClellan.   No.

12268           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes no.

12269           Chairman Guthrie?

12270           \*The Chair.   Aye.

12271           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes aye.

12272           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mr. Fry reported?

12273           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry is not recorded.

12274           \*Mr. Fry.   Aye.

12275           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes aye.

12276           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the ayes and nays.

12277           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 29

12278   ayes and 24 noes.

12279           \*Mr. Joyce.   The ayes have it, the motion is agreed to.

12280           Please allow me to take a moment of personal privilege

12281   as we all join together to congratulate and wish happy

12282   birthday to our colleague, Gary Palmer.

12283           [Applause.]

12284           \*Mr. Pallone.   Mr. Chairman?

12285           \*The Chair.   [Presiding] The gentleman is recognized.

12286           \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman, I seek recognition to make  
12287 a motion.

12288           \*The Chair. The gentleman will state his motion.

12289           \*Mr. Pallone. Well, it is getting late, and most  
12290 Americans are in bed or heading that way shortly, and I think  
12291 it would be beneficial, Mr. Chairman, to the public, to  
12292 continue to discuss these important health issues, the next  
12293 title, while they are -- while people are awake and can tune  
12294 in. And as such, Mr. Chairman, I would move the committee  
12295 recess until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning, and I would ask for  
12296 a recorded vote on the motion.

12297           \*The Chair. The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

12298           \*Mr. Griffith. Yes, Mr. Chairman, I move to table the  
12299 gentleman from New Jersey's motion.

12300           \*The Chair. The gentleman from Virginia moves to table  
12301 the motion.

12302           \*Mr. Pallone. I would ask for a vote on the motion to  
12303 table.

12304           \*Voice. No, no, no, it is a previous motion.

12305           \*The Chair. Yes, it is not debatable.

12306           \*Voice. It is a privileged motion. You can't table it.

12307           \*Mr. Pallone. What is that? Oh, you mean we have to  
12308 vote on it? We have to vote on the motion to --

12309           \*The Chair. So the vote will be on the motion to  
12310 recess. Those in favor of recess, vote aye. Those opposed

12311 will vote no.

12312 \*Ms. DeGette. Excuse me, Mr. Chair.

12313 \*The Chair. The clerk will call the roll. The clerk --

12314 \*Ms. DeGette. The motion to recess until 9:00 a.m.

12315 tomorrow morning.

12316 \*The Chair. The vote -- or the motion is to recess

12317 until 9:00 a.m. tomorrow morning. Those in favor, vote aye.

12318 Those opposed, vote no. And the clerk will call the roll.

12319 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

12320 \*Mr. Latta. No.

12321 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

12322 Mr. Griffith?

12323 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

12324 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

12325 Mr. Bilirakis?

12326 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

12327 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

12328 Mr. Hudson?

12329 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

12330 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

12331 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

12332 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

12333 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

12334 Mr. Palmer?

12335 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

12336           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
12337           Mr. Dunn?  
12338           [No response.]  
12339           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
12340           [No response.]  
12341           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce?  
12342           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
12343           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
12344           Mr. Weber?  
12345           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
12346           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
12347           Mr. Allen?  
12348           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
12349           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
12350           Mr. Balderson?  
12351           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
12352           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
12353           Mr. Fulcher?  
12354           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
12355           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
12356           Mr. Pfluger?  
12357           [No response.]  
12358           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger?  
12359           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
12360           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

12361 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
12362 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
12363 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
12364 Mrs. Cammack?  
12365 [No response.]  
12366 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
12367 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
12368 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
12369 Mr. James?  
12370 \*Mr. James. No.  
12371 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
12372 Mr. Bentz?  
12373 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
12374 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
12375 Mrs. Houchin?  
12376 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
12377 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
12378 Mr. Fry?  
12379 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
12380 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
12381 Ms. Lee?  
12382 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
12383 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
12384 Mr. Langworthy?  
12385 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.



12386           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
12387           Mr. Kean?  
12388           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
12389           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
12390           Mr. Rulli?  
12391           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
12392           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
12393           Mr. Evans?  
12394           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
12395           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
12396           Mr. Goldman?  
12397           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
12398           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
12399           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
12400           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
12401           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
12402           Mr. Pallone?  
12403           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
12404           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
12405           Ms. DeGette?  
12406           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
12407           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
12408           Ms. Schakowsky?  
12409           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Big aye.  
12410           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

12411 Ms. Matsui?  
12412 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
12413 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
12414 Ms. Castor?  
12415 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
12416 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
12417 Mr. Tonko?  
12418 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
12419 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
12420 Ms. Clarke?  
12421 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
12422 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
12423 Mr. Ruiz?  
12424 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
12425 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
12426 Mr. Peters?  
12427 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
12428 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
12429 Mrs. Dingell?  
12430 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
12431 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
12432 Mr. Veasey?  
12433 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
12434 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
12435 Ms. Kelly?

12436           \*Ms. Kelly.   Aye.  
12437           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
12438           Ms. Barragan?  
12439           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
12440           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
12441           Mr. Soto?  
12442           \*Mr. Soto.   Aye.  
12443           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
12444           Ms. Schrier?  
12445           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
12446           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
12447           Mrs. Trahan?  
12448           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.  
12449           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
12450           Mrs. Fletcher?  
12451           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
12452           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
12453           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
12454           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
12455           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
12456           Mr. Auchincloss?  
12457           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
12458           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
12459           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
12460           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.

12461           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
12462           Mr. Menendez?  
12463           \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
12464           \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
12465           Mr. Mullin?  
12466           \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
12467           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
12468           Mr. Landsman?  
12469           \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
12470           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
12471           Ms. McClellan?  
12472           \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
12473           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
12474           Chairman Guthrie?  
12475           \*The Chair. No.  
12476           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
12477           \*The Chair. Anyone seeking -- how is Mr. Crenshaw  
12478 recorded?  
12479           \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw is not recorded.  
12480           \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.  
12481           \*The Chair. Mr. Pfluger?  
12482           \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
12483           \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
12484           \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
12485           \*The Chair. Mrs. Cammack?

12486           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack is not recorded.

12487           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.

12488           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.

12489           \*The Chair.   Is Mr. Hudson -- okay, is anyone seeking  
12490 recognition on the Democrat side to answer the roll call?

12491           Is Mr. Hudson recorded?

12492           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson is recorded --

12493           \*The Chair.   Okay.

12494           \*The Clerk.   -- as no.

12495           \*The Chair.   So no one else here?

12496           The clerk will report.

12497           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
12498 ayes and 29 noes.

12499           \*The Chair.   The motion is not agreed to.   So the chair  
12500 calls up committee print Subtitle D, Health, and asks the  
12501 clerk to report.

12502           \*The Clerk.   Title IV, Energy and Commerce, Subtitle D,  
12503 Health, Part 1, Medicaid.

12504           \*The Chair.   Without objection, the reading of the  
12505 committee print is dispensed with.   The committee print will  
12506 be open for amendment at any point.

12507           So ordered.

12508

12509

12510

12511           [The committee print follows:]

12512

12513       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

12514

12515           \*The Chair. And the chair has an amendment in the  
12516 nature of a substitute at the desk. The clerk will report  
12517 the amendment.

12518           \*The Clerk. Amendment in the nature of a substitute to  
12519 Subtitle D, offered by --

12520           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
12521 amendment is dispensed with.

12522           [The amendment of The Chair follows:]

12523

12524           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

12525

12526           \*The Chair. So the AINS is before us. Is there any  
12527 discussion or amendments to the amendment in the nature of a  
12528 substitute?

12529           The gentlelady from Colorado is recognized for five  
12530 minutes to --

12531           \*Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman --

12532           \*The Chair. -- speak on the AINS.

12533           \*Ms. DeGette. -- I move to strike the last word.

12534           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

12535           \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12536           Well, it is now 2 minutes of 1:00 a.m., Mr. Chairman,  
12537 and I guess I can see why the Republicans wanted to sneak  
12538 this health care bill through in the dead of night and defeat  
12539 a reasonable motion to go until tomorrow morning so my  
12540 constituents could know what is going on, and here is why.

12541           You can't just cut 700 and -- Mr. Chairman, the  
12542 committee is not in order.

12543           \*The Chair. The committee will come to order. The  
12544 gentlelady deserves to be heard.

12545           The gentlelady will proceed.

12546           \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you. You can't just cut \$715  
12547 billion for Medicaid without slashing benefits for people.  
12548 You can't do it. And in fact, the non-partisan Congressional  
12549 Budget Office says that 13.7 million Americans will be kicked  
12550 off their health care. Here is how it breaks down.



12551           CBO estimates that 8.6 million Americans will lose  
12552 coverage under this bill, and then 5.1 million will lose  
12553 their coverage because I am going to guarantee you the  
12554 Republican majority is not going to extend the enhanced ACA  
12555 subsidies.

12556           This bill asks people who are making barely more than  
12557 the poverty level, just \$15,650 a year, to pay more for their  
12558 care while at the same time providing massive and  
12559 disproportionate handouts to corporations and billionaires.  
12560 And it hamstring states' abilities to pay for quality care  
12561 that the Medicaid beneficiaries need.

12562           The Republicans are making insidious cuts to Medicaid  
12563 and our health insurance system, as I said. It adds up to  
12564 13.7 billion fewer people. Republicans continue to make this  
12565 claim -- they have all day and night -- saying that they  
12566 don't cut -- support cuts for providers or patients. And in  
12567 fact, my colleague from Colorado's 8th congressional district  
12568 who sits on this committee said, and I quote, "I don't  
12569 support cuts that harm Colorado providers or patients.'" But  
12570 look what will happen with these cuts. There will be cuts to  
12571 providers and patients.

12572           Medicaid covers nearly 80 million people nationwide,  
12573 including in my home state, nearly 1.2 million people. This  
12574 includes -- it is 163,000 people in my district, but look at  
12575 the 3rd congressional district, which is western Colorado.

12576 It is a very rural district. It is 213,000 people. And in  
12577 the 8th district, north of me, it is a very -- it is a mixed  
12578 district. It has 182,000 people.

12579 Medicaid is a critical part of our health insurance  
12580 system, and it impacts people all across the country. It  
12581 pays for care for new moms, for working families, kids with  
12582 serious medical needs, and more. And that is why 65 percent  
12583 of Americans say that Medicaid has covered them or someone  
12584 close to them at some point.

12585 So here is what is going to happen -- and the reason why  
12586 these people support Medicaid is because it saves lives.  
12587 States that have expanded Medicaid have saved tens of  
12588 thousands of lives by doing so. People who got Medicaid  
12589 through the expansion have a 20 percent lower overall  
12590 mortality rate than people who do not. These people are  
12591 living healthier, they are having more productive lives by  
12592 having access to the care they need when they need it, not  
12593 just when they show up to the emergency room.

12594 Now, I know we are going to have a lot more debate on  
12595 two of the things my colleagues across the aisle say.

12596 Number one, these work requirements. Now, let's be  
12597 really honest, is -- the work requirements that they are  
12598 saying not only will throw many, many people who are eligible  
12599 off of insurance, but it will also increase paperwork  
12600 requirements and it will increase costs for the states.

12601 I would like -- Mr. Chairman, I would like to put a  
12602 study from the Kaiser Family Foundation into the record which  
12603 shows that 92 percent of Medicaid recipients are working, in  
12604 school, disabled, or caregivers, or seniors, and that, for  
12605 those very few people that you could find, most of them are  
12606 already working. You are sure as heck not going to save \$715  
12607 billion by throwing these people off of their Medicaid.

12608 \*The Chair. Without objection, so ordered.

12609 [The information follows:]

12610

12611 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

12612

12613           \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you.

12614           Now, the other thing we are going to hear about -- and I  
12615 don't have much time so we can talk about it later -- is  
12616 beneficiary fraud. Beneficiary fraud amounts to one-tenth of  
12617 one percent of Medicaid. You tell me how you are going to  
12618 save \$715 billion through eliminating "beneficiary fraud."'  
12619           With that I yield back.

12620           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
12621 discussion on the amendment, on the amendment in the nature  
12622 of a substitute?

12623           The gentleman from California, Mr. Ruiz, is -- Dr. Ruiz  
12624 is recognized for five minutes.

12625           \*Mr. Ruiz. I move to strike the last word.

12626           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

12627           \*Mr. Ruiz. You know, we have spent the past 10-plus  
12628 hours debating the many ways that this bill is bad for  
12629 Americans. Over the next however many hours now we will  
12630 debate a health care bill that will make Americans  
12631 unhealthier. It will make health care less accessible. It  
12632 will make health care more expensive.

12633           Don't be fooled. The provisions in this bill are  
12634 designed to decrease health care coverage, not strengthen our  
12635 nation's health care system. This bill will drastically  
12636 increase the financial burden on states, and restrict their  
12637 ability to raise funds to cover their share of Medicaid costs

12638 so that they have no choice but to either raise taxes or cut  
12639 benefits and cut pay for providers, making it less likely to  
12640 find a provider to take Medicaid in those communities. It  
12641 will increase out-of-pocket costs for care for low-income  
12642 individuals who get their coverage through Medicaid  
12643 expansion. It will lead to at least 13.7 million individuals  
12644 losing their health care coverage. And even more cruel, it  
12645 makes it much harder for these individuals to get coverage  
12646 elsewhere on the ACA marketplace. This will only worsen the  
12647 Medicaid -- medical debt crisis and force hospitals to  
12648 provide even more uncompensated care.

12649       The atrocious policies in this bill will have lasting  
12650 negative impacts for our nation's health care system and  
12651 generations of Americans to come. As you vote on amendments  
12652 tonight, I implore you all to put the health and well-being  
12653 of your constituents first.

12654       Thank you, and I yield the remainder of my time.

12655       \*The Chair. Does the gentleman yield back his time?

12656       The gentleman yields back. Is there any discussion on  
12657 the Republican side?

12658       Seeing none, the gentlelady from California, Ms.  
12659 Barragan, is recognized for five minutes.

12660       \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to  
12661 speak in favor of the amendment, and --

12662       \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

12663           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you. I just want to say that I  
12664 fully support this amendment, especially in light of the very  
12665 strong statement that it will not cut Medicaid benefits.

12666           But I also want to show you my latest chart. Actually,  
12667 my latest poster board, I should say.

12668           [Chart]

12669           \*Ms. Barragan. This is a quote from a Republican  
12670 Senator: "This wing of the party wants Republicans to build  
12671 our big, beautiful bill around slashing health insurance to  
12672 the working poor. But that argument is both morally wrong  
12673 and, politically, suicide.'" This is a Republican in the  
12674 Senate. Republicans themselves are saying this is going to  
12675 slash health care for the working poor.

12676           So I have to agree with the Senator, the Republican  
12677 Senator, on this one. And it is devastating. It is  
12678 devastating to families, to people across the country. We  
12679 saw it today, evidenced today, by people who were here, who  
12680 were removed because they were so afraid of losing their  
12681 access to health care, because they were speaking out because  
12682 they wanted to share their story.

12683           In California's 44th district, Christine, a constituent  
12684 of mine, says, "I am retired and I live on a fixed income. I  
12685 have been battling metastatic cancer for two years, and I am  
12686 afraid, with cuts -- with the cuts to Medicare and Medi-  
12687 Cal," which is Medicaid and health care in California, "I am

12688 afraid that the cuts from Trump Administration and House  
12689 Republicans -- that I won't be able to continue on my cancer  
12690 immunotherapy treatments if my Medicaid gets cut.'`

12691       Alicia from the 44th district says, "I am a mother of  
12692 two autistic boys. I can't express the gratitude I have for  
12693 the services that Medicaid has provided my children. My  
12694 children have been given a chance of normalcy in our  
12695 community. Children with disabilities deserve a chance to be  
12696 loved and respected by others, not discriminated because they  
12697 cannot express themselves or ask for help. These types of  
12698 barriers make their living challenging, especially for those  
12699 with stemming that people can -- are confused and say they  
12700 are on drugs, when in reality they are sick or they can't be  
12701 understood. Imagine a world of disabled children and adults  
12702 left to fend for themselves because their families cannot  
12703 provide a service to help them understand daily life skills  
12704 or advocating for themselves,'` she continues on, "for them  
12705 to understand that they do have a voice, and someone is  
12706 willing to hear them out and help. I ask you to reconsider  
12707 and take the time to meet a child or an adult with autism and  
12708 see how curious and brilliant they are.'`

12709       And so I share those two stories, and I share again this  
12710 so-important quote from a Republican Senator just across the  
12711 chamber here, who says this wing of the party, those  
12712 Republicans that are in this room right now, that is "this

12713 wing of the party,'` wants Republicans to build our big,  
12714 beautiful bill -- by the way, all these binders say the big,  
12715 beautiful bill, so that is what we are talking about today --  
12716 around slashing health insurance to the working poor. So  
12717 Republicans themselves are saying they are slashing health  
12718 care for the working poor. And at least this one Republican  
12719 Senator got it wrong. It is morally wrong, and it is  
12720 political suicide.

12721 And with that I yield back.

12722 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. [Presiding] The gentlelady  
12723 yields. Is there any other discussion on the amendments to  
12724 the -- in the nature of the substitute?

12725 The chair recognizes the gentlelady from -- where is she  
12726 from? Washington State.

12727 Dr. Schrier.

12728 \*Ms. Schrier. Washington and Oregon are the same.

12729 [Laughter.]

12730 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

12731 Kittitas Valley Health Care is in Ellensburg,  
12732 Washington. It is a critical access hospital. It is in a  
12733 rural area. Ellensburg is just east of the snow-peaked  
12734 Cascade Mountains, where the passes often close and are --  
12735 and so they can't easily access other care. Over 60 percent  
12736 of the patients that they see at Kittitas Valley Healthcare  
12737 rely on Medicare or Medicaid. And so really, that is what



12738 keeps this rural hospital afloat.

12739 [Slide]

12740 \*Ms. Schrier. Now, I want you to know that they already  
12741 struggle to keep a labor and delivery department open. I  
12742 want you to meet Ila. She is four years old. Her parents  
12743 are Jason and Vanessa. They were so excited to welcome her  
12744 into the world in 2021 after an uncomplicated pregnancy. But  
12745 then everything went south in the delivery room. She came  
12746 out pale, limp, severely anemic, low oxygen levels, and had  
12747 to have emergency interventions. And thank goodness they had  
12748 labor and delivery at Kittitas Valley Healthcare, because  
12749 they were able to stabilize her while they called for  
12750 emergency transportation to get her over to Seattle  
12751 Children's to the NICU. They couldn't even use a helicopter  
12752 because of the weather, and certainly couldn't use the  
12753 mountain passes. So it took an actual airplane taking her  
12754 over there.

12755 And I just want to drive home this point as my  
12756 Republican colleagues are looking at taking Medicaid away  
12757 from 13.7 million Americans. That will jeopardize hospitals  
12758 like KVH, and that means they might not have a labor and  
12759 delivery department, might not have had it for Ila. She may  
12760 have had a completely different outcome that I won't even  
12761 talk about.

12762 But I want to be very clear. Our health care system is

12763     like -- it is like a three-legged stool, and one of those  
12764     legs is Medicaid. And if you take Medicaid away and you make  
12765     the biggest cut ever made to Medicaid, that stool is going to  
12766     collapse.

12767             That is our entire health care system. And it is going  
12768     to hit rural America first, but it is going to hit every  
12769     single hospital, and it is going to hit all of us because,  
12770     you know, when labor and delivery closes at KVH, they lose  
12771     one service. When people can't get primary care in Kittitas  
12772     Valley in Ellensburg, then they are going to get their care  
12773     on an emergency basis in the emergency department, where it  
12774     is expensive. And you know who is going to pay? All of us.  
12775     Our insurance rates are going to go up because, if hospitals  
12776     are going to stay in business, they have got to bill  
12777     somebody, and people on Medicaid are not going to be able to  
12778     pay.

12779             So I just want to be clear that these cuts -- and let  
12780     there be no doubt, these are dramatic cuts -- these cuts are  
12781     going to destabilize our healthcare system. They are going  
12782     to leave people sicker and poorer and less able to work. And  
12783     this is all to give a gigantic tax break to the wealthiest in  
12784     this country, to the billionaires, to the Elon Musks. And I  
12785     just have to emphasize that that is immoral. It is stupid to  
12786     destabilize our entire healthcare system, and it is just  
12787     plain cruel.

12788           So I want my Republican colleagues to understand exactly  
12789 what they are doing when they take these votes.

12790           I yield back.

12791           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Is  
12792 there any other discussion on the amendment in the nature of  
12793 a substitute?

12794           Hearing none, the chair -- are there any amendments to  
12795 the amendment in the nature of a substitute?

12796           The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Colorado.

12797           \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an  
12798 amendment at the desk, Health-FCD-AMD\_007.

12799           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Can you repeat that, please?

12800           \*Ms. DeGette. Health-FCD-AMD\_007.

12801           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the  
12802 amendment.

12803           \*The Clerk. Health-FCD-AMD\_007, an amendment offered by  
12804 Ms. DeGette. Add, at the end of the following, Section  
12805 effective date --

12806           \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Chairman --

12807           \*The Clerk. -- provisions of this subtitle --

12808           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection, the reading  
12809 of the amendment is dispensed with.

12810

12811

12812

12813           [The amendment of Ms. DeGette follows:]

12814

12815       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

12816

12817           \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Chairman, if I could reserve a point  
12818 of order, please.

12819           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. A point of order is reserved by  
12820 the gentleman from Virginia.

12821           And the gentlelady from Colorado is recognized for five  
12822 minutes in support of the amendment.

12823           \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

12824           Well, staff didn't read the amendment, so I will. It  
12825 says the provisions of this subtitle shall not be made  
12826 effective unless and until the date on which the Secretary of  
12827 Health and Human Services submits to Congress a certification  
12828 that such provisions will not have the effect of reducing  
12829 benefits provided under state plans or waivers of such plans,  
12830 as promised by the United -- President and the article  
12831 published by the White House entitled, "Fact Check:  
12832 President Trump Will Always Protect Social Security,  
12833 Medicare.'"`

12834           And I want to say, since this process started, Mr.  
12835 Chairman, Republicans have said repeatedly that they would  
12836 not cut Medicaid benefits or coverage. The chairman of the  
12837 full committee actually said in this very room, "We are not  
12838 going to do it in a way that threatens hospitals.'"` So let's  
12839 just talk about a couple of ways that these cuts are going to  
12840 harm beneficiaries.

12841           The first one is the hospitals. The American

12842 Association of Medical Colleges, in fact, says that the  
12843 nation's -- that it is likely in rural communities that a  
12844 shortage of doctors and a shortage of funding for Medicaid is  
12845 going to potentially close rural hospitals. And certainly,  
12846 as Ms. Schrier talked about, it is going to cut benefits.

12847 I have a letter from the Colorado Hospital Association  
12848 outlining how this bill will hurt hospitals all across my  
12849 state and the patients they serve, and I would ask unanimous  
12850 consent to put that into the record.

12851 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

12852 [The information follows:]

12853

12854 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

12855

12856           \*Ms. DeGette. Speaker Johnson himself said it is non-  
12857 benefit-related reforms to the program that are under  
12858 consideration. But here is another one, and I want to take  
12859 this moment to thank all of the people in the pink tee shirts  
12860 that say I fight for Planned Parenthood who are right here in  
12861 the audience. Because they know, like we all know, Planned  
12862 Parenthood provides health care for millions of Americans,  
12863 services like pap smears, primary care visits, and breast  
12864 exams all across this country. Sixty-four percent of Planned  
12865 Parenthood clinics are in rural areas or otherwise  
12866 underserved areas.

12867           Guess what? This legislation -- we are going to be  
12868 talking a lot more about this this morning -- is -- this  
12869 legislation eliminates Medicaid funding to Planned  
12870 Parenthood. And so what that means is that 64 percent of  
12871 Planned Parenthood clinics in rural areas or other  
12872 underserved areas is going to be eliminated for these  
12873 beneficiaries. That sounds like a benefit cut to me.

12874           CBO estimates, as I said before, that just this bill  
12875 will relate -- will result in 8.6 million fewer people having  
12876 health care coverage. And it does that by making it more  
12877 difficult for lawful beneficiaries to enroll. It puts  
12878 burdensome and confusing bureaucratic red tape between  
12879 Americans and health care, and it throws whole categories of  
12880 people off of Medicaid. You tell me how that is not

12881 eliminating care for people.

12882           Now, President Trump himself said that he would veto a  
12883 bill that cuts Medicaid by taking away provider fees as a  
12884 funding mechanism and by making states revise their current  
12885 provider fees. This bill does exactly that. And so I guess  
12886 I would have to say, if President Trump wants to keep his  
12887 promise, I know he will veto this bill if it ever gets to his  
12888 desk because it is going to cut, in this bill alone, over  
12889 eight million people off of Medicaid.

12890           So my amendment is very simple. It holds my Republican  
12891 colleagues to their word. It just simply says that, if the  
12892 Secretary certifies that what the White House said, that the  
12893 Trump Administration won't cut Social Security, Medicare, or  
12894 Medicaid benefits, it can go into effect. And so this is a  
12895 simple opportunity to ensure President Trump has kept his  
12896 word and all my colleagues on this committee have kept their  
12897 word that, in fact, they won't -- this won't go into effect  
12898 unless and until they can certify that no one has been harmed  
12899 by the provisions in this bill.

12900           I yield back.

12901           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields back.  
12902 The chair recognizes himself for five minutes to -- on the  
12903 amendment.

12904           The President and House Republicans have made it very  
12905 clear. We have made it very clear that we will not touch



12906 essential health care services for vulnerable populations.  
12907 The policies in the underlying bill protect and preserve --  
12908 protect and preserve -- benefits for vulnerable patients on  
12909 Medicaid, including pregnant women, children with  
12910 disabilities, and those experiencing financial hardships,  
12911 while preventing against waste, fraud, and abuse.

12912 Examples. Ensuring beneficiaries aren't enrolled in two  
12913 states, in two state Medicaid programs, unnecessarily eating  
12914 into state Medicaid budgets and taking resources away from  
12915 individuals with chronic conditions and other life-  
12916 threatening conditions.

12917 We also have common-sense solutions that were  
12918 bipartisan, bipartisan, last Congress. These include  
12919 policies to ensure deceased patients aren't enrolled in  
12920 Medicaid programs and ensuring providers are eligible to  
12921 build state Medicaid programs.

12922 My Democratic colleagues want to paint the picture that  
12923 Republicans are cutting Medicaid to pay for tax increases for  
12924 billionaires, when in reality we, under the leadership of  
12925 President Trump, are protecting benefits for vulnerable  
12926 beneficiaries for decades to come. We are stabilizing. We  
12927 are saving. We are sustaining Medicaid for those it was  
12928 intended for, for those who need it the most, the vulnerable  
12929 in our population. That is what we are doing here.

12930 I yield back. Is there any other discussion?

12931           \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

12932           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I yield.

12933           \*Ms. DeGette. I would just ask the gentleman who is  
12934 going to define the essential populations. Is that defined  
12935 in statute somewhere?

12936           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. It is defined as a vulnerable  
12937 population. You all know we --

12938           \*Ms. DeGette. Where are the --

12939           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Excuse me. Reclaiming my time,  
12940 we all recognize that there are parameters by which people  
12941 qualify. The most vulnerable in our society, the aged, the  
12942 blind, disabled, children, mothers, pregnant women, those are  
12943 the ones that this program was designed for. Those are the  
12944 ones that this program is intended for.

12945           And I yield back and I will recognize the gentleman from  
12946 -- where is he from? Where is he from, Ohio?

12947           \*Mr. Pallone. Ohio.

12948           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman from Ohio for  
12949 five minutes.

12950           \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair, just a couple  
12951 questions because you are making a very significant statement  
12952 in that \$700 billion later Medicaid is going to be protected,  
12953 and that the intent of these cuts is to help people on  
12954 Medicaid, those who deserve it or need it. It is not clear.

12955           So first question, you all are adding a copay for low-

12956 income folks go visit the -- a doctor. So on top of all of  
12957 the other bills that they are struggling to pay, you are  
12958 adding a new bill. You are saying every time you see a  
12959 doctor, you now have to pay more money. How is that  
12960 protecting folks on Medicaid? How does the copay help people  
12961 on Medicaid, or how does it address waste, fraud, and abuse?

12962 I mean, what is the argument for adding an additional  
12963 cost for folks going to see a doctor? If that money was  
12964 being invested back into Medicaid, you could make that  
12965 argument, but it is not being invested back in Medicaid, you  
12966 are using it for the tax cuts. So what is the argument for  
12967 requiring people to pay more to go see the doctor?

12968 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Does the gentleman have a  
12969 question?

12970 \*Mr. Landsman. That is the --

12971 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. That is a pretty long question.

12972 \*Mr. Landsman. Well, that is literally the question.

12973 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Literally --

12974 \*Mr. Landsman. That is the question. What is the  
12975 argument?

12976 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Again, what we are doing here  
12977 is that we are making sure that we are going to sustain this  
12978 program, we are going to stabilize this program.

12979 You know, I don't buy into the idea that, just because  
12980 you are --

12981           \*Mr. Landsman. All right, let me --

12982           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- cutting a certain amount of  
12983 money --

12984           \*Mr. Landsman. I am going to -- I am reclaiming my  
12985 time.

12986           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- that means you have got to  
12987 cut --

12988           \*Mr. Landsman. No, no, no, I just want to reclaim my  
12989 time. It is a question.

12990           You want to sustain the program, I get it. I get that  
12991 is what you are saying. Why are you charging people more  
12992 money to go see the doctor, then? That is the question.  
12993 What is the argument for that?

12994           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Part of our -- part of what we  
12995 are proposing is to make sure that this program is  
12996 sustainable.

12997           \*Mr. Landsman. But you are not investing the additional  
12998 money. You are saying to people, low-income folks, people  
12999 who make 16,000, 17,000, \$18,000 a year, you now have to pay  
13000 more to go see the doctor. But that money, that new revenue  
13001 is going to pay for tax cuts, not going to the Medicaid. So  
13002 how is that helping people on Medicaid?

13003           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Again, what we are trying to do  
13004 is to make sure this program is sustainable.

13005           I think it is presumptuous for you to say that that

13006 money is not going back into the program. The money is going  
13007 back into the program to make sure we sustain it, to make  
13008 sure we stabilize it, to make sure that it is there for the  
13009 most vulnerable in our society.

13010 \*Mr. Landsman. But that is dishonest. I mean, I don't  
13011 -- you can't say "lie," we are not saying "lie," but that  
13012 is -- we know it is not -- you are using that money to -- as  
13013 part of the \$715 billion that is being removed from Medicaid  
13014 in order to pay for the tax cuts, so it is not helping anyone  
13015 on Medicaid.

13016 The shifts to the states, where the states are going to  
13017 have to pay more, we are going to pay less, a lot of states  
13018 won't be able to pay their part. People will lose coverage.  
13019 How is that helping to sustain Medicaid? How is that helping  
13020 to protect Medicaid?

13021 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Whenever we clean up the rolls,  
13022 whenever we take people --

13023 \*Mr. Landsman. Clean up the rolls?

13024 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- who are not supposed to be  
13025 on there, when we put illegals off of here, when we get  
13026 people who are in more than one state, that makes more money  
13027 for those who need it the most.

13028 \*Mr. Landsman. But you are not -- first of all, you are  
13029 taking health care away from seven to eight million people.  
13030 That is -- I mean, cleaning up the rolls is going to be

13031 heartbreaking for people who are about to lose their health  
13032 care that they were -- they lost their health care as part of  
13033 an effort to clean up the rolls.

13034       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. If they are not eligible for  
13035 it, they shouldn't be on it in the first place.

13036       \*Mr. Landsman. But they are eligible.

13037       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No, no, no, that is not who we  
13038 are going to take off the roll.

13039       \*Mr. Landsman. Who do you take off the rolls?

13040       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. If they are eligible, they will  
13041 be on the roll. What we are going to do is to take those who  
13042 are not eligible, who may be in more than one state, and we  
13043 are going to make sure they are only in one state.

13044       \*Mr. Landsman. Wait, what?

13045       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. What?

13046       \*Mr. Landsman. I am sorry, this is confusing. This is  
13047 why the American -- I am going to yield back, because I am  
13048 out of time.

13049       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman's time has  
13050 expired.

13051       \*Mr. Landsman. I think you have created enormous  
13052 confusion on top of the real fear and anger --

13053       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman's time has  
13054 expired.

13055       \*Mr. Landsman. -- people are going to lose their health

13056 care.

13057 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Does anyone else seek time to  
13058 speak on the amendment?

13059 \*Mr. Pallone. McClellan.

13060 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the  
13061 gentlelady from Virginia, Ms. McClellan, for five minutes.

13062 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

13063 Would the gentleman yield for a question, the chairman?

13064 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I will yield.

13065 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you. I want to make sure --  
13066 because you have repeated several times, other members on  
13067 that side have repeated seven -- several times that this bill  
13068 is intended to ensure that no one loses coverage, vulnerable  
13069 people who Medicaid was originally intended for, and that  
13070 caught my attention, and so I just want to ask, point blank.

13071 The Affordable Care Act expanded who was eligible by  
13072 allowing the states to cover adults with incomes up to 138  
13073 percent of the Federal poverty line, which for an individual  
13074 in 2025 is someone who makes up to \$21,597 a year, which, to  
13075 me, is someone who is pretty vulnerable.

13076 So will this bill ensure that individuals who make up to  
13077 138 percent of the Federal poverty line, who were included in  
13078 Medicaid expansion in the states that expanded it, who meet  
13079 the requirements will not lose any coverage?

13080 Is that the intent of this bill? Are they included in

13081 the vulnerable population that Medicaid was originally  
13082 intended to cover, as stated by you, Mr. Chairman?

13083 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. If they are eligible, they are  
13084 going to continue to be covered.

13085 What we are looking to do is to remove those who are  
13086 registered in more than one state.

13087 What we are looking to do is to make sure -- and yes,  
13088 there are those who are eligible in more than one state, and  
13089 we are going to clean that up.

13090 We are also going to make sure that, if they are not  
13091 supposed to be on the Medicaid rolls, that they are not on  
13092 the Medicaid rolls. Therefore, we are going to take care of  
13093 those who are the most vulnerable, who should be getting this  
13094 most necessary coverage.

13095 \*Ms. McClellan. And Mr. Chairman, just to be crystal  
13096 clear, because it is 1:00 a.m. and very few people are paying  
13097 attention to this, and I want it very clearly on the record,  
13098 the majority party that wrote and intends to vote for this  
13099 bill includes the expansion population in those states that  
13100 expanded it to cover adults who make up to 138 percent of the  
13101 Federal poverty line. You include that as the vulnerable  
13102 Americans who are eligible and should continue to get  
13103 Medicaid.

13104 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The bill before us includes a  
13105 work requirement so that, if they engage in 80 hours a month



13106 and the parameters are set, there is no reason why they would  
13107 not be able to continue on this Medicaid.

13108 \*Ms. McClellan. And Mr. Chairman, who will implement  
13109 the work requirement?

13110 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The work requirements are in  
13111 this bill, the parameters of that, and they will be  
13112 administered by the states.

13113 \*Ms. McClellan. Okay. So that includes Georgia, which,  
13114 when it implemented work requirements, kicked eligible people  
13115 off the rolls. That includes Alabama -- this is not a  
13116 question, this is a statement -- that includes Alabama that,  
13117 when they implement work requirements, that kicked people off  
13118 of the rolls who were otherwise eligible. That means, if you  
13119 fill out the paperwork incorrectly, you lose your health  
13120 insurance. That means if the state hasn't figured out how to  
13121 determine when you got pregnant, when you stopped or began  
13122 work, you are kicked off. That means that under this bill,  
13123 because they do multiple checks, if you have been laid off  
13124 and you haven't gotten a new job yet, you are kicked off.  
13125 That is what that means.

13126 And we are going to have a whole lot of discussion about  
13127 work requirements tonight because, basically, the work  
13128 requirements are red tape requirements that, if you fail to  
13129 fill out these forms that states -- there is evidence that  
13130 states have not been able to implement in a way that doesn't

13131 kick off eligible people. We are going to have a lot of  
13132 conversation about that this morning.

13133 I yield back.

13134 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
13135 there any further discussion on this amendment?

13136 The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Illinois for  
13137 five minutes of questioning.

13138 \*Ms. Schakowsky. I yield my time, Mr. Chair, to  
13139 Congresswoman DeGette.

13140 \*Ms. DeGette. I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

13141 Mr. Chairman, I guess I am confused, because several  
13142 times you said we are not going to cut Medicaid for  
13143 vulnerable populations. You mentioned pregnant people, the  
13144 disabled, and the elderly. But of course, there are a number  
13145 of other people, low-income people, as I mentioned in my  
13146 opening, who are on Medicaid. And I guess I am wondering if  
13147 those people will be cut off of Medicaid.

13148 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Ms. DeGette, if they are  
13149 eligible for Medicaid --

13150 \*Ms. DeGette. If they are eligible, then --

13151 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. If they are eligible, they will  
13152 continue to be covered. The most vulnerable in our society,  
13153 a program --

13154 \*Ms. DeGette. Well --

13155 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- that was intended for the

13156 aged, the blind --

13157 \*Ms. DeGette. Well, all those people --

13158 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- disabled, for pregnant  
13159 mothers, for children --

13160 \*Ms. DeGette. Yes, okay, wait. If I can reclaim --  
13161 well, I guess I have Ms. Schakowsky's time -- but almost all  
13162 of these 8.6 million people who are going to lose their  
13163 Medicaid are eligible.

13164 Now, you did mention several different groups. One of  
13165 them is -- one of the groups you mentioned is people who are  
13166 registered for Medicaid in more than one state, and I think  
13167 all of us can agree that, if people are registered in more  
13168 than one state, they shouldn't be, and they should go -- they  
13169 should only be registered one time.

13170 But I have got the CBO score in my hand. And what it  
13171 says is, for those people who are registered in more than one  
13172 state, that only saves \$17.4 billion of the \$700 billion that  
13173 you cut in this. So I am guessing -- so I am wondering where  
13174 you are going to get the other money to save if you are just  
13175 going to cut 17.4 billion here.

13176 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. That is not the only policy  
13177 that we are getting these savings from.

13178 \*Ms. DeGette. Okay, well, the other -- thank you. You  
13179 know, the other one you mentioned was this thing about the  
13180 "illegals," which you keep talking about. And I did put the

13181 statute into the record earlier that -- saying that Medicaid  
13182 does not cover benefits for anybody who is not here legally,  
13183 but some states do, some states with their own state money.

13184 And so what your bill does, Mr. Chairman, is it says  
13185 that we are not going to give matches to states that, with  
13186 their own money, pay for undocumented people. But even that  
13187 -- so I get that you are saying we are not going to give that  
13188 to them, either, but that one would save \$11 billion.

13189 So if you add it up, if you add it up to -- the people  
13190 who are registered in two states and the states that with  
13191 their own money cover undocumented people, that is like \$28.4  
13192 billion out of \$700 billion. So where are you going to get  
13193 the rest without throwing eligible people off of Medicaid?

13194 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. We are not throwing eligible  
13195 people off of Medicaid. Again --

13196 \*Ms. DeGette. Well, I hear you keep saying that.

13197 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Again, what we are doing is  
13198 ensuring the beneficiaries who aren't enrolled in two state  
13199 Medicaid programs, that they are -- those people are  
13200 unnecessarily eating into state Medicaid budgets --

13201 \*Ms. DeGette. Right, that is --

13202 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- and taking resources away  
13203 from those who truly need it.

13204 \*Ms. DeGette. That is right. That is 17.4 billion.

13205 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. That is correct. And that is

13206 part --

13207 \*Ms. DeGette. So where do you --

13208 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- of the savings that we are  
13209 using --

13210 \*Ms. DeGette. -- get the other 700?

13211 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- to stabilize this program  
13212 that is --

13213 \*Ms. DeGette. I --

13214 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- intended for the most  
13215 vulnerable in our society.

13216 \*Ms. DeGette. I don't think you are going to answer my  
13217 question, so I will yield back to Ms. Schakowsky because  
13218 several other of my colleagues would like you to yield to  
13219 them.

13220 Do you want to yield to Mr. Auchincloss?

13221 \*Mr. Pallone. I think they want their own time.

13222 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Mr. Auchincloss?

13223 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Ms. Schakowsky. I want to  
13224 briefly touch on something that the gentleman from Ohio  
13225 raised with the copays, which I believe are \$35 per doctor's  
13226 visit now.

13227 And my question for the gentleman from Georgia, our  
13228 chair, is why are copays acceptable for primary care visits  
13229 for Medicaid for low-income patients when they are not for  
13230 prescription drugs?

13231           The gentleman from Georgia has done terrific bipartisan  
13232 work on lowering copays for prescription drugs. How does  
13233 that, though, apply to this situation, where you are claiming  
13234 to be strengthening Medicaid and yet you are putting barriers  
13235 to care for primary care, which we know to be just as  
13236 preventative and helpful in avoiding downstream costs as  
13237 prescription drug adherence? So what is, like, the  
13238 philosophical difference there?

13239           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. What we are doing is we are  
13240 trying to mirror what is in current law --

13241           \*Voice. For optional cost sharing policies.

13242           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- for optional cost sharing  
13243 policies in Medicaid.

13244           This is not something new. This is something that has  
13245 been done in the past, and something we are going to  
13246 continue. This is part of the savings to make sure that we  
13247 stabilize this program, that we sustain this program, that it  
13248 is going to be there in the future for the most vulnerable in  
13249 our society.

13250           \*Mr. Auchincloss. But you are not putting those \$35  
13251 back into Medicaid, like Mr. Landsman said.

13252           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman's time has  
13253 expired.

13254           \*Ms. Schakowsky. I yield back.

13255           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Ms. Schakowsky's time has

13256 expired. Does anyone seek time to speak on the amendment?

13257 The chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

13258 \*Voice. Thank you --

13259 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Okay, excuse me. The chair  
13260 recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky, the chair.

13261 \*The Chair. Well, thanks. I just want to say what our  
13262 bill does, and I -- it seems like we are not actually talking  
13263 about the bill that is before us. I want to make sure we  
13264 are.

13265 So think about what this bill does. It stops us from  
13266 paying for people that aren't actually eligible for Medicaid.  
13267 So we had eligibility determinations that were suspended,  
13268 changed, a lot during COVID. All we are saying is it is --  
13269 that -- and I didn't vote for the Medicaid program, I didn't  
13270 vote for the expansion of the Medicaid program, so I didn't  
13271 set the standard, I didn't set the qualification standards.  
13272 The people who voted for that did set the qualification  
13273 standards. And it is -- all we are saying is that twice a  
13274 year, that we verify people are qualified to be on Medicaid  
13275 by the standards that was set by the people who voted for the  
13276 Medicaid program and the expansion.

13277 It stops us from continuing to pay for 1.6 million  
13278 people who are estimated by CBO to be enrolled in multiple  
13279 states. It is -- sometimes it is a transient population,  
13280 people move. And so when you are doing the Medicaid-managed

13281 care, states get per enrollee, and they believe -- and 1.6  
13282 million people is what CBO has scored are actually registered  
13283 in two different states. We have a lot of that in my area.  
13284 People move between Ohio and Kentucky and Kentucky and  
13285 Tennessee, so we have that happen.

13286         It stops us from paying for states that choose to cover  
13287 people that are not here in a legal presence.

13288         It stops people from qualifying for Medicaid while they  
13289 live in a -- we put the exemption to \$1 million. So if they  
13290 have a \$1 million home, they can't qualify to be on Medicaid.

13291         It stops us from paying per-member per-month fees to  
13292 insurance companies for covering to -- pay them for covering  
13293 people that have already passed away. I think these are all  
13294 common-sense approaches.

13295         It stops criminals from fraudulently billing Medicaid by  
13296 impersonating doctors who pass away. I think we can all  
13297 agree on that.

13298         It stops Medicaid from paying for gender reassignment  
13299 surgeries for minors.

13300         And finally, it stops able-bodied people that aren't  
13301 taking care of a dependent from receiving free Medicaid if  
13302 they refuse to work a part-time job or at least spend some  
13303 time volunteering -- and I earlier today, when we were  
13304 talking, read directly from the bill all of the people who  
13305 were exempt. And I would think, if you took all the



13306 exemptions, you have to say it is -- if people aren't  
13307 working, with all the exemptions, are truly people who are  
13308 choosing not to work. And we feel like that is not fair to  
13309 the American taxpayer.

13310         So that is what this bill does, and we think these are  
13311 common-sense approaches to make sure that we have -- save the  
13312 Medicaid program, because the Medicaid program is exploding.  
13313 We know it is exploding. We have a \$2 trillion budget  
13314 deficit. I spend a lot of time talking to hospitals,  
13315 providers. I changed some of my opinions, and some of what  
13316 is in the bill I was able to change because of what people  
13317 said, it would affect people's coverage.

13318         If you noticed, state-directed payments are frozen where  
13319 they are because people use this to make sure that high  
13320 Medicaid hospitals -- rural hospitals are high Medicaid,  
13321 urban hospitals are high Medicaid. And if you have a high  
13322 Medicaid and Medicare population and very few private pay,  
13323 then you need the extra money for the hospital to be  
13324 successful and stay open.

13325         And so there are a lot of things that we put in this  
13326 bill because we spent a lot of time talking to providers,  
13327 people who provide for people. But we thought that -- we  
13328 think we -- and I strongly believe that we came up with who -  
13329 - the common sense issues that, if -- I just read through the  
13330 list, I won't read through it again, but we think that that

13331 is common sense to make sure that we have not people covered  
13332 by multiple states, not people paying for other people that  
13333 aren't even eligible to be on the program, people with a \$1  
13334 million home, people with all the exceptions -- I can re-read  
13335 the bill again, I don't have it right in front of me -- of  
13336 the exceptions for people who are -- or the work requirement  
13337 is excepted for.

13338         And so we think these are reasonable approaches, and  
13339 that is the bill we are discussing today.

13340         And I appreciate the time, and I will yield back.

13341         \*Mr. Pallone. You can do me --

13342         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. The  
13343 chair now recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, the  
13344 ranking member, Mr. Pallone.

13345         \*Mr. Pallone. You see, the problem is, in my -- from my  
13346 point of view, Mr. Chairman, that -- what you define as  
13347 eligible.

13348         I think probably the best example is the gentleman from  
13349 Georgia's state. We have a couple cases historically where  
13350 states have tried to impose -- you call it work requirements,  
13351 I call them red tape -- and this is where the Congressional  
13352 Budget Office gets most of the people that are thrown off of  
13353 Medicare not because they are undocumented, not because they  
13354 are in two states, not for some of the other reasons that you  
13355 articulated. It is about the red tape.

13356           So in Georgia I think they had about 400,000 people that  
13357   were eligible for Medicaid. In other words, that means that  
13358   if they had filled out all the paperwork and met the -- you  
13359   know, had done everything they were supposed to do to file  
13360   the paper requirements, they would have been eligible. But  
13361   less than something like 7,000 of those 400,000 ended up  
13362   getting Medicaid, less than 10 percent. I don't know, six  
13363   percent, three percent, whatever the figure was.

13364           Now, you are -- you would say, okay, only those three  
13365   percent are eligible because they are the only ones that  
13366   filled out the forms, did everything properly with the forms,  
13367   you know, did all that, when the reality is that almost all  
13368   those people would have been eligible. Most of them are  
13369   working. Something like 92 percent, I think, of those were  
13370   working. They -- you know, they -- there was just too much  
13371   red tape, I don't know, because they couldn't figure out how  
13372   to do it, because they didn't know about it, because it was  
13373   too frequent that they had to fill out these forms. And so  
13374   it is not that they weren't eligible. It is that you put --  
13375   not you; Georgia, the State of Georgia -- put too many  
13376   barriers in the way of their being able to qualify. And that  
13377   is what I think is happening here today, you know, with this  
13378   bill.

13379           In other words, you know, I look -- I hate to use the  
13380   example, but I am going to -- I look at someone who walks

13381 into this room and who is disabled and I say, gee, how can I  
13382 help them get health insurance? What I believe you are  
13383 doing, not intentionally, but what I believe you are doing is  
13384 you are filling out -- in this bill figuring every way  
13385 possible for them not to qualify, either because they can't  
13386 fill out the paperwork, they don't know how to do it, they --  
13387 you know, I don't know, whatever, they might be illiterate,  
13388 they can't physically fill it out, they have to go on a  
13389 website and they don't know how to use the website, they  
13390 don't have the website.

13391         And then, if they are not eligible because they didn't  
13392 fill out the paperwork, then you have a thing that says,  
13393 well, then they are not eligible for any kind of subsidy  
13394 under the Affordable Care Act. So they don't have that  
13395 option, as well, which is, of course, also the basis for the  
13396 CBO saying so many people get kicked off Medicaid. They  
13397 assume that if you didn't have Medicaid, you would go to the  
13398 ACA, and that would have probably eliminated most of your  
13399 savings, you know.

13400         But instead, now you say they can't go to the ACA  
13401 because they still haven't, you know, they haven't filled out  
13402 the paperwork for the Medicaid, so we are not going to let  
13403 them go to the ACA and get any kind of subsidized care. And  
13404 it goes on and on, the limiting the enrollment period under  
13405 the ACA, saying that if they sign up today for Medicaid but

13406 they don't actually get official documents certifying that  
13407 for another month or two, they don't qualify for Medicaid  
13408 coverage during that period between when they applied -- you  
13409 know, it can't be retroactive. I mean, the list goes on and  
13410 on like this. I can't even mention it all.

13411         So it is not that these people are not eligible for  
13412 Medicaid. If they did everything that you say they have to  
13413 do to qualify, meaning all the paperwork, of course they  
13414 would qualify, of course they would be eligible. Or then  
13415 they would be eligible for the ACA with the subsidy. So it  
13416 is really not fair to say that you are not kicking these  
13417 people off. You are kicking these people off because you are  
13418 putting everything in place to make it difficult for them to  
13419 qualify, even though they really do qualify.

13420         And we, as Democrats, spent the last, you know, four  
13421 years when we were in the majority trying to find out ways to  
13422 make sure that these people didn't trip up in the process so  
13423 they didn't qualify because we wanted them to have health  
13424 care. That is the distinction here between what you are  
13425 doing tonight and what we did. And it is really a terrible  
13426 thing because it shouldn't be that, you know, these eight  
13427 million plus another five, you are not going to get this  
13428 subsidy if they -- ACA -- don't qualify. It is not fair.  
13429 They should get health insurance. They do qualify, but you  
13430 are going to make it so they can't qualify.

13431           That is what is happening here, and I think it is a  
13432 really terrible thing. But, you know, you are in the  
13433 majority.

13434           So I yield back.

13435           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman has yielded. The  
13436 chair now recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina, Mr.  
13437 Hudson, for five minutes of comments.

13438           \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And Mr.  
13439 Chairman, I just want to reject the idea that was just put  
13440 out there, and we have been hearing it all day, that somehow  
13441 Republicans want to keep people from getting Medicaid. That  
13442 is just not true. We are here to fight for the people in our  
13443 districts who depend on Medicaid. And I just reject that  
13444 idea, you know, this idea that -- because the reality is this  
13445 program is going broke, and it is going broke because of  
13446 Democrat policies that have loaded the program up with a lot  
13447 of people that don't qualify.

13448           And what I want to do is preserve it for Melissa, for my  
13449 district, and Christine, who has a son who says without  
13450 Medicaid they would be homeless. And to suggest that I don't  
13451 care, or that I want them to somehow not be able to get  
13452 access to that Medicaid so they will be homeless, like, that  
13453 is offensive to me. And so I just reject the idea.

13454           And to give more clarity I would like to yield to  
13455 Chairman Guthrie.

13456           \*The Chair. Thanks. I just want -- a couple of things  
13457 that my ranking member friend brought up.

13458           One is the enrollment period in the ACA. You know, when  
13459 the ACA passed, it had a enrollment period that you had to  
13460 apply for your health insurance. And it is something, when  
13461 you have guaranteed issue -- which everybody on this side of  
13462 the aisle -- is a -- preexisting conditions, that --  
13463 absolutely nothing has changed in that. When you have  
13464 guaranteed issue, you have to have a special enrollment  
13465 period because then you could apply for insurance only when  
13466 you needed it.

13467           And so, over time, it has gotten to where it is almost  
13468 -- I don't think it is technically open enrollment. The way  
13469 it is implemented, it is open enrollment. And we are going  
13470 back to the original design of the Affordable Care Act that -  
13471 - people had a certain time. If there is a life-changing  
13472 event, you get married, you have a baby, all these other  
13473 things that are life-changing events, you can change and  
13474 enroll in your insurance. But there is an enrollment period  
13475 that all insurance has that you have to apply for, and not  
13476 just open enrollment, because -- just so people will not only  
13477 take the insurance when they actually need it.

13478           And on the work requirements, you are right, Arkansas is  
13479 a great example of where people were not able to maintain  
13480 their Medicaid not because they didn't qualify, it was

13481 because the process was so onerous. Arkansas had a monthly  
13482 check, that you had to monthly verify employment. And it  
13483 became so difficult they couldn't do it. So what did we do?  
13484 We spend a lot of time with Arkansas, Georgia, and other  
13485 states trying to figure out what they did different.

13486 And so we require beneficiaries to have -- to verify  
13487 work at the time of enrollment or during a redetermination of  
13488 their eligibility. We are not doing the monthly checks that  
13489 Arkansas had. And so this allows states and beneficiaries to  
13490 take advantage of existing processing and paperwork that  
13491 beneficiaries already go through to become eligible for  
13492 Medicaid.

13493 And what is more, though, is that we are also  
13494 encouraging states to use existing data sources like state  
13495 payroll data so they can better utilize so-called ex-parte  
13496 reviews. This is already a pretty well-established concept  
13497 for states. They use existing data sources all the time to  
13498 help verify a number of different eligibility requirements.

13499 So right off the bat, we are talking about paperwork  
13500 that is already part of the current process of applying for  
13501 Medicaid, not adding additional monthly work requirements for  
13502 the exact reason that -- what you just said, Mr. Ranking  
13503 Member. The exact reason is that we don't want people to  
13504 lose Medicaid who are eligible for Medicaid because they  
13505 don't fill out the paperwork. We want people who are in the



13506 expansion population that are able-bodied, with the  
13507 exceptions that I -- the list -- to work, and we think that  
13508 is a good use of the taxpayer dollars. That is why we have  
13509 that in here.

13510 But we absolutely don't do it like Arkansas. We don't  
13511 do it like other states have done it because we don't want to  
13512 have happen exactly what you said, that red tape disqualifies  
13513 them. They either choose -- we want it to be either they  
13514 choose to work or they disqualify themselves, not because of  
13515 the paperwork. And we felt like we addressed that in this  
13516 bill because that is the concerns that we have, exactly the  
13517 concerns you just articulated.

13518 \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

13519 \*The Chair. Sure.

13520 \*Ms. DeGette. I --

13521 \*The Chair. Oh, that is not my time.

13522 \*Ms. DeGette. The one who has the time has to yield.

13523 Mr. Hudson.

13524 \*Mr. Hudson. I will yield.

13525 \*Ms. DeGette. So --

13526 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. He has yielded.

13527 \*Ms. DeGette. So I just want to point out that on page  
13528 71 of the -- is it the AINS? Yes, of page 71 of the AINS in  
13529 subpart D it does say, Mr. Chairman, as you said, that they  
13530 have to certify and then re-certify every six months. But it

13531 also, in paragraph little ii says that states actually can,  
13532 at their discretion, conduct more frequent verifications of  
13533 compliance. So they can actually do -- under this AINS, they  
13534 can actually do what Arkansas did, and that is part of the  
13535 problem we have, is you are you are going to let the states  
13536 do whatever they want.

13537 I yield back.

13538 \*The Chair. Oh, I am out of time. I am sorry, we are  
13539 out of time.

13540 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman has yielded.

13541 Does anyone else seek recognition to speak on the amendment?

13542 The chair recognizes the gentleman from -- the  
13543 gentlelady from New York.

13544 Who do you want?

13545 \*Mr. Pallone. Well, Tonko --

13546 \*Mr. Ruiz. Tonko and then --

13547 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the  
13548 gentleman from New York, Mr. Tonko, for five minutes.

13549 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the  
13550 last word.

13551 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

13552 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you. I rise in support of this  
13553 amendment.

13554 Let's call Republicans' so-called community engagement  
13555 and eligibility check requirements what they really are, an

13556 attempt to make paperwork great again.

13557         If you have ever struggled with an insurance company  
13558 denying care, or been on hold with customer service for hours  
13559 on end and thought I wish this process could be even worse,  
13560 Republicans have delivered the bill just for you. This is  
13561 death by paperwork.

13562         What does this look like in reality? Imagine you are  
13563 working two jobs to make ends meet, and currently receive  
13564 health care through Medicaid. Now every month in the mail  
13565 you will get some confusing form that you have to spend an  
13566 hour filling out and have your boss sign off on just to make  
13567 certain you can see your doctor -- just what everyone was  
13568 clamoring for, having your boss more involved in your medical  
13569 care.

13570         On top of that, every six months you are going to get  
13571 another confusing form that is going to take another hour to  
13572 fill out to make certain you haven't earned a single dollar  
13573 too much. Otherwise, guess what? They are going to kick you  
13574 off of your health care.

13575         All of this is assuming that the bureaucrats in charge  
13576 of the Medicaid program in your state know that you have  
13577 changed apartments in the last month and send the mail to  
13578 your right address. Otherwise, guess what? They will kick  
13579 you off of your health care for not responding.

13580         What Republicans are doing with this amendment is the

13581 healthcare equivalent of self-deportation. They want to make  
13582 receiving actual health care so burdensome that people just  
13583 give up on even trying. And guess what? It will probably  
13584 work. As we have discussed, almost 14 million people will  
13585 lose health care because of these and other requirements in  
13586 this legislation. In New York State these death-by-paperwork  
13587 requirements could lead to 1.6 million people to lose  
13588 coverage.

13589         Is there anything more soul sucking than having to  
13590 constantly validate your worth to an insurance company,  
13591 having to send document after document just to prove that you  
13592 are worthy of care? These efforts are dehumanizing and  
13593 demoralizing. This is the future that Republicans want for  
13594 Medicaid, a system so mind-numbingly bureaucratic and full of  
13595 red tape that no one can actually get the health care that  
13596 they were promised.

13597         What if, instead of spending all this time and effort  
13598 and money on paperwork, we just made certain everyone had  
13599 access to health care? Now, that is a system I could believe  
13600 in. So I urge all of my colleagues to support this vital  
13601 amendment, and let's get back to providing health care for  
13602 real people, rather than finding soul-sucking ways to take it  
13603 away.

13604         With that I yield back.

13605         \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

13606           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back. Is  
13607 there anyone --

13608           \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

13609           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- seeking recognition on the  
13610 Republican side?

13611           \*Mr. Tonko. Yes, I will yield to the congresswoman from  
13612 California.

13613           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The congresswoman from  
13614 California is recognized.

13615           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

13616           [Slide]

13617           \*Ms. Barragan. Since we are summarizing what the bill  
13618 does -- oops, it is upside down -- let's review again what  
13619 this bill is going to do, and what the CBO has told us it is  
13620 going to do, and that is the Republican bill -- combined, by  
13621 the way, with the Affordable Care Act subsidies effectively  
13622 expiring -- it cuts at least \$715 billion from health care.  
13623 And we are talking about 13.7 million people being kicked off  
13624 of Medicaid.

13625           Now, we can talk word salad, explain it this way,  
13626 explain it that way. But the bottom line is people are going  
13627 to lose benefits, people are going to be cut off of Medicaid,  
13628 and that is not a good thing.

13629           We have heard everything from, oh, millionaires are on  
13630 Medicaid. Let me tell you about what happened with -- what

13631 happened in California, what was happening to people in  
13632 California that were on Medicaid. You had -- I had a  
13633 constituent, many people who were on Medicaid, which meant  
13634 they couldn't earn more than \$2,000 a month, and they  
13635 couldn't have more than, I don't know, \$500 in the bank. It  
13636 was some very low amount. Those people couldn't even afford  
13637 to replace their homes. They would never be able to afford  
13638 to replace the roofs on their homes because they could never  
13639 save. It was not permitted under Medicaid. So what they  
13640 said was, hey, we are not going to judge your bank account,  
13641 we are going to judge your income.

13642 Do you really think millionaires are getting income that  
13643 is less than \$2,000 a month? I mean, shut the front door.  
13644 Come on, be reasonable. That doesn't happen. That is not  
13645 going to happen.

13646 But they are finding every which way they can to kick  
13647 people off Medicaid. And in the next conversation we will  
13648 talk about the new requirements about checking in every six  
13649 months, because I can give you story after story of how  
13650 people get kicked off, and how long it takes for them to get  
13651 back on when there was just an error.

13652 I yield back.

13653 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The time has expired.

13654 \*Mr. Tonko. And I yield back, Mr. Chair.

13655 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the

13656 gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Latta, for five minutes.

13657       \*Mr. Latta. Well, thank you very much, Mr. Chair. I  
13658 yield to the chair as much time as he may need.

13659       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Thank you. I want to address  
13660 the earlier comments regarding the coverage loss in this  
13661 bill.

13662       Let me make sure everyone understands the estimates that  
13663 are being cited here include policies that are simply not in  
13664 our bill. The CBO has determined policies in our bill that  
13665 would only result in 7.6 million recipients being shifted off  
13666 of Medicaid. All of this comes -- all of it, all 7.6 that  
13667 are shifted off of Medicaid -- come from able-bodied adults  
13668 who choose not to work. It comes from illegal immigrants.  
13669 It comes from recipients who are getting benefits who are not  
13670 actually eligible, so that those who truly need it will be  
13671 able to get it. And it includes potential future growth that  
13672 is unrealized. The individuals my colleagues are concerned  
13673 about today -- the disabled, children, mothers, and seniors  
13674 -- are not impacted by this bill.

13675       We are seeking to strengthen this program, to stabilize  
13676 this program, to sustain this program for them, the most  
13677 vulnerable, instead of the illegal immigrants and able-bodied  
13678 adults. It is that simple. It is common sense.

13679       Democrats continue to mislead the public about the  
13680 impact of our bill by claiming that they result in 13.7

13681 million losing coverage. That simply is not true. Democrats  
13682 are adding an additional five million to that number because  
13683 they are attributing the effect of policies that not only  
13684 aren't in our bill, but aren't even in the committee's  
13685 jurisdiction.

13686       They want to convince everyone that the impact of our  
13687 bill is as scary as possible. This is nothing more than  
13688 fearmongering. They are telling you that kids and people  
13689 with disabilities are going to be kicked off of their  
13690 coverage. That is simply not true.

13691       And what is sad is that you know it is not true.

13692       \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

13693       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. You know it is not true.

13694       \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

13695       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I yield.

13696       \*Ms. Barragan. Okay. I entered into the record the CBO  
13697 estimates. The CBO estimate says that we estimate the  
13698 expiration of the extended premium tax credits will increase  
13699 the number of people without health insurance by 4.2 million  
13700 and 2034 relative -- yada, yada, yada. So take your eight  
13701 million that you are okay with kicking off Medicaid and add  
13702 these, and that is how you get to the number. Okay?

13703       So you might be okay with eight million people coming  
13704 off. We are not. But when Republicans -- and let's not  
13705 forget, Republicans tried to put an end to the Affordable



13706 Care Act -- this is their way of attacking the Affordable  
13707 Care Act, by allowing these premiums to end, the premium tax  
13708 credits to end, which is how you get the additional 4.2  
13709 million.

13710         So I want to make sure, because the math adds up if you  
13711 do the math -- and if I had a whiteboard, I could do it on a  
13712 whiteboard, but I don't have one tonight. But just believe  
13713 CBO, the Congressional Budget Office, it is 13.7. Under  
13714 their leadership, the bill combined --

13715         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Reclaiming my time, the  
13716 gentlelady knows perfectly well that that is not true, that  
13717 it is not kicking 13.7 million people off of Medicaid. And  
13718 that is not -- simply not true, and the gentlelady knows  
13719 that. This is nothing more than fearmongering. This is  
13720 nothing more than misleading the public.

13721         What we are doing here is stabilizing this program.  
13722 This is a program that I worked in for over 40 years as a  
13723 pharmacist, and I can assure you it is a program that is  
13724 needed. It is intended for the most vulnerable in our  
13725 society, the aged, the blind, the disabled, pregnant mothers,  
13726 children, those who truly need it. And that is what we are  
13727 doing. We may -- we are making sure that no illegals are  
13728 going to be on this program. We are making sure that people  
13729 aren't registered in more than one state. We are making sure  
13730 that there are going to be work requirements so that able-

13731 bodied adults are truly in need of it. That is what we are  
13732 doing. We are stabilizing this program.

13733 To insinuate, to fearmonger that we are trying to kick  
13734 people off is simply untrue.

13735 And I yield back my time. Is there anyone looking to  
13736 speak on this?

13737 The gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Carter, is recognized  
13738 for five minutes.

13739 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You  
13740 have said consistently tonight that you want to stand up and  
13741 sustain the program, that these attempts are to find waste,  
13742 fraud, and abuse. Can you share with me what percentage, if  
13743 in fact you are able to find these and make these cuts, will  
13744 go back into Medicaid to "sustain the program," as you say?

13745 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. All of it.

13746 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. All of it? None of it is  
13747 going to be -- thank you -- none of it is going to be used to  
13748 support tax breaks?

13749 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. What this does is to free up  
13750 more money for states so that they can run these programs and  
13751 invest in these programs. That is why we depend on states.

13752 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So all of it -- none of it  
13753 will go for tax breaks, period. You said all of it, so I  
13754 just want to make sure that we are on the same page because,  
13755 for me, all of it means all of it.

13756 [Laughter.]

13757 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. When we free up money for the  
13758 states, they can make investments into their programs, making  
13759 it a better program for those who truly need it.

13760 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Right.

13761 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. That is what we are trying to  
13762 do.

13763 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. And I am supportive. So  
13764 every penny we find goes back into building this program. So  
13765 if we find waste, fraud, abuse, we find people that were not  
13766 eligible to be there, that money will then go back into  
13767 building even stronger Medicaid.

13768 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Okay.

13769 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Yes?

13770 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Why don't you go down there,  
13771 and I will call him?

13772 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. That is not a trick question.

13773 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I am sorry. Please repeat.

13774 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Okay. So if you are able to  
13775 find waste, fraud, abuse, people who should not be on the  
13776 rolls, and you deem that to be savings, will those savings  
13777 all go back into Medicaid to build a stronger Medicaid, and  
13778 none of it will go toward giving tax breaks for anyone, that  
13779 it will all go back in to the program to make it better?

13780 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. When states save money, when

13781 states save money, they have more money to invest into the  
13782 program to make it a better program for those who need it the  
13783 most, the vulnerable, the most vulnerable in our society.  
13784 That is what this program was intended for.

13785 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. So --

13786 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And that is what we are trying  
13787 to do, is to stabilize this program --

13788 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I am going to  
13789 reclaim my time.

13790 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- because right now it is out  
13791 of --

13792 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I have got about -- Mr.  
13793 Chairman, I am going to --

13794 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- control.

13795 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. -- reclaim my time, I am  
13796 going to reclaim my time, because you clearly don't want to  
13797 answer this very basic question.

13798 So I am going to let the people figure it out. The  
13799 chairman has said that all the money goes back. But when I  
13800 ask him will it all go back into the program to make it  
13801 stronger, he tap dances.

13802 I yield the balance of my time to Mr. Landsman from  
13803 Ohio.

13804 \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you.

13805 A quick question for the chair, since you are

13806 entertaining questions. You just said that -- because we are  
13807 getting into the policy now. As you said, the folks who are  
13808 multiple, you know, states, that is a policy change, but it  
13809 is one of many policy changes -- your words. The policy  
13810 changes that you all are pursuing, you said, shift people off  
13811 of Medicaid. What is the difference --

13812 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Shift people who are not  
13813 eligible --

13814 \*Mr. Landsman. That is fine.

13815 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- and who should not be on  
13816 it --

13817 \*Mr. Landsman. Yes.

13818 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- in the first place off of  
13819 it.

13820 \*Mr. Landsman. What is the difference between shifting  
13821 and kicking somebody off?

13822 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Shifting people who are not  
13823 supposed to be on there, you --

13824 \*Mr. Landsman. Let me --

13825 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Listen, if they are not  
13826 supposed to be on there, you can kick them off.

13827 \*Mr. Landsman. Okay, so there is no difference.

13828 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. If they are not eligible,  
13829 they --

13830 \*Mr. Landsman. There is no --

13831           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- they should not be on a  
13832 program --

13833           \*Mr. Landsman. Okay, got it.

13834           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- as necessary as this program  
13835 is, because we need to protect these people --

13836           \*Mr. Landsman. I yield -- I reclaim my time. That is -  
13837 - so shifting people off is no different than kicking them  
13838 off.

13839           You have said that you want to save Medicaid, protect  
13840 Medicaid, sustain Medicaid. But you have admitted tonight,  
13841 thankfully, that you all are cutting Medicaid.

13842           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. That is not --

13843           \*Mr. Landsman. That you are --

13844           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. We have admitted --

13845           \*Mr. Landsman. You are shrinking --

13846           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Do not put words into my mouth.

13847           \*Mr. Landsman. I reclaim my time, I reclaim it.

13848           \*Mr. Ruiz. Will the chairman respect the parliamentary  
13849 rules of your committee --

13850           \*Mr. Landsman. You are shrinking --

13851           \*Mr. Ruiz. -- and allow him to speak?

13852           \*Mr. Landsman. You are shrinking Medicaid by \$715  
13853 billion. That will mean that 8.6 million people will lose  
13854 health insurance. You are cleaning up the rolls, as you  
13855 said, removing people through red tape, copays, and cuts to

13856 states.

13857           So in the last 30 seconds of my time, I do think that  
13858 you should heed the advice of Republican Senator Josh Hawley  
13859 when he says walk away from this, this is morally bankrupt  
13860 and politically suicidal.

13861           I yield back.

13862           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. The  
13863 chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Bilirakis,  
13864 for five minutes.

13865           \*Mr. Bilirakis. Mr. Chairman, I yield my time to the  
13866 chairman of the full committee, Mr. Guthrie.

13867           \*The Chair. So I just want to put back to where we are.  
13868 We put a lot of time, a lot of thought. We want people to be  
13869 covered if they are eligible for Medicaid.

13870           And just so you know -- a lot of numbers have been  
13871 thrown around -- this year, in 2025, we are going to spend  
13872 \$650 billion on the Medicaid program. When this bill is  
13873 fully in effect in a decade from now -- so this year we spend  
13874 650 billion -- all the cuts that the other side have been  
13875 trying to describe, the Medicaid spend under this bill in  
13876 2034 will be \$1.1 trillion. That is what the -- that is  
13877 where the direction of the program is going under this bill.  
13878 We are going to spend \$1.1 trillion where we spend \$650  
13879 billion.

13880           So just let -- just -- people need to know where -- the

13881 direction this is going. And so what we are saying, the  
13882 people that are being shifted off of Medicaid -- the people  
13883 who set up Medicaid, people who voted for Medicaid, people  
13884 who have this program in place set up eligibility  
13885 requirements. And all we are saying is we are going to check  
13886 the eligibility requirements twice a year to make sure that  
13887 people match the eligibility requirements.

13888         The other group we have, a lot of -- I read people in  
13889 the Indian Health System, people that have disabilities,  
13890 people that have a dependent child, people that have  
13891 substance use disorder, people that have a diagnosed mental  
13892 disorder, we have all of those exceptions in our bill. So  
13893 when you break down all the exceptions, if you are 18 to 64  
13894 and you are not one of those exceptions, you are able-bodied  
13895 and choosing not to work.

13896         So we are saying all you have to do is work, and you get  
13897 to -- because the taxpayers are providing your health  
13898 insurance, and we think that is just fair to taxpayers. So  
13899 people who are eligible, people who are working, all they  
13900 have to do is work. And somebody who says, well, 64 -- well,  
13901 I am 61, I hope I am working until I am 64, at least -- but  
13902 when you are 64 it says you can volunteer. So what you can't  
13903 do is say you retire at 55, and if you retire at 55 or go on  
13904 Medicaid -- well, you still have to engage in your community,  
13905 you have to be a volunteer, because you are getting a



13906 taxpayer-funded benefit. And so that is what we are asking  
13907 there.

13908 And the other one is people that are covered that aren't  
13909 here in a legal presence, and we are just saying that that  
13910 shouldn't be covered under the Federal health care program.

13911 And so the number you need to know is as of today we are  
13912 spending \$650 billion on health care. If this bill is  
13913 enacted, as it is written, we will spend \$1.1 trillion 10  
13914 years from now on Medicaid. So just let -- so the idea that  
13915 we are rolling back the program to some negative direction,  
13916 it just is not accurate.

13917 And then with the work requirements, we want to make  
13918 sure that able-bodied people who are eligible to work are  
13919 working, and people aren't separated from Medicaid because  
13920 they can't go through the red tape. And so there are  
13921 requirements you check twice a year. We have made it easier.  
13922 We do give state flexibility. Arkansas said, hey, they have  
13923 learned from their mistakes, they have learned how to do it  
13924 better, they have got data to do it better.

13925 We talked about AI a whole lot in the previous section,  
13926 and so there is opportunities for states to do it better to  
13927 make sure people are working and they can check it more  
13928 often, but the absolute intent and the absolute expectation  
13929 from the members of this side is that people who are not on  
13930 Medicaid -- is because they choose not to work, not for other

13931 reasons.

13932 But I will -- again, these two numbers, this year we are  
13933 going to spend \$650 billion; 10 years from now we are going  
13934 to spend \$1.1 trillion on Medicaid.

13935 \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

13936 \*The Chair. Sure.

13937 \*Ms. Barragan. Don't you think we are going to spend  
13938 more on health care if we kick -- or, as you say, shift --  
13939 people off of Medicaid because they are going to get, like,  
13940 more sick and go to the ER? So don't you think we are going  
13941 to spend more in the long run?

13942 \*The Chair. Well, so the answer to that is that, one,  
13943 that we just want people eligible to be on Medicaid. If we  
13944 need to change the eligibility -- I mean, when you all had  
13945 the majority, you all didn't change the eligibility.

13946 And the second thing is we do think people who are  
13947 qualified to work and able-bodied to work should work. And  
13948 so if they work, they get their health care.

13949 And the third section is that people aren't here in a  
13950 legal status. And that is a debate that I know that we can  
13951 have. But we feel that, to be on the Federal health care  
13952 program, you should be here on a legal status.

13953 And so that -- but we are still going to spend that much  
13954 more money on health care.

13955 And I will yield back to my friend from Florida.

13956           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman's time has  
13957 expired. The chair now recognizes the gentleman from  
13958 California, Dr. Ruiz, for five minutes.

13959           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

13960           In Spanish we have a saying, "entre el dicho y el hecho  
13961 hay un gran trecho''. "Between what is said and what is done  
13962 there is a large trench''. And, you know, you said you want  
13963 to increase people on Medicaid. Well, we did in the  
13964 Affordable Care Act with Medicaid expansion of which you  
13965 voted against. But now this bill is designed to kick those  
13966 people out. It is essentially a backdoor way of repealing  
13967 the Affordable Care Act, the Medicaid expansion that covered  
13968 people, low-income individuals, even more in Medicaid.

13969           So we are hearing over and over from Republicans that  
13970 this bill will not cut benefits, and that is not true.  
13971 Reducing Federal funding, imposing restrictions on how states  
13972 can pay for Medicaid, creating administrative burden and red  
13973 tape for beneficiaries, these things have consequences. The  
13974 bill simply passes the buck to states to deal with the  
13975 massive financial problem it creates for them.

13976           The Congressional Budget Office estimated that states  
13977 would resort to limiting optional benefits and reducing  
13978 enrollment in Medicaid, should provisions in this bill become  
13979 law. That is cutting benefits. CBO also estimated that the  
13980 bill would result in 13.7 million individuals losing their

13981 health care coverage. How is that not cutting benefits?

13982       When you legislate, you have to look at the big picture.  
13983 Another part of this big picture is that these red tape work  
13984 requirements are designed to get people off of the rolls, is  
13985 designed to go after the Medicaid expansion that covers more  
13986 than 20 million low-income people. The Medicaid expansion  
13987 saves lives. More than 27,000 lives and counting have been  
13988 saved across the states that have adopted to expand Medicaid  
13989 because of increased coverage. In states that expanded  
13990 Medicaid, opioid deaths were 6 percent lower, cancer  
13991 screenings were 5 percent higher, and rural hospitals were 62  
13992 percent less likely to close. And now you are going after  
13993 Medicaid expanded patients with these onerous work  
13994 requirements.

13995       You know, we have some examples here, as we mentioned  
13996 before, through the Arkansas and the Georgia experiment. In  
13997 Arkansas it resulted in 18,000 Arkansans from being kicked  
13998 off of Medicaid in just one year. One in four people,  
13999 subject to the requirements, lost their health care, many of  
14000 whom were working or otherwise subject to an exemption. In  
14001 other words, these are individuals that qualified.

14002       In Georgia, which has the third highest uninsured rate  
14003 in the country, something I would not be proud of, burdensome  
14004 red tape requirements have prevented over 240,000 Georgians  
14005 likely eligible for health care from enrolling in its state-

14006 specific Medicaid expansion program.

14007         So let me give you some examples of how this works. The  
14008 red tape requirements create crushing administrative barriers  
14009 like paperwork, long wait lines, and unreliable online  
14010 portals for Americans trying to stay on care.

14011         In Arkansas, people who try to set up online accounts  
14012 reported an inability to get in touch with state agency  
14013 staff, long wait times, and an inability to navigate the  
14014 state's online portal. One Arkansan attempting to document  
14015 her work hours shared, "My mom said I needed to go online and  
14016 do this and that. I was on the phone with a lady trying to.  
14017 She said I needed to do something with my hours. Well, I was  
14018 on the phone with a lady for like an hour. Then she sent me  
14019 to someone else. Then she sent me to someone else. So it  
14020 just -- I just gave up from trying to report my work, my  
14021 hours worked.'`

14022         Medicaid enrollees who may be eligible for certain  
14023 exemptions because they are caregivers, disabled, or students  
14024 often get buried under red tape, and can lose their health  
14025 care as a result. One enrollee applying for a caregiver  
14026 exemption shared, "The worker told me that I would need to  
14027 provide documentation showing that my husband's disability  
14028 required me to be a caregiver. The worker was not able to  
14029 tell me what kind of documentation I would need to provide''.

14030         So red tape requirements often require logging hours

14031 electronically, punishing low-income Americans who do not  
14032 have Internet, smartphones, cars, or reliable transportation  
14033 to log hours in person. In New Hampshire one mother shared  
14034 her experience trying to log her work hours: "We do not have  
14035 Internet at our home, so I rely on my phone. At times we do  
14036 not have phone service, due to our finances. Even when I  
14037 have phone service, sometimes when I try to upload documents  
14038 on my phone I have trouble and end up needing to go to Health  
14039 and Human Services in person. But right now I do not even  
14040 have a vehicle that is roadworthy to drive to Health and  
14041 Human Services.'`

14042       These are clearly examples of the way this is designed  
14043 to get people frustrated, to give up, to not undergo these  
14044 onerous work requirements, reporting, to get them out. In  
14045 fact, the vast majority of the eight million people that will  
14046 be kicked out of Medicaid in this bill come from these type  
14047 of onerous work requirements.

14048       Entre el dicho y el hecho hay un gran trecho. So all  
14049 night we will be correcting these falsehoods over and over  
14050 again.

14051       And with that I yield back.

14052       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back. The  
14053 chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Representative  
14054 Pfluger, for five minutes.

14055       \*Mr. Pfluger. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

14056           Hey, I loved our AI discussion earlier, so I just did a  
14057   little AI search, and I want to see if we -- because I think  
14058   we agree that health care is important. But this is just  
14059   what it said on the AI overview that is really pretty basic:  
14060   Medicaid was designed as a health insurance program for low-  
14061   income individuals, including children, some adults, pregnant  
14062   women, and people with disabilities.

14063           And I just want to -- since we are in the business of  
14064   asking questions, does anybody disagree with this on the  
14065   other side?

14066           That is just an AI overview. I mean, it is not, like,  
14067   technical or anything. But, you know, I bring that up  
14068   because I think that our similarities on health care outweigh  
14069   a lot of our differences, that we want to make sure we  
14070   provide health care for people that deserve it.

14071           \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman yield?

14072           \*Mr. Pfluger. When it comes to -- I am going to keep  
14073   going for a second -- when it comes to Medicaid, you know,  
14074   this program was designed specifically for a group of people  
14075   that would not have otherwise had benefits, and that is  
14076   really, I think, the heart of this, and that is where I --  
14077   and that brings us to the differences, I think, that we have.

14078           And the differences are -- and please correct me if I am  
14079   wrong here, but the differences are that we don't believe  
14080   people that aren't eligible for Medicaid should be receiving

14081 the benefits. I don't believe that the 1.6 million people  
14082 who are fraudulently enrolled in Medicaid should be taking  
14083 benefits from the people that came into this room here today  
14084 that were fighting for it, or for the people in my district,  
14085 the children who need Medicaid.

14086 So I will ask the gentleman from California because you  
14087 spoke last, but do you agree that 1.6 million people who are  
14088 fraudulently enrolled should not receive Medicaid?

14089 \*Mr. Ruiz. I agree that if there is any fraudulent  
14090 enrollment, that the courts should settle who is committing  
14091 fraud and who is not.

14092 \*Mr. Pfluger. Okay, all right --

14093 \*Mr. Ruiz. -- and not by theoretical policy.

14094 \*Mr. Pfluger. Let me go to the --

14095 \*Mr. Ruiz. The other thing I want --

14096 \*Mr. Pfluger. I will take my time back. I want to ask  
14097 you --

14098 \*Mr. Ruiz. Yes, but I --

14099 \*Mr. Pfluger. I want to ask you a series.

14100 \*Mr. Ruiz. And I have another answer when you say low-  
14101 income.

14102 \*Mr. Pfluger. Okay, I am going to take my time back.

14103 What about people -- my friend from California, if you  
14104 live in a \$1 million home --

14105 \*Mr. Ruiz. I don't.



14106           \*Mr. Pfluger. -- should you be qualified for Medicaid?  
14107           [Laughter.]  
14108           \*Mr. Ruiz. I don't live in a \$1 million home, trust me.  
14109           \*Mr. Pfluger. If someone lives in a \$1 million home,  
14110 should they be --  
14111           \*Ms. Barragan. In California you can't buy a home --  
14112           \*Mr. Pfluger. -- enrolled in Medicaid?  
14113           \*Ms. Barragan. -- for less than \$1 million.  
14114           \*Mr. Ruiz. No, I don't --  
14115           \*Mr. Pfluger. No, no, I am asking --  
14116           \*Mr. Ruiz. No, I don't think they should.  
14117           But let me ask you a question. Do you think an  
14118 individual --  
14119           \*Mr. Pfluger. No, no, I will reclaim --  
14120           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the  
14121 gentleman from Texas.  
14122           \*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you. We got all night. It is 2:00  
14123 in the morning.  
14124           \*Mr. Ruiz. This is a serious question. But if you  
14125 allow me --  
14126           \*Mr. Pfluger. Buddy, come on.  
14127           \*Mr. Ruiz. This is a serious question.  
14128           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Sir.  
14129           \*Mr. Ruiz. Well, he is asking me questions. He wants  
14130 to engage. I would like --

14131           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the  
14132 gentleman from Texas, Mr. Pfluger.

14133           \*Mr. Pfluger. Thank you, thank you.

14134           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. He has two minutes left.

14135           \*Mr. Pfluger. We got lots of time to do this, trust me.  
14136           Look, we have a difference, I think, between the two  
14137 sides, where we don't believe that people who are here in  
14138 this country illegally should receive Medicaid benefits to  
14139 the detriment of those that we just described as having been  
14140 needing the benefits, as the targeted population.

14141           This bill stops us from paying per-member per-month fees  
14142 to insurance companies to pay them for covering people who  
14143 aren't even alive.

14144           This bill stops criminals from fraudulently billing  
14145 Medicaid and impersonating doctors who passed away.

14146           This bill stops Medicaid from paying for gender  
14147 reassignment surgeries for minors. That is a difference, I  
14148 think, between the two sides, and that is okay. Let's just  
14149 call this what it is. There are differences in the way we  
14150 see this.

14151           This bill stops able-bodied adults who have chosen not  
14152 to work, who have chosen -- and that is their choice, and  
14153 there is nothing wrong with that. But this bill says, you  
14154 know what? If you are an able-bodied adult and you don't  
14155 want to work, you don't qualify for Medicaid. That is a

14156 difference between the two sides. It is okay to debate that.  
14157 We are saying that we believe there is a work requirement to  
14158 be able to receive Medicaid.

14159 \*Mr. Ruiz. Will the gentleman yield?

14160 \*Mr. Pfluger. So I will ask you a final question.

14161 \*Mr. Ruiz. Well --

14162 \*Mr. Pfluger. If you will answer the question, I will  
14163 yield.

14164 Do you believe that you should have some sort of work  
14165 requirement to be able to receive these benefits?

14166 \*Mr. Ruiz. No. That is an easy one.

14167 \*Mr. Pfluger. Okay, I will take the time. I will take  
14168 the time.

14169 \*Mr. Ruiz. Okay, now. So, look, there is a lot --

14170 \*Mr. Pfluger. He is my friend, so wrap it up, 10  
14171 seconds.

14172 \*Mr. Ruiz. Yes, and you are a good baseball player, and  
14173 we play good together in the baseball field.

14174 [Laughter.]

14175 \*Mr. Ruiz. Look, you know, you said that Medicaid was  
14176 intended for low-income individuals.

14177 \*Mr. Pfluger. No, that is what AI said.

14178 [Laughter.]

14179 \*Mr. Ruiz. Well, I mean, but -- and we agree --

14180 \*Mr. Pfluger. We had a good AI discussion.

14181           \*Mr. Ruiz. And you agreed. You said that.

14182           \*Mr. Pfluger. Mr. Chairman, my time has expired, I  
14183 yield back.

14184           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. The  
14185 chair recognizes the gentlelady from Massachusetts,  
14186 Representative Trahan, for five minutes.

14187           \*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike  
14188 the last word.

14189           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

14190           \*Mrs. Trahan. So I think we are going to go all morning  
14191 with a tastes great, less filling volley back and forth. You  
14192 are going to accuse us of being for all sorts of people who  
14193 should be on the rolls, and it is just going to be a complete  
14194 misrepresentation of what we believe.

14195           Democrats are pretty unapologetic about expanding health  
14196 care, right? We came up with the ACA. Since we enacted the  
14197 ACA, Republicans have been trying to repeal it. And the  
14198 problem with that is you have never had an alternative. So  
14199 when you talk about shifting people off of Medicaid, like,  
14200 just be honest about it. You are taking away health care  
14201 because you don't agree that we ever should have expanded  
14202 Medicaid to begin with.

14203           You just used AI, which proved it is flawed, to define  
14204 what Medicaid -- who that should cover. So like, let's just  
14205 call work requirements what they are. They are obstructions.

14206           I mean, to the sitting chair, Georgia is the only state  
14207   in the country that is currently enforcing Medicaid work  
14208   reporting requirements. The results are already proving what  
14209   we have long known. This is an expensive bureaucracy-  
14210   creating policy, and it doesn't work. Despite spending over  
14211   \$40 million in state and Federal tax dollars to launch the  
14212   program, fewer than 4,500 people have enrolled. That is well  
14213   short of the state's own goal of 25,000 in the first year,  
14214   and it is less than 2 percent of the 359,000 Georgians who  
14215   would have gained coverage if the state had simply expanded  
14216   Medicaid like 40 other states did.

14217           Nearly 80 percent of the program's spending has gone to  
14218   administration and consulting fees, not medical care. That  
14219   means public dollars are being spent building bureaucratic  
14220   barriers instead of breaking them down. And now the state  
14221   has launched a \$10.7 million advertising campaign just to  
14222   convince people to sign up for a program that was designed to  
14223   be difficult to access in the first place.

14224           Look, if this is the model that our Republican  
14225   colleagues want to take national, yes, we are going to stay  
14226   here and fight it tooth and nail because it doesn't work, it  
14227   is expensive, and it basically just takes health care away  
14228   from people. Georgia's experiment is already showing us what  
14229   the outcomes will be: fewer people with coverage, more  
14230   wasted taxpayer dollars, and a healthcare system that is

14231 harder, not easier to navigate.

14232 \*Mr. Pfluger. Will the gentlelady yield?

14233 Right here, Lori.

14234 \*Mrs. Trahan. Yes, I will yield.

14235 \*Mr. Pfluger. Would you agree that the biggest  
14236 difference we have is our viewpoint on whether or not work  
14237 requirements should be part of the system?

14238 I mean, do you agree, like, just the foundational debate  
14239 that we --

14240 \*Mrs. Trahan. No, no, we are going to go one by one on  
14241 all the ways that your policies that you are putting into  
14242 this bill translates into less people with health care. Work  
14243 requirements is just one of them. We will stay here all  
14244 night.

14245 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Lori, would you mind --

14246 \*Mrs. Trahan. I yield back.

14247 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Would the gentlewoman yield?

14248 \*Mrs. Trahan. Oh, yes, absolutely, I yield --

14249 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you.

14250 \*Mrs. Trahan. -- to my colleague from Massachusetts.

14251 \*Mr. Auchincloss. The gentleman from Texas is talking  
14252 about coverage and disagreements there. But I want to talk  
14253 about cost and disagreements there, because there actually is  
14254 something that we both agree on on both sides, which is we  
14255 actually agree on a version of universal access to health

14256 care. It is a 1980s law, EMTALA, that says that if you get  
14257 sick, you can go to the emergency room, right? You call 911,  
14258 someone has to answer. Does anybody on the other side of the  
14259 aisle disagree with that? If you call 911, someone has to  
14260 answer, right?

14261         So what we are saying as Democrats is, hey, you know, it  
14262 is actually a lot cheaper if fewer people have to call 911  
14263 and go to the emergency room, and instead they get to see a  
14264 doctor or afford their prescription drugs, or see a substance  
14265 abuse therapist before they go to emergency room. And what  
14266 Republicans are saying is, no, we want to add copays to  
14267 people seeing a primary care physician, we want to gut SAMHSA  
14268 and substance abuse treatments, and we want to kick people  
14269 off the Medicaid rolls so they have no access to preventative  
14270 or primary care. And at that point, those people still get  
14271 sick, right? Sickness is not an eligibility requirement.  
14272 They are still sick. They are going to the emergency room,  
14273 and they will now -- not just they, all of us -- will pay  
14274 more money.

14275         So Democrats care about lowering health care costs  
14276 through comprehensive health care policy; Republicans want to  
14277 have higher health care costs.

14278         And I yield back to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

14279         \*Mrs. Trahan. I yield back.

14280         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. The

14281 chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Balderson, for  
14282 five minutes.

14283 \*Mr. Balderson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield my  
14284 time to Chairman Guthrie.

14285 \*The Chair. Thank you very much.

14286 And I have heard Arkansas come up a couple of times, so  
14287 I am sure this will, as well, so I just want to start by  
14288 saying this year we are spending \$650 billion in Medicaid.  
14289 We are going to spend more money each and every year over the  
14290 next 10 years. In 2034 under this bill the CBO estimates we  
14291 will spend \$1.1 trillion in Medicaid, from 650 billion to 1.1  
14292 trillion.

14293 And so on the work requirements, because my friend from  
14294 -- the doctor from California said -- brought up the Arkansas  
14295 model again, and we don't want to repeat the Arkansas model.  
14296 We agree that was the wrong way to do it, and I don't -- and  
14297 I strongly believe Arkansas didn't set their process up  
14298 because they wanted to use it to get people off Medicaid.  
14299 They wanted people who are going to take taxpayer dollars for  
14300 free health care have some obligation to do something for it.

14301 Most people work for their health care, they get it  
14302 through their employer. And we think that able-bodied people  
14303 who are eligible to work should do something and not just  
14304 have something given to them for free. And so Arkansas did  
14305 that. They made it overly cumbersome. They made monthly



14306 checks. It was outside of the normal process. People  
14307 couldn't get checked in the way they want. So Arkansas  
14308 backed off because they knew that was separating people from  
14309 Medicaid that they didn't want separated from Medicaid, and  
14310 they are trying to do it better.

14311         So just since we brought Arkansas and Georgia up a  
14312 couple of times already, just remember the bill today would  
14313 only require a beneficiary to have to verify work at the time  
14314 of enrollment or during a re-determined position of their  
14315 eligibility, and this allows states and beneficiaries to take  
14316 advantage of the existing processing and paperwork that they  
14317 already go through.

14318         This is already a pretty well-established concept for  
14319 states. They use existing data sources all the time to  
14320 verify a number of different people's eligibility  
14321 requirements. So right off the bat, we are talking about  
14322 paperwork that is already part of the current system by  
14323 learning from -- and I accept the criticism of what Arkansas  
14324 -- Arkansas did it with good intentions, but I accept the  
14325 criticism of what they did.

14326         So who are we requiring to work? We are requiring to  
14327 work -- we are not requiring -- the work requirements do not  
14328 apply to pregnant women, individuals under 19, individuals  
14329 over 64, if you are foster youth and former foster youth  
14330 under the age of 26 -- so it does not apply to you. If you

14331 are members of a tribe it does not apply to you. Individuals  
14332 who are considered medically frail, which includes but is not  
14333 limited to individuals who are blind, disabled, have a  
14334 chronic substance use disorder, who have a serious and  
14335 complex medical condition, you are not required to work.  
14336 Individuals who are already in compliance with work  
14337 requirements under TANF and SNAP do not have to go through  
14338 the process of Medicaid. Individuals who are a parent or  
14339 caregiver of a dependent child, or an individual with a  
14340 disability are not required to work, or are incarcerated or  
14341 recently released from incarceration within the past 90 days.  
14342 There is also provisions for short-term hardship waivers for  
14343 natural disasters and for counties where the unemployment  
14344 rate is greater than 8 percent or greater than 150 percent of  
14345 the national average.

14346       So if you are not pregnant, if you are between 19 and  
14347 64, if you are not a foster youth or former foster youth  
14348 under the age of 26, if you are not a member of a tribe, if  
14349 you are not an individual who is medically frail, if you are  
14350 not an individual who is already in compliance with other  
14351 work requirements, if you are not an individual who is a  
14352 parent of a caregiver or a dependent child, or an individual  
14353 with a disability, or not one who is incarcerated or recently  
14354 released from incarceration, or you are not in an area where  
14355 there is a short-term hardship for a natural disaster -- and

14356 all of those apply, so if you are not pregnant, if you are  
14357 not -- if you are between 18 and 64, you are not a foster  
14358 youth -- I have to repeat it because I know it is going to  
14359 come up again -- not a member of a tribe, if all those things  
14360 I just described, then I think -- you are an able-bodied  
14361 person, if you are not working in this condition, you are  
14362 chosen -- you choose not to work, and we have a system in  
14363 place -- we are requiring a system to be in place that the  
14364 red tape doesn't eliminate people just because they can't go  
14365 through the red tape.

14366 And I will yield back.

14367 \*Mr. Balderson. I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

14368 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back. The  
14369 chair recognizes the gentlelady from New York, Ms. Ocasio-  
14370 Cortez.

14371 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

14372 I just want to also clarify once again that, as has been  
14373 stated several times by the Republican majority here, many of  
14374 the work standards and requirements and many of the ways that  
14375 they are designing these changes to Medicaid are based on  
14376 changes in Georgia. Georgia has the third-highest number of  
14377 uninsured Americans in the country. Catastrophic. And that  
14378 is with the so-called improvements from monthly reporting  
14379 paperwork requirements to annual paperwork requirements.

14380 And so the Republican majority has looked at the state

14381 with the third highest number of uninsured Americans and  
14382 said, that is what we want to model our Medicaid system  
14383 after, this catastrophic failure. And I understand that the  
14384 Republican majority wants the American public to be sold into  
14385 accepting this by saying, you know what? We are secretly  
14386 paying for Medicaid for every Venezuelan in the world, and  
14387 that there are millions of eight-year-olds getting sex  
14388 reassignment surgeries on Medicaid time, and if we just take  
14389 all of that, that will somehow make your Medicaid -- cut that  
14390 and make your Medicaid better. It sounds ridiculous because  
14391 it is.

14392         And then they want to say, if you have a \$1 million  
14393 house, right -- let's set this cap at \$1 million. Okay,  
14394 cool. I have a question, though. I have another number that  
14395 I think is interesting. Maybe -- what if you are getting a  
14396 \$22 million house, inheriting a \$22 million house? Because  
14397 what Republicans are saying is that if you -- if we cut all  
14398 of -- make all of these cuts, we will then shift that and  
14399 invest it into Medicaid for people who actually deserve it.  
14400 But if that were true, then the top-line number, our budget  
14401 for Medicaid, would be staying the same, right? We would be  
14402 taking from undeserving people and giving it to deserving  
14403 people, and that should even out.

14404         But that is not what is happening in this bill. This  
14405 bill is cutting nearly \$1 trillion in Medicaid spending

14406 overall. Why? Because down the hallway they are trying to  
14407 finance tax cuts for people who are inheriting \$22 million  
14408 houses because in 2017 Republicans and the Trump  
14409 Administration tried to increase the exemption of what you  
14410 get a tax break on. If you used to inherit an \$11 million  
14411 house, you would get no taxes, you had no taxes on that in  
14412 that estate tax. They said that is not enough, we need no  
14413 taxes on a \$22 million house.

14414 \*Mr. Weber. Will the gentlelady yield?

14415 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. And that expired -- I have to  
14416 finish -- that expired -- that expires now. And it costs a  
14417 lot of money to extend that tax break up to \$22 million.

14418 So to pay for that they are doing this. They are  
14419 modeling and completely retrofitting the United States  
14420 Medicaid system to model it after the state with the third  
14421 most catastrophic uninsured American number in the country,  
14422 in the dead of night, at 2:38 in the morning, when everyone  
14423 is asleep, when we have asked for the opportunity to do this  
14424 in the light of day so that people can call their  
14425 representatives' offices in order to stop this disaster.

14426 So let's be crystal clear about what is going on right  
14427 now, because it is not so-called illegals, who do not receive  
14428 a dime in Federal Medicaid dollars. That is a tall tale.  
14429 Being nice today.

14430 And with that I yield back.

14431           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields back.  
14432       The chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Weber, for  
14433       five minutes.

14434           \*Mr. Weber. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am going to  
14435       yield back to you.

14436           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Thank you, I appreciate that.  
14437       Because I do have the honor and privilege of  
14438       representing the State of Georgia, I do want to speak about  
14439       that, and I want to be very clear about the work  
14440       requirements, the community engagement requirements that are  
14441       proposed in this bill, and how they are different from what  
14442       Georgia is doing.

14443           First of all, let's understand. Georgia is not an  
14444       expansion state. Georgia did a targeted eligibility  
14445       expansion for select adults only if they meet the state's  
14446       work requirements. You know, it is difficult to compare the  
14447       results to an actual expansion state that covers all low-  
14448       income adults. But let me emphasize again the steps in this  
14449       bill that -- this bill takes to ensure that those who are  
14450       working will keep their coverage.

14451           The bill is designed to be flexible. It is designed to  
14452       be flexible for states and easy for beneficiaries to meet the  
14453       requirements. It only applies to able-bodied adults without  
14454       dependents. Chairman Guthrie went over the exceptions.  
14455       Again, it only applies to able-bodied adults without

14456 dependents, and provides ample exception processes like  
14457 carve-outs for short-term hardships and for areas facing  
14458 economic hardships where there are insufficient jobs.

14459       The number-one goal of this bill is to make clear that,  
14460 if you are working, that the process can work to make sure  
14461 that you keep your health insurance --

14462       \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

14463       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- make sure you keep your  
14464 health insurance. But at the end of the day, we believe that  
14465 it is the right thing to make Medicaid coverage for able-  
14466 bodied adults, able-bodied adults, just like insurance for  
14467 every other American.

14468       \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Will the chair yield for a  
14469 question?

14470       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. You have got to work to keep  
14471 it.

14472       \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Will the chairman yield for a  
14473 question?

14474       \*Mr. Weber. Actually, the time -- do you want to keep  
14475 going, Mr. Chairman?

14476       \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Oh.

14477       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No, I yield back.

14478       \*Mr. Weber. I will yield to the gentlelady.

14479       \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you.

14480       In terms of some of the exemptions, pregnancy is

14481 covered, correct?

14482 \*Mr. Weber. May I interrupt for just -- I am glad you  
14483 are addressing us, instead of speaking to the camera.

14484 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Yes.

14485 \*Mr. Weber. Keep going.

14486 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Pregnancy is covered, correct?

14487 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Yes.

14488 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. As an exemption?

14489 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. As we have said.

14490 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I have a question. Given the Dobbs  
14491 decision and the fact that many women in many states are  
14492 forced to be carrying --

14493 \*Mr. Weber. All right, I am going to have to stop you,  
14494 I am going to reclaim my time, thank you.

14495 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Okay, what about miscarriage?

14496 \*Mr. Weber. Thank you.

14497 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. What about miscarriage?

14498 \*Mr. Weber. I am reclaiming my time, thank you. I just  
14499 want to make the point that we would like for you to address  
14500 the Republicans, and let's have a dialog this way and not to  
14501 a camera.

14502 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Okay.

14503 \*Mr. Weber. Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

14504 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Okay, can -- look, but I --

14505 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields --



14506           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. But you are --

14507           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman --

14508           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Wait.

14509           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- yields back.

14510           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. But I am asking the question. What  
14511 about a miscarriage?

14512           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back.

14513           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I am trying to engage in the way  
14514 that the gentleman --

14515           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The lady is out of order. The  
14516 gentleman yields back.

14517           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Oh, so we don't want to answer for  
14518 women --

14519           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair -- is there someone  
14520 on the Democratic --

14521           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. -- having miscarriages and bleeding  
14522 out in parking lots, okay.

14523           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- side who looks to be  
14524 recognized?

14525           The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey, Mr.  
14526 Menendez, for five minutes.

14527           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman.

14528           And first I want to associate myself with the comments  
14529 from my colleague from New York, because I think she hit this  
14530 exactly on the head.

14531           This would all be a different conversation if this  
14532 wasn't part of a budget resolution that calls for the  
14533 extension of the original tax -- Trump -- the Trump tax cuts.  
14534 So we know that those cuts have to be paired with spending  
14535 cuts, which is what this conversation is about, the \$880  
14536 billion that we have to cut, and that is why it makes  
14537 listening to our friends across the aisle so difficult  
14538 because you are tying yourself into knots to talk about  
14539 improving Medicaid, but you are not doing that, right?

14540           So as my colleague from Louisiana said, if you were  
14541 taking this money that you believe you are saving in the  
14542 program and reinvesting it in Medicaid, well, that would make  
14543 a lot more sense.

14544           Mr. Pfluger said that he wants the program to work for  
14545 the people it was intended to, the people who are here today,  
14546 both earlier in the day and now at 2:30 a.m., but the savings  
14547 that Republicans think that they are going to find are not  
14548 being invested to make those services better for Medicaid  
14549 recipients.

14550           Chairman Guthrie has talked about how much we are going  
14551 to be spending in 10 years, but whatever savings that  
14552 Republicans think that they are going to find are not being  
14553 put towards the solvency of the program for what we are going  
14554 to have to spend in 10 years.

14555           In this moment the reason we are having a conversation

14556 around potential savings in Medicaid, which is really cutting  
14557 health care for millions of Americans, is to pay for the tax  
14558 cuts, as we have previously discussed, disproportionately  
14559 benefit the wealthy.

14560         We have had this conversation around the specific words  
14561 that Republicans would like to use, like "shifting.'" If I  
14562 was in an office and I was shifting an employee, I would be  
14563 shifting them to another role or to another office. I don't  
14564 hear the Republicans talking about where they are shifting  
14565 these individuals to. Off Medicaid to what program? Because  
14566 it is not just Medicaid, it is also the ACA, right? So you  
14567 are making it harder for people to have health care, and you  
14568 are not telling anyone where they are going to be shifted to.

14569         So if someone relies on Medicaid, right, and now they  
14570 have these work requirements, this red tape, right, that like  
14571 in Georgia, like in Arkansas, boots people from Medicaid,  
14572 right, where are you "shifting'" them to, right? And you  
14573 haven't made that point clear at all or spoken to the  
14574 American people who rely on Medicaid, who rely on the ACA  
14575 expansion to know where they are going to go.

14576         And that is why they are so worried, and that is why we  
14577 are so worried for them, because we know you are not  
14578 reinvesting in the program, we know that you have no  
14579 alternative to Medicaid or the ACA, and that is what is so  
14580 alarming. And until you can answer those questions, we are

14581 going to keep calling out what harm this will do.

14582 But I want to yield to my colleague from New York  
14583 because I think she was about to touch on some really  
14584 important questions --

14585 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you.

14586 \*Mr. Menendez. -- that the American people need to  
14587 hear.

14588 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you so much. I thank my  
14589 colleague from New Jersey.

14590 You know, it seems as though I touched on something that  
14591 was sensitive for the majority, but this is an important  
14592 question. You know, many of us we -- working -- were here in  
14593 Congress -- this is a body that is less than 30 percent  
14594 female, so it is not uncommon that many of my colleagues are  
14595 unfamiliar with our biology and the needs for 50 percent of  
14596 Americans. Since the majority did not seem interested in  
14597 answering the question, I would like to pose a question to  
14598 counsel.

14599 Able-bodied American. Obviously, if you are pregnant,  
14600 you are covered under the exemption, correct?

14601 \*Counsel. That is correct.

14602 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. If you are not pregnant, you would  
14603 not be covered under the pregnancy exemption, correct?

14604 \*Counsel. That is correct.

14605 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. So if a woman miscarries, she would

14606 then be kicked off the exemption, correct?

14607 \*Counsel. The exemption also includes postpartum  
14608 coverage.

14609 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Postpartum, miscarriage. Is  
14610 miscarriage covered under that?

14611 \*Counsel. If a state includes miscarriage under  
14612 postpartum coverage, then yes.

14613 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Federally, in this statute, is  
14614 miscarriage explicitly included in the language of the text?

14615 \*Counsel. The bill includes postpartum coverage as an  
14616 exemption.

14617 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Miscarriage is not listed, correct?

14618 \*Counsel. If a miscarriage by a state is included in  
14619 postpartum coverage, then yes.

14620 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Is the text -- is miscarriage  
14621 explicitly included in the text of the bill?

14622 \*Counsel. Is not explicitly stated in the state.

14623 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you very much.

14624 I think this is tremendously important for my colleagues  
14625 to understand because President Trump nominated anti-  
14626 abortion, anti-choice Supreme Court Justices that now,  
14627 because of the Dobbs ruling, have forced women to carry not  
14628 just -- not just carry out miscarriages, traumatic  
14629 miscarriages which can be debilitating, life-threatening, and  
14630 then, on top of it, could potentially endanger their

14631 insurance status. Sit with that. Thank you.

14632 \*Mr. Menendez. I yield back.

14633 \*The Chair. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back.

14634 Does -- the gentlelady from -- the doctor from Iowa is  
14635 recognized for -- to speak on the amendment.

14636 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to  
14637 strike the last word.

14638 I have heard mention from our colleagues on the other  
14639 side of the aisle \$22 million houses, and let me just explain  
14640 the death tax from an Iowa perspective.

14641 The death tax is a fifth-generation family farm. You  
14642 have heard the expression "land rich." They have assets in  
14643 land which are not sellable. And in order to pass a farm  
14644 down or a small business down from one generation to the next  
14645 generation, you have to pay the inheritance tax on that. And  
14646 that tax often requires the sale of that farm.

14647 So I have farmers that want to pass their farm on to the  
14648 sixth generation or their small business. I don't know about  
14649 the \$22 million homes in New York, but I know about the farms  
14650 in Iowa and I know about the farms in Texas, where I grew up.

14651 Number two, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle  
14652 have mentioned the ACA, and they have talked about loss of  
14653 coverage or they have talked about what we are trying to do,  
14654 thinking and reading our minds. Well, I happen to remember  
14655 the ACA very well. I happen to remember that The Washington

14656 Post gave four Pinocchios to the president for the lies --  
14657 or, excuse me, the misrepresentations and falsehoods -- about  
14658 the ACA. What were those?

14659 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Which president?

14660 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. If you like your plan, you can keep  
14661 your plan. If you like your doctor, you can keep your  
14662 doctor. Your premiums will go down by 2,500. Premiums never  
14663 went down. People lost their coverage. They lost their  
14664 health care. They lost their health insurance. And I had  
14665 patients calling me who lost me as their doctor.

14666 You didn't seem to care about anybody losing coverage at  
14667 that time. That has happened, and insurance premiums have  
14668 gone up every single year. People that were small businesses  
14669 that offered coverage could no longer offer coverage. So I  
14670 find it rather remarkable that you would comment on this now  
14671 on a program where the costs are skyrocketing.

14672 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield.

14673 \*Ms. McClellan. Will the gentlelady yield for a  
14674 question?

14675 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No, I have already yielded back.

14676 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
14677 anyone seeking -- the gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui,  
14678 is recognized for --

14679 \*Ms. Matsui. I want to yield --

14680 \*The Chair. Okay, the gentlelady's time from

14681 California, Ms. Matsui's time? All right.

14682 \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you. Thank you for yielding.

14683 Well, Mr. Chairman, you all keep talking about these  
14684 exemptions that are in place to protect people that -- I  
14685 guess you agree -- deserved health coverage from losing it  
14686 under the red tape requirements. So I want to follow up on  
14687 what my colleague from New York was talking about because I  
14688 guess I don't know how this is going to work. There is a  
14689 provision in the text related to automatically determining  
14690 compliance with the requirements, and so I want to ask  
14691 counsel about that, if it is in the bill.

14692 So can you confirm on page 76, line 10 that a state only  
14693 needs to automate this process "where possible"? "Where  
14694 possible," that is from the bill.

14695 I am asking counsel.

14696 \*Counsel. The question is if it says "where possible"?

14697 \*Ms. DeGette. Yes.

14698 \*Counsel. Yes, it says "where possible."

14699 \*Ms. DeGette. Yes, it does. Okay. And then I guess I  
14700 am just wondering how it would work for the state to automate  
14701 some of these exemptions. So let me go back to what my  
14702 colleague from New York was saying.

14703 First of all, it exempts somebody who becomes pregnant.  
14704 How is a state automatically going to know that somebody  
14705 enrolled in the Medicaid program becomes pregnant and should



14706 be exempt? Is -- are there -- are people going to be  
14707 reporting pregnancy, or what? Is that in the bill?

14708 \*Counsel. I would need to refer you to the Centers for  
14709 Medicare and Medicaid Services for implementation.

14710 \*Ms. DeGette. Is that in the bill, how they are going  
14711 to determine whether somebody pregnant?

14712 \*Counsel. I would need to refer you to CMS for how  
14713 implementation --

14714 \*Ms. DeGette. So that answer is no.

14715 What happens, then, if they have a miscarriage? How  
14716 will the state know that automatically they are exempt?

14717 \*Counsel. I would need to refer you to CMS for --

14718 \*Ms. DeGette. You don't know that, either.

14719 How would they know if somebody had a stillbirth, would  
14720 they know that?

14721 \*Counsel. Again, for implementation I would have to  
14722 direct you to CMS.

14723 \*Ms. DeGette. You don't know, okay.

14724 How about somebody -- because, as the chairman said,  
14725 somebody with a substance use disorder is going to be  
14726 automatically exempt. How is the state going to know if an  
14727 individual has a substance use disorder, are they going to  
14728 require some kind of reporting by providers?

14729 \*Counsel. The implementation would be established by  
14730 CMS.

14731           \*Ms. DeGette. So that is not in the bill, either.

14732           What about a disabling mental disorder, and what  
14733 condition -- does the bill say what conditions that would  
14734 include, a disabling mental disorder?

14735           \*Counsel. The definition is established by the  
14736 Secretary.

14737           \*Ms. DeGette. So that -- so we don't know what a --  
14738 that -- oh, wait, wait. So Secretary Kennedy would establish  
14739 what a disabling mental disorder was?

14740           \*Counsel. The Secretary of Health and Human Services.

14741           \*Ms. DeGette. That would be -- okay, that would be  
14742 Secretary Kennedy. We look forward to that.

14743           [Laughter.]

14744           \*Ms. DeGette. Now, somebody with a serious or complex  
14745 medical condition, is that defined in the bill?

14746           [Pause.]

14747           \*Counsel. It would be established by the --

14748           \*Ms. DeGette. Yes, it is not defined in the bill,  
14749 either. And so I see -- think you can see where I am going.

14750           Is the state even required to automate exemptions, or is  
14751 that -- or again, that goes to back to where possible,  
14752 correct?

14753           \*Counsel. I am sorry, that was the question, yes?

14754           \*Ms. DeGette. That is directed at you, sir. Yes, sir.

14755           \*Counsel. Yes.

14756           \*Ms. DeGette. Okay. So, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me  
14757 the only thing that states are required to do is to automate  
14758 compliance work with the work standard. So all the people I  
14759 described above, as well as parents and others who are  
14760 purportedly exempted, would have to prove somehow that they  
14761 were exempted. And it is obvious that these exemptions and  
14762 the so-called automation is nothing but window dressing  
14763 because there is no provision in the bill for how you are  
14764 going to be able to do this.

14765           I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and I yield back.

14766           \*Ms. Matsui. I yield back.

14767           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
14768 anyone seeking recognition?

14769           The gentleman from Georgia, you are recognized for five  
14770 minutes to speak on the amendment.

14771           \*Mr. Allen. Yes, just a little background -- and my  
14772 colleague from Iowa brought this up -- and these numbers are  
14773 astounding. But, you know -- and I think it is all  
14774 surrounding, you know, what -- where we are headed and why we  
14775 are dealing with this right now. And thank God we are  
14776 dealing with it, because it does not paint a really pretty  
14777 picture for the future.

14778           But if -- well, number one, I don't think it can be  
14779 denied that in 2018, right before COVID, we had the best  
14780 economy in the history of my lifetime. Now, how did that

14781     happen?

14782             \*Voice.   Obama.

14783             [Laughter.]

14784             \*Voice.   I knew the left was delusional.

14785             \*Mr. Allen.   Well, I think -- I am not quoting here, but  
14786     I think it was about -- well, one of the reasons I ran for  
14787     Congress was the growth then under President Obama was about  
14788     1.3 percent GDP.   And it was kind of considered that that is  
14789     about all it should be, just -- that is just the way it is  
14790     going to be, we are not going to manufacture anything  
14791     anymore, or whatever.

14792             But I will say this.   Since 2010, total national health  
14793     care expenditures have increased by \$2 trillion.   We are  
14794     paying today 4.9 trillion in health care costs.   It is almost  
14795     17 percent of GDP.

14796             Now, I have heard different folks say that we need to  
14797     model our health care after other nations.   Well, you got  
14798     Germany, they spend about \$7,000 per capita; Sweden, 6,000;  
14799     Canada, our neighbor, 5,905; the United Kingdom, 5,387.   And  
14800     so I think what we are trying to do -- and this is a question  
14801     that I asked -- I served on the Healthy Future Task Force --  
14802     where is all the money going?

14803             \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Will the gentleman yield?

14804             \*Mr. Allen.   The providers, the providers, they are --  
14805     you know, what they are being paid on a fee basis is going

14806 down.

14807 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Will the gentleman yield?

14808 \*Mr. Allen. Yes.

14809 \*Mr. Auchincloss. So I appreciate this point, because  
14810 health care in America costs a lot of money. And I have  
14811 heard from gentleman from Georgia, as well as the chair of  
14812 the full committee that Medicaid spending is out of control,  
14813 and that Republicans are coming in to save Medicaid by  
14814 cutting it. And I think we have to just put facts on the  
14815 table that Medicaid is actually the most efficient health  
14816 program in the country, okay, it -- and that is despite  
14817 covering costly care that no other payer covers, particularly  
14818 long-term services and supports --

14819 \*Mr. Allen. Did you just hear what I said? Did you  
14820 just hear what our health care cost is?

14821 \*Mr. Auchincloss. The --

14822 \*Mr. Allen. Do you know we are spending almost 800  
14823 billion on Medicaid?

14824 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Medicaid expenditures are growing at  
14825 a slower rate than private insurance. Private insurance  
14826 premiums are going up at 2X wages. Medicaid expenditures per  
14827 capita are going up slower than that, and that is despite the  
14828 fact that Medicaid is covering long-term services and support  
14829 for the elderly.

14830 And here is the thing. Those -- the home and community-

14831 based services for long-term services and support are  
14832 optional, not federally mandated, it is optional at the state  
14833 level. So when you all slash Medicaid, the states are going  
14834 to have to restrict the home and community-based services --

14835 \*Mr. Allen. So what you are saying is, if we put  
14836 everybody in this country on Medicaid we are going to be --  
14837 we are going to cut it in -- we are going to be down there  
14838 with Canada at 5,906 per capita?

14839 \*Mr. Auchincloss. I am saying that Medicaid is a much  
14840 more efficient insurer than UnitedHealth Group is.

14841 \*Mr. Allen. Yes.

14842 \*Mr. Auchincloss. And it is certainly a more efficient  
14843 insurer than the emergency room is.

14844 \*Mr. Allen. Well, I can assure you of this, that --

14845 \*Mr. Auchincloss. But --

14846 \*Mr. Allen. -- you know, if you need a hip, you are  
14847 going to get in line.

14848 You know, I am going to tell, you the biggest problem we  
14849 have got in health care today is a shortage of providers,  
14850 okay? And the reason for that is because, you know, Medicaid  
14851 and the provider network is not there.

14852 \*Mr. Auchincloss. If the gentleman from Georgia or --

14853 \*Mr. Allen. And New York right now has a tremendous  
14854 shortage of doctors.

14855 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Yes, we should --

14856           \*Mr. Allen. -- people waiting in line for health care.

14857           \*Mr. Auchincloss. -- laws or foreign-trained  
14858 physicians. We can have that conversation. That is not the  
14859 conversation we are having in this room right now. The  
14860 conversation we are having in this room right now is not how  
14861 to strengthen Medicaid, not how to provide home and  
14862 community-based services for the elderly population, which is  
14863 growing --

14864           \*Mr. Allen. I --

14865           \*Mr. Auchincloss. -- which is why Medicaid spending is  
14866 going up. The conversation we are having is, how do we pay  
14867 for the tax cuts for people who don't need tax cuts?

14868           \*Mr. Allen. Yes, here is how we pay for it.

14869           \*Mr. Auchincloss. -- health care.

14870           \*Mr. Allen. We grow GDP, okay? That is the secret.  
14871 That is the secret sauce. If we don't grow GDP, we are out  
14872 of business. We can't -- you know --

14873           \*Mr. Auchincloss. We are not having that conversation  
14874 in here, either.

14875           \*Mr. Allen. We --

14876           \*Mr. Auchincloss. The conversation we are having in  
14877 here right now is taking away health care.

14878           \*Mr. Allen. Yes, well --

14879           \*The Chair. The gentleman's time --

14880           \*Mr. Allen. I have looked at it for a long -- okay, my

14881 time is -- I yield back.

14882 \*The Chair. The time is expired. Does anyone seek  
14883 discussion on the -- the gentlelady from New York, Ms.  
14884 Clarke.

14885 \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

14886 I did want to just share with one of my colleagues from  
14887 Texas that when the gentlelady from New York looks at the  
14888 screen, and if she wants to check her hair, she wants to say  
14889 anything she wants to to that screen, she has the right to do  
14890 so, and there is not a member on this on this panel that can  
14891 tell another member where to look, who to look at, and where  
14892 they want to look. So you need to back up off your rules  
14893 because we are not going to be dealing with that tonight.

14894 The man from Texas. And if you know who I am talking  
14895 about, let him know I said it.

14896 On the other side of that, there was a colleague from  
14897 Iowa that talked about the farms. And I can appreciate the  
14898 6-year farm passed down of 22 million. But I can also  
14899 appreciate the fact that in Brooklyn, New York you can buy  
14900 your house when you are 50 years old at \$20,000, and now you  
14901 are 65 years old, and that same house that you bought is now  
14902 \$1 million. But guess what? You are retired. You are  
14903 retired.

14904 So, you know, we are not going to be able to crack the  
14905 code on this because you folk want to give your rich friends,



14906 your billionaires, the tax cut and extend it. But there are  
14907 some realities that we need to deal with here that is not a  
14908 one-size-fits-all scenario.

14909 And I am going to look at myself. Wait, my hair.

14910 [Laughter.]

14911 \*Ms. Clarke. Oh, okay.

14912 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Well the gentlelady yield?

14913 \*Ms. Clarke. I will yield.

14914 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you so much.

14915 And, you know, speaking of where we are addressing and  
14916 who we are addressing, there are 13.7 million Americans on  
14917 the other side of that screen right there.

14918 Hello, hello. I am talking to you because I work for  
14919 you.

14920 \*Ms. Clarke. That is right.

14921 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. And they deserve to see what is  
14922 happening here because there are plenty of districts,  
14923 including Republican ones, where 25 percent of your  
14924 constituents are on Medicaid, 40 percent of your constituents  
14925 are on Medicaid. And yes, I am --

14926 \*Mr. Weber. Will the gentlelady yield?

14927 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I am talking to them, and I will  
14928 not yield because it was a terribly disrespectful comment,  
14929 and I will not yield to disrespectful men.

14930 Thank you very much.

14931           \*Mr. Ruiz. Do you yield back?

14932           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. We will yield back to the  
14933 gentlelady.

14934           \*Ms. Clarke. Yes, I would yield to the doctor from  
14935 California.

14936           \*Mr. Ruiz. Yes, I am going to look at the screen, too,  
14937 and address all the people that are watching.

14938           You know, I have heard a lot of misstatements from the  
14939 other side. They mentioned that their intention is to cut in  
14940 order to save, and that is the whole reason why we are having  
14941 this. That is not true. The whole reason why we are having  
14942 this hearing is because of the budget resolution that --  
14943 around the tax cuts that primarily will go to billionaires  
14944 said that the Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit  
14945 changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit  
14946 by not less than \$880 billion for the period of fiscal years  
14947 2025 through 2034. It doesn't say anything about saving  
14948 Medicaid or any altruistic reason. It doesn't mention even  
14949 waste, fraud, and abuse. It is just spin that they are using  
14950 now.

14951           The purpose that we are cutting so much is in order to  
14952 pay for the reconciliation bill that is going to give tax  
14953 cuts in the billions to billionaires. It is right there in  
14954 the budget resolution as part of this tax bill. So spare me  
14955 the phony altruistic intentions.

14956           The other thing that they mention is that costs are  
14957 going up in health care. Well, if you cut Medicaid, if you  
14958 take \$13.7 million off of -- million people off of Medicaid,  
14959 costs will go up because Medicaid helps with prevention, it  
14960 helps lower costs. If people can't see their doctors, and  
14961 people get sick and go to the emergency department or have to  
14962 be hospitalized in the ICU, costs will go up.

14963           And regarding this number that is thrown out, whether,  
14964 you know, we are going to spend 1.1 trillion, et cetera, look  
14965 -- in 2035, you are cutting \$710 billion from Medicaid. So  
14966 regardless of what we spend in the future -- because  
14967 inflation goes up, people's health will go down, costs will  
14968 go high -- I mean, it is almost absurd and very misleading to  
14969 say that just because we are going to spend more in 2035,  
14970 that somehow this isn't going to cut Medicaid.

14971           Thank you, I yield back.

14972           \*The Chair. The gentleman's time has expired. I don't  
14973 know whose time it was, but it has expired, so --

14974           \*Ms. Clarke. I yield back.

14975           \*The Chair. Does anyone need time?

14976           Okay, thanks, Ms. Clarke. Anybody have time on our  
14977 side?

14978           The gentlelady from Indiana seeks recognition to speak  
14979 on the amendment.

14980           \*Mrs. Houchin. Mr. Chairman, I would like to yield my

14981 time to the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Carter.

14982       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I thank the gentlelady for  
14983 yielding, and I want to make an important point here, and  
14984 that is that we have been talking about work requirements, we  
14985 have been talking about getting illegals off of Medicaid, we  
14986 have been talking about the duplication, that some recipients  
14987 were eligible in more than one state, and all of those things  
14988 are important, and all of those things do save taxpayers  
14989 money and give states the opportunity to improve the programs  
14990 by having more money available. And all of them sustain and  
14991 save and stabilize the program, and that is important.

14992       But there are other things, too. There are other things  
14993 that this bill does. One is the doc fix, and I think that is  
14994 important. It was mentioned that we were having trouble  
14995 getting physicians to participate in this program. One of  
14996 the reasons why is because since 2001 Medicare physician  
14997 payment rates have declined by roughly 33 percent, and that  
14998 creates a growing instability for medical practices and we  
14999 don't have as many doctors participating because of that.  
15000 That is a -- we need a healthy health care marketplace so  
15001 that we can have a system that encourages independent  
15002 practice instead of having a system that only works for  
15003 consolidated health care conglomerates.

15004       So far this decade we have been having to patch together  
15005 payment updates to the Medicare physician fee schedule, but

15006 that is not a good way for us to operate, and certainly not  
15007 good for the physician workforce.

15008 \*Mr. Ruiz. Would the gentleman yield?

15009 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Thankfully, this bill -- just a  
15010 second -- thankfully, this bill includes a fix to the  
15011 Medicare physician fee schedule, making -- marking the first  
15012 time -- the first time -- physician reimbursement will be  
15013 tied to inflation, and that is important.

15014 So to my point, what we are doing is that we are making  
15015 this program better. We are stabilizing it. We are  
15016 sustaining it. We are saving it. We are going to have  
15017 physicians for the most vulnerable in our society, thanks to  
15018 what we are doing in this legislation, in this bill. The  
15019 structural reform in this bill to physician payments is  
15020 essential to preserving beneficiary access to care and  
15021 addressing longstanding deficiencies in the Medicare  
15022 physician fee schedule.

15023 So this bill, in a lot of ways, includes many big wins  
15024 for American patients.

15025 \*Mr. Ruiz. Will the gentleman yield?

15026 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And I will yield to the  
15027 gentlelady from Iowa.

15028 Mike. Mike.

15029 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Sorry, thank you.

15030 Mr. Chairman, thank you for recognizing me. Thank you

15031 for holding the markup and advancing this legislation to  
15032 safeguard and strengthen Medicaid. I would like to comment  
15033 on Representative -- I am not allowed to say his name, excuse  
15034 me -- the gentleman from Georgia's comments recently.

15035 I think what is very important in this bill is the doc  
15036 fix. This is a tremendous issue in Iowa and rural areas such  
15037 as Iowa in getting physicians into practice. Seventy-five  
15038 percent of the MEI for year one, and then ten percent of the  
15039 MEI for subsequent years, this is a policy that I have been  
15040 advocating for since my first term in Congress so that  
15041 seniors and people on Medicaid can have access to physicians,  
15042 especially independent physicians and in rural areas. This  
15043 not only saves them money and preserves quality care, but it  
15044 saves the program money, as well, too.

15045 I look forward to working with us on a permanent,  
15046 lasting doctors fix and on physician reimbursement, and I  
15047 yield back the balance of my time to the representative from  
15048 Georgia.

15049 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And I yield back.

15050 \*Mr. Ruiz. Will the gentleman yield?

15051 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

15052 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone  
15053 seeking recognition?

15054 The gentleman from Florida -- do we have more than one  
15055 Floridian? Mr. Soto. We do, so I will call you by name.

15056           \*Mr. Soto. We have a bunch of Floridians.

15057           \*The Chair. We have a bunch of Floridians, I know. So  
15058 that is why I said Mr. -- well, we have -- yes, we have both  
15059 male and female Floridians.

15060           \*Mr. Soto. And it is --

15061           \*The Chair. We got -- all right, anyway, Mr. -- let's  
15062 start his time over, I am sorry.

15063           [Laughter.]

15064           \*The Chair. So Mr. Soto from Florida is recognized.

15065           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
15066 the last word.

15067           And here at 3:00 a.m. I have amazing news for you all.  
15068 You don't need to kick 13.7 million Americans off of health  
15069 care. I am just going to repeat that. You don't need to do  
15070 it. You don't need to kick 13.7 million Americans off health  
15071 care. Here is a little advice on reconciliation. We could  
15072 see a real middle-class tax-cut package with no major cuts to  
15073 Americans' health care if you simply abandon tax cuts for  
15074 billionaires and giant corporations.

15075           You could increase the standard deduction for families.  
15076 You could increase the Child Tax Credit for families. You  
15077 could have no tax on tips or overtime or Social Security.  
15078 You could extend the premium tax credit. Heck, you could  
15079 even help out with SALT, and you could do all of that by  
15080 simply rolling back the corporate tax rate to 2018 levels, or

15081 maybe even just a partial rollback. And then you could also  
15082 roll back billionaire tax rates and the top tax rate to 2018  
15083 levels, or maybe just a partial rollback. That would get you  
15084 anywhere from 1.5 to \$2 trillion. That would pay for all  
15085 those things. And you wouldn't have to add five trillion to  
15086 the debt in the process. It would actually reduce the  
15087 deficit, which exploded, doubled, almost tripled after all  
15088 that.

15089         And you certainly wouldn't have to be here tonight at  
15090 3:00 in the morning kicking 13.7 million Americans off their  
15091 health care between Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act  
15092 because of the extended premium tax credits that right now  
15093 would lapse, and you would get a lot of support from  
15094 Democrats for a true middle-class tax package. I think we  
15095 might even get this unanimously, because this is what we are  
15096 for, an actual middle-class tax cut.

15097         But I get it. You are not going to follow my advice.  
15098 And that tells our constituents all they need to know. They  
15099 need to know you are making a choice, and that this is mostly  
15100 about billionaires and giant corporations and not about the  
15101 middle class. Because if that happened, that bill would sail  
15102 through this Congress in a bipartisan fashion.

15103         And I yield my time to the gentlelady from California,  
15104 Ms. Barragan.

15105         \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you. I just want to show a chart.



15106 [Chart]

15107 \*Ms. Barragan. Just a little reminder of some of my  
15108 colleagues who have -- are relying -- whose constituents are  
15109 relying on Medicaid.

15110 You could see Colorado's 8th district, 25 percent of  
15111 people are relying on --

15112 \*Mr. Griffith. A point of order.

15113 \*Ms. Barragan. Yes, I have used this chart before.  
15114 What is the issue?

15115 \*The Chair. Gentleman, state your point of order.

15116 \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Evans is named on the board and he  
15117 is in the room.

15118 \*Ms. Barragan. He is on the board, but I haven't said  
15119 his name. I said the person who represents Colorado's 8th.

15120 \*The Chair. Well --

15121 \*Ms. Barragan. I have used this chart before.

15122 \*The Chair. I think that is one --

15123 \*Ms. Barragan. Do you guys not want the people to know  
15124 that the -- that a Member of Congress in this room's  
15125 constituency --

15126 \*The Chair. The gentlelady --

15127 \*Ms. Barragan. -- represents 25 percent?

15128 \*Mr. Griffith. -- rules follow.

15129 \*Ms. Barragan. It is not a rule that it can't be on a  
15130 board.

15131           \*The Chair. The point of order is sustained. It is the  
15132 same principle of saying their name or having it posted  
15133 there. It is the same principle.

15134           \*Ms. Barragan. This is the most ridiculous double  
15135 standard in a committee hearing, ever, because we have done  
15136 this every single day for the last -- I don't know how many  
15137 years I have been on this committee, and it is totally  
15138 ridiculous, and this is their way of trying to protect their  
15139 members.

15140           In Colorado's 8th district, 25 percent of Medicaid  
15141 recipients --

15142           \*The Chair. I am sorry, the -- just suspend. It is the  
15143 poster that needs to come down.

15144           \*Ms. Barragan. It is not even on the screen.

15145           \*The Chair. I know, but it just needs to come --

15146           \*Voice. It was.

15147           \*The Chair. It was.

15148           \*Ms. Barragan. Okay, well, here, let me read it for the  
15149 people. It is Colorado's 8th district is 25 percent of  
15150 people relying on Medicaid. In Michigan's 10th, another  
15151 Member of Congress that is in the room, 24 percent of his  
15152 constituents are on Medicaid. And Republicans don't want you  
15153 to see the chart, they don't want you to see how many people  
15154 rely upon --

15155           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, come on.

15156           \*Ms. Barragan. -- Medicare in their district.

15157           And let me tell you, those members, how many have we --  
15158 how many times have we heard those members speak up in this  
15159 committee hearing, speak up and say, I am going to fight for  
15160 my constituents, I am going to fight for the Medicaid  
15161 recipients, really.

15162           I mean, this is really something I have never  
15163 experienced before, Mr. Chairman, where there is new rules  
15164 all of a sudden that are being enforced when the other side  
15165 has called out the president by name, and this and that, and  
15166 has let -- has allowed charts to be used before and is now  
15167 saying, no, you can't use charts. I mean, it is just so  
15168 ridiculous.

15169           But let's go back to the facts. Let's go back to the  
15170 focus here.

15171           It is astonishing to me. It really is astonishing to me  
15172 that you have members who sit on this committee, which is the  
15173 committee of jurisdiction, that is about to cut -- or shift,  
15174 I am going to use the Republican word, shift -- that really  
15175 means kicking off -- people off of Medicaid -- that are in  
15176 this room who represent a huge chunk of Medicaid recipients  
15177 who haven't said a single word, who haven't said a peep about  
15178 Medicaid.

15179           I mean, really? I would think you would be in here  
15180 standing up for your constituents. But I can understand why

15181 it is so hard to defend what is happening.

15182 So let's go to one of my other charts.

15183 [Chart]

15184 \*Ms. Barragan. Let's go back to this one, because maybe  
15185 the Republicans, who represent a huge chunk of the Medicaid  
15186 community, can take a lesson and a word from Senator Hawley  
15187 and stop the slashing of health care benefits, stop the  
15188 slaughter, because that is what this is. It is going to be  
15189 absolutely devastating. We have heard from constituents. We  
15190 have heard from recipients. This is a lifeline for them.

15191 What else does the bill do? We haven't even talked  
15192 about this one. They are kicking hungry people off of food  
15193 benefits, low-income people off of food assistance. I mean,  
15194 how do you defend that? Seriously? It is remarkable to me  
15195 to see that -- to find places to cut to give billionaires a  
15196 tax cut -- and we know they are going to be the beneficiaries  
15197 -- that this is what we are doing.

15198 Now, we keep hearing this word also of undocumented  
15199 people getting Medicare -- or, rather, Medicaid. And there  
15200 is a prohibition against people that are undocumented getting  
15201 Medicaid. But you know what Republicans are suggesting we do  
15202 is, if you have a child that gets into a car accident and has  
15203 to be rushed to an emergency room, that you say the doctor  
15204 has to turn that person away and not give them any care, and  
15205 turn them away, and not treat them. That is what they are

15206 saying. That is exactly what they are saying. Because you  
15207 know why? Some of the numbers that are tied to undocumented  
15208 folks is when they go to a hospital and the emergency room  
15209 and they are being treated, and the hospitals aren't going to  
15210 turn them away.

15211 As a matter of fact, we have heard in the past  
15212 Republicans have said that we should kick them out of school,  
15213 we should not treat them medically. I mean, talk about the  
15214 inhumanity. Where is the compassion? Where is the humanity?

15215 And by the way, if one of these people works for them  
15216 undocumented, it is okay. Then we are going to protect them.  
15217 I remember when I was a freshman Member of Congress meeting  
15218 with other members, and a Republican had confessed to me and  
15219 other people that he helped get papers under the table for  
15220 some undocumented person who worked in his home because they  
15221 worked for him.

15222 I mean, the hypocrisy in this Congress is something that  
15223 is just beyond comprehensible, and we have heard it today in  
15224 this hearing. Don't be fooled. Don't believe what is being  
15225 told. Check the CBO. They are kicking people off of  
15226 Medicaid in the millions, and they are perfectly fine with  
15227 it.

15228 I yield back.

15229 \*The Chair. Time has expired.

15230 \*Voice. Mr. Chairman?

15231           \*The Chair. So first we had a -- so let me explain  
15232 about -- we have referred to each other. My friend from  
15233 California, I have called you by name before, we have called  
15234 each other by name. There was a point of order raised  
15235 earlier, and I just want Mr. Griffith to -- where that point  
15236 of order comes from, and why we are sustaining the point of  
15237 order and not calling people by names who are in the room.  
15238 That is how it -- Mr. Griffith is going to read.

15239           \*Mr. Griffith. Well, Mr. Chairman, I was going to  
15240 respond to the fact that it is somehow new. It actually is  
15241 from Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice and  
15242 Procedure. The rule of the House is similar, is almost  
15243 identical. No person in speaking is to mention a member then  
15244 present by his name, but to describe him by his seat in the  
15245 House, or who spoke last, or on the other side of the  
15246 question.

15247           Now in the present -- in the practice of the House and  
15248 any member is not permitted -- this is out of the notes -- to  
15249 address another member by name, or to address a member in the  
15250 second person, that was a Speaker Boehner ruling previously.  
15251 This comes up from time to time.

15252           Now, Mr. Chairman, let me just say so that everybody  
15253 understands. This is not something -- and this is where we  
15254 are all tired, and this is where sometimes people get  
15255 excited. The chairman of the committee is not the referee

15256 and making calls on his own. This is like making an  
15257 objection in court. The court in this case cannot rule sua  
15258 sponte. The chairman has to have an objection.

15259         So when people get upset, "When you didn't call it on  
15260 me," well, that is because no one raised the objection.  
15261 When the objection is raised, however, this is the rule of  
15262 the House, it is a longstanding rule -- as I said, it goes  
15263 back to Jefferson's Manual of Parliamentary Practice and  
15264 Procedure. And unfortunately, we in the House have gotten  
15265 sloppy. These rules are not to pick on one side or the  
15266 other. They are made to make the House more efficient, and  
15267 to make the committee more efficient, and to create a  
15268 situation where we have comity, c-o-m-i-t-y. I said that a  
15269 few years ago and somebody thought I was talking about  
15270 comedy, a joke. No, it is not joke, but it is to make the  
15271 situation a little less tense in tense situations, that you  
15272 not refer to people by their name and as a part of the  
15273 debate.

15274         And so that is the reason that I raised it earlier and  
15275 then raised it again. So it is not to pick on anybody, it is  
15276 to try to move things forward. But it is the chairman's job  
15277 only to rule once an objection has been made, not to act as a  
15278 referee and raise the issue sua sponte.

15279         \*The Chair. Well, thank you, and the ranking member has  
15280 asked to have time since we had time.

15281           \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman --

15282           \*Ms. Barragan. Just --

15283           \*Mr. Pallone. I am speaking on the point of order, yes,  
15284 in support, I think, of what you said.

15285           Look, I think that Ms. -- the gentlewoman from  
15286 California sitting there in the yellow --

15287           [Laughter.]

15288           \*Mr. Pallone. I think that she --

15289           \*The Chair. I think we have to use our names in order  
15290 to figure --

15291           \*Mr. Pallone. I think that she has made --

15292           \*The Chair. -- out who is from California.

15293           \*Mr. Pallone. -- a good point, which is that in the  
15294 past we have never hesitated to call people by their name,  
15295 their first name, their last name. I mean, I have called --  
15296 obviously, I said August today, right?

15297           I mean, he is right, Mr. Griffith is right in saying  
15298 that the rule says you can't do that. But, I mean,  
15299 understand if we are now going to follow that rule, I will  
15300 insist on it, as well. And that means you can never mention  
15301 a person's name, their first name, their last name ever  
15302 again, right? That is what he is saying.

15303           And I am not arguing with Mr. Griffith that that is not  
15304 the rule. The rule does say that. I just read it. But, I  
15305 mean, this is going to make it very difficult for us to



15306 operate if every time we mention a person by name, first  
15307 name, last name, whatever, whether they cosponsored a bill,  
15308 whether they are a sponsor of the bill -- I mean, you know,  
15309 like a lot of times we will say, well, thank you -- I want to  
15310 thank the sponsor of the bill, Ms. Barragan, because she is  
15311 the chief sponsor of the Democratic sponsor of the bill. I  
15312 mean, if that is the path we are going down, I mean, that is  
15313 fine, but I don't think it is a good idea. I think we -- I  
15314 think that in the past we have been very flexible, and we  
15315 have not insisted that we never call a member by name.

15316         So I would just hope, Mr. Chairman, that we don't start  
15317 down that path because it is going to be kind of crazy around  
15318 here. And if you are going to call this as a point of order  
15319 and say we can never call a person by their name, then I will  
15320 do that every time, and you are going to have to figure it  
15321 out. How are you going to identify somebody, you know?

15322         \*The Chair. Let's --

15323         \*Mr. Pallone. The woman with the yellow dress? I mean,  
15324 you know, what are we doing here?

15325         \*The Chair. All right. So let's -- we will work  
15326 through this as we move forward, but --

15327         \*Ms. Barragan. Can I ask a point of just --

15328         \*The Chair. My --

15329         \*Ms. Barragan. -- clarification?

15330         \*The Chair. So let me just finish. So my understanding

15331 is it is in the debate, so I have been over-careful with it,  
15332 too, so when I have to -- when I said the gentleman from  
15333 Texas, I had two people start speaking at the same time. You  
15334 have to figure out how to sort that out.

15335 It says, "in debate.'" So if I am saying today is Mr.  
15336 Palmer's birthday, I think that is okay. But if I am  
15337 debating Mr. Palmer, I should call him the gentleman from  
15338 Alabama. We will -- let's -- we will work through that. I  
15339 think we can --

15340 \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman?

15341 \*The Chair. -- we can get it right, but I know --

15342 \*Ms. DeGette. If you will yield, Mr. Chairman --

15343 \*The Chair. -- the gentlelady from California had a  
15344 point of order.

15345 \*Ms. DeGette. If you will yield, that is not what the  
15346 rule says. And I think -- I would just say I think that you  
15347 and the ranking member should work it out.

15348 \*The Chair. We will work it out.

15349 \*Ms. DeGette. Because what I believe -- I think Mr.  
15350 Griffith will agree with me -- is what this -- actually, he  
15351 just said this -- is this rule is designed to force comity.  
15352 And I do think that we have gotten too -- my view is we have  
15353 gotten too casual on this committee, in general. But  
15354 however, I do think, if the chairman were going to say the  
15355 gentlelady from California, Ms. Barragan, or the -- you know,

15356 the gentleman from Virginia, or whatever, I think you can be  
15357 a little bit free with that.

15358 But if people are debating and they are accusing people  
15359 by name of things, I think that is the intent of the rule.  
15360 But you guys are going to have to work it out because the  
15361 plain language of the rule, as Mr. -- as you say, is -- I  
15362 almost said your name -- as the gentleman from Virginia says,  
15363 the plain language of the rule says no person in speaking is  
15364 to mention a member then present by his name. So there you  
15365 go.

15366 \*The Chair. We will --

15367 \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Chairman, I would just say in --  
15368 at least in Jefferson's, it is specifically in the section on  
15369 debate, which is why I think it only applies to debate.

15370 But you are correct, in the rules itself it is not in  
15371 that same order, but in Jefferson's, which is the basis of  
15372 everything else that we do, it is in the section entitled,  
15373 "Order and Debate."'

15374 \*Voice. Mr. Chair, can we go back to health care?

15375 \*Voice. Yes.

15376 \*Ms. Barragan. Can I ask my clarification question?

15377 \*The Chair. Yes, yes. The gentlelady from California.

15378 \*Ms. Barragan. Is that -- are you saying it applies to  
15379 somebody who is in the room, or are you saying it applies to  
15380 any Member of Congress's name, even if they are not in the

15381 room?

15382 \*Mr. Griffith. So --

15383 \*The Chair. It says --

15384 \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Chairman?

15385 \*The Chair. Okay.

15386 \*Mr. Griffith. It applies to their name if they are in  
15387 the room. And any Member of Congress you cannot say  
15388 insulting words -- to be brief, you can't use words that  
15389 would --

15390 \*Ms. Barragan. Okay.

15391 \*Mr. Griffith. -- tend to be insulting or in --

15392 \*Ms. Barragan. So --

15393 \*Mr. Griffith. So if somebody is in the room --

15394 [Slide]

15395 \*Ms. Barragan. So would you agree this fixes the  
15396 problem? Because these members are not in the room, these  
15397 names are out, and it is just now the district number.

15398 \*Mr. Griffith. I think that is accurate.

15399 \*Ms. Barragan. Yes, because this is -- this, just so  
15400 everybody knows what we are talking about, no name is on it  
15401 anymore. Now it just says --

15402 \*The Chair. Well, we let you --

15403 \*Ms. Barragan. -- Colorado 8th's district.

15404 \*The Chair. We did let you continue when you had the  
15405 names covered, if you remember. So we --

15406           \*Ms. Barragan. What is that?

15407           \*The Chair. So when Mr. -- the friend from New Jersey  
15408 came and covered your letters, we let you continue with that  
15409 up there. So yes, we did let that happen.

15410           All right, so let's -- do you have something on the  
15411 point of order, or are you ready to get back to health care?

15412           Okay, so the point of order -- so it was Mr. Fulcher's  
15413 turn, and then we will come back to the other side.

15414           So the gentleman from Idaho.

15415           \*Mr. Fulcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I would like to  
15416 yield my time to the gentleman from Georgia, not in debate,  
15417 so Mr. Carter.

15418           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I thank the gentleman for  
15419 yielding.

15420           And again, I want to bring up the fact that, aside from  
15421 just work requirements, aside from illegals on the program  
15422 who shouldn't be on it, aside for [sic] those who are in  
15423 duplicate states, there are a lot of other good things in  
15424 this bill, including the doc fix, including PBM reform,  
15425 something that this committee has worked on in a bipartisan  
15426 way and something that is going to save taxpayers billions of  
15427 dollars.

15428           The Drug Price Transparency and Medicaid Act, which will  
15429 ban spread pricing in Medicaid managed care programs, is  
15430 included in this bill. It will save nearly \$3 billion.

15431           Look, when it comes down to it, we all want the same  
15432 thing. Whether you are a Republican, a Democrat, or an  
15433 independent, we want accessible, affordable, quality health  
15434 care. And because of that we need accessibility.

15435           Approximately 450 independent pharmacies closed in one  
15436 year, from June of 2023 to June of 2024. Many of you have  
15437 heard that Rite Aid has announced it is filing for chapter 11  
15438 again, and that it will close or attempt to sell all its  
15439 1,200 pharmacies in the coming weeks. For independent  
15440 pharmacies in 2023, Medicaid prescriptions made up an average  
15441 of 20 percent of all prescriptions that were dispensed. So  
15442 the good news is that pharmacists will be able to negotiate  
15443 better terms in their contracts. Some of the most basic, yet  
15444 most life-sustaining medications are often under-reimbursed,  
15445 and pharmacists are rarely paid for the actual cost to  
15446 dispense.

15447           Another part of this bill is the Protecting Patients  
15448 Against PBM Abuses Act, which will prohibit PBMs from being  
15449 compensated for Medicare Part D-covered drugs based on the  
15450 manufacturer's list price. In other words, it delinks the  
15451 price of the medication from the drug itself. This is good,  
15452 and this will help to save taxpayers money, as well.

15453           What is the problem?

15454           So I want to make sure we all understand that there are  
15455 other parts of this bill. I keep hearing that you are only

15456 saving money -- you are only having the savings through the  
15457 work requirements and through the frequent and more frequent  
15458 checking, but that is simply not true. There are other parts  
15459 that are saving to this bill that are bipartisan in fashion,  
15460 that are helping all of us, and that will make the program  
15461 even better. It will help to save the program, to sustain  
15462 the program, and to make it better.

15463 And I will yield back to the gentleman from Idaho.

15464 \*Mr. Fulcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield to the  
15465 chair.

15466 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The chair  
15467 recognizes the gentlelady from Washington, Dr. Schrier, for  
15468 five minutes to speak on the amendment.

15469 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I often get up  
15470 at around 3:00 in the morning thinking about things, and so  
15471 this is the perfect time for me to bring up several things I  
15472 have been thinking about during this discussion.

15473 One of those is that there is not an exemption for  
15474 people who just lost their jobs. And I have been thinking  
15475 about this a lot lately because, here we are, tariff wars,  
15476 barreling toward a recession, people are losing their jobs.  
15477 I think of rangers in my district. I think about people who  
15478 work in small businesses. Maybe they do -- they are  
15479 machinists and rely on aluminum and steel. And, you know, if  
15480 they lose their jobs, that feels like that is the one time in

15481 their life they are really going to need Medicaid. And so I  
15482 just wanted to bring that up, that this feels like it is also  
15483 a penalty for people who, through no fault of their own or  
15484 because of a recession, just lost their jobs. I want you to  
15485 consider that.

15486         The other issue that came up is that, you know, the  
15487 costs are ballooning for Medicaid, and I just wanted to point  
15488 out the same thing is happening for Medicare, and that one  
15489 way to keep costs down is to prevent illness, treat people  
15490 early, and it becomes less expensive, and that the ER is the  
15491 most expensive place to take care of people.

15492         I also wanted to address this issue of, you know, like,  
15493 I -- you may not want to kick people off of health care.  
15494 This has come up a couple of times. But, I mean, I think you  
15495 just have to look at the facts. Like, it might not be your  
15496 intention, but the Georgia Budget and Policy Institute found  
15497 that a cumbersome enrollment process and restrictive  
15498 eligibility criteria contributed to the program's lack of  
15499 success: 4,000 enrolled out of a projected 100,000. This  
15500 led to significant costs and paperwork that disincentivizes  
15501 people from applying.

15502         All right, I got that through. Next, workforce. My  
15503 colleague from Texas pointed out -- and he said that the  
15504 biggest problem right now in health care is that there aren't  
15505 enough providers. Now, I don't know that that is the biggest



15506 problem in health care, but it is a huge problem, that we do  
15507 not have a pipeline for new docs, and we have doctors who are  
15508 retiring early or resigning. And in part that is because of  
15509 inadequate Medicare reimbursement and inadequate Medicaid  
15510 reimbursement.

15511 But the thing is that, first of all, they don't want the  
15512 fix in Medicare reimbursement if it is happening at a cost to  
15513 their patients. Like, the trade-off of the patients who they  
15514 care for, who they care about losing their access to health  
15515 care, that is not a trade most docs would want to make.

15516 Also, by the way, if you take Medicaid away from  
15517 patients, then those doctors, because they adore their  
15518 patients, are providing uncompensated care. Like, that  
15519 actually brings their salaries down.

15520 So I just want to point out, like, if you really want to  
15521 help here, one thing you could do is enhance Medicaid. In  
15522 fact, I have a bill that would raise Medicaid reimbursement  
15523 levels to match Medicare levels. That would allow more  
15524 doctors to be able to see more Medicaid patients to give more  
15525 kids a medical home to prevent illnesses and to keep our  
15526 emergency rooms from backing up.

15527 Okay. I am looking down my list here to see if there  
15528 are other things here. Ah, I found another one. Okay. I  
15529 keep wondering, like, what are you going to do with 13.7  
15530 million Americans who don't have insurance? Like, this feels

15531 -- remember how upset we were in 2017 about the whole repeal  
15532 and replace of the Affordable Care Act? We were up in arms  
15533 they were taking health care away from people with  
15534 preexisting conditions, and they didn't have anything to  
15535 replace it with? But at least it was repeal and replace, we  
15536 just didn't know what the replace would be. This is repeal  
15537 Affordable Care Act, and slash Medicaid, and have no plan.

15538 And so I just -- I want to emphasize, like, this is  
15539 worse than we were dealing with the first time around, and  
15540 that I believe that without a plan to cover those 13.7  
15541 million people, this is a very disingenuous argument and is  
15542 directed at the wrong place.

15543 Thank you, I yield back.

15544 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The chair  
15545 recognizes the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Crenshaw.

15546 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

15547 \*The Chair. Five minutes.

15548 \*Mr. Crenshaw. I move to strike the last word.

15549 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

15550 \*Mr. Crenshaw. So it is almost 4:00 a.m., and I want to  
15551 be clear. I think it is -- we have got to talk some facts.  
15552 That is why we are all here, right? To talk facts.

15553 And here is a fact: We are not here to cut the Medicaid  
15554 lifeline for the neediest Americans. That is just a lie.

15555 \*Ms. Clarke. Hey.

15556           \*Mr. Crenshaw. And here is a basic principle.

15557           \*The Chair. We decided we weren't going to say, "lie,"`

15558       so --

15559           \*Ms. Barragan. We would like to take the words down.

15560           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Take my words down. I didn't say any of  
15561       you were liars, I said it is a lie.

15562           \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chair, I thought we said we were not  
15563       going to use that --

15564           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Well, here -- hey, stop interrupting me.  
15565       I reclaim my time.

15566           \*The Chair. The gentleman will suspend. Hey, Mr. --

15567           \*Ms. Barragan. You --

15568           \*The Chair. We decided not to use the word "lie,"` so  
15569       we are not going to use that word. We will just say --

15570           \*Mr. Crenshaw. It is a -- "lie"` is a common word in  
15571       the English language, and it is -- okay. It is a falsehood  
15572       perpetuated by people who perpetuate falsehoods.

15573           Now, here is the basic principle. Medicaid has to be  
15574       preserved for the people it was meant to help: children,  
15575       mothers, seniors, Americans with disabilities. And our  
15576       mission during this entire process has been very simple:  
15577       protect Medicaid for those who genuinely need it, so that the  
15578       program can actually survive in the long term.

15579           I want to clear some things up. Here is what Democrats  
15580       claim, and then the facts they keep ignoring. Some might

15581 call these lies, but I won't. I will just suggest that they  
15582 are stating blatant falsehoods. Are you happy with that?

15583 Number one, Democrats say we are kicking poor people off  
15584 Medicaid. Here is the reality. CBO numbers: 4.8 million of  
15585 those numbers are from able-bodied adults choosing not to  
15586 work. They are not being kicked off. They are being told to  
15587 work or volunteer or look for work. That directly  
15588 contradicts what was just said by Ms. Schrier, by the way;  
15589 1.6 million are --

15590 \*Voice. Objection.

15591 \*Mr. Crenshaw. -- duplicative enrollees --

15592 \*Voice. Objection.

15593 \*Mr. Crenshaw. -- who are enrolled in two --

15594 \*Voice. Objection.

15595 \*Mr. Crenshaw. -- states at the same time.

15596 \*Voice. Objection. He used a colleague's name.

15597 \*Voice. Yes.

15598 \*The Chair. I was just -- what? I didn't hear, I am  
15599 sorry.

15600 \*Mr. Crenshaw. If I could roll two eyes, I would.

15601 \*The Chair. We are not using the word "lie," and we  
15602 are not, in debate, using a colleague in the room's name. So  
15603 if you did that --

15604 \*Voice. He is -- you are going to rephrase.

15605 \*The Chair. Then --

15606           \*Mr. Crenshaw. All right, let me rephrase.

15607           \*Voice. You are in the majority, these are your rules.

15608           \*Mr. Crenshaw. It directly contradicts the statement  
15609 that was just made by one of my colleagues on this side --  
15610 the other side of the aisle.

15611           Here is another number: 1.6 million are duplicative  
15612 enrollees who were enrolled in two states at the same time.

15613           Here is another number: 1.2 million individuals, they  
15614 are not even eligible for coverage in the first place, just  
15615 according to the laws that we have.

15616           Another 1.4 million people are illegal immigrants. That  
15617 is not exactly the narrative they have been spinning, is it?

15618           Number two, Democrats say we are taking away substance  
15619 abuse treatment. That is just false. This bill specifically  
15620 exempts individuals with substance use disorders, full stop.

15621           Number three, Democrats say we are cutting Medicaid.  
15622 Here is the reality. An actual analysis by CBO Medicaid  
15623 baseline projections shows Medicaid spending will still grow,  
15624 grow by 6.5 percent above 2021 projections, even after this  
15625 \$800 billion in savings.

15626           So let me ask you, how can one honestly claim we are  
15627 cutting a program that is actually still growing? Just  
15628 intellectually, how can you claim that? Asking for a friend.

15629           Number four, Democrats say there aren't illegal aliens  
15630 in Medicaid. Here is the reality. We know states are doing

15631 this. California uses a managed care organization tax scheme  
15632 to shift costs to the Federal Government. That frees up  
15633 about \$5.2 billion in state funds. California then uses that  
15634 money to pay for Medicaid coverage for illegal immigrants,  
15635 skirting the Federal band [sic]. This bill closes the  
15636 loophole by cutting Federal funding by 10 percent for states  
15637 that use Medicaid or other state-based programs to cover  
15638 illegal immigrants. The vast majority of Americans would  
15639 agree with that.

15640         Number five, Democrats say we are causing steep state  
15641 budget cuts by changing provider tax and state-directed  
15642 payment rules. Here is the reality. State-directed payments  
15643 in Medicaid managed care arrangements have actually grown by  
15644 about 62 percent between February 2023 and August of 2024.  
15645 These payments do have a place in supporting our hospitals.  
15646 Texas uses them to support our most needy. But you have to  
15647 have common sense. You can't let them grow out of control  
15648 and let them grow indefinitely. All we are doing is freezing  
15649 the provider tax and state-directed payments. That is it.  
15650 It is a freeze. This will preserve payments for hospitals  
15651 that need them. So guess what? Again, no cuts. The sky is  
15652 not falling.

15653         Look, in summary, this bill is nothing like Democrats  
15654 claim, nothing. It is past 3:00 a.m., and I have watched my  
15655 colleagues make false statement after false statement for the

15656 sole purpose of scaring the most vulnerable in our society.  
15657 Democrats have forced disabled Medicaid recipients to travel  
15658 to D.C. and crowd the committee room for nothing but cynical  
15659 political theater. And my message to all of you who were  
15660 tricked into being here, guess what? Your Medicaid benefits  
15661 aren't at risk under this bill, full stop. They are using  
15662 you, and they are lying to you.

15663 Notice how --

15664 \*The Chair. Hey, let me --

15665 \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman --

15666 \*Voice. Objection.

15667 \*The Chair. I will just --

15668 \*Ms. Barragan. Take it down. You need to educate your  
15669 member, come on.

15670 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Take my words down.

15671 \*The Chair. Well, don't --

15672 \*Mr. Crenshaw. I just want to point out one last thing.

15673 \*The Chair. Can the gentleman suspend?

15674 \*Ms. Barragan. Take them down.

15675 \*The Chair. Can you suspend? We agreed we are not  
15676 going to call each other out in debate or use the word  
15677 "lie," so please --

15678 \*Mr. Crenshaw. There is not that many synonyms for the  
15679 terrible lying.

15680 \*The Chair. -- honor that. Please honor --

15681           \*Ms. Barragan. Mr. Chairman, you have already warned  
15682 him.

15683           \*Voice. He is disrespecting your chair.

15684           \*Ms. Barragan. You need to take his words down.

15685           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Take them down.

15686           \*Ms. Barragan. You already warned him. He did it  
15687 again.

15688           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Take them down.

15689           \*Ms. Barragan. You need to take his words down. I  
15690 would like --

15691           \*The Chair. The committee will suspend.

15692           \*Ms. Barragan. -- to get a parliamentary ruling on  
15693 this.

15694           \*Voice. Listen to the lady in the yellow jacket.

15695           \*The Chair. The committee will suspend.

15696           \*Voice. You are disrespecting your chair. It is his  
15697 ruling.

15698           \*Ms. Barragan. He said "lying" again, and he said,  
15699 "Take my words down." He is being a jerk.

15700           Oh, I am -- my apologies. I said I didn't --

15701           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I withdraw the word "lying," are you  
15702 happy?

15703           It is all of you they brought here. They are using you,  
15704 and they are misrepresenting the truth to you.

15705           \*The Chair. Just suspend, just suspend.



15706           The gentleman has withdrawn the word that was  
15707 objectionable, and therefore he may proceed.

15708           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I just want to end with this.

15709           Notice how none of these measures can even be loosely  
15710 interpreted as cuts? Because they aren't. In sum, this is a  
15711 serious, evidence-based policy-making exercise. It is not  
15712 heartless austerity driving.

15713           \*The Chair. We had -- when he was --

15714           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Protecting Medicaid for the truly needy.  
15715 That is what we are doing.

15716           \*The Chair. All right, the gentleman's --

15717           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I yield back.

15718           \*The Chair. -- time has expired. The gentlelady from  
15719 Illinois is recognized for five minutes.

15720           \*Ms. Kelly. I would like to yield my time to Ranking  
15721 Member Pallone.

15722           \*Mr. Pallone. Oh, thank you.

15723           I don't intend to, you know, use any terms that people  
15724 don't like here, I just want to talk about the reality,  
15725 because the gentleman from Texas talked about facts. And I  
15726 think the facts are very different from what he described.

15727           If I am a person that is on Medicaid now and I get  
15728 kicked off, which is what the CBO says is going to happen to  
15729 8-something million and another 5, because you guys have not  
15730 -- because the Republicans have not reauthorized the subsidy,

15731 right, for enhanced Medicaid, I am one of these 13 million  
15732 people, and now all of a sudden I don't have Medicaid  
15733 anymore. Okay. As far as I am concerned, I don't have  
15734 Medicaid. I don't have health insurance. You know, what do  
15735 I do? And what is the impact of that on the rest of the  
15736 public, right? I mean the -- or the hospitals, the nursing  
15737 homes, whatever.

15738 I mean, the problem that you have here is you are  
15739 reducing access to health care. If people do not have health  
15740 insurance, they are not going to have access to health care,  
15741 for the most part. Maybe they can go to the emergency room,  
15742 but they are going to stop seeing a doctor.

15743 You also have in this bill that certain people are going  
15744 to have to have a \$35 copay every time they go to the doctor,  
15745 so that is going to reduce their access.

15746 And then also the quality of care is going to be  
15747 reduced, right? Nobody has mentioned yet -- maybe somebody  
15748 did, I don't remember -- tonight about getting rid of the  
15749 nurse staffing rule. I mean, the Republicans have actually  
15750 touted that, that that is such a great thing. It is not  
15751 because it means that the services at the nursing home are  
15752 going to be worse, because you don't have the nurse at night,  
15753 or you don't have a nurse or enough nurses during the day.

15754 So I wish -- you know, I wish we -- my Republican  
15755 colleagues wouldn't just keep talking about numbers, wouldn't

15756 keep talking about who is being kicked off. The bottom line  
15757 is that if I am one of these 13 million people who no longer  
15758 has health insurance, or I am one of these people that can't  
15759 afford the copay, even if I have Medicaid, or I am one of  
15760 these people that maybe didn't get kicked out of the nursing  
15761 home but is going to have terrible care, maybe, you know,  
15762 develop bed sores and I am going to die sooner than I  
15763 normally should, I am impacted. And that is what I don't  
15764 understand here.

15765         We can talk all you want about whether you are kicked  
15766 off or not or, you know, whether you are trimmed or cut or  
15767 whatever, but you can't get away from the fact that there is  
15768 going to be 13 million people who are -- no longer have the  
15769 coverage. There is going to be a lot more people that are  
15770 going to not see a doctor because they have to pay \$35 every  
15771 time they go, a lot more people who are going to suffer  
15772 because they are in a really crappy nursing home because the  
15773 services that are provided can't be provided, you know,  
15774 without the nurses or whoever, you know, is going to be  
15775 staffing the place.

15776         And we, as Democrats, feel very strongly that our goal  
15777 here is to provide people with care, make sure they have  
15778 health insurance, make sure that their -- it is not -- that  
15779 it is affordable for them to go to the doctor, make sure that  
15780 they have quality care when they are at a nursing home. And

15781 that is what is lacking here. That is what I don't  
15782 understand.

15783         You, for some reason, believe that with all this red  
15784 tape and everything, and all these restrictions on  
15785 enrollment, and all these copays, and all these eliminations  
15786 of requirements like nursing homes -- like nurses at a  
15787 nursing home, that somehow things are going to be all right.  
15788 But they are not. They are not going to be all right,  
15789 because a lot of people who are eligible and would normally  
15790 qualify based on what the CBO is telling us are going to get  
15791 kicked off who really do qualify, who actually are working,  
15792 who actually meet your criteria but somehow, because of the  
15793 paperwork, can't file the thing that says -- or can't figure  
15794 out how to go about this. That is what the CBO is saying.

15795         And I -- you know, I know it is late, and I know that  
15796 the gentleman from Texas, you know, wants to talk about the  
15797 facts. Those are the facts. That is why CBO is saying all  
15798 these people are losing care. That is why we are here. That  
15799 is why we care. We don't want services to disappear. We  
15800 don't want people to not see a doctor. We don't want people  
15801 not to have health insurance.

15802         And that is what you are effectuating here, no matter  
15803 what you think otherwise. That is what is going to happen.  
15804 And I think it is a very sad thing, and there is no amount --  
15805 there is no way you are going to convince me that these

15806 things are not going to happen. They are. If you pass this  
15807 bill six months from now, a year from now, those people are  
15808 going to be calling our office and saying, I don't have  
15809 health insurance, I can't see a doctor, and my services at  
15810 the nursing home stink. That is the reality. Those are the  
15811 facts.

15812 I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

15813 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. I think -- the  
15814 gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

15815 The gentleman from Oregon, you will be next after -- you  
15816 will be the next Republican.

15817 The gentleman from Alabama is recognized for five  
15818 minutes for the amendment.

15819 \*Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will do my  
15820 very best to stay within the safe space that has been created  
15821 in here so we don't offend anybody. It reminds me of some of  
15822 what has going on at some of our college campuses creating a  
15823 little safe space for everybody.

15824 But I do want to address some things. One is on the  
15825 work aspect about this. And again, listening to what has  
15826 been cited tonight, that 13 million people are going to lose  
15827 their health care, even the New York Times has said that is a  
15828 false number. And so -- but you can keep using it. I am  
15829 fine with that, because I think we know how this is going to  
15830 come out.

15831           But health care and work are integrally linked in this  
15832 country. I mean, talk to any health care professional you  
15833 want to, and they will tell you that people who work  
15834 generally have better health than people who don't. Half of  
15835 all Americans get their insurance through their employer.  
15836 Seniors get their Medicare because they worked and paid into  
15837 the system, and our service members and veterans get their  
15838 health care because of their work to serve our country. Most  
15839 of the Medicaid population, whether it is children or seniors  
15840 or people with disabilities, it doesn't make sense to have  
15841 any sort of work requirement for them, and we don't.

15842           But the interesting thing is that my colleagues keep  
15843 saying that only eight percent of able-bodied adults who are  
15844 getting Medicare -- Medicaid, that -- these are able-bodied  
15845 adults with no dependents -- are not working. Well, the  
15846 unemployment rate for disability -- people with disabilities  
15847 is only 7.5 percent. So you have got people with  
15848 disabilities who want to work. There are groups out there  
15849 advocating for their right to work, yet my colleagues across  
15850 the aisle are defending able-bodied adults with no dependents  
15851 who refuse to work, and want people who are working paying  
15852 taxes to pay for it. That doesn't make sense. If you are  
15853 able-bodied and you don't have dependents, then you should be  
15854 working, or looking for a job, or volunteering, contributing  
15855 something to your community and to society.

15856           Our colleagues want to portray this as some kind of  
15857   cruel policy because they believe people shouldn't have to  
15858   work to pay into the welfare system, or that we shouldn't  
15859   encourage people to move out of poverty. I think that is --  
15860   you know, we get caught up in this whole issue of what all  
15861   this costs, and we don't think about what it is costing us in  
15862   terms of the quality of life, because we have got so many  
15863   people with great talent, great ability that were denied  
15864   their creativity and their intellect because they are trapped  
15865   in this system.

15866           You know, we talked about welfare reform in the 1990s  
15867   under President Clinton. There was a bipartisan consensus  
15868   that people who could work should be working as a condition  
15869   of receiving Federal assistance under SNAP and TANF. Now,  
15870   those who don't know their history would just hear this and  
15871   say, sure, we agreed on work requirements for those programs,  
15872   but not Medicaid.

15873           Well, the thing is, Medicaid today is different from  
15874   what Medicaid was in the 1990s. At the time there was no  
15875   need to add work requirements to Medicaid, because Medicaid  
15876   only covered the most: vulnerable children, pregnant women,  
15877   seniors, and people with disabilities. Twenty years later,  
15878   Democrats under President Obama changed the very nature of  
15879   the Medicaid program and the relationship that we have  
15880   between work and Federal benefits by expanding Medicaid to

15881 cover all low-income Americans, regardless of whether they  
15882 work or not. It is time that we restore that linkage between  
15883 work and health care.

15884 And to those saying that this is unnecessary because  
15885 Medicaid beneficiaries already work, then I say, great, let's  
15886 prove it. You shouldn't have any objections to work  
15887 requirements. if you think that 92 percent of the able-bodied  
15888 adults with no dependents are already working.

15889 I also want to point out something else, and that is you  
15890 talk about cuts. When you pass the so-called Inflation  
15891 Reduction Act -- I called it the income reduction act -- you  
15892 set up -- set it up so that the enhanced premium tax credits  
15893 would expire this year. And I have to wonder why you would  
15894 self-impose a cut on that yourself. I mean, you put billions  
15895 of dollars into the Green New Deal agenda. You set up this  
15896 Green New Deal bank at the EPA, but you set up the enhanced  
15897 premium tax credits to expire.

15898 So, you know, I just -- I think there is a lot of things  
15899 that have been misrepresented here. But the most important  
15900 thing here, Mr. Chairman, is that we have lost sight of the  
15901 value of work.

15902 My time has expired, I yield back.

15903 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. [Presiding] The gentleman  
15904 yields back. The chair recognizes the gentlelady from  
15905 Virginia for five minutes.



15906           \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

15907           A lot of the discussion tonight has been over how this  
15908 bill is supposedly going to help sustain Medicaid, long term,  
15909 and there has been a lot of talk about costs going up. But  
15910 we haven't addressed the reason the costs have gone up, and  
15911 this bill does nothing to address the reasons the costs have  
15912 gone up.

15913           Over 50 percent of the costs are spent on the Medicaid  
15914 population of seniors and individuals with disabilities. And  
15915 it is because they have more complex health care needs. A  
15916 lot of it is tied up in prescription drug costs, the chronic  
15917 diseases that they have, they are more expensive to treat.  
15918 And yet the so-called savings from this bill are not being  
15919 invested to bring down the cost of long-term care or to bring  
15920 down the costs in a meaningful way of prescription drugs, or  
15921 to invest in the health care workforce at large.

15922           It is these little piecemeal -- I don't even know what  
15923 to call them, because they are not fixes. It is like  
15924 piecemeal Band-Aids that ignore that the reason the costs of  
15925 Medicaid are going up are the same reasons that the cost of  
15926 health care is going up, because of an aging population with  
15927 chronic diseases.

15928           And what Medicaid expansion and the Affordable Care Act  
15929 were designed to do was recognize when you have insurance you  
15930 are more likely to be connected to a medical home where you

15931 get preventative care to stay healthy, to avoid chronic  
15932 illnesses, or to get treatment early, to not have your  
15933 primary care provider be the emergency room, because all of  
15934 those things increase the cost for everybody else.

15935         And so I would take my colleagues at the other side of  
15936 the aisle at their word when they say, well, we are just  
15937 trying to make Medicaid more sustainable if we were doing  
15938 this in a bill that holistically looked at the cost of  
15939 Medicaid and the cost of health care, but that is not where  
15940 we are. We are doing this in the context of a reconciliation  
15941 bill, where congressional Republicans passed a budget plan  
15942 that said to this committee, find \$880 billion in cuts, not  
15943 to reinvest in other programs under your jurisdiction, but to  
15944 pay for tax cuts.

15945         And this bill is not being done in a vacuum, but against  
15946 the backdrop of everything the Trump Administration has done  
15947 to cut the Federal workforce, which impacts states like  
15948 Virginia and their income, which shifts other costs to the  
15949 states, which ties their hands on their ability to raise  
15950 funds to pay for their increased share of Medicaid under this  
15951 bill, while they are trying to pay the costs of every other  
15952 action of the Trump Administration, where you have a research  
15953 hospital that is facing devastating cuts to NIH funding  
15954 grants at the same time they are the largest Medicaid  
15955 provider in the region.

15956           And I think we are losing sight of who is suffering from  
15957 our inability to look at the big picture and try to tackle  
15958 the problem with rising health care costs holistically are  
15959 people who just want to know, if I get sick I can go to the  
15960 doctor and not go bankrupt, who just want to know, if I need  
15961 to get preventative care I can, and want to know if I have  
15962 lived in my house -- if my mother has lived in her house for  
15963 50 years, paid \$45,000 for it, and then needs to go into  
15964 long-term care, she is not forced to sell that house because  
15965 it is now \$1 million.

15966           And we are losing sight of these people in these, you  
15967 know, back and forth arguments at 4:00 in the morning or  
15968 whatever time it is, and not looking at the big picture of  
15969 how do we comprehensively tackle the cost of --

15970           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady's time has  
15971 expired.

15972           \*Ms. McClellan. And I yield back.

15973           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the  
15974 gentleman from Oregon, Mr. Oregon.

15975           \*Voice. Mr. Oregon.

15976           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Yes, for five minutes.

15977           \*Mr. Bentz. Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I move to strike  
15978 the last word.

15979           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

15980           \*Mr. Bentz. Thank you.

15981           So Medicaid is an essential and necessary program. I  
15982   should know, because 40 percent of my constituency is on  
15983   Medicaid. And the reason, partially, that we have that many  
15984   folks in Oregon in my district on Medicaid is because of -- I  
15985   will call them -- liberal policies. We can't get back into  
15986   the woods, where the jobs are, so that we could drive down  
15987   poverty in one of the most poverty-stricken spaces in the  
15988   United States. We can't get into the mines. We can't get  
15989   into the -- where water is. So guess what? People are  
15990   broke. They don't have the jobs they used to have.

15991           So, all right, fine, 40 percent on Medicaid, an  
15992   essential, necessary program.

15993           If you go back and look at the -- by the way, I think  
15994   this bill should be called the accountability bill, because  
15995   what it is striving to do is make groups accountable for the  
15996   billions and billions of dollars that we are spending. So  
15997   accountability. Let's go back to 1967, when Lyndon Johnson  
15998   was trying to pass Medicaid. He and Congress back then  
15999   imposed criteria, eligibility criteria. You couldn't just  
16000   everybody get on to the program, no. It was the aged, the  
16001   pregnant, the children, the disabled. From day one, there  
16002   were criteria that had to be met, from day one.

16003           So why would anyone complain -- that we have heard over  
16004   and over again -- about us suddenly here, in this many, many  
16005   years later, demanding that people actually meet the

16006 standards established so long ago? What happened? Did the  
16007 accountability go away? It shouldn't. This program is  
16008 costing us literally billions and billions and billions of  
16009 dollars. And if we want to continue to have any chance of  
16010 maintaining this essential and necessary program, we better  
16011 make sure that those who are utilizing it actually meet the  
16012 criteria established so long ago. Why would people object?  
16013 And that accountability goes across the board.

16014       There has been so much said tonight, it is hard to pick  
16015 out any one thing to address. But something that I have  
16016 heard over and over again is it is all about the  
16017 billionaires. It is not. The Tax Cut and Jobs Act, if it  
16018 were to expire, the National Taxpayers Union projects upwards  
16019 of 6 million jobs would be lost, along with 500 billion in  
16020 lost wages and upwards of a trillion in economic growth. The  
16021 only way we are able to keep doing what we are doing is  
16022 because there is taxes being paid.

16023       And while we are talking about that, let me bring up a  
16024 really inconvenient fact for a lot of the folks on the other  
16025 side of the aisle. The top 10 percent -- you know, those  
16026 billionaires -- pay 70 percent of the taxes. The top 10  
16027 percent pay 70 percent of the taxes. Okay, what are we going  
16028 to do if we run those folks off by raising their taxes, as we  
16029 heard over and over again? Who is going to pay that 70  
16030 percent?

16031           By the way, we also heard over and over again about the  
16032 five -- I am sorry, it is five million -- excuse me, the  
16033 eight million people that are going to be affected. And then  
16034 there has been reference to another five million under the AC  
16035 Enhanced Credits. The AC Enhanced Credits, that is actually  
16036 3.8 million, but there tends to be some exaggeration. I  
16037 would just want to say about the enhanced credits, those came  
16038 up in 2021. They were added on to an already existing credit  
16039 program. That is why they are called enhanced credits. They  
16040 cost about 335 billion over the next 10 years if they are  
16041 renewed. What happened? Just in 2021, just in, what, 4  
16042 years ago, that new feature was added in, and suddenly the  
16043 Democrats suggest that it has to be permanent. What is this,  
16044 a ratchet that just goes one way? We can -- once having done  
16045 it, we can never go back? Please.

16046           But that is not what we are talking about tonight.  
16047 Tonight we are talking about a bill that involves 8 million  
16048 out of the 70 million people that are on this essential and  
16049 necessary program. We are talking about 8 million people out  
16050 of the 70 million people. But if you listen to these folks  
16051 over here, you would think it is all 70 million. It is not.  
16052 We are talking about eight million. And of those, as we  
16053 already heard from the gentleman from Texas, many don't  
16054 belong on there at all. So why in the world wouldn't we be  
16055 extraordinarily cautious in how we extend this benefit?

16056           And by the way, a work requirement for those who are  
16057   able, for the \$9,000 a year it costs for them to be on that  
16058   program, you think that is too much to ask, that they at  
16059   least try to get a job or they volunteer? Come on.

16060           So what irks me is that the same tactics used years ago  
16061   are being used now. "Mediscare" it was called 30 years ago.  
16062   I wish we could stop doing that. It is not --

16063           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman's time has  
16064   expired.

16065           \*Mr. Bentz. I yield back.

16066           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back.  
16067   Does anyone else seek recognition to speak on the bill?

16068           \*Mr. Pallone. Lizzie Fletcher.

16069           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady from Texas is  
16070   recognized for five minutes.

16071           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I  
16072   will try to be brief. I know it is late, and I know we have  
16073   a lot of ground to cover.

16074           But I have been listening to the debate on this  
16075   amendment, and I just heard my colleague from Oregon giving a  
16076   history lesson with some inaccuracies, starting with the  
16077   creation of Medicaid in 1965, President Lyndon Johnson, a  
16078   great Texan who signed that bill into law with the Congress.  
16079   But what we are missing here as we talk about this, my  
16080   friends on the other side of the aisle and some of my friends

16081 from Texas who are not in this room seem to want to take us  
16082 back to a golden age of Medicaid, as though we haven't  
16083 amended this bill in the past, as though the ACA didn't  
16084 happen 15 years ago.

16085         And we keep talking about what was intended and what  
16086 happened in 1965, but Congress amended this in the late 1980s  
16087 to include pregnancy, pregnant women, right? There are all  
16088 sorts of complications in how this has actually been  
16089 administered and worked over the years. But we had -- 1965,  
16090 we had amendments in the 1980s, we had the Affordable Care  
16091 Act 15 years ago, right, and then we expanded it again.

16092         And so I don't understand why we are continuing to talk  
16093 as though there is only one thing, and it is only the  
16094 original bill, because the American people do not want to  
16095 repeal the Affordable Care Act. I thought we learned that  
16096 lesson back in 2017. And what it seems like we are trying to  
16097 do here is ignore the Affordable Care Act, or act like it  
16098 wasn't passed by this Congress, signed into law, and it  
16099 hasn't been the law for the last 15 years.

16100         And what we have said is everything my colleagues have  
16101 said before about it is better to get people health care  
16102 coverage, it is better to get into the doctor before you have  
16103 to go to the emergency room, that it makes sense to expand  
16104 this program so that people can get affordable health care.  
16105 And, you know, I heard a lot of the conversation, and I am



16106 sure it was irksome to some folks in the room about where  
16107 various states, you know, rank vis a vis others in terms of  
16108 coverage. Well, I can tell you that I love my home state,  
16109 but we are dead last when it comes to -- or I guess we are  
16110 first when it comes to having the most uninsured people in  
16111 our state in the country.

16112 And so we should all be trying to help people get access  
16113 to affordable care. That is what the Affordable Care Act  
16114 was, and the American people like it. Our state hasn't  
16115 expanded it, but other states have. And that is the law.  
16116 That is what we are talking about. And so this, you know,  
16117 make Medicaid great again kind of message that we are getting  
16118 today is -- just really ignores the history of this program  
16119 and where we are in this moment.

16120 And so I could talk about a lot of other things, but we  
16121 got a lot more amendments to get through, so I am going to  
16122 yield back now.

16123 \*Mr. Menendez. Will the gentlewoman yield?

16124 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Yes, I will yield my time to Mr.  
16125 Menendez -- oh, to my friend from New Jersey.

16126 \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, I appreciate it, and I know  
16127 it is late and we still have so much more to cover, but at  
16128 4:00 a.m. you don't want things to sneak between the cracks.

16129 So our colleague from Oregon said what would happen if  
16130 the Trump tax credits from 2017 were to expire. I believe he

16131 cited a study or a report by the National Taxpayers Union  
16132 which, as we know, is a conservative taxpayer organization  
16133 that was founded by James Dale Davidson.

16134       Quickly about James Dale Davidson, he wrote a book  
16135 called, "The Plague of the Black Debt: How to Survive the  
16136 Coming Depression'' in 1993, in which he predicted, similar  
16137 to the organization's predictions of what would happen if the  
16138 Trump tax cuts were to expire, that Clinton is going to be a  
16139 one-term president. I am as sure of this as I am that the  
16140 sun will rise tomorrow, and that the U.S. national debt would  
16141 increase by \$1 trillion during Clinton's one-term presidency.  
16142 As we all know, at the end of President Clinton's two terms  
16143 as president was the last time we had a balanced budget and a  
16144 surplus, which George W. Bush blew up shortly thereafter.

16145       So I yield back.

16146       \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Menendez.

16147       And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

16148       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Does  
16149 any other member wish to be recognized?

16150       Hearing none, if there is no further discussion, the  
16151 vote occurs on the amendment.

16152       The gentleman has requested a recorded vote. The clerk  
16153 will call the roll.

16154       \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

16155       \*Mr. Latta. No.

16156           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.  
16157           Mr. Griffith?  
16158           \*Mr. Griffith.   No.  
16159           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
16160           Mr. Bilirakis?  
16161           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.  
16162           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.  
16163           Mr. Hudson?  
16164           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.  
16165           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
16166           Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
16167           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
16168           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
16169           Mr. Palmer?  
16170           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
16171           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
16172           Mr. Dunn?  
16173           [No response.]  
16174           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
16175           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
16176           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
16177           Mr. Joyce?  
16178           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
16179           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
16180           Mr. Weber?

16181           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
16182           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
16183           Mr. Allen?  
16184           \*Mr. Allen.   Allen votes no.  
16185           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
16186           Mr. Balderson?  
16187           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
16188           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
16189           Mr. Fulcher?  
16190           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
16191           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
16192           Mr. Pfluger?  
16193           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
16194           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
16195           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
16196           [No response.]  
16197           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
16198           [No response.]  
16199           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
16200           [No response.]  
16201           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte?  
16202           [No response.]  
16203           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte?  
16204           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
16205           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.

16206 Mr. James?

16207 \*Mr. James. No.

16208 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.

16209 Mr. Bentz?

16210 \*Mr. Bentz. No.

16211 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.

16212 Mrs. Houchin?

16213 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.

16214 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.

16215 Mr. Fry?

16216 [No response.]

16217 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee?

16218 \*Ms. Lee. No.

16219 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.

16220 Mr. Langworthy?

16221 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.

16222 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

16223 Mr. Kean?

16224 \*Mr. Kean. No.

16225 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.

16226 Mr. Rulli?

16227 \*Mr. Rulli. No.

16228 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.

16229 Mr. Evans?

16230 \*Mr. Evans. No.

16231           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
16232           Mr. Goldman?  
16233           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
16234           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
16235           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
16236           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
16237           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
16238           Mr. Pallone?  
16239           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
16240           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
16241           Ms. DeGette?  
16242           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
16243           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
16244           Ms. Schakowsky?  
16245           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
16246           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
16247           Ms. Matsui?  
16248           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
16249           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
16250           Ms. Castor?  
16251           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
16252           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
16253           Mr. Tonko?  
16254           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
16255           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.

16256 Ms. Clarke?  
16257 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
16258 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
16259 Mr. Ruiz?  
16260 [No response.]  
16261 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters?  
16262 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
16263 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
16264 Mrs. Dingell?  
16265 \*Mrs. Dingell. Yes.  
16266 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
16267 Mr. Veasey?  
16268 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
16269 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
16270 Ms. Kelly?  
16271 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
16272 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
16273 Ms. Barragan?  
16274 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
16275 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
16276 Mr. Soto?  
16277 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
16278 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
16279 Ms. Schrier?  
16280 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

16281           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
16282           Mrs. Trahan?  
16283           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.  
16284           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
16285           Mrs. Fletcher?  
16286           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
16287           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
16288           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
16289           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
16290           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
16291           Mr. Auchincloss?  
16292           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
16293           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
16294           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
16295           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.  
16296           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
16297           Mr. Menendez?  
16298           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.  
16299           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
16300           Mr. Mullin?  
16301           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.  
16302           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
16303           Mr. Landsman?  
16304           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
16305           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.



16306 Ms. McClellan?

16307 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

16308 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

16309 Chairman Guthrie?

16310 \*The Chair. No.

16311 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

16312 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. How is Mrs. Harshbarger

16313 recorded?

16314 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger is not recorded.

16315 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

16316 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

16317 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. How is Mrs. Miller-Meeks --

16318 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks is not recorded.

16319 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

16320 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

16321 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Mrs. Cammack?

16322 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack is not recorded.

16323 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.

16324 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.

16325 \*Mr. Fry. Fry, how am I recorded?

16326 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry is not recorded.

16327 \*Mr. Fry. No.

16328 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.

16329 \*Mr. Ruiz. How is Ruiz --

16330 \*The Clerk. Dr. Ruiz is not recorded.

16331           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Yes.

16332           \*The Clerk.   Dr. Ruiz votes aye.

16333           [Pause.]

16334           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
16335 ayes, 29 noes.

16336           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   The amendment is not agreed to.  
16337 Are there further amendments?

16338           For what purpose does the gentleman from Texas seek  
16339 recognition?

16340           \*Mr. Veasey.   Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the  
16341 desk.

16342           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   What is the number on the  
16343 amendment, sir?

16344           \*Mr. Veasey.   The number on the amendment, sir, is  
16345 AMD\_046.

16346           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Have you got it?

16347           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, I don't have that amendment  
16348 at the desk.

16349           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Okay.   Does any member have an  
16350 amendment that we have?

16351           \*Mr. Pallone.   Menendez.

16352           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   The chair recognizes the  
16353 gentleman from New Jersey.

16354           \*Mr. Menendez.   I have an amendment at the desk.

16355           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   And the number on the

16356 amendment?

16357           \*Mr. Menendez. Health-FCD-AMD\_222.

16358           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the  
16359 amendment.

16360           \*The Clerk. Health-FCD-AMD\_222, an amendment offered by  
16361 Mr. Menendez. Add at the following --

16362           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection, the reading  
16363 of the amendment is dispensed with.

16364           [The amendment of Mr. Menendez follows:]

16365

16366           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

16367

16368           \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Chairman?

16369           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And the gentleman is recognized  
16370 for --

16371           \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Chairman --

16372           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- five minutes --

16373           \*Mr. Griffith. If I could reserve.

16374           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Before the gentleman is  
16375 recognized, the gentleman from Virginia reserves.

16376           \*Mr. Griffith. Yes, sir, reserve a point of order.

16377           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Now the gentleman from New  
16378 Jersey is recognized for five minutes to speak on the  
16379 amendment.

16380           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman.

16381           My amendment is straightforward. It would prohibit this  
16382 bill from going into effect if any of the provisions result  
16383 in the deaths of individuals stemming from reduced access to  
16384 health care services.

16385           To put it simply for my colleagues, having health care  
16386 coverage saves lives. But their bill will leave millions of  
16387 people without access to health insurance and lifesaving  
16388 health services and medications. And despite President Trump  
16389 promising that he will not cut Medicaid, this bill includes  
16390 the largest cuts to the Medicaid program. And the \$715  
16391 billion in cuts on the table translates to 8.6 million  
16392 Americans losing their health care coverage.

16393           In other words, policies in this bill will result in a  
16394 catastrophic benefit cut, and millions of people losing their  
16395 health care. This includes low-income children, people with  
16396 disabilities, pregnant and postpartum women, caregivers,  
16397 veterans, and older adults in long-term care.

16398           The data is clear: uninsured people are sicker and die  
16399 earlier than people who have insurance, and policies like  
16400 Medicaid expansion lead to reductions in mortality rates.  
16401 And now my Republican colleagues want to move backwards from  
16402 this progress by rushing to gut Medicaid and take away  
16403 coverage from millions of people to pay for tax breaks that  
16404 only benefit the wealthy and big corporations. Is it a  
16405 betrayal of the people who sent us here to act in their best  
16406 interests.

16407           And thank you to the people who are still here. We  
16408 appreciate you being here.

16409           In my home state of New Jersey, Dominique has had sickle  
16410 cell disease since she was six years old. She has spent much  
16411 of her time in hospitals and doctors' offices to receive  
16412 care. Through her Medicaid coverage she is able to see a  
16413 hematologist regularly to treat her condition, acquire  
16414 necessary medical equipment, and receive treatment for any  
16415 potential medical emergencies. In her own words, Dominique  
16416 says that, "Without Medicaid, I probably wouldn't be alive  
16417 because I wouldn't have been able to afford the medicine.'`

16418 The Republican bill would terminate health insurance for  
16419 individuals like Dominique.

16420 My amendment aims to protect people like Dominique by  
16421 preventing this grossly misguided bill from going into effect  
16422 if any of the policies result in deaths of Americans,  
16423 something we should all be advocating for. And for all of  
16424 the Republicans claiming that this bill will only eliminate  
16425 so-called, "fraud, waste, and abuse," my amendment puts  
16426 their claims to the test. If the Republicans truly believe  
16427 that these Medicaid cuts are simply to root out fraud, waste,  
16428 and abuse, this amendment should be an easy yes vote.

16429 My amendment is extremely common-sense. No law should  
16430 result in more deaths and less access to lifesaving care. I  
16431 urge my Republican colleagues to support this simple  
16432 amendment.

16433 I yield back.

16434 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Is there  
16435 further discussion on the amendment?

16436 The chair recognizes the chair from Kentucky --

16437 \*The Chair. Thank you, Mr. --

16438 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. -- for five minutes.

16439 \*The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I just want to say I  
16440 share my colleague's interest. Boy, nobody here wants  
16441 anybody to pass away, and that is why we -- this bill would  
16442 ensure we are doing just that.

16443           So if you -- so this bill would repeal the Biden  
16444 Administration's nursing home minimum staffing rule, which,  
16445 according to CMS's own estimates, 80 percent -- 80 percent --  
16446 of current nursing homes in the country would be unable to  
16447 find enough staff to meet these requirements, meaning  
16448 facilities will likely reduce their patient intake or they  
16449 will close entirely. More seniors will die if nursing homes  
16450 close, and they have nowhere to go for long-term care. More  
16451 seniors will die in hospitals as they wait to be discharged  
16452 to a facility for post-acute care.

16453           This top-down mandate will exacerbate provider  
16454 shortages, increase costs, and put the nation's most  
16455 vulnerable at increased risk. And this is why we are  
16456 repealing the rule, and that is why I am -- I urge my  
16457 colleagues to reject this amendment.

16458           And I yield back.

16459           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Is there  
16460 any further discussion on this amendment?

16461           The chair recognizes the gentlelady from California for  
16462 five minutes.

16463           \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
16464 the last word.

16465           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

16466           \*Ms. Matsui. It is 4:30 in the morning, and we have  
16467 been debating the finer points of this bill for hours now,

16468 and we will keep doing so. But I want to bring this back to  
16469 the people that matter the most, the constituents we are  
16470 fighting for. Because let's be clear, whether we are talking  
16471 about work requirements, massive cuts to state budgets, or  
16472 anything else in the hundreds of pages of this bill, this  
16473 will strip health care from millions of hard-working  
16474 Americans. It will rob people of their fighting chance  
16475 against illnesses like cancer, people like one of my  
16476 constituents, Denise.

16477         Denise is a breast cancer survivor and an amazing  
16478 advocate. She was brave enough to share her story in the  
16479 hopes that no one will have to fight the battles she did  
16480 without support. In her words, Denise had to fight all her  
16481 life for everything. As one of 5 siblings, she started  
16482 working at the age of 13 to help support her family. She put  
16483 herself through college, met her husband, and became a proud  
16484 mother of two. Then tragedy struck her family. Denise's  
16485 husband was diagnosed with a rare and aggressive brain  
16486 cancer. Denise stood by him through it all, through the  
16487 pain, the treatment, and ultimately his passing. Losing him  
16488 meant not only heartbreak, but loss of one of her family's  
16489 sources of income. That is when Denise became eligible for  
16490 Medicaid.

16491         Then came another blow. Denise found a lump in her  
16492 breast. Because of Medicaid she got care immediately, and



16493 was diagnosed with breast cancer. Because of Medicaid,  
16494 Denise says she was able to take on this battle. She fought  
16495 to be here for her children because she didn't want her kids  
16496 to lose two parents to cancer. Denise told me, "I am excited  
16497 to say I am a survivor of breast cancer by the help of  
16498 Medicaid.'`

16499         Denise is a fighter and a survivor. Like many  
16500 Americans, she has worked her whole life, and when she fell  
16501 on hard times she has support to help her get back on her  
16502 feet. Yet my Republican colleagues would say Denise isn't  
16503 someone who truly needs Medicaid. Let's be clear. Denise is  
16504 alive today, thanks to the Affordable Care Act Medicaid  
16505 expansion. Denise's children aren't orphans today because of  
16506 the Affordable Care Act Medicaid expansion. Without  
16507 Medicaid, Denise might have put off the care she needed.  
16508 Uninsured people are almost three times more likely to skip  
16509 necessary care because it is too expensive. For cancer  
16510 patients, delay could be deadly.

16511         Republicans can try to spin it. But the truth is the  
16512 bill before us is a death sentence for patients like Denise.  
16513 If they succeed in pushing this cruel bill, millions of  
16514 Americans will not survive their cancer diagnosis. So I am  
16515 grateful to my colleague for introducing this important  
16516 amendment.

16517         If Republicans are confident that their bill won't cause

16518 more cancer patients to die, this should be a simple yes  
16519 vote.

16520 I yield back.

16521 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Are  
16522 there any other members seeking to speak on this bill?

16523 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas for five  
16524 minutes.

16525 \*Mr. Veasey. I move to strike the last word in support  
16526 of this amendment.

16527 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

16528 [Slide]

16529 \*Mr. Veasey. So \$884 billion, that is what this poster  
16530 signifies here. These are the VIPs that had VIP seating at  
16531 President Trump's inauguration. These are the billionaires  
16532 that he prioritizes at every turn, kind of like that big old  
16533 jet.

16534 Eight hundred and eight billion dollars, that is how  
16535 much Republicans are getting from this Medicaid -- from  
16536 Medicaid in this bill. I want everybody to just think about  
16537 that for a second. Republicans are stealing health coverage  
16538 from 14 million Americans so that Trump's buddies can get  
16539 another tax break. That is the trade-off, working Americans  
16540 for these guys. That is why this Menendez amendment is so  
16541 important, because it says that if any part of this bill  
16542 increases mortality or reduces access to care, then those

16543 provisions won't take effect. That is not radical. That is  
16544 common sense.

16545         And make no mistake, without this amendment we already  
16546 know what will happen. More people are going to die. More  
16547 people are going to lose coverage. Millions are going to  
16548 lose coverage in communities like the ones that I represent  
16549 and members on this committee on both the Democratic and  
16550 Republican side represent are going to suffer.

16551         Take 76104. It is not just any zip code in Fort Worth.  
16552 It has the highest maternal mortality rate in the entire  
16553 country. And this bill will only make that worse. Why?  
16554 Because Medicaid isn't just a line item in the budget, it is  
16555 the difference between life and death for moms in the  
16556 district that I represent.

16557         There are some amazing providers in the DFW area,  
16558 Parkland, many others, and they are doing amazing work. They  
16559 are offering wraparound care to pregnant and postpartum  
16560 women, most of whom rely on Medicaid. And so let me tell you  
16561 what that care looks like. At the north Texas CHC they are  
16562 educating moms on how to have a healthy pregnancy. They  
16563 teach them what warning signs to watch for, like severe  
16564 headaches, shortness of breath, so they know what to do when  
16565 it is time to go to the hospital. They do car seat  
16566 inspections. They provide a baby pantry for moms who don't  
16567 have enough food or diapers. They follow moms closely after

16568 birth, especially those having serious health conditions.

16569         And here is something we don't say enough. The most  
16570 dangerous time for a new mother is often right after the baby  
16571 is born. That is when complications strike, that is when  
16572 lives are lost. But here is the catch. These organizations  
16573 are already stretched thin. I think that everybody in here  
16574 knows that. So if 14 million people lose coverage, that  
16575 means more uncompensated care at places like Parkland and  
16576 John Peter Smith Hospital. That means fewer resources, and  
16577 that means these providers will be forced to scale back, and  
16578 moms in the district will pay. And they have told me  
16579 directly, "We will have no choice but to cut back services if  
16580 this bill passes.'" Those are providers in Fort Worth and in  
16581 Dallas.

16582         And so, yes, this bill has a direct line to maternal  
16583 deaths in the district that I represent. It puts lives at  
16584 risk to give \$880 billion back to these guys. These guys  
16585 don't need that money back. It is just bad policy. It is  
16586 cruel. And we should be finding ways to strengthen Medicaid  
16587 to expand postpartum coverage, to invest in community care,  
16588 not taking a sledgehammer to the very systems that are saving  
16589 lives.

16590         And so I ask my colleagues, if you are not willing to  
16591 vote for this amendment, if you are okay that this is going  
16592 to increase mortality, then just say that because moms are

16593 dying, and we don't need for moms to die. We need for moms  
16594 to be around to take care of their kids because that -- and  
16595 by taking away their health care, we are definitely  
16596 increasing maternal mortality, and that is something that we  
16597 don't need.

16598 And so I urge every member here to support the Menendez  
16599 amendment, and let's not add death to the cost of this  
16600 legislation.

16601 I yield back.

16602 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back.

16603 Does any other member seek recognition on this bill?

16604 The chair recognizes the gentleman from New York, Mr.  
16605 New York for five minutes.

16606 \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the  
16607 last word.

16608 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

16609 \*Mr. Tonko. I am speaking in support of this amendment  
16610 today on behalf of all of the constituents in my district who  
16611 have benefitted from Medicaid, including Susan and Aria.

16612 [Slide]

16613 \*Mr. Tonko. I hold here a photo of Aria. Susan Miller  
16614 is the mother of Aria, a young child with cerebral palsy,  
16615 cortical visual impairment, and epilepsy. Aria is tube fed,  
16616 so Medicaid covers all of her formula and supplies, not to  
16617 mention her medications for her epilepsy. Aria attends the

16618 Kevin G. Langan School in Albany, New York. Susan shared  
16619 that by attending school through the Center for Disabilities,  
16620 Aria has accomplished so much when they thought she would  
16621 not. She is standing with help, and starting to take steps  
16622 and saying words and learning. She even participated in the  
16623 Special Olympics last September.

16624 Susan shared, "Medicaid is my child's lifeline. Please  
16625 don't endanger my baby's life. Please do not cut Medicaid.  
16626 There are so many children and seniors that need this to  
16627 survive. Medicaid and all of the programs make life possible  
16628 for their special needs, and give them the life they deserve.  
16629 I have been so scared, and reached out, and keep doing what I  
16630 can, for I am her voice. This is important for my child's  
16631 survival and so many others like her.' '

16632 Some may belittle Susan's fears and argue that they  
16633 aren't cutting Medicaid for families like hers. Republicans  
16634 falsely claim that children like Aria and children like Isla  
16635 won't be impacted by their package. But I have read the  
16636 text, and that is simply not true. New York State stands to  
16637 lose billions of dollars in cuts to Medicaid from the reduced  
16638 Federal match, the provider tax provisions, and more  
16639 senseless provisions in this cruel package.

16640 When states have to make these massive cuts to their  
16641 Medicaid programs, where do you think they are going to look  
16642 first? To the most expensive patients, the elderly, the

16643 sick, and the disabled, to the very people that my Republican  
16644 colleagues claim they are trying to protect.

16645 I urge all of my colleagues to support this vital  
16646 amendment, and let's get back to providing health care and  
16647 life-changing services for children like Aria.

16648 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

16649 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Does any  
16650 other member seek recognition?

16651 The gentleman recognizes -- the chair recognizes the  
16652 gentleman from California for five minutes.

16653 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16654 This amendment talks about how people who are uninsured  
16655 go without care. Going without care exacerbates whatever  
16656 illness or chronic illness they have that could increase  
16657 their risk of dying. And that is what this bill puts at  
16658 risk: many people's lives.

16659 Let me highlight this story of a nurse who has diabetes.  
16660 Stephen Jaime of El Centro is a registered nurse and  
16661 caregiver for his daughter, Olivia. Nurse Stephen at El  
16662 Centro Regional Medical Center Outpatient clinic struggles to  
16663 obtain insulin for himself and his daughter through private  
16664 insurance. Stephen and his wife serve as caregivers for  
16665 their daughter, and have only a week supply of insulin left  
16666 before they run out. "Even with insurance, in my experience  
16667 there is so much that insurance will not cover for the cost

16668 of insulin pumps. The pumps work to provide the need, and  
16669 sometimes the need is higher than what insurance or Medicare  
16670 or Medicaid is willing to cover.'`

16671         He has contacted his daughter [sic] about increasing his  
16672 insulin. And while the doctor agrees, insurance companies  
16673 deny coverage. Stephen runs the only diabetes education  
16674 program in Imperial County recognized by the American  
16675 Diabetes Association. As a healthcare advisor, he witnesses  
16676 firsthand how patients must wait until their conditions  
16677 worsen to meet specific health care criteria. He is  
16678 extremely concerned about the impacts of Medicaid reductions  
16679 on his patients. In fact, the Diabetes Patient Advocacy  
16680 Coalition states that the budget resolution will likely lead  
16681 to cuts to the Safety Net Medicaid program, which provides  
16682 health insurance to almost 80 million low-income Americans.  
16683 This action would disproportionately impact Americans most in  
16684 need, including those with diabetes and other chronic  
16685 conditions who rely on Medicaid to access the medications and  
16686 technology they need to manage their conditions.

16687         So to break it down to real-life examples, let's say a  
16688 medicaid expansion patient who has found it very difficult to  
16689 keep up or navigate the system for the work requirements and  
16690 decides that he just gives up goes without the Medicaid  
16691 coverage and goes without the checkups, the follow-ups, the  
16692 insulin, the medication for his diabetes. He has chronic



16693 hypoglycemia. He starts to develop neuropathy, blindness,  
16694 other comorbidities. Eventually, he falls into a diabetic  
16695 coma and he is rushed to the emergency department.

16696       Those are real stories, stories that I have of patients  
16697 that I have taken care of who have gone without health  
16698 insurance, therefore health care, and whose conditions  
16699 exacerbated into an emergency where now they are being rushed  
16700 into the emergency department. And in some cases, with  
16701 patients that require anti-hypertensive medications or  
16702 require medications to help treat their congestive heart  
16703 failure and they don't have any, they come in gasping for  
16704 air, respiratory failure, and sometimes even in cardiac  
16705 failure, as well. And so -- and sometimes we -- most of the  
16706 time we can resuscitate them, but sometimes we can't, and we  
16707 pronounce them dead in the emergency department.

16708       That is a real-life experience in the emergency  
16709 department with patients who go without insurance, go without  
16710 health care. And that is what this bill is intended to do,  
16711 is to protect those people, is to protect the millions of  
16712 Americans as part of those 13.7 million that are not going to  
16713 have health insurance moving forward to protect them from  
16714 ending up in the emergency department and possibly dead  
16715 because they couldn't get their medications, they couldn't  
16716 get their health care.

16717       So that is why I urge everybody to vote yes on this

16718 amendment.

16719 And I yield back.

16720 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Does any  
16721 other member seek recognition?

16722 The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Washington for  
16723 five minutes.

16724 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

16725 You know, I wasn't planning to speak on this particular  
16726 amendment, but I was listening to Dr. Ruiz speaking, and he  
16727 was talking about diabetes and the importance of care. And I  
16728 wanted to tell you I got a letter from a doctor in a rural  
16729 part of my district.

16730 She is the only endocrinologist in town, I believe, and  
16731 she had been practicing there since 2009, so she had some  
16732 time practicing before the Affordable Care Act went into  
16733 effect. And at that time in her practice she said 80 percent  
16734 of her patients had diabetes, 50 percent of them had type 1  
16735 diabetes. After the Affordable Care Act went into effect a  
16736 few years later and many more adults were able to enroll in  
16737 Medicaid, she saw many new patients with type 1 diabetes  
16738 seemingly coming out of the woodwork. These were not new  
16739 diagnoses. Instead, these were adults with type 1 who had  
16740 never had insurance as adults, and had been surviving for  
16741 years by purchasing over-the-counter insulin, called NPH, or  
16742 regular, without a prescription. They had been getting by

16743 barely, and many had already developed permanent  
16744 complications because of inadequate care.

16745         Well, after the Affordable Care Act, they had insurance  
16746 for the first time in their adult lives. She could get them  
16747 started on better treatment with newer insulins, insulin  
16748 pumps, continuous glucose sensors. For her patients who have  
16749 Medicaid, which is most of them, she can get them started  
16750 very quickly on the best treatments with insulin pumps and  
16751 continuous glucose monitors and diabetes educators, which  
16752 just helps them manage their diagnosis optimally and live  
16753 their best lives. For her patients who have Medicaid as  
16754 their payer, who have developed new onset diabetes since the  
16755 rollout of the Affordable Care Act, they are better overall  
16756 because they have had good care all along.

16757         So she wanted me to emphasize to you that if Medicaid  
16758 takes coverage away for these patients, it will be like going  
16759 back to the dark ages in terms of treatment. For adults with  
16760 type 1 diabetes before the Affordable Care Act, not having  
16761 insurance meant trying to survive when there were treatments  
16762 available but they were out of reach due to not having  
16763 insurance.

16764         Pumps are expensive, I can tell you that firsthand.  
16765 Continuous glucose monitors are expensive, I can tell you  
16766 that firsthand. And if you are paying the cash price for  
16767 insulin, that is expensive, I can tell you that firsthand.

16768 So to take away Medicaid from these individuals would be  
16769 truly inhumane, and will lead to worse health outcomes and,  
16770 ultimately, much more of a financial and social burden for  
16771 the country when you have to pay for people suffering with  
16772 long-term complications that were preventable.

16773 And with that I yield back.

16774 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Are  
16775 there other members seeking recognition?

16776 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Louisiana for  
16777 five minutes.

16778 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
16779 yield to my good friend from New Jersey.

16780 \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you. I appreciate the gentleman  
16781 from Louisiana yielding, and I appreciate all my colleagues  
16782 on the Democratic side of the aisle lifting up stories from  
16783 their districts, from across the country about what these  
16784 cuts would do to so many vulnerable Americans. And I also  
16785 appreciate my colleague from Kentucky speaking on the  
16786 amendment, although his point was really focused on the  
16787 moratorium on implementation of rule relating to staffing  
16788 standards for long-term care facilities under the Medicare  
16789 and Medicaid programs and, in his view, what those staffing  
16790 requirements would do in terms of the operation of long-term  
16791 care facilities and seniors that rely on them.

16792 I would just note two things. One, this amendment is

16793 broader than that, and it is -- it ensures and ensures to the  
16794 American people that the bill would not go into effect if any  
16795 of the provisions result in the deaths of individuals  
16796 stemming from reduced access to health care services. So if  
16797 the bill were to pass along a party-line vote, section 44121,  
16798 the moratorium on staffing standards for long-term care  
16799 facilities would be part of the bill, which I believe would  
16800 alleviate the concern that you have with the rule as it is.

16801         So I was just curious if my colleague from Kentucky,  
16802 after hearing the stories of constituents from our districts  
16803 and from those across the country, would consider speaking in  
16804 support of the amendment to ensure all Americans that this  
16805 bill will not go into effect if it could lead to the death of  
16806 any individuals who rely on Medicaid, especially because, as  
16807 we have heard from our Republican colleagues, this will only  
16808 impact able-bodied people, and that the cuts will not impact  
16809 the most vulnerable amongst us.

16810         So if that were to be the case, then I think this  
16811 amendment is something that all members of the committee,  
16812 both Republicans and Democrats, would be able to support.  
16813 So --

16814         \*The Chair. Sorry, I didn't hear you.

16815         \*Mr. Menendez. Sure, I am happy to repeat. So I would  
16816 just ask that, based on the stories that my colleagues have  
16817 shared, the fact that Republicans have spoken that this bill

16818 only impacts able-bodied people and that cuts would not  
16819 impact the most vulnerable amongst us, cuts would not impact  
16820 those for whom the program was originally intended for,  
16821 whether you would speak in support of the amendment which  
16822 simply states that the bill will not go into effect if any of  
16823 the provisions result in the deaths of individuals stemming  
16824 from reduced access to health care services.

16825 I also mentioned that the section that you had spoken  
16826 on, the moratorium on implementation of rule relating to  
16827 staffing standards for long-term care facilities, if the bill  
16828 is passed along party lines that would be part of it.

16829 So now that you have heard from so many of our  
16830 colleagues about the constituents that cuts to Medicaid would  
16831 impact, whether you would speak in support of the amendment  
16832 to ensure that -- to ensure to all Americans that these cuts  
16833 will not lead to a loss of access to care that could result  
16834 in the death of any Americans who currently rely on Medicaid.

16835 \*The Chair. Well, I don't need to vote for the  
16836 amendment because I wouldn't support a bill if I thought it  
16837 was going to lead to the death of any American. So I am not  
16838 supporting a bill that leads to death of Americans. I don't  
16839 think ours does. I think it strengthens the Medicaid system.  
16840 So I am supporting the underlying bill.

16841 \*Mr. Menendez. Well, I think just given how late it is,  
16842 and how many questions people have, and the disconnect

16843 between the two parties, I think supporting the amendment  
16844 would just send a very clear signal to all Americans that  
16845 this bill will do what the majority says it will.

16846 \*The Chair. I think the bill stands for itself. I  
16847 don't think it is going to lead to the death of individuals.

16848 \*Mr. Menendez. Okay. Well, I think an amendment like  
16849 this one, instead of hoping and thinking, it would provide a  
16850 little more certainty for all the Americans out there who  
16851 understandably rely on Medicaid and all that it does to  
16852 improve their lives, especially those with long-term  
16853 disabilities. I would just want them to be able to wake up  
16854 in the morning and know that both Republicans and Democrats  
16855 want this program to continue to serve those populations, and  
16856 this amendment would really solidify that.

16857 So I hope to have the support of everyone on this  
16858 committee, both Republicans and Democrats.

16859 Thank you, and I yield back to my colleague from  
16860 Louisiana.

16861 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. The gentleman yields. Is  
16862 there any other members seeking recognition?

16863 \*Mr. Pallone. Hopefully not.

16864 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Hearing none --

16865 \*Mr. Pallone. Roll call, please.

16866 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. If there is no further  
16867 discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment. A roll call

16868     vote has been requested.   The clerk will call the roll.

16869             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta?

16870             \*Mr. Latta.   No.

16871             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.

16872             Mr. Griffith?

16873             \*Mr. Griffith.   No.

16874             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.

16875             Mr. Bilirakis?

16876             \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.

16877             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

16878             Mr. Hudson?

16879             \*Mr. Hudson.   No.

16880             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.

16881             Mr. Carter of Georgia?

16882             \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.

16883             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

16884             Mr. Palmer?

16885             \*Mr. Palmer.   No.

16886             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.

16887             Mr. Dunn?

16888             [No response.]

16889             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?

16890             \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.

16891             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

16892             Mr. Joyce?



16893           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
16894           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
16895           Mr. Weber?  
16896           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
16897           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
16898           Mr. Allen?  
16899           [No response.]  
16900           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson?  
16901           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
16902           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
16903           Mr. Fulcher?  
16904           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
16905           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
16906           Mr. Pfluger?  
16907           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
16908           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
16909           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
16910           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
16911           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
16912           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
16913           [No response.]  
16914           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
16915           [No response.]  
16916           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte?  
16917           [No response.]

16918           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James?  
16919           \*Mr. James.   No.  
16920           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
16921           Mr. Bentz?  
16922           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
16923           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
16924           Mrs. Houchin?  
16925           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
16926           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
16927           Mr. Fry?  
16928           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
16929           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
16930           Ms. Lee?  
16931           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
16932           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
16933           Mr. Langworthy?  
16934           [No response.]  
16935           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy?  
16936           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
16937           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
16938           Mr. Kean?  
16939           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
16940           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
16941           Mr. Rulli?  
16942           [No response.]

16943           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli?  
16944           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
16945           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
16946           Mr. Evans?  
16947           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
16948           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
16949           Mr. Goldman?  
16950           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
16951           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
16952           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
16953           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
16954           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
16955           Mr. Pallone?  
16956           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
16957           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
16958           Ms. DeGette?  
16959           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
16960           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
16961           Ms. Schakowsky?  
16962           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
16963           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
16964           Ms. Matsui?  
16965           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
16966           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
16967           Ms. Castor?

16968           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
16969           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
16970           Mr. Tonko?  
16971           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
16972           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
16973           Ms. Clarke?  
16974           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
16975           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
16976           Mr. Ruiz?  
16977           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
16978           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
16979           Mr. Peters?  
16980           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
16981           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
16982           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
16983           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
16984           Mr. Veasey?  
16985           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
16986           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
16987           Ms. Kelly?  
16988           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
16989           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
16990           Ms. Barragan?  
16991           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
16992           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.

16993 Mr. Soto?

16994 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

16995 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.

16996 Ms. Schrier?

16997 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

16998 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

16999 Mrs. Trahan?

17000 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

17001 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

17002 Mrs. Fletcher?

17003 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.

17004 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

17005 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

17006 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

17007 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

17008 Mr. Auchincloss?

17009 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.

17010 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

17011 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

17012 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.

17013 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

17014 Mr. Menendez?

17015 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

17016 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

17017 Mr. Mullin?

17018           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.  
17019           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
17020           Mr. Landsman?  
17021           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
17022           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
17023           Ms. McClellan?  
17024           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.  
17025           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
17026           Chairman Guthrie?  
17027           \*The Chair.   No.  
17028           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
17029           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   How is Allen recorded?  
17030           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen is not recorded.  
17031           \*Mr. Allen.   Allen votes no.  
17032           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
17033           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   How is Miller-Meeks recorded?  
17034           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks is not recorded.  
17035           \*Mr. Obernolte.   Obernolte, no.  
17036           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
17037           [Pause.]  
17038           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
17039   ayes and 27 noes.  
17040           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   For what purpose does the  
17041   gentleman from Texas seek recognition?  
17042           \*Mr. Veasey.   Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the

17043 desk.

17044 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the  
17045 amendment.

17046 \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, is this amendment FCD-  
17047 AMD\_046?

17048 \*Mr. Veasey. Yes.

17049 \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mr. Veasey. Strike  
17050 section 44132 --

17051 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection, the reading  
17052 of the amendment is dispensed with.

17053 [The amendment of Mr. Veasey follows:]

17054

17055 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

17056

17057           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And the gentleman is recognized  
17058 for five minutes in support of the amendment.

17059           \*Mr. Veasey. Buried deep in this \$800 billion in cuts  
17060 to Medicaid and the Affordable Care Act is a particularly  
17061 harmful provision that would prohibit states from creating a  
17062 new provider tax or existing ones. Provider taxes allow  
17063 states to expand access to covered Medicaid benefits by  
17064 taxing providers such as hospitals and nursing homes, instead  
17065 of increasing the burden on taxpayers. Provider taxes are  
17066 used to ensure that Federal tax dollars are returned to your  
17067 state and spent in your districts and communities.

17068           And let me be clear. This provision is a direct attack  
17069 on the way states fund health care. This is a move that  
17070 would devastate state Medicaid programs, especially in places  
17071 like Texas, and my amendment moves to strike this provision  
17072 entirely.

17073           Now I represent Texas, and we are a state that has not  
17074 expanded Medicaid. And I want my colleagues to understand  
17075 something. Texas runs the leanest, most efficient Medicaid  
17076 program in the country. That is not an opinion, it is a  
17077 fact. We spend the lowest percentage above Federal minimum  
17078 requirements of any state. And so if you are looking for a  
17079 fiscal discipline in Medicaid, Texas is the model. And so  
17080 when we say this bill will punish states, a state like Texas  
17081 gets hit hardest. And for what, for doing more with less?



17082           This moratorium on provider taxes is not some technical  
17083   tweak. It is going to be a gut punch to how a state manages  
17084   Medicaid. And when my Republican colleagues say this won't  
17085   hurt kids, and this won't hurt moms, and this is not going to  
17086   hurt the disabled, I have got news for each and every one of  
17087   them: It is just not true. I am going to tell you exactly  
17088   why.

17089           In states like Texas, provider taxes are the backbone of  
17090   our Medicaid financing system. We use these tools to  
17091   supplement Federal funds to enhance care for children, for  
17092   pregnant women, people with disabilities, and vulnerable  
17093   adults. This isn't a loophole. It is a congressionally  
17094   sanctioned mechanism used responsibly by 49 out of 50 states.  
17095   Only Alaska doesn't use them.

17096           And so let me say again, 49 states use these provider  
17097   taxes, and that means the state will -- then that means the  
17098   health care of over 81 million people across the country is  
17099   funded in some way by provider taxes. And we want to give  
17100   their state no option to adjust if necessary. If this is  
17101   some shady, abusive gimmick, why is everyone doing it, and  
17102   why has Congress allowed it for decades?

17103           These taxes support supplemental payments to providers  
17104   that allow states to improve behavioral health access, expand  
17105   home and community-based services, and support critical  
17106   safety net hospitals, and this bill will be particularly

17107 detrimental to Texas because of the way we fund our provider  
17108 taxes.

17109         In Texas these provider taxes are locally designed and  
17110 state-approved through what is called the Local Provider  
17111 Participation Funds, or the LPPFs. These aren't imposed from  
17112 Austin, they are built from the ground up. And local  
17113 communities -- local communities -- get to decide to  
17114 participate. They pass ordinances and the state legislature  
17115 sign off, and they use the funds to meet local health care  
17116 needs. And some counties participate and some don't. It is  
17117 called federalism, it is called local control.

17118         And this bill would take a sledgehammer to that model,  
17119 and not only would it cap the tax rate, it would freeze the  
17120 system entirely. No new LPPFs could be created. If a county  
17121 doesn't have one now, guess what? They are out of luck  
17122 forever. That means if a community wants to improve maternal  
17123 care, build out a children's clinic, or respond to a health  
17124 crisis like a workforce shortage or a behavioral health  
17125 emergency, they can't. Their hands are tied. And that is  
17126 just shortsighted, it is dangerous, and it is uniquely  
17127 damaging to Texas. That gives us no ability to adjust,  
17128 respond, innovate.

17129         And let me tell you, local hospitals are worried. I  
17130 have already heard from local hospitals about reconsidering  
17131 plans to expand services for children, moms, and babies.

17132 Parkland, one of the largest safety net hospitals in the  
17133 country, said this provision will put them in a very  
17134 precarious situation, threatening their ability to deliver  
17135 essential care. And rural hospitals in Texas stand to lose  
17136 the most. They will close as a result. Rural hospitals in  
17137 Texas will close.

17138 And let's be real, this isn't just about Medicaid  
17139 beneficiaries. This is going to touch everyone because if  
17140 states can't use provider taxes to finance Medicaid, they  
17141 will have to find money elsewhere. That means raising taxes  
17142 on everyday citizens: sales taxes, income taxes, property  
17143 taxes. So when folks say, oh, this bill won't affect the  
17144 average American, I say again that is a lie. This bill will  
17145 affect everyone, whether you are a mom --

17146 \*Voice. [Inaudible.]

17147 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. It is a what?

17148 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I strike that.

17149 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Thank you.

17150 [Laughter.]

17151 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. This bill will affect  
17152 everyone, whether you are a mom trying to schedule a prenatal  
17153 visit, a child needing therapy, or a taxpayer footing the  
17154 bill for a broken system that can no longer self-fund. And  
17155 what message are we sending to states with this provision?

17156 I have run out of time, Mr. Speaker, but -- Mr.

17157 Chairman, but I wanted everyone to know just how this is  
17158 particularly going to hurt a lot of our communities around  
17159 the country, but Texas in particular. Thank you.

17160 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Does any  
17161 member seek recognition?

17162 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

17163 \*The Chair. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I appreciate the  
17164 opportunity to speak to this.

17165 So here, you know, the issue when Medicaid was set up,  
17166 it is a state-run program. So the state makes a lot of the  
17167 decision on what they cover, who they cover, how they cover.  
17168 And it has always been a share between the states and the  
17169 Federal Government. And so in Kentucky, it was -- it is  
17170 currently \$0.72, \$0.28 for the most vulnerable. But if you  
17171 are an able-bodied adult, it is \$0.90 from the Federal,  
17172 \$0.10. That is the way it was set up.

17173 And so when I was in the general assembly, I remember --  
17174 before I even understood what provider taxes and things were  
17175 -- people would get up on the House floor or the senate floor  
17176 and say, let's expand this program, it only costs us a  
17177 quarter, or 25 percent. Well, you know, a quarter of a  
17178 several-billion-dollar program was real money. And you had  
17179 to make decisions, and you had to be efficient and you had to  
17180 work.

17181 But then providers would come to the general assembly --

17182 so the general assembly doesn't go tax providers, the  
17183 providers go to the general assembly and says, come take  
17184 money from me, put that money in your general fund, and then  
17185 send it up to Washington and draw down Federal dollars.

17186         It becomes -- it became an open checkbook on the Federal  
17187 taxpayers. And so throughout time there has been limits put  
17188 on provider care -- provider taxes throughout. Currently, it  
17189 is at six percent total of a revenue of a hospital can be for  
17190 the provider tax. But it just became just an unlimited  
17191 drawdown of Federal dollars. Some states, like California,  
17192 have figured out that, well, they can tax their Medicaid  
17193 managed care plans and get around the provider tax.

17194         So what we are doing here is all of those kind of  
17195 funding -- so the general assembly of Kentucky -- we call it  
17196 the general assembly -- you know, really doesn't have to make  
17197 decisions, because they can just go to some kind of health  
17198 care entity, draw down money, send it to Washington, and take  
17199 Federal tax dollars. That is why the explosive growth of  
17200 Medicaid has been there, and that is why previous Congresses  
17201 -- I am not even sure when the six percent came in, so I  
17202 can't even answer who voted for or who didn't, but I do know  
17203 that it was just a protection on the Federal taxpayer.

17204         And so I have had a couple of people comment that this  
17205 provision or these similar provisions we have, we hold  
17206 harmless other provisions. They say the hospital is going to

17207 close across their states. But if they are operating today  
17208 -- so if a hospital in your state -- rural, urban, suburban  
17209 -- is operating today, there is not a penny they are going to  
17210 see go backwards. So I don't understand how saying you are  
17211 going to have the same money you have today and -- is going  
17212 to just shut hospitals down tomorrow, and that is the  
17213 argument people are making. It is not accurate.

17214 And so what we want to make sure is that we have control  
17215 on the drawdown of Federal dollars and have a say in the  
17216 drawdown of Federal dollars. So we have decided -- and there  
17217 has been a lot of discussion of this -- we decided to hold  
17218 states harmless and hold them at the provider tax where they  
17219 are, and we think that is the right policy.

17220 And I will yield back.

17221 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Does any  
17222 other member seek recognition?

17223 The chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

17224 \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.

17225 This bill will increase the financial strain and burden  
17226 on states. There is no doubt about that. It will require  
17227 the unfunded mandate for the states to administer the work  
17228 requirement programs. There will be 13.7 million uninsured,  
17229 which will drastically increase uncompensated costs in  
17230 hospitals, and there will be more administrative reporting  
17231 and eligibility verifications, which are unfunded mandates,

17232 as well.

17233       So while there will be an increase in unfunded mandate  
17234 costs and increased uncompensated care costs to states, this  
17235 bill hamstring states from using the provider taxes that  
17236 produces matching Federal funds. So let me give you some  
17237 quotes from the California Hospital Association, which said  
17238 that, "This legislation, proposed by the House Energy and  
17239 Commerce Committee to enact massive Medicaid cuts, is a  
17240 devastating blow that will be felt by all who need hospital  
17241 care.'" That was a quote by Carmela Coyle, President and CEO  
17242 of the California Hospital Association.

17243       She continues, "Cuts of this magnitude cannot be  
17244 absorbed. Hospitals will have no other choice but to reduce  
17245 patient care services or, in the worst cases, close entirely.  
17246 That means care is lost for everyone, children, seniors,  
17247 privately insured people, no matter what type of health  
17248 insurance coverage you have.'"

17249       The National Rural Health Association says, "The  
17250 Medicaid program is a lifeline for the rural hospitals.  
17251 Medicaid cuts will close rural hospitals. Since 2010 nearly  
17252 190 rural hospitals have already shuttered their doors or  
17253 stopped inpatient care. Public payers, including Medicare  
17254 and Medicaid, comprise a large share of hospitals serving in  
17255 rural areas, making rural hospitals more vulnerable to cuts  
17256 in these programs. Medicaid funding is critical for

17257 sustaining rural health care systems, including hospitals,  
17258 clinics, community health centers, and long-term care  
17259 facilities. Right now, almost half of rural hospitals across  
17260 the country are operating with negative margins, meaning that  
17261 any reductions to Medicaid funding would force many  
17262 facilities to reduce or eliminate essential services, delay  
17263 much-needed equipment upgrades, or close their doors  
17264 entirely.'`

17265         So this will affect patients on Medicaid and patients on  
17266 private health insurance. This affects everybody.

17267         And so when the states are strained with their budget,  
17268 what do they do? Now, we know this by history, but -- by  
17269 experience, but we also know that the CBO kind of informed us  
17270 of what they would do, as well. So in order to pay for this  
17271 unfunded mandate that you all are imposing on states, they  
17272 will raise taxes or have to shift funds from other programs.

17273         Another thing states will do is they will cut benefits.  
17274 But whoa, I heard before that they said they were not cutting  
17275 benefits. This is how these benefits are going to get cut.

17276         And they will also reduce eligibility, further reducing  
17277 the people that are on Medicaid programs in those states.

17278         The other thing they will do is they will reduce  
17279 physician payments, which will lead to less access to  
17280 physicians who take Medicaid patients. And in some cases,  
17281 with physician practices that see a high caseload of Medicaid



17282 patients, they may have to close their clinic, and patients  
17283 with private health insurance will have less access to those  
17284 physicians, as well.

17285         So I hope you all take this seriously, and that this  
17286 provision that freezes the provider tax, you know, is  
17287 detrimental and fits into this cascading downward spiral of  
17288 the access to care for not only Medicaid patients, but also  
17289 patients on other health insurances.

17290         And with that I yield back.

17291         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Does any  
17292 other member seek recognition?

17293         The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Michigan.

17294         \*Mrs. Dingell. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last  
17295 word.

17296         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

17297         \*Mrs. Dingell. Mr. Chairman, by freezing states'  
17298 providers tax rates and prohibiting any new provider taxes,  
17299 Republicans are gutting the ability of states to respond to  
17300 their individual health needs. Most states rely on provider  
17301 taxes as supplementary revenue to finance a portion of their  
17302 Medicaid program, serving as a cost effective tool to  
17303 maximize Federal support.

17304         In Michigan, approximately 20 percent of the state's  
17305 non-Federal Medicaid funding is generated through provider  
17306 taxes. Freezing provider taxes will increase rates of

17307 uncompensated care, hamstring and destabilize providers,  
17308 restrict access to health coverage, and increase risks of  
17309 service cuts and closures. The biggest concern in Michigan  
17310 has -- is the way that this -- the way that it is drafted.  
17311 In just the first year Michigan would lose over \$1 billion.  
17312 And with provider rates capped at a fixed amount, the  
17313 provider tax implications will continue to grow into greater  
17314 funding challenges.

17315 I believe we must reject any effort that would restrict  
17316 access to care that patients deserve, which is why I support  
17317 Representative Veasey's amendment.

17318 And I yield back.

17319 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Does  
17320 any other member seek recognition?

17321 The chair recognizes the gentlelady from California for  
17322 five minutes.

17323 \*Ms. Barragan. I would like to speak in support of this  
17324 amendment.

17325 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

17326 \*Ms. Barragan. I would like to support this amendment  
17327 and take an opportunity to read what the California Medical  
17328 Association has stated about this particular section.

17329 CMA opposes section 44132, the moratorium on new or  
17330 increased provider MCO taxes. "We are strongly opposed to  
17331 the new draconian funding freeze on provider and managed care

17332 organization taxes. This freeze is a cut that will  
17333 ultimately reduce funding for safety net providers already on  
17334 the brink of closure, especially in rural communities. One-  
17335 third of all rural hospitals are at risk of closing  
17336 nationwide. The moratorium will also discriminate against  
17337 states that want to adopt an MCO or provider tax in the  
17338 future to ensure plan and provider participation, cover  
17339 beneficiary case load growth, or meet new public health  
17340 challenges in their states.'`

17341 "Moreover, these capped allocations will not keep pace  
17342 with increasing costs and caseloads brought on by inflation,  
17343 economic recession, public health emergencies, and natural  
17344 disasters. These cuts jeopardize our patients' health and  
17345 the viability of the entire healthcare system. As the  
17346 independent CBO estimated last week, reduction in provider  
17347 and MCO taxes would result in 8.6 million people losing  
17348 Medicaid coverage. Over time, a funding freeze will have the  
17349 same impact. States will not be able to close the funding  
17350 gap, and will ultimately be forced to cut coverage and  
17351 benefits for -- Medicaid enrollees will get less care,  
17352 veterans, seniors, people with disabilities, children,  
17353 pregnant women, and low-income working adults. Rural  
17354 communities across the nation will suffer enormously from  
17355 these disproportionate cuts. We urge the committee to  
17356 withdraw this short-sighted proposal,'` and it is signed by

17357 their president, Shannon Udovic-Constant, and their CEO,  
17358 Dustin Corcoran.

17359 Again, I think this is something that is going to be  
17360 devastating, and not just for California. The Kaiser Family  
17361 Foundation says, "All states but Alaska finance part of the  
17362 state share of Medicaid funding through at least one provider  
17363 tax, and 39 states have three or more provider taxes in  
17364 place.'`

17365 So I support this amendment and I yield back.

17366 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Does  
17367 any other member seek recognition?

17368 The chair recognizes the gentleman from California for  
17369 five minutes.

17370 \*Mr. Obernolte. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17371 Look, let's have an honest conversation about what we  
17372 are talking about here, right? Provider taxes is a provision  
17373 of Medicaid law that has been abused. And the fact that so  
17374 many states are doing it is an indication of just how  
17375 widespread the abuse is. And we have created a system,  
17376 unfortunately, that incentivizes the bad actors and states  
17377 feel bad when they are left behind.

17378 I mean, here is a system where the Federal FMAP for  
17379 expansion population is 90 percent. So a state imposes a tax  
17380 on its own providers, the state only has to pay 10 percent of  
17381 the tax, the Federal Government -- U.S. taxpayers -- pay 90

17382 percent of the tax. The state kicks back the tax that the  
17383 provider paid and pockets itself or, in some cases, finds  
17384 ways of getting it back to the providers. Okay, that is a  
17385 system that should never be allowed because it is just a way  
17386 of drawing down Federal dollars.

17387         So what we are proposing here is a simple moratorium.  
17388 We are not taking anything away from anybody. All we are  
17389 saying is don't make the system any worse. More draconian  
17390 solutions have been proposed in the past by, ironically, my  
17391 colleagues across the aisle. President Obama in 2013  
17392 proposed actually ramping down the maximum allowed safe  
17393 harbor on the provider taxes all the way down to 3.5 percent.  
17394 And at the time then-Vice President Joe Biden called provider  
17395 taxes a scam, because that is what they are. So the fact  
17396 that all we are doing here is capping it is a lot less  
17397 draconian than what has been proposed by Democrat  
17398 administrations in the past.

17399         So let me just suggest to everyone here this is a  
17400 problem that we need to fix. I mean, this is a huge wart on  
17401 our Medicaid system. It creates all kinds of perverse  
17402 incentives, and it rewards the states that are willing to be  
17403 the most abusive. It needs to be fixed.

17404         But let me challenge everyone here. I hear what people  
17405 are saying about rural hospitals and health care providers.  
17406 I have them too, and I don't want them hurt by a lack of

17407 revenue. So let's sit down and talk about how to phase out  
17408 provider taxes and figure out an alternate way of getting  
17409 these providers the funds that will backfill their losses  
17410 there. And that way we will have fixed the system while at  
17411 the same time holding our providers harmless.

17412 But, I mean, this is baby steps here. All we are doing  
17413 here is saying let's not let the abuse get any worse.  
17414 Everyone ought to be able to agree to that.

17415 I yield back.

17416 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Does any  
17417 other member seek recognition?

17418 The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Illinois for  
17419 five minutes.

17420 \*Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I yield my time to  
17421 the gentleman from Louisiana, Mr. Carter.

17422 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you very much.

17423 I move to strike the last word.

17424 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection.

17425 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. I want to thank my colleague  
17426 for offering this amendment.

17427 As a former state legislator, I know firsthand what  
17428 provider taxes mean for states like Louisiana. Imposing a  
17429 moratorium on new or increased provider taxes is simply  
17430 Republicans' plan to restrict what a state can do in the  
17431 future with their Medicaid program.

17432           Yes, you heard it right. The party in favor of so-  
17433   called states' rights is controlling what states can do and  
17434   can't do with their provider taxes.

17435           As everyone in this committee knows, provider taxes are  
17436   a critical source of revenue that states like Louisiana use  
17437   to finance their state's share of Medicaid costs. That is  
17438   why proposals restricting states' abilities to carry out the  
17439   provider taxes should be seen for exactly what they are,  
17440   Medicaid funding cuts and a tax on people who rely on  
17441   Medicaid for health coverage.

17442           What does this mean for Americans and Louisianans on  
17443   Medicaid? It means health coverage losses, less money for  
17444   Medicaid, people off the rolls. Unfortunately, less Medicaid  
17445   funding leads to tough decisions. Louisiana policymakers  
17446   could be forced to cut services and kick people off Medicaid,  
17447   or consider reducing income eligibility levels for mandatory  
17448   eligibility groups such as children, pregnant women, and  
17449   parents/caretakers.

17450           Almost half of the population in my district relies on  
17451   Medicaid for health coverage. The effects of this proposal  
17452   will be extremely devastating for people in my district, the  
17453   State of Louisiana, and the people across the country who  
17454   rely on Medicaid for health care. I will tell you, when we  
17455   expanded Medicaid in Louisiana we put tons of people on the  
17456   rolls who had been the ward of emergency rooms, which was a

17457 burden on the system. We also took the state from a fiscal  
17458 cliff and brought them into a point where resources were  
17459 available to reopen rural hospitals, where up until then many  
17460 of these communities had -- did not have access to hospitals.

17461 The reverse will also be true. If we take away these  
17462 provider taxes, the state will have no choice but to reduce  
17463 the amount of people they can serve. And when they reduce  
17464 the amount of people they can serve, rural hospitals will, in  
17465 fact, close. It is a domino effect. Follow the dollars.  
17466 That is what the net effect is going to be.

17467 While on its face it sounds good to say this is just  
17468 trying to take baby steps, well, these baby steps are steps  
17469 that will hurt people who are barely trying to step at all.

17470 I implore you to take a long look at the science. Look  
17471 at the fact that these are people, and not simply numbers on  
17472 a spreadsheet.

17473 I yield.

17474 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Are any  
17475 other members seeking recognition?

17476 \*Ms. Kelly. No, that was my time.

17477 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Oh, excuse me, I am sorry.

17478 \*Ms. Kelly. I just want to add, as people have heard me  
17479 say before, my district is urban, suburban, and rural. I  
17480 start on the south side of Chicago, and I have 4,500 farms in  
17481 my district also in every part of my district, urban,



17482 suburban, and rural. Some of my hospitals are already  
17483 hanging by a thread, hanging by a thread. And they are  
17484 already cutting services, moving obstetrics to other  
17485 hospitals. A couple of my hospitals have already tried to do  
17486 this.

17487         So please listen to my colleagues. Please listen to  
17488 this amendment. We are hanging by a thread right now, and I  
17489 am so afraid more of my hospitals will close in every part of  
17490 my district.

17491         I yield back.

17492         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Does  
17493 any other member seek recognition?

17494         The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Massachusetts  
17495 for five minutes.

17496         \*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

17497         In Massachusetts and in nearly every state, provider  
17498 taxes are a vital tool to keep Medicaid afloat. Provider  
17499 taxes are a core part of how states finance their Medicaid  
17500 programs and maintain access to care, especially during  
17501 public health emergencies and system-wide crises. When  
17502 provider taxes are frozen, it strips states of the  
17503 flexibility they need to act quickly when emergencies hit,  
17504 whether it is a pandemic, a natural disaster, or the collapse  
17505 of a hospital system. These taxes, reviewed and approved by  
17506 CMS, help states make up for chronic under-funding in

17507 Medicaid, and ensure that care remains accessible for low-  
17508 income seniors, people with disabilities, and families who  
17509 depend on long-term care.

17510         We can have a conversation about different financing  
17511 models, but the fact is this is the system in place. And if  
17512 we freeze provider taxes, states will lose critical Medicaid  
17513 funding. And while my Republican colleagues claim the real  
17514 problem in health care is a lack of providers, this policy  
17515 will only deepen that shortage. Freezing provider taxes will  
17516 result in fewer nurses in nursing homes, fewer doctors in  
17517 community hospitals, and fewer providers able to stay open in  
17518 the hardest-hit parts of our state.

17519         We have already seen the consequences when our health  
17520 care system is pushed past its breaking point. When Steward  
17521 Health Care collapsed in Massachusetts, hospitals shuttered  
17522 overnight. Patients were forced to travel hours for  
17523 emergency care. The state had no choice but to step in, and  
17524 provider taxes were one of the only immediate levers we had  
17525 to stabilize the situation. This bill takes that tool away.  
17526 It doesn't just tie states' hands, it tells them to stand by  
17527 and watch the next crisis unfold without the power to  
17528 respond. There is nothing neutral about that.

17529         This is Federal overreach, plain and simple, with  
17530 devastating consequences for the people that we represent.  
17531 If this bill passes, states will be expected to manage public

17532 health disasters with fewer resources, fewer options, and  
17533 more red tape.

17534 We should be equipping states to protect access to care,  
17535 not making it harder for them to do so, so I urge my  
17536 colleagues to think twice before forcing this cut on the  
17537 backs of working families.

17538 And I yield back.

17539 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Are  
17540 there other members seeking recognition?

17541 The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Florida for  
17542 five minutes.

17543 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

17544 I want to thank the gentleman from Texas for offering  
17545 this amendment. It is really an essential piece of financing  
17546 health care back home. And, boy, the -- my Florida hospitals  
17547 are very outspoken and concerned about this because, like my  
17548 colleague from Texas, Florida is pretty stingy. They have  
17549 been very conservative, they have not expanded Medicaid. And  
17550 we have an older population that -- you know, as all the Baby  
17551 Boomers retire and enter into long-term care or have really  
17552 chronic or acute conditions, they -- the hospitals and  
17553 skilled nursing use the -- this flexibility to serve  
17554 everyone.

17555 And what the Republican bill is doing, it is kind of  
17556 choking off the ability to serve those residents all for a

17557 tax cut for billionaires, by the way. So remember, don't  
17558 forget that part.

17559 So I have a couple questions for counsel, because I want  
17560 to make sure that I am clear on this.

17561 Counsel, is there any circumstance in which a state  
17562 could establish a new provider tax or increase an existing  
17563 provider tax?

17564 And I will give you a few circumstances, and just  
17565 confirm yes or no whether a state could establish a new  
17566 provider tax in that scenario.

17567 Okay. If a state has concerns about the duration of its  
17568 home and community-based services wait list, which sometimes  
17569 leaves our neighbors with disabilities, including children,  
17570 waiting for as long as 20 years to get the care that they  
17571 need, could the state establish a new or increased provider  
17572 tax to generate revenue to invest in expanding home and  
17573 community-based services?

17574 \*Counsel. The bill in question would grandfather in all  
17575 current provider taxes.

17576 \*Ms. Castor. But -- my question was --

17577 \*Counsel. It does not permit --

17578 \*Ms. Castor. My question was, could they establish a  
17579 new or increased provider tax to address the wait list on  
17580 home and community-based services?

17581 \*Counsel. The bill does not permit increases in

17582 provider taxes.

17583       \*Ms. Castor. Okay. If there is an economic downturn,  
17584 and thus the state has to manage the competing problem of  
17585 Medicaid spending going up because fewer people have jobs at  
17586 the same time the state revenues are going down, could the  
17587 state get a new provider tax or increase it to -- could they  
17588 increase it then?

17589       \*Counsel. The bill does not permit increases on the  
17590 amount or rate of the tax imposed, but does not otherwise  
17591 prohibit other usage of state funds.

17592       \*Ms. Castor. So no. If uncompensated care increases  
17593 dramatically, given 13.7 million fewer people having health  
17594 insurance under the GOP bill, can a state increase its  
17595 provider taxes to generate revenue to help fund payments to  
17596 shore up hospitals at imminent risk of closing?

17597       \*Counsel. The bill does not permit increases in the  
17598 amount or rate of the tax --

17599       \*Ms. Castor. How about if a hurricane hits, it  
17600 devastates a region, and it creates massive demand for health  
17601 care? Could a state get a new provider tax or increase an  
17602 existing provider tax then?

17603       \*Counsel. The bill does not permit increases in the  
17604 amount or rate of the tax.

17605       \*Ms. Castor. Okay. Well, you heard it. It doesn't  
17606 matter what the circumstance is. They can't -- they don't

17607 have the flexibility.

17608           The GOP now is choking off the ability to -- for our  
17609 hospitals back home, our states to be able to serve everyone  
17610 no matter what the circumstances is. So they are not going  
17611 to have many options. They are going to say, all right,  
17612 taxpayers, we are going to you to raise taxes from everyone  
17613 -- that is not great -- or they will slash other things like  
17614 public education. More likely, as the -- acknowledged by the  
17615 Congressional Budget Office, states will have to turn to  
17616 cutting provider payments, cutting benefits, cutting people  
17617 off of their coverage, all to squeeze more money out for  
17618 billionaire tax giveaway.

17619           So my colleague from Florida, I am happy to yield you  
17620 some time, the remaining time.

17621           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you.

17622           I would just associate myself with the amazing marks of  
17623 Representative Castor. We have heard from a ton of local  
17624 hospitals and the Florida Hospital Association, not groups  
17625 known for being, you know, super spendthrift or liberal,  
17626 right? They are -- they have the provider tax capped at four  
17627 percent right now. That is a -- that would be a permanent  
17628 cap, and that would restrict their ability to be able to  
17629 react to different emergencies that may happen.

17630           And so I certainly support the amendment.

17631           And I yield back to the gentlelady.

17632           \*The Chair. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields back.  
17633   The gentlelady yields back, the chair will now recognize Mr.  
17634   Tonko for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

17635           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I speak in support  
17636   of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Texas.

17637           I have hospitals in my region that have truly struggled  
17638   and are hurting. Many of these same hospitals have been hit  
17639   especially hard over the last few years, and yet they provide  
17640   services in communities where people have nowhere else to go.  
17641   If it were not for these hospitals, my constituents could not  
17642   get care. And I am not the only one. There are several  
17643   members here that have hospitals in their districts that  
17644   would be harmed by these policies.

17645           Mr. Chair, a hospital in your district, the Medical  
17646   Center in Bowling Green, would lose millions of dollars from  
17647   these cuts to Medicaid. What does that mean? That means  
17648   people losing their jobs and their health care or worse.

17649           Other ,members who I cannot name per the rules of this  
17650   committee because Republicans are so scared of being called  
17651   out for what they are doing to their constituents, have  
17652   hospitals in their districts that will lose millions of  
17653   dollars if these changes to Medicaid go through.

17654           I also recognize that hospitals don't get to pick their  
17655   patients in the way that other parts of our health system,  
17656   unfortunately, can do. In the capital region of New York,

17657 our hospitals provide access to care for those who need it  
17658 most. With that in mind, I am extremely concerned that the  
17659 cuts to Medicaid made in this package will pull the  
17660 foundation out from hospitals that are already struggling.

17661 But don't take it from me. Listen to our hospitals,  
17662 including many from my communities. Dr. Steven Hanks,  
17663 president and CEO of the Saint Peter's Health Partners in  
17664 Albany and Saint Joseph's Health in Syracuse, shared how  
17665 devastating these proposed Medicaid changes would be. I  
17666 quote him in that he stated, "Restrictions on coverage are,  
17667 in fact, camouflaging direct cuts to hospitals, forcing us to  
17668 shoulder more and more uncompensated care. These proposals  
17669 will result in significant harm to our systems, and cuts to  
17670 the tune of tens of millions of dollars that will force us to  
17671 make some incredibly difficult decisions. Congressman  
17672 Tonko's proposed efforts on our behalf is a welcome effort to  
17673 help prevent a disaster. We strongly urge others to join in  
17674 supporting this action to ensure our hospitals can continue  
17675 to serve our communities.'`

17676 The Healthcare Association of New York State, HANYS,  
17677 which is New York's statewide hospital and continuing care  
17678 association, shared this statement, and I quote, "No patient,  
17679 provider, or community will be healthier if the U.S. House  
17680 Energy and Commerce Committee's Medicaid proposals go into  
17681 effect. This package will cause a substantial number of New



17682     Yorkers who rely on Medicaid to lose their coverage, and it  
17683     will slash all New Yorkers' access to care by cutting  
17684     essential funding for hospitals and other providers. HANYS  
17685     urges New York's congressional delegation to reject this  
17686     bill.'`

17687             The Greater New York Hospital Association slammed the  
17688     Republican Medicaid cuts and said this, and I quote, "The  
17689     bill's massive cuts will strip health coverage from millions  
17690     of hard-working Americans, drive up uncompensated care costs  
17691     for financially struggling hospitals, and shift unsustainable  
17692     costs to states that will have no choice but to reduce  
17693     hospital reimbursements, cut health insurance benefits, or  
17694     limit eligibility. It will severely harm the constituents of  
17695     every Member of Congress that votes for it, and the hospitals  
17696     that care for them. Furthermore, Medicaid cuts to hospitals  
17697     affect all patients, not just those with Medicaid coverage.  
17698     This bill should be rejected.'`

17699             And America's Essential Hospitals shared this, and I  
17700     quote, "America's Essential Hospitals is deeply concerned by  
17701     the draft reconciliation bill text released by the House  
17702     Committee on Energy and Commerce. This unprecedented level  
17703     of Medicaid cuts would devastate the program, undermining the  
17704     ability of essential hospitals to provide critical services,  
17705     including trauma care, behavioral health, maternal health,  
17706     and public health emergency response. These hospitals, which

17707 already operate on thin margins, cannot absorb such losses  
17708 without reducing services or closing their doors  
17709 altogether.'`

17710 The President of the Federation for American Hospitals  
17711 said this, and I quote, "Congressional Republicans and  
17712 President Trump rightly pledged to protect Medicaid benefits  
17713 and coverage. This bill fails that test.'` I couldn't agree  
17714 more, and I urge everyone to support this amendment and  
17715 support our hospitals across our nation.

17716 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back the remainder of my  
17717 time.

17718 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentleman yields back. And  
17719 I have a submission for the record.

17720 [The information follows:]

17721

17722 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

17723

17724           \*The Chair. The gentleman, my good friend from New  
17725   York, mentioned my hospitals in my area. So I had a message  
17726   today from the Kentucky Hospital Association that says it  
17727   appreciates all the hard work Chairman Guthrie put into  
17728   protecting Medicaid in Kentucky, and it says, "Chairman  
17729   Guthrie's mark will assure our hospitals can continue to  
17730   provide care to our patients where they are and when they  
17731   need it.'`

17732           So I look forward to seeing where you got those numbers,  
17733   because it doesn't seem to match up with the Kentucky  
17734   Hospital Association.

17735           And does anyone seek recognition for the -- to speak on  
17736   the amendment?

17737           The gentleman from Massachusetts, you are recognized for  
17738   five minutes to speak on the amendment.

17739           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Chairman. I want to start  
17740   by associating myself with the comments from the gentlewoman  
17741   from Florida and gentlewoman from Massachusetts about the  
17742   criticality that these taxes provide for flexibility for  
17743   states to respond to disasters and to unforeseen  
17744   circumstances where they need that spending power. Like Mrs.  
17745   Trahan, I saw it in Massachusetts with Steward.

17746           I also, though, Mr. Chairman, I want to actually say  
17747   that your description of the provider taxes is not wholly  
17748   without merit. You laid out legitimate critiques that could

17749 be addressed in a bipartisan fashion. And the gentleman from  
17750 California is not wrong when he says that former Presidents  
17751 Obama and Biden had in the past talked about provider taxes  
17752 as challenging.

17753 Here is the difference, though. Presidents Obama and  
17754 Biden had a plan. They talked about something that needed to  
17755 be fixed, and then they had a plan to fix it. What we heard  
17756 from the gentleman from California is, well, we are going to  
17757 freeze it, and then we are just going to kind of hope that  
17758 Congress solves a big problem.

17759 The problem with that is that hospital services are the  
17760 fastest inflating sector of the U.S. economy. So when you  
17761 freeze something, in fact you are not freezing it. It is a  
17762 cut. Let's be real. And then you are cutting rural  
17763 hospitals, and then you are telling these rural hospitals,  
17764 but don't worry, because Congress is on the case and they are  
17765 going to solve this problem for you immediately. And you are  
17766 going to have to forgive these rural hospitals for saying,  
17767 well, that doesn't help me serve my patients right now, and  
17768 the states from saying, that doesn't help me cover my  
17769 population right now.

17770 So this is an example of something that, had this bill  
17771 been done in a bipartisan fashion, had you brought to the  
17772 table, Mr. Chairman, a critique of provider taxes along with  
17773 a solution, and had we been having a conversation about taxes

17774 and health care together, as opposed to having cuts to health  
17775 care serve cuts to taxes, we could have actually gotten to a  
17776 really strong bipartisan solution here. And instead, we are  
17777 in a situation where we are going to be having cuts to rural  
17778 hospitals in service of tax cuts for the wealthiest  
17779 Americans. And that is a backwards policy.

17780 I yield back.

17781 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Are there any  
17782 others seeking recognition?

17783 The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five  
17784 minutes to speak on the amendment.

17785 \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I speak in support  
17786 of the amendment.

17787 States rely on provider taxes to finance their share of  
17788 Medicaid costs and close the cost gap for essential services  
17789 our families rely on. Depriving states of this vital support  
17790 would be devastating for states, hospitals, especially safety  
17791 net and rural hospitals, and our constituents who stand to  
17792 lose lifesaving coverage.

17793 My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying  
17794 to pretend this policy isn't as harmful as it is. But over  
17795 time, as state health needs change, and as factors such as  
17796 inflation, medication prices, increases in demand, and  
17797 changes in utilization increase the overall cost of care,  
17798 this policy would reduce the value of resources that support

17799 our Medicaid patients, all without giving states any other  
17800 means to compensate for the loss, as my colleague from  
17801 Massachusetts pointed out. This would leave states with  
17802 three damaging choices: slash payments to hospitals, nursing  
17803 homes and other providers; cut benefits for patients; or kick  
17804 people off the program entirely.

17805 I thank my Democratic colleagues for speaking about the  
17806 impacts that this provision of the bill would have on  
17807 hospitals in their districts and states. I would ask my  
17808 Republican colleagues, have you talked to hospitals in your  
17809 district? Have you talked to your nursing homes? Have you  
17810 talked to your healthcare providers? Because they have been  
17811 overwhelmingly clear that they don't want this.

17812 Let's be clear. For all Republicans have thrown around  
17813 like term -- thrown around terms like "efficiency" today,  
17814 they are only trying to reduce the amount of money the  
17815 Federal Government spends on essential health services. They  
17816 are not trying to make the overall healthcare system work  
17817 better. In fact, this Republican proposal will make our  
17818 health care system less efficient and more expensive.

17819 First, they devastate state budgets, forcing them to pay  
17820 more and cut coverage. Then, many of our most vulnerable  
17821 community members lose insurance or lose benefits that keep  
17822 them healthy. And then families in all of our districts  
17823 become sicker, requiring more care than they would otherwise

17824 need from a system that is now less equipped to provide it.  
17825 So who loses? Our states, our healthcare providers, our  
17826 hospitals, and, most importantly, our constituents. The only  
17827 reason to take a hammer to provider taxes is to deliberately  
17828 force states into a corner. Either they can cut care or they  
17829 can eat the cost.

17830         So clearly, this bill, and specifically this provision,  
17831 has a deep and lasting impact on how we pay and provide for  
17832 Medicaid across the country. So I want to touch on two  
17833 quotes from the President from this year.

17834         In February, he said, "Medicare, Medicaid, none of that  
17835 stuff is going to be touched.'" So between 13.7 million  
17836 people losing health care coverage or states not being able  
17837 to have flexibility on their provider taxes, I just ask any  
17838 of my Republican colleagues if they would say that is not  
17839 touching Medicaid.

17840         [Pause.]

17841         \*Mr. Menendez. So it seems that the President misled  
17842 the American people when he said Medicare and Medicaid, none  
17843 of that stuff, is going to be touched, based on the text of  
17844 this bill.

17845         In April of this year, President Trump said, "House  
17846 Republicans are working to invest more money in Medicaid than  
17847 we spend today.'" But with respect to this bill, and  
17848 specifically this provision, it seems that we will not be

17849 investing more money in Medicaid. And I welcome any  
17850 Republicans who believe that this bill, and specifically this  
17851 provision, would lead to a greater investment, investing more  
17852 money in Medicaid than we spend today.

17853 [Pause.]

17854 \*Mr. Menendez. So this bill is zero for two on promises  
17855 that President Trump just this year made to all Americans,  
17856 one again being that Medicaid is not going to be touched, and  
17857 two, that House Republicans are working to invest more money  
17858 in Medicaid than we spend today.

17859 Clearly, that was not accurate. That is not what we are  
17860 doing here today. In fact, we are doing the opposite. We  
17861 are cutting health care for so many Americans who rely on  
17862 Medicaid, and that is why so many Democrats are opposed to  
17863 what is happening here, especially the fact that it is  
17864 happening in the middle of the night and early in the  
17865 morning, when Americans cannot see that the Republican  
17866 majority is cutting health care for over 13 million  
17867 Americans.

17868 Thank you, and I yield back.

17869 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back, and the  
17870 gentleman from Alabama is recognized.

17871 \*Mr. Palmer. I thank the chairman. I rise in  
17872 opposition to the amendment.

17873 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.



17874           \*Mr. Palmer. I move to strike the last word.

17875           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

17876           \*Mr. Palmer. You know, we have been sitting here all  
17877 night, and I appreciate the opportunity to spend this evening  
17878 with you.

17879           My Democrat colleagues are acting as though this is an  
17880 unreasonable policy to freeze provider taxes when Democratic  
17881 leadership just a few years ago were trying to reform  
17882 provider taxes in a much more serious and deliberate way. In  
17883 President Obama's fiscal year 2013 budget it said the budget  
17884 seeks to make Medicaid more efficient by streamlining  
17885 financing and reimbursement policies.

17886           Specifically, the budget proposes reducing the Medicaid  
17887 provider tax threshold beginning in 2015 to promote integrity  
17888 of Federal-state financing. And what that plan called for  
17889 was reducing the provider tax to 3.5 percent, phasing it down  
17890 to 3.5 percent. Even Vice President Joe Biden had this to  
17891 say, "It is a scam. The states were gaming the system,  
17892 taxing doctors and hospitals so they could get Federal  
17893 reimbursement and then returning the money to the  
17894 providers.'" He said, "Let's call it like it is, and let's  
17895 just do this.'"

17896           The Washington Post, talking about what a hideously  
17897 complex program it is, that it needed to be made more  
17898 transparent and accountable. There in an editorial they

17899 wrote, "We refer specifically to reforming the so-called  
17900 provider taxes that 46 states and the District use to fund  
17901 increased payment rates to Medicaid providers and to shift  
17902 the cost to the Federal Government.' "

17903         Dick Durbin called it a bit of a charade. He is still  
17904 in office. They supported, as I said, the provider tax to  
17905 3.5 percent. And in one study, the GAO found that the  
17906 states' reliance on provider taxes and local government funds  
17907 decreased states' share of Medicaid payments, and effectively  
17908 increased the Federal share of net Medicaid payments by 5  
17909 percentage points in fiscal year 2018.

17910         So again, what we are saying here today is that, by  
17911 freezing the state provider taxes at current rates, we can  
17912 make sure states have skin in the game to help the Medicaid  
17913 program run as efficiently and effectively as possible, also  
17914 run in such a way that it is not a complete scam, as Vice  
17915 President Biden called it at the time.

17916         And the problem is, if we don't address this, the states  
17917 are going to continue to have an over-reliance on provider  
17918 taxes, which erodes that incentive for the program to operate  
17919 in a more transparent and honest way.

17920         So, you know, once again -- and again, I keep hearing my  
17921 colleagues say there is 13 million people going to lose their  
17922 health insurance, and we all know that that is inaccurate. I  
17923 am trying to be sensitive to their sensibilities about the

17924 use of words, Mr. Chairman, but that is totally inaccurate.  
17925 But it is okay for them to keep doing it, because it is  
17926 totally in keeping with their message.

17927 I yield back.

17928 \*The Chair. Will you yield to me?

17929 \*Mr. Palmer. Yes, sir.

17930 \*The Chair. I just wanted to, you know, point out what  
17931 President Trump did say was waste, fraud, and abuse. I say  
17932 the word "efficiency," because I -- you know, "fraud" is  
17933 doing stuff just illegally, and it is not illegal to do what  
17934 they are doing. But it is something we have to get a handle  
17935 on to be efficient.

17936 And talking about not cutting, we are holding it  
17937 harmless. People are getting the money that they are getting  
17938 from the program, and provider taxes is six percent of --  
17939 base of the revenue of the provider. So as the revenue  
17940 increases, the provider tax increases with it, as well. It  
17941 doesn't just freeze it at the current dollar value, it just  
17942 freezes at the current rate.

17943 So I appreciate you yielding to me, and I will yield  
17944 back to you.

17945 \*Mr. Palmer. Well, you just reinforced what is going on  
17946 here is the misrepresentation of the facts. It is a fraud in  
17947 and of itself, but we have been listening to that all night.

17948 I yield back.

17949           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone  
17950 seeking recognition?

17951           The gentleman from California, Mr. Mullin, is recognized  
17952 for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

17953           \*Mr. Mullin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
17954 the last word.

17955           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

17956           \*Mr. Mullin. The needless freeze of state provider  
17957 taxes included in this bill is an existential threat to  
17958 thousands of hospitals and community health centers across  
17959 the country.

17960           Provider taxes have been in place for over 2 decades,  
17961 and 49 states use them today. This is not fraud or abuse,  
17962 but rather a legitimate and vital funding stream that states  
17963 desperately need. California voters made their decision  
17964 clear when they voted for Proposition 35 in 2024 to enact a  
17965 permanent provider tax. Sixty-eight percent of Californians  
17966 supported the measure, including the majority of voters in  
17967 every California congressional district, Democratic and  
17968 Republican alike.

17969           The provider tax freeze and redistribution requirements  
17970 included in the bill would be catastrophic. They would  
17971 effectively overturn the will of the voters in my state and  
17972 dozens of others. Countless hospitals and community health  
17973 centers would close, especially in rural areas. And at a

17974 time when the cost of living is already too high, they will  
17975 raise health care premiums for everyone.

17976 I urge my colleagues to think of their constituents and  
17977 communities, and vote yes on the amendment.

17978 I yield back.

17979 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
17980 further discussion on the amendment?

17981 Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote  
17982 occurs on the amendment.

17983 A roll call vote?

17984 A roll call vote has been requested, and the clerk will  
17985 call the roll.

17986 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

17987 [No response.]

17988 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

17989 \*The Chair. No.

17990 \*Mr. Latta. No.

17991 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

17992 Mr. Griffith?

17993 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

17994 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

17995 Mr. Bilirakis?

17996 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

17997 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

17998 Mr. Hudson?

17999 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

18000 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

18001 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

18002 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

18003 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

18004 Mr. Palmer?

18005 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

18006 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

18007 Mr. Dunn?

18008 [No response.]

18009 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

18010 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

18011 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

18012 Mr. Joyce?

18013 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

18014 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

18015 Mr. Weber?

18016 \*Mr. Weber. No.

18017 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

18018 Mr. Allen?

18019 [No response.]

18020 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson?

18021 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

18022 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

18023 Mr. Fulcher?

18024 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
18025 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
18026 Mr. Pfluger?  
18027 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
18028 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
18029 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
18030 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
18031 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
18032 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
18033 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
18034 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
18035 Mrs. Cammack?  
18036 [No response.]  
18037 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
18038 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
18039 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
18040 Mr. James?  
18041 [No response.]  
18042 \*The Clerk. Mr. James?  
18043 \*Mr. James. No.  
18044 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
18045 Mr. Bentz?  
18046 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
18047 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
18048 Mrs. Houchin?

18049           \*Mrs. Houchin. No.

18050           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.

18051           Mr. Fry?

18052           \*Mr. Fry. No.

18053           \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.

18054           Ms. Lee?

18055           \*Ms. Lee. No.

18056           \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.

18057           Mr. Langworthy?

18058           \*Mr. Langworthy. No.

18059           \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

18060           Mr. Kean?

18061           \*Mr. Kean. No.

18062           \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.

18063           Mr. Rulli?

18064           \*Mr. Rulli. No.

18065           \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.

18066           Mr. Evans?

18067           \*Mr. Evans. No.

18068           \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.

18069           Mr. Goldman?

18070           \*Mr. Goldman. No.

18071           \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.

18072           Mrs. Fedorchak?

18073           [No response.]



18074           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone?  
18075           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
18076           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
18077           Ms. DeGette?  
18078           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
18079           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
18080           Ms. Schakowsky?  
18081           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
18082           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
18083           Ms. Matsui?  
18084           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
18085           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
18086           Ms. Castor?  
18087           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
18088           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
18089           Mr. Tonko?  
18090           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
18091           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
18092           Ms. Clarke?  
18093           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
18094           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
18095           Mr. Ruiz?  
18096           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
18097           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
18098           Mr. Peters?

18099 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
18100 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
18101 Mrs. Dingell?  
18102 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
18103 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
18104 Mr. Veasey?  
18105 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
18106 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
18107 Ms. Kelly?  
18108 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
18109 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
18110 Ms. Barragan?  
18111 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
18112 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
18113 Mr. Soto?  
18114 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
18115 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
18116 Ms. Schrier?  
18117 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
18118 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
18119 Mrs. Trahan?  
18120 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
18121 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
18122 Mrs. Fletcher?  
18123 [No response.]

18124           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
18125           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
18126           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
18127           Mr. Auchincloss?  
18128           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
18129           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
18130           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
18131           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.  
18132           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
18133           Mr. Menendez?  
18134           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.  
18135           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
18136           Mr. Mullin?  
18137           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.  
18138           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
18139           Mr. Landsman?  
18140           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
18141           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
18142           Ms. McClellan?  
18143           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.  
18144           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
18145           Chairman Guthrie?  
18146           \*The Chair.   No.  
18147           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
18148           \*The Chair.   So how is Mr. Allen recorded?

18149           \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen is not recorded.  
18150           \*Mr. Allen. Allen votes no.  
18151           \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.  
18152           \*The Chair. Mrs. Fletcher?  
18153           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher is not recorded.  
18154           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
18155           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
18156           \*The Chair. Is anyone on the Republican side here to --  
18157 anyone on the Democrat side?  
18158           Seeing none, the clerk will report.  
18159           [Pause.]  
18160           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.  
18161           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
18162 ayes and 27 noes.  
18163           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.  
18164           \*Ms. Castor. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment.  
18165           \*The Chair. The gentlelady from Florida.  
18166           \*Ms. Castor. I have an amendment at the desk labeled  
18167 047.  
18168           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.  
18169           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, could the gentlelady please  
18170 specify the amendment?  
18171           \*The Chair. Oh --  
18172           \*Ms. Castor. It is Health-FCD-AMD\_047.  
18173           \*The Clerk. HE-FCD-AMD\_047, amendment offered by Ms.

18174 Castor. Strike section 44 --

18175 \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
18176 amendment is dispensed with.

18177 [The amendment of Ms. Castor follows:]

18178

18179 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

18180

18181           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
18182 minutes in support of the amendment.

18183           \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18184           Good morning, everyone. This is an amendment that is  
18185 certain to wake you up. It is relating to state-directed  
18186 payments.

18187           Seriously, though, this is an amendment, again, that  
18188 highlights the fact that my Republican colleagues are  
18189 squeezing, choking off some of the important ways that we  
18190 finance care to our neighbors back home, all to provide a tax  
18191 cut to the wealthiest across the country. But these state-  
18192 directed payments are a real lifeline to hospitals, nursing  
18193 homes, other providers that treat a high volume of Medicaid  
18194 managed care beneficiaries.

18195           I think we all know, especially after our discussion  
18196 here, that Medicaid is very lean, it is efficient, so much so  
18197 that it often reimburses providers and hospitals at rates  
18198 below the actual cost of care. In Florida, Medicaid  
18199 reimburses providers at approximately \$0.48 for every dollar  
18200 spent providing care. And I am going to use Florida as an  
18201 example, but 40 states use these direct payments. This makes  
18202 state-directed payments particularly important in states like  
18203 Florida, where hospitals are operating on a razor thin  
18204 margin, and they need help to bridge the gap. The direct  
18205 payment program helps address this shortfall.

18206           DPP accounts for about \$2 billion in -- Federal dollars  
18207 to Florida each year to help serve our neighbors. Without  
18208 DPP, Florida hospitals would operate at a shortfall of about  
18209 \$5.7 billion. With DPP the shortfall is currently 3.7  
18210 billion.

18211           It is up to states to establish state-directed payment  
18212 programs, and they are often targeted toward services that  
18213 would otherwise be very difficult to afford. For example, in  
18214 the Tampa Bay area, Tampa General Hospital uses these funds  
18215 to operate their Healthpark Clinic in east Tampa, the only  
18216 place in Hillsborough County that our neighbors who are un or  
18217 underinsured can find access to a specialist. And even with  
18218 DPP, the clinic operates at a net loss of \$15 million. The  
18219 hospital wants to expand the clinic, but they likely will be  
18220 unable to afford to continue operating it, let alone grow it  
18221 if the GOP bill passes.

18222           Now, BayCare Health System uses DPP to invest in  
18223 behavioral health services in a state where we rank at the  
18224 bottom of the barrel in providing mental health care. But  
18225 even with DPP, they still operate at a loss of about 50 to  
18226 \$60 million a year. If you look south into Manatee County  
18227 right now, over 50 percent of women in Manatee County leave  
18228 the county to deliver their babies in a high-quality  
18229 facility. But thanks to DPP, BayCare is investing in rural  
18230 labor and delivery units and will soon open an NICU for moms

18231 and babies in underserved Manatee County.

18232         Now, these are just a few of the examples from the Tampa  
18233 Bay area, but these state-directed payments are also very  
18234 important tools for safety net providers of all types, home  
18235 and community-based services, dental, long-term care,  
18236 anywhere they are serving a high volume of Medicaid patients.

18237         Here are a few examples outside of Florida.

18238         Memorial Health University Medical Center in Savannah  
18239 uses support from Georgia Strong, a Medicaid state-directed  
18240 payment program, to expand its primary care services by  
18241 hiring additional physicians to grow its rural track  
18242 residency program. I know a lot of folks here over the past  
18243 day have talked about how difficult it is to have doctors.  
18244 We have a doctor shortage, a nursing shortage. This is what  
18245 these dollars go to.

18246         In 70 percent of patients at UPMC Chautauqua in  
18247 Jamestown, New York are covered by Medicaid, Medicare, and --  
18248 or are uninsured. The hospital there serves as a safety net  
18249 for surrounding counties. They receive directed payments for  
18250 inpatient and outpatient services of about \$25 million. So  
18251 slashing Medicaid here would destabilize care for an already  
18252 underserved community.

18253         Cook Children's Medical Center in Fort Worth, Texas  
18254 delivers critical care to a booming region, where 32 percent  
18255 of children are served by Medicaid and another 7 percent are



18256 uninsured. Cook receives about 257 million Medicaid state-  
18257 directed payments. So you can see that if you are squeezing  
18258 here, you are -- the people in that area are going to have  
18259 less care.

18260 Chatham Hospital in Siler City, North Carolina, serves a  
18261 25-bed critical access hospital serving 1,200 adults and  
18262 children each month. But thanks in part to these enhanced  
18263 Medicaid payments, the hospital has been able to buck the  
18264 trend of rural maternity ward closures.

18265 All I am trying to say is you are squeezing the Medicaid  
18266 services, you are squeezing our providers. That ultimately  
18267 impacts the care for everyone. It is not wise. It is  
18268 fiscally irresponsible to do this, again, to provide a  
18269 massive tax giveaway to people who really don't need it.  
18270 Please pass this amendment.

18271 I yield back my time.

18272 \*The Chair. Thanks. The gentlelady yields back, and I  
18273 will recognize myself for five minutes to address the  
18274 amendment.

18275 So state-directed payments, or SDPs, were created by CMS  
18276 in 2016, and allow states to direct managed care  
18277 organizations to pay providers according to specific rates or  
18278 methods based on stated value that the payment will provide  
18279 to the provider. As more state Medicaid programs have moved  
18280 enrollees into MCO arrangements for their care, SDP

18281 arrangements have grown rapidly.

18282         Traditionally, supplemental payments could not exceed  
18283 amounts paid by Medicare. However, the Biden-Harris  
18284 Administration finalized regulations permitting state-  
18285 directed payments to be paid up to the average commercial  
18286 rate, which can be two to five times above Medicare rates.

18287         In 2023 the Government Accountability Office reported  
18288 that CMS was approving state-directed payments that resulted  
18289 in hospital payments well above the Medicare payment rates in  
18290 selected states. The growth of state-directed payments is a  
18291 concern, given the broader growth in Medicaid spending and  
18292 because states are often financing the state-directed  
18293 payments with provider taxes, rather than state general  
18294 funds, which doubles down on efforts by states to reduce  
18295 their share of financing of Medicaid.

18296         CBO estimates that Medicaid spending has ramped up  
18297 considerably in the past two years, despite the unwinding  
18298 after the pandemic. And CBO has said that contributing  
18299 factors to these trends are states' Medicaid financing  
18300 loopholes and directed payments. And CBS -- CMS estimates  
18301 that state-directed payments could exceed \$125 billion in  
18302 2033.

18303         So what this policy does is direct HHS to revise its  
18304 current regulations to limit state-directed payments for  
18305 services furnished on or after the enactment of the

18306 legislation from exceeding the total published Medicare  
18307 payment rate for this service. This policy does not affect  
18308 total payment rates for state-directed payments approved  
18309 prior to this legislation's enactment. Placing these  
18310 guardrails on state-directed payments will prevent states  
18311 from shifting costs back to the Federal Government. And  
18312 maintaining the integrity of the Federal-state financing of  
18313 Medicaid is key to driving efficiencies in the program.

18314 And I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, and I  
18315 will yield back.

18316 Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

18317 \*Mr. Pallone. Doris.

18318 \*The Chair. The gentlelady from California, you are  
18319 recognized for five minutes to discuss the amendment.

18320 \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I move  
18321 to strike the last word.

18322 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

18323 \*Ms. Matsui. This bill before us doesn't just decimate  
18324 health care for the most vulnerable populations. This bill  
18325 will tear irreparable holes in the fabric holding many of our  
18326 communities together.

18327 It is no secret this bill would undoubtedly force many  
18328 of those hospitals, clinics, nursing homes, and emergency  
18329 medical services and other providers to close their doors.  
18330 In California alone this bill will result in tens of billions

18331 of dollars of cuts to hospitals over the next 10 years. Many  
18332 cuts come from limiting state-directed payments.

18333         If a hospital shutter a labor and delivery ward, that  
18334 means no one has a place to go to give birth. When more  
18335 moms-to-be are forced to drive hours to the closest birthing  
18336 facility and are having dangerous labor complications as a  
18337 result, Republicans will be to blame.

18338         Medicaid is the single largest payer for long-term care  
18339 in this country. If an assisted living facility can't afford  
18340 to keep its doors open after taking a major hit to its  
18341 biggest revenue stream, that means no one can find a bed.  
18342 When more of our constituents can't find a safe and  
18343 comfortable place for their parents or grandparents to grow  
18344 old, Republicans will be to blame.

18345         If an emergency room closes, that means no one has a  
18346 place to go when they need immediate care. And if emergency  
18347 medical services have to take an ambulance off the road, that  
18348 means one less ambulance available when anyone has a medical  
18349 emergency. When more people are dying en route to the closed  
18350 ER after a major heart attack or accident, Republicans will  
18351 be to blame.

18352         These cuts will be felt acutely by each and every person  
18353 in our districts.

18354         We also need to consider that our health care facilities  
18355 are often the anchors of our communities. They are often the

18356 largest employer and major economic drivers in their regions.

18357 I would like to submit for the record this letter from  
18358 over 200 California organizations about how detrimental these  
18359 cuts will be not only to the health of more than 15 million  
18360 Californians, but also to the basic economic foundations of  
18361 the entire state.

18362 Medicaid supports over 500,000 jobs in California. In  
18363 my district alone 12,000 employees, doctors, nurses,  
18364 technicians, and support staff rely on Medicaid funding for  
18365 their salaries. I know I am not the only one in representing  
18366 a district where health care is one of the top employers. If  
18367 Republicans succeed today, millions of livelihoods across the  
18368 country will be at risk.

18369 In California we have seen this story play out. Just a  
18370 few years ago, a local hospital in the rural central valley  
18371 of California, Madera Community Hospital, had to close its  
18372 doors due to financial struggles. Predictably, the health  
18373 effects on Madera residents were immediate. Women were  
18374 driving hours to give birth. Cancer patients had nowhere to  
18375 go or their prescriptions with -- further prescriptions.  
18376 Hospitals and neighborhood areas were overflowing. And soon  
18377 after, Madera was feeling the vacuum effect of one of its  
18378 major institutions closing. Thousands of people lost their  
18379 jobs, businesses closed, people who could afford to moved out  
18380 of town. Others were left unemployed and scrambling. Madera

18381 basically turned into a ghost town.

18382           Fortunately, Madera was able to access emergency state  
18383 funding that allowed it to reopen its doors. But hospitals  
18384 can't be started up overnight. Many of the doctors, nurses,  
18385 and support staff who worked at Madera found other jobs when  
18386 it closed. It has been no small feat to get all the critical  
18387 services back to full capacity.

18388           The cuts in this bill will be the final nail in the  
18389 coffin for a community hospital that is already teetering on  
18390 the brink. Are Republicans ready for this story to play out  
18391 in their districts, for their constituents to be out of jobs,  
18392 out of health care coverage, and have nowhere to turn in an  
18393 emergency?

18394           I yield back the remainder of my time.

18395           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
18396 further discussion on the amendment?

18397           Seeing none --

18398           \*Mr. Pallone. We want a roll call.

18399           \*The Chair. -- if there is no further discussion, the  
18400 vote occurs on the amendment. A roll call has been  
18401 requested, and the clerk will call the roll.

18402           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

18403           \*Mr. Latta. No.

18404           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

18405           Mr. Griffith?

18406 [No response.]

18407 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis?

18408 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

18409 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

18410 Mr. Hudson?

18411 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

18412 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

18413 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

18414 [No response.]

18415 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?

18416 [No response.]

18417 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?

18418 [No response.]

18419 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

18420 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

18421 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

18422 Mr. Joyce?

18423 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

18424 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

18425 Mr. Weber?

18426 \*Mr. Weber. No.

18427 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

18428 Mr. Allen?

18429 [No response.]

18430 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson?

18431           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
18432           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
18433           Mr. Fulcher?  
18434           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
18435           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
18436           Mr. Pfluger?  
18437           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
18438           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
18439           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
18440           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
18441           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
18442           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
18443           [No response.]  
18444           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
18445           [No response.]  
18446           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte?  
18447           [No response.]  
18448           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James?  
18449           \*Mr. James.   No.  
18450           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
18451           Mr. Bentz?  
18452           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
18453           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
18454           Mrs. Houchin?  
18455           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.



18456           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
18457           Mr. Fry?  
18458           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
18459           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
18460           Ms. Lee?  
18461           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
18462           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
18463           Mr. Langworthy?  
18464           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
18465           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
18466           Mr. Kean?  
18467           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
18468           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
18469           Mr. Rulli?  
18470           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
18471           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
18472           Mr. Evans?  
18473           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
18474           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
18475           Mr. Goldman?  
18476           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
18477           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
18478           Mr. Pallone?  
18479           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
18480           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.

18481 Ms. DeGette?  
18482 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
18483 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
18484 Ms. Schakowsky?  
18485 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
18486 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
18487 Ms. Matsui?  
18488 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
18489 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
18490 Ms. Castor?  
18491 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
18492 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
18493 Mr. Tonko?  
18494 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
18495 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
18496 Ms. Clarke?  
18497 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
18498 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
18499 Mr. Ruiz?  
18500 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
18501 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
18502 Mr. Peters?  
18503 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
18504 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
18505 Mrs. Dingell?

18506 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
18507 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
18508 Mr. Veasey?  
18509 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
18510 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
18511 Ms. Kelly?  
18512 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
18513 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
18514 Ms. Barragan?  
18515 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
18516 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
18517 Mr. Soto?  
18518 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
18519 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
18520 Ms. Schrier?  
18521 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
18522 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
18523 Mrs. Trahan?  
18524 [No response.]  
18525 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher?  
18526 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
18527 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
18528 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
18529 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
18530 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

18531 Mr. Auchincloss?  
18532 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
18533 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
18534 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
18535 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
18536 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
18537 Mr. Menendez?  
18538 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
18539 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
18540 Mr. Mullin?  
18541 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
18542 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
18543 Mr. Landsman?  
18544 [No response.]  
18545 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan?  
18546 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
18547 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
18548 Chairman Guthrie?  
18549 \*The Chair. No.  
18550 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
18551 \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Griffith?  
18552 \*Mr. Joyce. How is Mr. Griffith recorded?  
18553 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith is not recorded.  
18554 \*Mr. Griffith. Griffith votes no.  
18555 \*Mr. Joyce. How is Mr. Carter from Georgia --

18556           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
18557           Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
18558           \*Mr. Joyce.   Mr. Palmer?  
18559           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
18560           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
18561           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
18562           \*Mr. Joyce.   Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
18563           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia is not recorded.  
18564           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Carter votes no.  
18565           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
18566           \*Mr. Joyce.   Dr. Miller-Meeks?  
18567           \*The Clerk.   Dr. Miller-Meeks is not recorded.  
18568           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
18569           \*The Clerk.   Dr. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
18570           \*Mr. Joyce.   Mrs. Fedorchak.  
18571           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak is not recorded.  
18572           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
18573           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Fedorchak votes no.  
18574           \*Mr. Joyce.   Mr. Obernolte?  
18575           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte is not recorded.  
18576           \*Mr. Obernolte.   Obernolte, no.  
18577           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte --  
18578           \*Mr. Joyce.   Mr. Allen?  
18579           \*The Clerk.   -- votes no.  
18580           Mr. Allen is not recorded.

18581           \*Mr. Allen.   No.

18582           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.

18583           \*Mr. Pallone.   Landsman.

18584           \*Mr. Joyce.   Mr. Landsman?

18585           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman is not recorded.

18586           \*Mr. Landsman.   Yes.

18587           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

18588           \*Mr. Pallone.   Has Menendez voted? Did you vote?

18589           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez is recorded as aye.

18590           \*Mr. Pallone.   I guess that is it.

18591           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the result.

18592           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23

18593 ayes and 28 noes.

18594           \*Mr. Joyce.   [Presiding] The amendment is not agreed to.

18595 Are there any further amendments?

18596           The gentleman from --

18597           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Mr. Chairman, I have an

18598 amendment at the desk.

18599           \*Mr. Joyce.   -- Louisiana is recognized.

18600           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Mr. Chairman, I have an

18601 amendment at the desk, AMD\_008.

18602           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, could the gentleman specify

18603 if that is FCD-AMD\_008?

18604           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Yes, that is correct.

18605           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the amendment.

18606           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. FCD-AMD --  
18607           \*The Clerk. FCD-AMD\_008, an amendment offered by Mr.  
18608 Carter of Louisiana. Add at the end the following. Section,  
18609 Conditional Effectiveness. This subtitle and the amendments  
18610 made --  
18611           \*Mr. Joyce. Without objection, he reading of the  
18612 amendment is dispensed with.  
18613           [The amendment of Mr. Carter of Louisiana follows:]  
18614  
18615           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*  
18616

18617           \*Mr. Joyce. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
18618 minutes in support of the amendment.

18619           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

18620           My amendment states that 100 percent of any reduction in  
18621 state expenditures resulting from reduced enrollment must be  
18622 reinvested to provide medical assistance to individuals  
18623 eligible for Medicaid, including people who need home and  
18624 community-based services. That means that this money would  
18625 go to children, mothers, people with disabilities, and the  
18626 elderly, instead of going to tax cuts for billionaires and  
18627 multinational corporations.

18628           My Republican friends say they want to help the people  
18629 that Medicaid was "intended for" and people who need it  
18630 most. And to that I say, put your money where your mouth is.  
18631 But we all know that they won't, because they are beholden to  
18632 Mr. Musk and Mr. Trump and the tax cuts that they promised,  
18633 because it has never been about helping people or reforming  
18634 Medicaid. It has never been about curbing waste, fraud, and  
18635 abuse. We are all for curbing waste, fraud, and abuse. It  
18636 has always been about stripping away health care from the  
18637 working poor to fill the pockets of high-paid, rich donors.  
18638 It has always been about enriching billionaires while ripping  
18639 away people's health care and gutting critical services like  
18640 those provided through Medicaid's home and community-based  
18641 services program.



18642           The home and community-based services program allows  
18643 seniors and people with disabilities to receive services like  
18644 bathing, medication management, and food preparation in the  
18645 comfort of their own homes or communities. In Louisiana,  
18646 over 11,400 people are eligible and are on a waiting list for  
18647 Medicaid home and community-based services. Let me say that  
18648 again. In Louisiana over 11,400 people are eligible and are  
18649 on a waiting list for Medicaid home and community-based  
18650 services.

18651           Under this plan, that number will continue to grow as  
18652 Medicaid and home and community-based services are put on the  
18653 chopping block. Medicaid, and specifically the home and  
18654 community-based services, play a crucial role in providing  
18655 lifesaving care for millions of Americans in Louisiana. It  
18656 is essential that we continue to uplift this program and the  
18657 impact that it has had on those who rely on it most,  
18658 including my constituents Katie and Connor Corcoran, who you  
18659 met earlier today.

18660           We have joined here today to do something for the  
18661 people, not to take away from the people. For Katie and  
18662 Connor, Medicaid's home and community-based service program  
18663 means life for their child. It means the ability to care for  
18664 him 24/7 while both parents are still working. As I shared  
18665 with the committee earlier, when Connor was first diagnosed  
18666 his physicians warned his parents that his life was extremely

18667 fragile, and there was a high chance that he would not  
18668 survive childhood. His Medicaid coverage is the reason he is  
18669 able to live and to see his high school graduation day on May  
18670 7 of this year.

18671         My amendment is about making sure that these funds go  
18672 toward helping more families like Connor and Katie's. This  
18673 amendment isn't just about one family. Katie's family never  
18674 thought that they would need Medicaid. We are all one event  
18675 away from needing the help from one another and neighbors and  
18676 Medicaid to assist us to get through.

18677         I urge my colleagues to join me in preventing these  
18678 attacks on the people that need health care the most. If the  
18679 true goal here today is to protect Medicaid, there should be  
18680 no opposition to my amendment. I urge my colleagues to vote  
18681 yes on my amendment. And if they don't, I would like to know  
18682 why they feel the need to hide behind an untruth, this  
18683 untruth that they are helping the most vulnerable in our  
18684 communities, when in reality they are devastating them the  
18685 most.

18686         We know that the pain that will come from these cuts are  
18687 real. But if we are true that every dollar that is cut will  
18688 go back into Medicaid to make it better, to make it stronger,  
18689 to make it more efficient, to truly serve more people that  
18690 need it, then this is an amendment that should fly out of  
18691 here with no objection.

18692 Mr. Chairman, I yield.

18693 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. I recognize myself  
18694 for five minutes.

18695 This amendment demands any reduction in Federal spending  
18696 as a result of this bill would be wholly offset by a  
18697 subsequent increase in Federal spending. This is in face of  
18698 Medicaid spending that has continued to increase unchecked  
18699 for decades. Federal and state governments spent \$759  
18700 billion on Medicaid last year, and are projected to spend  
18701 \$812 billion this year. This annual figure could reach \$1.1  
18702 trillion by 2035.

18703 We must take steps today to bend the cost curve for  
18704 Medicaid to ensure that it remains stronger, to ensure that  
18705 it remains more stable for the future generations. This bill  
18706 will prevent future gaming of money laundering schemes that  
18707 shift these increasing costs onto the Federal Government.  
18708 These are important steps to be taken today. These steps  
18709 need to ensure that this critical program is stronger for the  
18710 future. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose this  
18711 amendment.

18712 And I yield back. Are there any further --

18713 \*Mr. Pallone. We are okay. Roll call.

18714 \*Mr. Joyce. Seeing none, the gentleman requests a  
18715 recorded vote. The clerk --

18716 \*Mr. Pallone. So Ruiz isn't --

18717           \*Mr. Joyce. I am sorry?

18718           \*Mr. Pallone. Yes, a recorded --

18719           \*Voice. Mr. Tonko, he is asking to be recognized.

18720           \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Tonko, do you want to be recognized?

18721           \*Mr. Tonko. Yes.

18722           \*Mr. Pallone. I am sorry.

18723           \*The Chair. For what purpose does the gentleman seek  
18724 recognition?

18725           \*Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last word.

18726           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman is recognized.

18727           \*Mr. Tonko. Mr. Chair, members of the majority may not  
18728 be interested in defending their cuts to Medicaid, but I  
18729 believe their constituents still have a right to have their  
18730 voices heard as part of this debate, including the people of  
18731 New York's 23rd district that have relied upon and benefitted  
18732 from Medicaid.

18733           I can't share the name per the rules of this committee,  
18734 but I should tell you something. Republicans are so  
18735 terrified that they will have to answer to their constituents  
18736 that we can't name other members.

18737           Every single Medicaid recipient in New York's 23rd  
18738 district will be impacted by the clawing back of the 10  
18739 percent FMAP match. Let me repeat that. Every single  
18740 constituent from the 23rd district who relies on Medicaid  
18741 will be impacted by this cut to Medicaid. Whether it is

18742 reduced benefits or completely losing coverage, no one will  
18743 be spared.

18744 I would like to share several stories from constituents  
18745 of a colleague here who can't be named from the 23rd  
18746 district. Their stories deserve to be heard, and so I am  
18747 proud to share them, as I was asked to, with every member of  
18748 the committee.

18749 In New York's 23rd district, 193,200 people are covered  
18750 by Medicaid. The first one comes from Julie from Hamburg. I  
18751 am writing today not -- and I quote her -- "I am writing  
18752 today not as a policy expert, but as a mother, a community  
18753 worker, and someone who knows firsthand what it means to fall  
18754 through the cracks. In 2023 I lost my job after becoming  
18755 seriously ill. I was homeless for three months, struggling  
18756 to survive while trying to keep life as stable as possible  
18757 for my daughter. It was Medicaid that allowed me to access  
18758 care and begin to heal. Without it, I wouldn't have  
18759 recovered. Without it, I wouldn't be here today doing the  
18760 work I love.' '

18761 "Now I work at the Saints Peter and Paul Outreach and  
18762 Food Pantry in Hamburg, where I serve families every day who  
18763 are facing the same impossible choices I once did between  
18764 rent and medication, food and gas, groceries and a doctor  
18765 visit. And I still rely on Medicaid to keep myself and my  
18766 daughter healthy. If I were to lose Medicaid, it would

18767 jeopardize the fragile stability I have worked so hard to  
18768 rebuild.'`

18769 "As someone living with a significant disability, my  
18770 access to essential treatment, therapy, and medications would  
18771 be sharply limited, or it would disappear altogether.  
18772 Without care, I could easily slip back into crisis, unable to  
18773 work, parent, or maintain my health. For people like me,  
18774 Medicaid isn't extra help, it indeed is survival.'`

18775 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

18776 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. Is there any further  
18777 discussion?

18778 The gentlelady is recognized.

18779 \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chair, I  
18780 move to strike the last word.

18781 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady is recognized.

18782 \*Ms. Clarke. I would like to build on the support  
18783 expressed for constituents in New York's 23rd district who  
18784 have been -- who have benefitted from Medicaid by sharing an  
18785 additional story that highlights its impact.

18786 From Chemung County, residents demand local leaders  
18787 oppose possible safety -- social safety net cuts. I would  
18788 like to enter into the record the WSK Public Broadcasting of  
18789 March 12, 2025.

18790 \*Mr. Joyce. So ordered.

18791

18792           [The information follows:]

18793

18794       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

18795

18796           \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you.

18797           Megan Astrahot spoke to the legislature as a business  
18798 owner, health care worker, and a mother. She is an  
18799 independent voter, and voted for Congressman Langworthy in  
18800 November, but said she now regrets that choice. "I spoke  
18801 with him," said Astrahot. "Did I like everything he had to  
18802 say? Definitely not. I don't like anything any politician  
18803 has to say, in whole. But his values and what he supported  
18804 led me to believe that he would be a stop-gap. He is  
18805 definitely not a stop-gap."

18806           Astrahot, a registered nurse in Chemung County, is  
18807 worried about the possibility of job losses for caretakers  
18808 and healthcare workers, should Medicaid be cut, along with  
18809 the services that come with those jobs. In 2024, there were  
18810 nearly 7,000 jobs in health care and social services in  
18811 Chemung County, according to the Southern Tier Economic  
18812 Growth. In January, Medicaid enrollment in Chemung County  
18813 was 36 percent of the population, according to the most  
18814 recent population data from the U.S. Census Bureau. Medicaid  
18815 enrollment in the county in 2024, which is the most recent  
18816 data available, was 25 percent of the population.

18817           Does my Republican colleague from New York have anything  
18818 to say to one of your constituents, Megan?

18819           Well, I guess not, because he is not here.

18820           Well, we can say that cruelty is the point.



18821           Thank you, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

18822           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentlewoman  
18823 from New York is recognized.

18824           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I would like to speak to also  
18825 reiterate the points made by my colleagues from New York,  
18826 particularly around New York's 23rd district, which we know  
18827 and see have over 300,000 people in the Finger Lakes who rely  
18828 on Medicaid for their insurance. In fact, in a 2021  
18829 assessment, Corning found that 45,000 people in Chemung and  
18830 Steuben Counties have state Medicaid, while just one regional  
18831 dental provider accepts Medicaid coverage. Many residents  
18832 travel long distances to receive care or go without care.

18833           And we know that the representation and what we have  
18834 seen here understands that rural hospitals are at risk and  
18835 that rural hospitals require protection in the face of  
18836 Medicaid cuts. But we have a constituent of New York's 23rd  
18837 district who has reached out and asked us to amplify this  
18838 story. Her name is Laura. Laura says, "I have three clients  
18839 on Medicaid. I am their aide. One is 85 and nearly blind.  
18840 Another is 39 with brain and stomach cancer. The third is 73  
18841 and had a stroke. She can only use one arm. If Medicaid is  
18842 cut, they will lose their personal care aide and I will lose  
18843 my job. So many poor people would be left without health  
18844 care. And frankly, without it, they would die.'`

18845           Now, I know many of my colleagues on the other side of

18846 the aisle think that this is all hyperbole and exaggeration,  
18847 but we have seen from the provisions regarding nursing home  
18848 staffing that the danger is very much real, and many people  
18849 have their life and their health put at risk because of  
18850 insufficient nurse staffing ratios and other conditions in  
18851 nursing homes that would be impacted by Medicaid funding  
18852 levels.

18853 And with that I yield back.

18854 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. Is there any  
18855 further discussion?

18856 The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five  
18857 minutes.

18858 \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I want to thank my  
18859 colleague from Louisiana for introducing this amendment  
18860 because it really gets at what we have been discussing this  
18861 entire evening -- morning -- which is that, if the idea is to  
18862 make -- enhance Medicaid and make it better for the people  
18863 that rely on it, then this amendment would do exactly that.

18864 Any money that the state has from folks who are no  
18865 longer enrolled in Medicaid would go back into the system to  
18866 make the program better for people. And this is the point  
18867 that Democrats have been making this entire hearing, is that  
18868 we hear from our friends across the aisle that they want to  
18869 improve and strengthen Medicaid. Well, any savings that  
18870 either the Federal Government or states have should be

18871       reinvested into the program.

18872               You know, everyone that we hear from back home and all  
18873 of my colleagues from New York on this side of the aisle were  
18874 speaking to, they rely on Medicaid. And any additional funds  
18875 we can put into Medicaid would improve the program, make life  
18876 easier for them, make it -- make health care more accessible.  
18877 And that is exactly was what, as a Congress and as a  
18878 committee, we should be striving to do. There are 5  
18879 colleagues across the aisle who have over 200,000 people in  
18880 their district who are covered by Medicaid. There is a  
18881 colleague across the aisle who has over 300,000 people in  
18882 their district covered by Medicaid. The more people in your  
18883 district covered by Medicaid, the more I think you would want  
18884 to improve the program.

18885               So we can absolutely work together. But the way to show  
18886 some good faith is by supporting Mr. Individual from  
18887 Louisiana, because his amendment does exactly that. So let's  
18888 put the partisanship aside. Let's do what is right for all  
18889 of our constituents, whether they are in red or blue  
18890 districts, and make sure that we are reinvesting any savings,  
18891 any savings back into the program that so many people rely on  
18892 that we all care so much for. This should be a very easy yes  
18893 for everyone in this committee.

18894               I look forward to everyone supporting this amendment,  
18895 especially those 5 members across the aisle who have over

18896 200,000 constituents who are covered by Medicaid, especially  
18897 for that individual across the aisle who has over 300,000  
18898 constituents covered by Medicaid. I have to believe, for the  
18899 six of them, this is an obvious yes. I look forward to their  
18900 support for Mr. Carter's amendment.

18901 And I yield back.

18902 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The chair recognizes  
18903 the gentlelady from Florida.

18904 \*Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I oppose the  
18905 amendment, and want to take a moment to address some of the  
18906 misinformation being promulgated about our Republican  
18907 proposals to reform Medicaid.

18908 Let's be clear. The idea that Republicans are ending  
18909 Medicaid coverage for those in need is a myth. That  
18910 narrative is not based in fact. These reforms are about  
18911 preserving Medicaid for the people who truly need it:  
18912 seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families,  
18913 making sure that this program can continue to serve them for  
18914 generations to come.

18915 In my district, Florida's 15th, we have hard-working  
18916 families, children, and elderly neighbors who rely on  
18917 Medicaid for essential care. They are not asking for a  
18918 handout. They are asking for a system that works, that is  
18919 fiscally sustainable and solvent, and one that can ensure  
18920 that care is available when they need it most. And that is

18921 exactly what Republican reforms aim to deliver.

18922         What we are proposing are common-sense improvements,  
18923 restoring work requirements for able-bodied adults without  
18924 dependents, modernizing systems to prevent fraud and abuse,  
18925 and ending misdirected payments to those who are deceased or  
18926 who are not eligible for the program. These reforms are not  
18927 about taking something away. They are about protecting the  
18928 integrity of the program so that the people we represent,  
18929 those who truly need this support, can count on it to be  
18930 there now and in the future. Our reforms are about restoring  
18931 integrity to the system and ensuring that it works for the  
18932 long haul.

18933         So that is the real conversation that we should have  
18934 been having all night long, one that is grounded in facts and  
18935 grounded in good faith, about how to strengthen Medicaid, not  
18936 some story untethered from reality used to scare people with  
18937 baseless claims. The American people deserve better than  
18938 fiction and scare tactics. They deserve the truth and real  
18939 solutions, and that is what our Republican reforms will  
18940 deliver.

18941         Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

18942         \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentleman from  
18943 Ohio is recognized for five minutes.

18944         \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is where the  
18945 argument sort of goes off the rails.

18946           If you are cutting \$715 billion in Medicaid, people are  
18947 going to lose coverage, including eligible people. They are  
18948 going to lose coverage in part because of the red tape and  
18949 the paperwork. We know that because we have seen it in other  
18950 states, but they are going to lose coverage when states lose  
18951 money. And then, to make matters worse, you are tying the  
18952 hands of states by saying don't touch the provider tax, so  
18953 they don't have money to cover the gap. People will lose  
18954 their health insurance, and these are people who are eligible  
18955 or deserving, people who need it.

18956           The challenge on the waste, fraud, and abuse question is  
18957 we -- the GAO has put out a set of changes that CMS should  
18958 pursue as it relates to waste, fraud, and abuse, and I am  
18959 wondering, on the IT system, which has been a big issue for  
18960 CMS -- this is a question for counsel -- where in the bill  
18961 can I find language that tackles what my colleague just  
18962 mentioned in terms of fixing the IT issues as it relates to  
18963 waste, fraud, and abuse?

18964           \*Counsel. On page 88, line 17 of the AINS there is  
18965 funding for grants to states for systems.

18966           \*Mr. Landsman. But that doesn't take -- that doesn't  
18967 resolve the GAO's recommendation that the CMS changes be  
18968 made, just money for states.

18969           \*Counsel. If the question is in regards to the systems  
18970 that the states run for waste, fraud, and abuse --

18971           \*Mr. Landsman. It was to CMS.

18972           \*Counsel. Then that is -- then that funding is in  
18973 regards to states.

18974           \*Mr. Landsman. Right, so it is not there.

18975           My challenge is that there are several GAO  
18976 recommendations around waste, fraud, and abuse, most of which  
18977 -- or none of which -- is in this bill. I mean, the big  
18978 changes in this bill have to do with paperwork and red tape  
18979 around questions of whether or not people are working. Of  
18980 course, they are working or they can't work. And we know  
18981 from other states where they have done this, people just give  
18982 up or they lose their health care, even though they are  
18983 eligible. The cuts to states and then the provider -- or the  
18984 not allowing states to change the provider tax.

18985           The last one -- and I will stop -- the requiring of a  
18986 new fee -- I guess this is a question for my colleague,  
18987 because you mentioned waste, fraud, and abuse, and  
18988 modernizing the system. I am still so unclear on the fee for  
18989 low-income families. I don't know, my colleague -- I can't  
18990 address her by name, I just -- maybe I will just -- the  
18991 chair, because the person sitting in the chair when I asked  
18992 last didn't have an answer.

18993           I don't understand why the fee. And I know that people  
18994 watching who now on Medicaid are going to have to pay an  
18995 extra fee for all kinds of services they get. Why is there a

18996 fee for low-income people that goes to pay for tax cuts?

18997 That is not modernizing the system. That is not money going  
18998 back into the system. That is not waste, fraud, and abuse.  
18999 What is the purpose of that new fee?

19000 [Pause.]

19001 \*Voice. If you could, ask him to clarify which --

19002 \*Mr. Joyce. Could you please clarify specifically which  
19003 fees you are addressing?

19004 \*Mr. Landsman. Yes, the fees that you all are adding  
19005 for folks on Medicaid, \$16,000 a year, \$18,000 a year, low-  
19006 income families that now have to pay an additional fee for  
19007 any number of --

19008 \*Ms. DeGette. Is the gentleman referring to the \$35  
19009 co-pay?

19010 \*Mr. Landsman. Yes, any time, every time. I mean, I  
19011 just don't -- like, that is not money going back into the  
19012 system. I am -- genuinely, I don't understand that one. And  
19013 I suspect people who are about to be charged more money every  
19014 time they interact with the healthcare system -- for what?  
19015 What is the point?

19016 \*Mr. Joyce. Your time has expired. The gentleman from  
19017 New York is recognized.

19018 \*Mr. Landsman. No answer.

19019 \*Mr. Griffith. I got it.

19020 \*Mr. Langworthy. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.



19021           \*Mr. Griffith. Never mind.

19022           \*Mr. Langworthy. You know, we have heard an awful lot  
19023 of noise here in this chamber today -- yesterday. But  
19024 ultimately, it seems like my colleagues on the other side of  
19025 the aisle are looking to die on two hills which aren't  
19026 extreme proposals. These are basic principles. If you are  
19027 able-bodied and you have no dependents and you are receiving  
19028 taxpayer-funded Medicaid, you should be expected to work,  
19029 look for work, or enroll in job training. And if you are in  
19030 this country illegally, you should not be receiving a single  
19031 dollar of Medicaid benefits, period, hard stop. These are  
19032 not radical ideas, they are common-sense and they are proven.

19033           In fact, back in the 1990s, Democrat President Bill  
19034 Clinton, he worked with Congress to reform welfare by  
19035 requiring work from able-bodied adults. It was wildly  
19036 successful. Employment went up, dependency went down, and  
19037 Americans believed in the system again. Now Democrats  
19038 pretend that those same ideas that were so successful in that  
19039 era are heartless. But we have to stop looking at work as  
19040 punishment. It is an empowerment. A job brings dignity. It  
19041 brings pride, self-reliance. If you can work, if you are  
19042 able-bodied and you don't have dependents in your home, you  
19043 should. And taxpayers shouldn't be subsidizing those who  
19044 simply choose not to contribute.

19045           And let's address what we saw in this hearing room.

19046 Democrats have staged a grand performance, bringing in  
19047 disabled individuals as props to push a false narrative.  
19048 Their staff had them convinced that we were cutting  
19049 traditional Medicaid, the statutory population, and they were  
19050 wrong. It was exploitative and it was dishonest, and it has  
19051 been dishonest.

19052         Let's be clear. Not one disabled person is at risk of  
19053 losing Medicaid under this legislation, not one. This has  
19054 been six months of fearmongering: Democratic Members of  
19055 Congress, governors, U.S. Senators telling groups of seniors  
19056 and vulnerable Americans that they are in danger. They are  
19057 not. This isn't about cutting care, it is about restoring  
19058 credibility to this system. We are protecting Medicaid for  
19059 those that it was intended to serve, not for able-bodied  
19060 adults that refuse to get into the workforce, and certainly  
19061 not for illegal immigrants who have no legal right to these  
19062 benefits because, yes, illegal immigrants are burdening the  
19063 system. They do that very much so in our State of New York.  
19064 And every dollar spent on someone here unlawfully is a dollar  
19065 denied to a law-abiding citizen in need. That is not  
19066 compassion. It is theft from working families.

19067         If we do nothing, Medicaid will collapse under its own  
19068 weight. That is not speculation. It is basic math. We will  
19069 not apologize for expecting work in exchange for benefits.  
19070 President Clinton didn't, and neither should we. We will not

19071 ignore fraud or allow public benefits to go to those who  
19072 broke the law to be here, and we will not be lectured by  
19073 those who use fear and stagecraft to defend a broken and  
19074 unsustainable system. This is about fundamental fairness,  
19075 sustainability, and integrity. Let's act accordingly.

19076 Thank you, and I --

19077 \*Mr. Griffith. Will the gentleman yield?

19078 \*Mr. Langworthy. I yield back to the chairman.

19079 \*Mr. Griffith. Will the gentleman yield?

19080 \*Mr. Langworthy. I yield back to the chairman.

19081 \*Mr. Griffith. Oh, come on, I am one of your guys.

19082 [Laughter.]

19083 \*Mr. Langworthy. All right.

19084 \*Mr. Griffith. Put your glasses on.

19085 \*Mr. Langworthy. I couldn't see you, Morgan.

19086 \*Mr. Griffith. I understand.

19087 \*Mr. Langworthy. Sure.

19088 \*Mr. Griffith. Would the gentleman yield?

19089 \*Mr. Langworthy. I would be happy to yield a minute.

19090 \*Mr. Griffith. All right, I appreciate it. All right.

19091 Let me answer the gentleman from Ohio's question.

19092 The bill allows for a copay. In fact, it mandates that  
19093 there be a copay for those people on Medicaid expansion only  
19094 who have a 100 to 133 percent of the poverty level. The  
19095 state sets the amount somewhere between \$1 with a maximum of

19096     \$35. So my colleagues on the other side keep saying it is  
19097     \$35. It could be, depending on the state. That money, as I  
19098     understand it, goes to the state to help offset their costs  
19099     in the Medicaid expansion program if they choose to do that.

19100           This is not the only Federal program that has a copay,  
19101     and let me explain theory behind it. And you can disagree  
19102     with it, but here is the general thought. When you get to  
19103     that level you are eligible for the Medicaid expansion in the  
19104     expansion states, but you are also eligible to get an  
19105     Obamacare plan. But all Obamacare plans have copays. So if  
19106     the state wants to encourage people as they get closer to the  
19107     line to start looking at Obamacare plans, this makes it more  
19108     like an Obamacare plan.

19109           Now, that is up to the state. They can charge the  
19110     nominal amount. In fact, some would argue it could even be  
19111     less than a dollar, as long as it is over zero, but let's go  
19112     with \$1. And it just says that if you are in that area where  
19113     you are getting close to the line -- and a pay raise at work  
19114     probably puts you over the line -- this is going to make it a  
19115     little bit more like Obamacare.

19116           And so that is the reasoning, Mr. Chairman, that this is  
19117     there, and it is a state option between \$1 and 35. Thirty-  
19118     five is the cap.

19119           I yield back. And does the gentleman from New York  
19120     yield back?

19121           \*Mr. Langworthy. I do yield back.

19122           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman yields. The gentlelady from  
19123 Virginia is recognized.

19124           \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

19125           You know, people with disabilities were told under the  
19126 first Trump Administration we are going to let the states put  
19127 work requirements in place, and individuals with disabilities  
19128 aren't going to lose their health insurance, and that turned  
19129 out not to be true. The only examples we have of states that  
19130 imposed Medicaid work requirements ended up kicking people  
19131 with disabilities off of Medicaid, and my colleagues on the  
19132 other side of the aisle have admitted Georgia screwed it up,  
19133 Arkansas screwed it up. But we don't have an example of a  
19134 state that imposed a work requirement that didn't impact  
19135 individuals with disabilities. So they have seen this script  
19136 before. That is why they are skeptical.

19137           We keep hearing this bill is to make sure that Medicaid  
19138 stays sustainable. But if that were the case, we would adopt  
19139 the amendment from the gentleman from Louisiana because any  
19140 savings should be invested in actually ensuring that the  
19141 costs that are increasing under Medicaid the most are  
19142 addressed. And that is the cost of long-term care, seniors,  
19143 individuals with disabilities because they have much more  
19144 complex needs.

19145           This bill does not invest in long-term care facilities.

19146 This bill does not invest in long-term care facility  
19147 workforce. This bill does not invest in driving down the  
19148 cost of prescription drugs in a meaningful way. This bill  
19149 does not do anything to ensure that any of the savings that  
19150 the states or the Federal Government sees gets reinvested in  
19151 the program.

19152 And this bill is happening in a larger context where NIH  
19153 research that helps fund R&D for new treatments and new drugs  
19154 is being cut, making it that much more difficult for them to  
19155 do that unless companies invest their own work -- funds in,  
19156 which then they are going to want to recover their R&D costs.  
19157 This bill is happening in the larger context of other cuts  
19158 that the states are going to have to backfill, and all of  
19159 that is being ignored in this bill, and all of that is being  
19160 ignored in the talking points of my colleagues that says we  
19161 are going to save Medicaid by addressing undocumented  
19162 immigrants getting care, a very small percentage of able-  
19163 bodied people who are not working.

19164 There is not enough money there to make Medicaid long-  
19165 term sustainable if we are not addressing the underlying  
19166 increased costs of care for seniors, individuals with  
19167 disabilities as the population continues to age, as the  
19168 population continues to have these complex medical  
19169 conditions, as you continue to have people living in areas  
19170 where they get pollution. We have -- this bill cuts funding

19171 to address that.

19172       So you will forgive us for being skeptical when the  
19173 context of what we are doing this bill on is to fund tax  
19174 cuts. That is what the resolution that congressional  
19175 Republicans passed, I don't know, a month or two ago said,  
19176 find 880 billion in cuts to fund tax cuts, not to make  
19177 investments in Medicaid, not to make investments in our  
19178 public safety infrastructure, not to make investments in  
19179 cybersecurity, not to make investments in addressing AI  
19180 needs, not to make investments in environmental  
19181 sustainability, energy sustainability, or anything else, but  
19182 to fund tax cuts. So forgive our skepticism that this bill  
19183 is actually going to do anything to long-term -- make  
19184 Medicaid more long-term sustainable when what it is really  
19185 going to do is cause 13.7 million people to lose health  
19186 insurance.

19187       Between what this bill is doing and the failure to  
19188 extend the tax cuts, 13.7 people will lose health insurance.  
19189 That will cause costs to go up for everybody else. And this  
19190 bill is doing nothing to address that, either.

19191       I yield back.

19192       \*Mr. Joyce. The gentlelady yields. The gentleman from  
19193 Massachusetts is recognized.

19194       \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you. Chairman. The gentleman  
19195 from New York made a couple of claims, one about work

19196 requirements and the other about individuals with  
19197 disabilities that I wanted to respond to.

19198         First on work requirements. So I will just put forward  
19199 as a premise I think the best social program is a job. I  
19200 absolutely agree in the dignity of a job and of work, and I  
19201 think you would find on this side of the aisle a lot of  
19202 agreement with that premise. And actually, the last three  
19203 Democratic presidents under their tenure have created a lot  
19204 more jobs than the three contemporaneous Republican  
19205 President. So Democrats like work and Democrats, when we are  
19206 in charge, see more jobs get created.

19207         The challenge that you have is the work requirements  
19208 that you are talking about are not work requirements, they  
19209 are paperwork requirements. And if you don't believe me, you  
19210 should believe Luke Seaborn. And I am reading this from  
19211 ProPublica. Luke Seaborn was a 54-year-old from rural  
19212 Jefferson in Georgia, became the de facto face of Georgia  
19213 Pathways to Coverage, which was the governor's insurance  
19214 program for impoverished Georgians. Luke Seaborn was a  
19215 mechanic, earned a minimal salary, and he said, "I used to  
19216 think of pathways as a blessing. Now I am done with it,"  
19217 because his benefits were canceled twice due to bureaucratic  
19218 red tape.

19219         So here is my question for the gentleman from New York.  
19220 Someone like Mr. Seaborn, who gets canceled from Medicaid



19221 because of the paperwork requirements -- not his own fault,  
19222 he is working -- then he can't join the ACA exchanges. So  
19223 when he gets sick, what is he supposed to do?

19224 I will yield my time to the gentleman from New York.  
19225 Does he go to the emergency room? Because that costs a lot  
19226 more money.

19227 \*Mr. Langworthy. You live in as blue a state as I do.  
19228 You don't trust that your state can manage this program?

19229 We have an IRS that literally can track a \$600 Venmo  
19230 transaction, but you don't think that we can track a work  
19231 requirement? You have that little faith in our government to  
19232 handle this task at hand?

19233 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Just ask Mr. Seaborn. I mean, he is  
19234 living in the state --

19235 \*Mr. Langworthy. I mean, you just come with story after  
19236 sob story after sob story on how it fails. But you don't  
19237 come with any solutions as to how do we lift people out of  
19238 out of dependency on government, cradle to grave. I mean,  
19239 you all love Obamacare the most, but it broke Medicaid.

19240 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Reclaiming my time, I literally  
19241 didn't hear an answer from Mr. Seaborn, who does not have  
19242 access to Medicaid, does not have access to the Affordable  
19243 Care Act. He gets sick. What is he supposed to do? He goes  
19244 -- I will tell you what he is going to do. I will answer the  
19245 question myself. He goes to the emergency room. It costs

19246 somewhere between 8 to 10 times more money. And you know who  
19247 pays for that? People who get insurance through their  
19248 employer. Everybody in the middle class is going to see a  
19249 price hike because of these paperwork requirements.

19250 I want to move now to the other point that the gentleman  
19251 from New York made, which was about individuals with  
19252 disabilities. Apparently, we are fearmongering on this side  
19253 of the aisle, but here is the thing. Most of the optional  
19254 spending that states have under Medicaid goes for home and  
19255 community-based services, for individuals with disabilities,  
19256 at-home care, dignity-providing care for the elderly, for  
19257 people with profound autism, for people who need help with  
19258 the activities of daily living.

19259 When we crush these states by taking \$780 billion out of  
19260 their health care coverage, they are going to have to pull  
19261 back on home and community-based services. That is going to  
19262 affect families taking care of individuals with disabilities,  
19263 and the disability community knows that. They have seen this  
19264 before. They saw this over the last 15 years, that every  
19265 time Republicans try to take health care away it is the  
19266 individuals with disabilities and it is the elderly who end  
19267 up paying first for it.

19268 So my question for you, for this gentleman from New York  
19269 is, can you guarantee that no one with a disability or who is  
19270 elderly is going to lose access to home and community-based

19271 services because of this bill?

19272 \*Mr. Langworthy. No one is going to lose their coverage  
19273 because a state --

19274 \*Mr. Auchincloss. I didn't ask about coverage. Home  
19275 and community-based care, will they lose access to at-home  
19276 care, dignity-providing care?

19277 \*Mr. Langworthy. We have absolutely protected the  
19278 traditional population in this -- in -- of who Medicaid was  
19279 designed in statute to protect.

19280 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Yes, individuals with disabilities  
19281 and the elderly --

19282 \*Mr. Langworthy. Yes.

19283 \*Mr. Auchincloss. -- who get at-home care right now.

19284 \*Mr. Langworthy. And every dollar that goes for any of  
19285 these other categories goes away from that population, and  
19286 you know it.

19287 \*Mr. Auchincloss. So -- but are you saying that you are  
19288 guaranteeing that home and community-based services will not  
19289 be cut?

19290 I will actually direct this to the chairman of the  
19291 committee. Does the chairman of the committee want to put  
19292 forward that home and community-based services, long-term  
19293 services and supports for the elderly or for those with --

19294 \*The Chair. We have absolutely protected traditional  
19295 Medicaid. States make those decisions, what they do.

19296           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Ah --

19297           \*The Chair. We are leaving states with the money. We  
19298 are leaving them with a hold harmless. So --

19299           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Mr. Chairman, you are leaving states  
19300 with --

19301           \*The Chair. I mean, I trust my state --

19302           \*Mr. Auchincloss. -- an impossible trade-off.

19303           \*The Chair. -- is going to do that. I trust that the  
19304 Commonwealth of Kentucky is going to continue its process. I  
19305 have read -- put a letter in the record what our hospital  
19306 said, because they know the truth of this bill. And you can  
19307 say it all you want, but you are -- it is just not accurate,  
19308 what you are saying.

19309           \*Mr. Auchincloss. It is not accurate that home and  
19310 community-based services are going to get pulled back? That  
19311 is --

19312           \*Mr. Joyce. The time has --

19313           \*Mr. Auchincloss. That is --

19314           \*Mr. Joyce. The time --

19315           \*The Chair. You are saying that your states are going  
19316 to do that. I would say my state is not going to do that.

19317           \*Mr. Auchincloss. We shall see.

19318           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman's time has expired. Is there  
19319 any further discussion?

19320           \*Mr. Pallone. I ask for a roll call.

19321           \*Mr. Joyce. Seeing none, the vote occurs -- the  
19322 gentlelady from New York is recognized.

19323           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I think, even when indulging the  
19324 logic of kicking, shifting, transferring, moving people off  
19325 of Medicaid, whatever word we want to use, what is the logic  
19326 once you take someone off of Medicaid -- what is the logic  
19327 behind preventing them from purchasing an ACA plan at their  
19328 income level?

19329           Okay, you know, all right, you have determined that  
19330 someone is not eligible. You don't want them to be on, so  
19331 you kick them off of Medicaid, and now they can't even buy it  
19332 on their own on the ACA schedule. I mean, at this point,  
19333 then, what you are doing is you are taking someone who is  
19334 like, say, a single mom, kicking them off of Medicaid if you  
19335 determine that there is an ineligibility there, and then she  
19336 has to somehow pay full freight and not be able to take ACA  
19337 subsidies on that?

19338           I mean, you are leaving people on the street. That is  
19339 what this is, putting people on the street, a single mom.

19340           You know, I bought -- I had to buy my health care off  
19341 the exchange when I was a waitress. It cost hundreds of  
19342 dollars a month, could not -- barely afford it. That was  
19343 with the subsidy. Trying to pay that thing full freight, you  
19344 are making people uninsured. I just don't understand the  
19345 logic of if you are going to say someone should be self-

19346 sufficient and you kick them off of Medicaid, why then  
19347 prevent them from buying in on their own two feet.

19348 Or can any of my Republican colleagues kind of  
19349 illuminate the logic behind that?

19350 \*The Chair. Would the gentlelady yield?

19351 So a single mom with a dependent is exempted in our  
19352 bill.

19353 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. But say you have someone, you know,  
19354 let's say she is in that income bracket. Let's say she is  
19355 not exempt, right? Or let's say you have an individual, even  
19356 if she is not a single mom, an individual who is not exempt,  
19357 but you kick them off of Medicaid and you prevent them from  
19358 buying into the ACA plan that is affordable at their income  
19359 level.

19360 \*The Chair. I am trying to think of your -- I am sorry,  
19361 gentlelady, your example -- so again, if they are not  
19362 eligible for Medicaid, where would they go if they are --

19363 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. To my understanding, if someone is  
19364 kicked off the Medicaid rolls --

19365 \*The Chair. Because they are -- make too much money?

19366 I mean, why would they -- because a single mom would be  
19367 on --

19368 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Let's say a single woman, let's say  
19369 a single woman.

19370 \*Ms. DeGette. Would the gentlelady yield?

19371           \*The Chair. A single woman that is working, that is  
19372 eligible to work?

19373           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Let's say she is working -- let's  
19374 say she is deemed -- she is one of these individuals that --  
19375 one of the 7.6 million people that are deemed ineligible for  
19376 Medicaid. They would be also ineligible to buy into the ACA,  
19377 correct?

19378           \*The Chair. Well, so you got the 7.6, either they are  
19379 ineligible for Medicaid -- if they are eligible for Medicaid,  
19380 there would only be the work requirement. So if they worked  
19381 they wouldn't lose Medicaid. And then the other one would be  
19382 if they were not legal presence here. So they would still be  
19383 eligible to buy into the ACA. I know another committee is  
19384 working on that program. I can't answer that question  
19385 exactly --

19386           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. But it wouldn't be at the  
19387 subsidized rate. It would have to be full freight.

19388           \*The Chair. It depends on what -- I mean, I know  
19389 another committee is working on that jurisdiction. I can't  
19390 answer that question for you, but -- unless somebody here  
19391 could.

19392           But I know that the scenario you first rose, they  
19393 shouldn't lose their Medicaid under this bill.

19394           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. And see, for a work requirement the  
19395 retrospective on looking backwards on this, I have heard

19396 different things between states could look back several  
19397 months and if a person is -- has a spotty employment record  
19398 on that month, it seems like it -- as though it would be  
19399 unclear what the standard would be on whether they meet the  
19400 work requirement or not. Is that --

19401 \*The Chair. I am not --

19402 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Is there --

19403 \*The Chair. I mean, with that, I will get back with you  
19404 on that, I have to see. But I don't think so, because the  
19405 idea is if they are engaged -- they don't even have to be  
19406 working, they could be education -- we want people to move  
19407 up, that is all we want. I know we all do. So engaged in --  
19408 if they can't find work, volunteer. Like, there was some  
19409 question about what about -- now we go up to 64 --

19410 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. So say -- and so say, for example,  
19411 like many of the instances that we have seen, this creates a  
19412 lot of a bureaucratic burden. Someone's letter gets sent,  
19413 and their address isn't on the thing, they are not able to  
19414 fill it in on time, they get bumped off of Medicaid. If  
19415 someone is bumped off for whatever reason, it seems as though  
19416 they are prevented from being able to buy into the ACA at the  
19417 subsidized rate for their income level.

19418 \*The Chair. I don't know of anyone that would be  
19419 prevented from -- I don't know the answer about the ACA.  
19420 That is -- unless you are talking about the premium tax



19421 credits, which -- I don't know the answer to that.

19422 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Would you like me to yield to you?

19423 \*Ms. DeGette. I would -- thank you, if the gentlelady  
19424 would yield, there is only three -- so if -- Mr. Chairman, if  
19425 you don't think anybody would be bumped off, then why would  
19426 you have that provision in the bill?

19427 \*Mr. Joyce. The time has expired.

19428 \*Mr. Pallone. Mr. Chairman? Oh, I have got some bills  
19429 over here.

19430 \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman from New Jersey is  
19431 recognized.

19432 \*Mr. Pallone. I just wanted to say to Ms. Ocasio-  
19433 Cortez, there is a very simple reason why -- there is a very  
19434 simple reason for this, to my colleague from New York -- I  
19435 know I am not supposed to mention names -- and it is because  
19436 the CBO assumed exactly what you said, that if I am kicked  
19437 off Medicaid because I didn't file the paperwork -- you know,  
19438 which is, of course, what CBO says is the main reason why  
19439 people are going to be kicked off, not because they are not  
19440 eligible, but because they didn't meet -- they forgot to --  
19441 you know, they didn't get through the red tape, they missed  
19442 it, they went back and saw that they worked, you know, three  
19443 years ago, even if they are working now, all the different  
19444 reasons that are being -- they weren't able to meet the  
19445 exceptions of, you know, that they were pregnant or some of

19446 the other things that are exceptions because they couldn't  
19447 figure out how to justify that or provide the paperwork for  
19448 that, whatever it is. Then they would -- the CBO would  
19449 assume that they would naturally then go to the ACA  
19450 marketplace, the exchange, and buy a subsidized policy, and  
19451 therefore there would be no savings.

19452         So in other words, if the savings from Medicaid is 300  
19453 -- I am just making it up -- 300 billion because all these  
19454 people are kicked off because of red tape, they -- CBO  
19455 assumed those people would move to the marketplace, they  
19456 would get health coverage through the subsidy, and therefore  
19457 there would be no savings because the government would still  
19458 have to pay for their health insurance through the ACA. So  
19459 it is strictly because of that, there is no other reason. It  
19460 makes no sense. That is the reason. And it is sad because,  
19461 essentially -- because they want to meet the -- you know,  
19462 this draconian cut of 880 -- or now it is almost a trillion  
19463 -- they have to say to those people, you can't go to the  
19464 marketplace.

19465         \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. So --

19466         \*Mr. Pallone. And I would yield to the gentlewoman.

19467         \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. And so, Mr. Ranking Member, if I am  
19468 understanding what you are saying correctly, we are talking  
19469 about 13.7 million Americans who will lose their health  
19470 insurance due to this bill, as well as some of the lack of

19471       expansions in the ACA.

19472               \*Mr. Pallone.   Sure.

19473               \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Those 13.7 million people, once  
19474       they are kicked off their insurance, naturally would turn to  
19475       the ACA marketplace to say maybe I can buy insurance off the  
19476       exchange, except then those people will not have the income  
19477       support, the income subsidy to be able to buy ACA insurance  
19478       the way other people would in that marketplace.   Correct?

19479               \*Mr. Pallone.   Right.   And if I could reclaim my time,  
19480       essentially CBO assumes that, if you get kicked off Medicaid  
19481       for all these red-tape things -- I mean, the list is endless  
19482       -- you would then go to the marketplace, you would be  
19483       eligible for the maximum subsidy because your income is so  
19484       low, and it is going to cost the government as much money for  
19485       that as it would if you are on Medicaid -- or approximately  
19486       -- and therefore, there is no savings, the 300 or whatever  
19487       savings that they get from kicking off the people doesn't  
19488       exist anymore.   There is nothing else.   I mean, they may not  
19489       admit that, but that is the reality.

19490               I yield back.

19491               \*Mr. Joyce.   The gentleman from Virginia is recognized.

19492               \*Mr. Griffith.   Thank you very much.

19493               Well, I appreciate the ranking member's explanation,  
19494       because that makes a lot of sense.   This is CBO math.   And I  
19495       have always had a hard time with CBO math.   But -- so what

19496 they are saying is that they are making the assumption that,  
19497 while they -- that they wouldn't go to the ACA plans, but not  
19498 that they could not, which has been the argument all night,  
19499 at least if I understand that. And so sometimes the CBO  
19500 makes these conclusions.

19501 But the point is not whether we have the savings or not  
19502 in this particular argument. The point is the people would  
19503 have an option to go to the ACA plans, if I understand it  
19504 correctly.

19505 \*Mr. Pallone. Would the gentleman yield?

19506 \*Mr. Griffith. And -- well, I need to yield --

19507 \*Mr. Pallone. That is not what I said.

19508 \*Mr. Griffith. I thought that is what you said.

19509 \*Mr. Pallone. No. The way you have done this bill --

19510 \*Mr. Griffith. All right, I will yield briefly. I need  
19511 to also get to my chairman. Go ahead.

19512 \*Mr. Pallone. I just wanted to say -- I will be quick  
19513 -- the bill says that you can go to the marketplace and pay  
19514 the full freight, but you can't get the subsidy. So those  
19515 people can afford -- most of them, probably -- to buy the,  
19516 you know, the insurance policy with the subsidy, but they  
19517 can't afford the full freight.

19518 \*Mr. Griffith. All right.

19519 \*Mr. Pallone. And so --

19520 \*Mr. Griffith. And to explain that, if I might --

19521           \*Mr. Pallone. Okay.

19522           \*Mr. Griffith. -- I am going to yield now to the  
19523 chairman of the full committee.

19524           \*Mr. Pallone. Sure.

19525           \*The Chair. I think, to clarify this, I would like to  
19526 ask the counsel if the counsel would clarify the question,  
19527 now that I understand the question that was trying to be  
19528 asked. I didn't follow, I am sorry.

19529           But counsel, would you explain?

19530           \*Counsel. Yes, thank you for the question. The  
19531 provision in question pertains to subparagraph B on page 80,  
19532 which clarifies that section 5000 A F1 A2 of the Internal  
19533 Revenue Code -- only makes eligible advance premium tax  
19534 credits for people who are not otherwise eligible for other  
19535 minimum essential coverage.

19536           \*The Chair. But so they are eligible for Medicaid,  
19537 right? That is the -- so they can't -- if they are eligible  
19538 for Medicaid but they don't receive benefits because they are  
19539 not working, are they eligible to go into -- with the premium  
19540 tax credits?

19541           \*Counsel. If an individual is satisfying the community  
19542 engagement requirements, they would maintain eligibility for  
19543 Medicaid. If they are not meeting the community engagement  
19544 requirements, they would be considered eligible for Medicaid  
19545 and could be enrolled in Medicaid as soon as they satisfy the

19546 requirements.

19547       \*The Chair. But they wouldn't be eligible to go into  
19548 the Affordable Care Act tax credit because they are --  
19549 because they have other coverage in Medicaid?

19550       \*Counsel. They would be considered eligible for  
19551 Medicaid, and thus would not -- and thus would be precluded  
19552 from that definition of minimum essential coverage.

19553       \*The Chair. So the purpose of that would be if you are  
19554 in Medicaid and you are eligible, but you don't have -- you  
19555 are not meeting the work requirement because you are -- met  
19556 all the exemptions and you are choosing not to work, then you  
19557 couldn't go take a subsidized plan somewhere else and not  
19558 work, because if you were working you wouldn't need the  
19559 subsidized plan because you would get -- you can't not work  
19560 to not -- and then lose your Medicaid and not work and go to  
19561 the premium tax credits, right?

19562       \*Counsel. Yes. If an individual began to meet the  
19563 community engagement requirements, they would be re-enrolled  
19564 in Medicaid.

19565       \*The Chair. So what if you are deemed ineligible for  
19566 other reasons? So you are -- it is not a work requirement,  
19567 you are just deemed ineligible for Medicaid, you can't --  
19568 don't qualify for Medicaid. Does that prevent you from going  
19569 to the marketplace?

19570       \*Counsel. This provision would not apply in that

19571 instance.

19572 \*The Chair. So only if you make yourself ineligible  
19573 does this apply.

19574 \*Counsel. Correct.

19575 \*Mr. Pallone. Wait a minute. Can I --

19576 \*Mr. Griffith. So if I might restate that, claiming my  
19577 time back from the chairman, if I might restate that, only if  
19578 you are able-bodied, eligible for Medicaid, Medicaid  
19579 expansion -- only if you are able-bodied and refused to do  
19580 even community service --

19581 \*Mr. Pallone. That is absurd.

19582 \*Mr. Griffith. -- would you be caught in that conundrum  
19583 where you -- because you are eligible for Medicaid but refuse  
19584 to do anything besides sit on the couch, then you wouldn't be  
19585 eligible for the tax subsidy. You could still get it, but it  
19586 would cost you a lot of money. Somebody in your family would  
19587 probably have to pick it up.

19588 But if you were ineligible for any other reason, you  
19589 could still get the tax subsidy for an Affordable Care Act  
19590 Obamacare Insurance plan, correct?

19591 \*Counsel. That is what the provision says.

19592 \*Mr. Griffith. I appreciate that. I yield to the  
19593 gentleman from New Jersey.

19594 \*Mr. Pallone. What did you say?

19595 \*Mr. Griffith. I yielded to you.

19596           \*Mr. Pallone. Oh, you yielded to me? I don't know what  
19597 the counsel is saying.

19598           Look, the problem is the chairman is saying that you are  
19599 kicked off because you refused to work. Of course, what --  
19600 our argument on the Democratic side is you were kicked off  
19601 because you didn't meet the red tape requirements, not  
19602 because of work, but because you missed the deadline, you  
19603 couldn't file, because you were pregnant, whatever.

19604           The bottom line is that if you can't meet those red tape  
19605 requirements, work requirements, exemptions, whatever, for  
19606 pregnancy, whatever, you cannot get the subsidy on the ACA,  
19607 correct?

19608           \*Counsel. Yes.

19609           \*Mr. Pallone. Okay.

19610           \*Counsel. If an individual does not meet the  
19611 requirements, then they --

19612           \*Mr. Pallone. Okay.

19613           \*Counsel. -- they would not meet the definition.

19614           \*Mr. Pallone. Okay, thank you.

19615           \*Mr. Joyce. The gentleman's time has expired.

19616           \*Mr. Griffith. I yield back.

19617           \*Mr. Joyce. Is there any further discussion?

19618           \*Mr. Pallone. I ask for a roll call.

19619           \*Mr. Joyce. Seeing none, there is a roll call vote  
19620 requested. The clerk will record the call -- the clerk will



19621     call the roll.

19622             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta?

19623             \*Mr. Latta.   No.

19624             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.

19625             Mr. Griffith?

19626             \*Mr. Griffith.   No.

19627             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.

19628             Mr. Bilirakis?

19629             \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.

19630             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

19631             Mr. Hudson?

19632             \*Mr. Hudson.   No.

19633             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.

19634             Mr. Carter of Georgia?

19635             \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.

19636             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

19637             Mr. Palmer?

19638             \*Mr. Palmer.   No.

19639             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.

19640             Mr. Dunn?

19641             \*Mr. Dunn.   No.

19642             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.

19643             Mr. Crenshaw?

19644             \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.

19645             \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

19646 Mr. Joyce?  
19647 \*Mr. Joyce. No.  
19648 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.  
19649 Mr. Weber?  
19650 \*Mr. Weber. No.  
19651 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.  
19652 Mr. Allen?  
19653 [No response.]  
19654 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson?  
19655 \*Mr. Balderson. No.  
19656 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.  
19657 Mr. Fulcher?  
19658 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
19659 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
19660 Mr. Pfluger?  
19661 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
19662 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
19663 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
19664 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
19665 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
19666 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
19667 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
19668 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
19669 Mrs. Cammack?  
19670 [No response.]

19671           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte?  
19672           \*Mr. Oubernolte.   No.  
19673           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
19674           Mr. James?  
19675           \*Mr. James.   No.  
19676           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
19677           Mr. Bentz?  
19678           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
19679           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
19680           Mrs. Houchin?  
19681           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
19682           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
19683           Mr. Fry?  
19684           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
19685           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
19686           Ms. Lee?  
19687           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
19688           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
19689           Mr. Langworthy?  
19690           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
19691           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
19692           Mr. Kean?  
19693           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
19694           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
19695           Mr. Rulli?

19696 \*Mr. Rulli. No.  
19697 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.  
19698 Mr. Evans?  
19699 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
19700 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.  
19701 Mr. Goldman?  
19702 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
19703 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
19704 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
19705 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.  
19706 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
19707 Mr. Pallone?  
19708 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
19709 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
19710 Ms. DeGette?  
19711 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
19712 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
19713 Ms. Schakowsky?  
19714 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
19715 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
19716 Ms. Matsui?  
19717 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
19718 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
19719 Ms. Castor?  
19720 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

19721           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
19722           Mr. Tonko?  
19723           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
19724           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
19725           Ms. Clarke?  
19726           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
19727           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
19728           Mr. Ruiz?  
19729           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
19730           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
19731           Mr. Peters?  
19732           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
19733           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
19734           Mrs. Dingell?  
19735           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
19736           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
19737           Mr. Veasey?  
19738           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
19739           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
19740           Ms. Kelly?  
19741           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
19742           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
19743           Ms. Barragan?  
19744           [No response.]  
19745           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto?

19746 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
19747 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
19748 Ms. Schrier?  
19749 [No response.]  
19750 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan?  
19751 [No response.]  
19752 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher?  
19753 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
19754 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
19755 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
19756 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
19757 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
19758 Mr. Auchincloss?  
19759 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
19760 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
19761 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
19762 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
19763 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
19764 Mr. Menendez?  
19765 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
19766 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
19767 Mr. Mullin?  
19768 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
19769 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
19770 Mr. Landsman?

19771           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.  
19772           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
19773           Ms. McClellan?  
19774           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.  
19775           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
19776           Chairman Guthrie?  
19777           \*The Chair.   No.  
19778           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
19779           \*Mr. Allen.   How is Allen recorded?  
19780           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen is not recorded.  
19781           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
19782           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
19783           Ms. Schrier is not recorded.  
19784           \*Ms. Schrier.   Oh, aye.  
19785           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
19786           Mrs. Cammack is not recorded.  
19787           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
19788           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
19789           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Ms. Barragan recorded?  
19790           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan is not recorded.  
19791           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
19792           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
19793           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Mrs. Trahan recorded?  
19794           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan is not recorded.  
19795           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.

19796           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

19797           \*Ms. Matsui.   How is Matsui recorded?

19798           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Ms. Matsui recorded?

19799           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui is voted -- is recorded as aye.

19800           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report.

19801           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24

19802 ayes and 30 noes.

19803           \*Mr. Joyce.   Are there any further amendments?

19804           \*Mr. Ruiz.   I do, Mr. Chairman.   I have an amendment at

19805 the desk under the file Health-FCD-AMD\_203.

19806           \*Mr. Joyce.   The clerk will report the amendment.

19807           \*The Clerk.   Health-FCD-AMD\_203, amendment offered by

19808 Mr. Ruiz.   Add to the end the following section.   Assessment

19809 of effects of coverage losses --

19810           \*Mr. Joyce.   Without objection, the reading of the

19811 amendment is dispensed with.

19812           [The amendment of Mr. Ruiz follows:]

19813

19814           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

19815



19816           \*Mr. Joyce. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
19817 minutes in support of the amendment.

19818           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

19819           This amendment would require states to produce an  
19820 assessment of the effects of the coverage losses from this  
19821 Medicaid title on rates of uncompensated care as defined in  
19822 section 1923, and emergency department wait times for each  
19823 hospital that receives a disproportionate share hospital  
19824 payment.

19825           As an emergency medicine physician, I have seen  
19826 firsthand the long wait times patients endure when they  
19827 present in the emergency department. Sometimes they can wait  
19828 up to 6 or 8, sometimes 10 hours just to see the physician.  
19829 Cuts to Medicaid -- and make no mistake, that is what these  
19830 Republican policies are, no matter how you disguise them --  
19831 will only make these wait times worse, and make it more  
19832 challenging to access care for everyone, not just for  
19833 Medicaid beneficiaries.

19834           The Congressional Budget Office examined several  
19835 policies in this book, and they found that millions would  
19836 lose their health coverage. At least 13.7 million more  
19837 individuals would be without health insurance. Now that is a  
19838 problem because, guess what, people still need medical care,  
19839 regardless of whether they have insurance. If they lose  
19840 their insurance, they are less likely to be able to afford to

19841 go to the doctor, and will end up presenting in the emergency  
19842 department. That means longer wait times for everyone, not  
19843 just Medicaid patients. Patients may be unable to pay, but  
19844 the hospital would treat them anyway, due to our EMTALA law.  
19845 That means hospitals will take on even more uncompensated  
19846 care.

19847 California hospitals currently provide an average of  
19848 \$5.1 million in uncompensated care per hospital per year,  
19849 according to the California Hospital Association. Rural and  
19850 critical access hospitals especially would be forced to cut  
19851 back on services like pediatrics or labor and delivery, or  
19852 close their doors altogether. When a hospital closes, it  
19853 closes for everyone, including kids on Medicaid, including  
19854 women who need pregnancy care. So Medicaid cuts will have  
19855 consequences for everyone.

19856 And during this markup and in discourse over the past  
19857 several months I have been hearing my Republican colleagues  
19858 claim over and over that their proposed cuts to Medicaid  
19859 won't cut benefits or strip health care away from vulnerable  
19860 individuals, that by cutting funding for this vital health  
19861 insurance program they are "strengthening it," that they  
19862 won't have devastating impacts on communities and our  
19863 nation's health care system. All this despite common sense  
19864 and concrete evidence to the contrary.

19865 Now, if my colleagues are not in fact being honest to

19866 the American people just to be able to give tax cuts to the  
19867 uber-wealthy, then they should vote for this amendment to  
19868 prove it. If you firmly believe that slashing funding for a  
19869 health insurance program and stripping coverage from millions  
19870 of Americans will strengthen health care in America and will  
19871 not have devastating impacts on healthcare infrastructure and  
19872 hospitals, then you have nothing to lose by supporting a  
19873 study that would, in theory, prove your point. But I have a  
19874 feeling you suspect that the results of this study would be  
19875 pretty damning. Otherwise, you would be jumping at this  
19876 opportunity to prove your claims.

19877         So I urge my colleagues to do their due diligence and  
19878 put their constituents' best interests at the forefront by  
19879 authorizing this study to investigate the impacts that their  
19880 proposed Medicaid cuts would have on the hospitals their  
19881 communities rely on.

19882         Thank you, and I yield back the remainder of my time.

19883         \*The Chair. [Presiding] The gentleman yields back and I  
19884 will recognize myself.

19885         And we have already noted that coverage losses  
19886 associated with this legislation are due to people who are  
19887 not eligible for the program that are enrolled, able-bodied  
19888 adults, and truly able-bodied adults -- I could read through  
19889 the qualifications again if you would like, but I think we  
19890 have put that into the record -- who are choosing not to

19891 work, and individuals who are not legally in this country.  
19892 And by reducing burdens on the states as the Biden  
19893 Administration's sweeping eligibility and enrollment -- so as  
19894 people who are not eligible to be on Medicaid, the states  
19895 aren't having to pay the share for ineligible people, so the  
19896 states will have money -- make savings, and Medicaid has  
19897 already -- has payments that help make providers whole for  
19898 the cost of uncompensated care such as disproportionate share  
19899 hospital payments. And I will point out that this bill  
19900 delays the DSH cuts for four years.

19901 And I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment and  
19902 vote for the underlying bill, and I will yield back.

19903 And the gentlelady from New York, Ms. Clarke, is  
19904 recognized for five minutes in support of the amendment -- or  
19905 to speak on the amendment, I am sorry.

19906 \*Ms. Clarke. Thank you, Chairman, and I indeed do  
19907 support this amendment as presented by my colleague, Mr.  
19908 Ruiz.

19909 As the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus, I would  
19910 be remiss if I did not point out that these cruel cuts to  
19911 Medicaid will leave millions of Black Americans across the  
19912 nation without a lifeline. The NAACP published a report,  
19913 "Medicaid cuts Would Rip Away Health Coverage for Millions of  
19914 Americans, Disproportionately Harming People of Color.'`

19915 Mr. Chair, I would like to enter this report into the

19916     record.

19917             \*The Chair.  Without objection, so ordered.

19918             [The information follows:]

19919

19920     \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

19921

19922           \*Ms. Clarke. Currently, there are 13.3 million African  
19923 Americans who use Medicaid for health care. Historically,  
19924 Black communities have faced injustices within healthcare  
19925 systems, and they have -- they will absolutely feel the  
19926 impacts of these cuts by experiencing skyrocketing medical  
19927 expenses without Medicaid.

19928           Black communities will have lifelong health effects  
19929 without proper access to health care, and the uninsured will  
19930 experience severe damage to their health without receiving  
19931 the essential care that Medicaid provides.

19932           The biggest driver of a racial coverage gap are the  
19933 states that have not expanded Medicaid under the Affordable  
19934 Care Act. Approximately over one-third of the U.S. Black  
19935 population currently lives in 10 states that haven't expanded  
19936 Medicaid. The majority of those states are within red states  
19937 such as Alabama, Florida, Texas, South Carolina, Tennessee,  
19938 and, you got it, Georgia. And Black communities in these  
19939 states and around the country will be even more  
19940 disproportionately impacted by these cuts.

19941           Approximately 35 percent of Black people are more likely  
19942 to enroll into Medicaid, regardless of Medicaid expansion  
19943 status. And without a doubt, this will cut off a lifeline to  
19944 Black children, women, the elderly, disabled individuals,  
19945 veterans, et cetera from receiving proper health care in an  
19946 already unfair and unjust system.

19947           Time and time again, Republicans have demonstrated their  
19948 relentless obsession to cut billions from safety net  
19949 programs, programs that are essential to underserved  
19950 communities, furthering racial disparities in coverage. This  
19951 is an outright assault on Black health. As chair of the  
19952 Congressional Black Caucus, I will continue to lead the fight  
19953 to keep our community safe from MAGA extremists.

19954           Why? Why are Republicans intentionally targeting and  
19955 inflicting harm to our communities? Well, it is because  
19956 cruelty is the point.

19957           Thank you, and I yield back.

19958           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
19959 further discussion on the amendment?

19960           Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote  
19961 occurs on the amendment. A roll call vote has been  
19962 requested, and the clerk will call the roll.

19963           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

19964           \*Mr. Latta. No.

19965           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

19966           Mr. Griffith?

19967           \*Mr. Griffith. No.

19968           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

19969           Mr. Bilirakis?

19970           \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

19971           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

19972 Mr. Hudson?

19973 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia?

19974 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

19975 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

19976 Mr. Palmer?

19977 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

19978 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

19979 Mr. Dunn?

19980 \*Mr. Dunn. No.

19981 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

19982 Mr. Crenshaw?

19983 [No response.]

19984 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce?

19985 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

19986 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

19987 Mr. Weber?

19988 \*Mr. Weber. No.

19989 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

19990 Mr. Allen?

19991 [No response.]

19992 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson?

19993 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

19994 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

19995 Mr. Fulcher?

19996 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.



19997 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
19998 Mr. Pfluger?  
19999 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
20000 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
20001 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
20002 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
20003 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
20004 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
20005 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
20006 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
20007 Mrs. Cammack?  
20008 [No response.]  
20009 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
20010 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
20011 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
20012 Mr. James?  
20013 \*Mr. James. No.  
20014 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
20015 Mr. Bentz?  
20016 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
20017 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
20018 Mrs. Houchin?  
20019 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
20020 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
20021 Mr. Fry?

20022 \*Mr. Fry. No.

20023 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.

20024 Ms. Lee?

20025 \*Ms. Lee. No.

20026 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.

20027 Mr. Langworthy?

20028 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.

20029 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

20030 Mr. Kean?

20031 \*Mr. Kean. No.

20032 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.

20033 Mr. Rulli?

20034 \*Mr. Rulli. No.

20035 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.

20036 Mr. Evans?

20037 \*Mr. Evans. No.

20038 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.

20039 Mr. Goldman?

20040 \*Mr. Goldman. No.

20041 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.

20042 Mrs. Fedorchak?

20043 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

20044 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

20045 Mr. Pallone?

20046 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.

20047           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
20048           Ms. DeGette?  
20049           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
20050           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
20051           Ms. Schakowsky?  
20052           [No response.]  
20053           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky?  
20054           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
20055           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
20056           Ms. Matsui?  
20057           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
20058           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
20059           Ms. Castor?  
20060           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
20061           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
20062           Mr. Tonko?  
20063           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
20064           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
20065           Ms. Clarke?  
20066           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
20067           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
20068           Mr. Ruiz?  
20069           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
20070           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
20071           Mr. Peters?

20072 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

20073 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

20074 Mrs. Dingell?

20075 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.

20076 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

20077 Mr. Veasey?

20078 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

20079 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

20080 Ms. Kelly?

20081 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

20082 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

20083 Ms. Barragan?

20084 [No response.]

20085 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto?

20086 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

20087 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.

20088 Ms. Schrier?

20089 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

20090 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

20091 Mrs. Trahan?

20092 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

20093 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

20094 Mrs. Fletcher?

20095 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.

20096 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

20097 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

20098 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

20099 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

20100 Mr. Auchincloss?

20101 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.

20102 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

20103 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

20104 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.

20105 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

20106 Mr. Menendez?

20107 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

20108 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

20109 Mr. Mullin?

20110 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

20111 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

20112 Mr. Landsman?

20113 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

20114 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

20115 Ms. McClellan?

20116 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

20117 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

20118 Chairman Guthrie?

20119 \*The Chair. No.

20120 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

20121 \*The Chair. Who is not recorded?

20122 Mr. Allen?

20123 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen is not recorded.

20124 \*Mr. Allen. Allen votes no.

20125 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

20126 \*The Chair. Is there anyone on the other side?

20127 Oh, Mrs. Cammack?

20128 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack is not recorded.

20129 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.

20130 \*The Chair. Mr. Crenshaw?

20131 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.

20132 Mr. Crenshaw is not recorded.

20133 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

20134 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

20135 \*The Chair. The clerk will -- anyone on the Democrat --

20136 the clerk will report.

20137 \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23

20138 ayes and 29 noes.

20139 \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.

20140 Are there any further amendments?

20141 Mr. Peters --

20142 \*Mr. Peters. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the

20143 desk.

20144 \*The Chair. -- from California is recognized.

20145 \*Mr. Peters. It is Health-FCD-AMD\_039.

20146 \*The Clerk. Health-FCD-AMD\_039, amendment offered by

20147 Mr. Peters. Strike section 44141.

20148 \*The Chair. Could you read the amendment again?

20149 \*The Clerk. Health-FCD-AMD\_039, amendment offered by

20150 Mr. Peters.

20151 \*The Chair. Okay, you will report, clerk will report.

20152 He just reported?

20153 \*Voice. He hasn't reported it yet.

20154 \*The Chair. You haven't reported it. You have read the

20155 title, but you haven't reported. Just report the amendment.

20156 \*Mr. Peters. That is the amendment.

20157 \*The Clerk. To clarify, Health-FCD-AMD\_039.

20158 \*The Chair. Okay. Without objection, the reading of

20159 the amendment is dispensed with.

20160 [The amendment of Mr. Peters follows:]

20161

20162 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

20163

20164           \*The Chair. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
20165 minutes in support of the amendment.

20166           \*Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment  
20167 has to do with the work requirements. We have discussed that  
20168 extensively through the night, so what I say will come more  
20169 as a summary of what we discussed.

20170           But we should remember what is at stake today. Medicaid  
20171 covers more than 72 million Americans. That includes nearly  
20172 40 million children, 7 million seniors, and 15 million people  
20173 with disabilities. In my district alone Medicaid -- or  
20174 MediCal, as we call it in California -- covers nearly one in  
20175 five people. And across the San Diego region, that number is  
20176 almost one in three. Medicaid helps working families who  
20177 don't get health insurance through their jobs, and helps  
20178 struggling rural hospitals stay afloat. Medicaid provides  
20179 treatment for opioid addiction and mental health services for  
20180 those who need them the most. And let's not forget Medicaid  
20181 is also the largest provider of long-term care in this  
20182 country. If you have a loved one who relies on home care, if  
20183 you have a grandma in a nursing home, Medicaid is there to  
20184 make sure she gets the care she needs.

20185           So when Republicans propose slashing Medicaid, what does  
20186 that really mean? It means seniors will be kicked out of  
20187 nursing homes. It means people with disabilities will lose  
20188 their independence. It means kids will miss critical doctors



20189 visits. And we know this because we have seen it before, and  
20190 we have discussed it.

20191         Look at Arkansas. When the state piloted its Medicaid  
20192 work requirement, over 18,000 people lost coverage not  
20193 because they refused to work, but because they struggled to  
20194 report their hours at a newly-created, online-only portal.  
20195 The vast majority of these people had jobs. Many more were  
20196 caring for disabled relatives, recovering from illness, or  
20197 navigating mental health challenges. The problem is the work  
20198 requirement didn't account for all that. Local doctors and  
20199 clinics felt the strain almost immediately. Physicians  
20200 reported longer waits. Patients missed their follow-up  
20201 appointments, emergency rooms saw increases in uncompensated  
20202 care.

20203         And it wasn't just those subject to the mandate who  
20204 suffered. Everyone in the system felt the impact, including  
20205 the elderly, pregnant women, children, and people with  
20206 disabilities. Similar results followed when Georgia  
20207 experimented with its own mandate, and the evidence is  
20208 consistent. Republican policies will increase red tape and  
20209 cut health care coverage for everyone, but they do not  
20210 increase employment for so-called able-bodied people.

20211         Medicaid is the difference between children getting a  
20212 medication they need or not. It is the difference between a  
20213 working mother affording prenatal care or risking her

20214 pregnancy. It is the difference between a senior being able  
20215 to stay in his -- in their home or being forced into a  
20216 nursing facility.

20217         And we all believe and understand that work is valuable.  
20218 It provides stability, dignity, and a path toward  
20219 opportunity. I also believe deeply that every American who  
20220 can work should be encouraged and supported in doing so. But  
20221 time and time again, when states have made these cuts we have  
20222 not seen increases in employment. What we have seen is  
20223 people lose their health coverage, more red tape for doctors,  
20224 and worse health outcomes.

20225         We heard a lot of arguments today that there are  
20226 exemptions for the elderly or people with disabilities. And  
20227 the problem is in practice these exemptions are often poorly  
20228 implemented and difficult to navigate, as is the bill before  
20229 us. People who should qualify still lose coverage. My  
20230 constituents, veterans with post-traumatic stress injury, new  
20231 mothers recovering from childbirth, or people managing  
20232 chronic conditions often can't make it through the reporting  
20233 process in time. My colleagues will and have pointed to the  
20234 bill text and say people with disabilities are exempted. But  
20235 tragically, it takes people who are disabled almost eight  
20236 months to receive a formal determination from the Social  
20237 Security Administration.

20238         So this bill would kick disabled people who have health

20239 care off -- today off their coverage today, and that is  
20240 because many of them are covered by the Affordable Care Act's  
20241 Medicaid expansion, which the legislation before us would  
20242 gut. And even for those who do work, often in low-wage,  
20243 unstable jobs, these mandates create a penalty for workers.  
20244 A missed shift, a lost job, or a technical error can trigger  
20245 a cascade that ends in lost coverage. That is not promoting  
20246 work, it is punishing job loss.

20247 And when people lose Medicaid, they don't stop getting  
20248 sick, they just stop getting preventative care. They end up  
20249 in the emergency room, often sicker and often at greater cost  
20250 to their family and to the taxpayers.

20251 The evidence is overwhelming, and it is from experience.  
20252 These policies will drastically cut Medicaid funding and take  
20253 health care away from more than 13 million Americans. The  
20254 short-term spending cuts we may see on our balance sheet will  
20255 be outweighed by downstream costs in both dollars and  
20256 American lives.

20257 We can do better than this. I encourage my colleagues  
20258 to vote yes on my amendment.

20259 And I yield back.

20260 \*The Chair. Thank you.

20261 The gentleman yields back, and I recognize myself. And  
20262 so, again, we have heard a couple of times about Georgia and  
20263 Arkansas. We are aware of the situations they had. They did

20264 not do that intentionally. We have been -- crafted this bill  
20265 carefully to avoid the issues that they have. We absolutely  
20266 don't want people to -- who qualify for Medicaid to not  
20267 receive Medicaid because of red tape, particularly when they  
20268 are trying to work and be gainfully employed.

20269         If you think about what Medicaid is, it is that people  
20270 go to work every day, pay their taxes. The hard-working  
20271 taxpayers pay Medicaid to provide health insurance for the  
20272 most vulnerable. And in the expansion populations we say we  
20273 are going to provide -- our taxpayers are going to provide  
20274 health insurance for people -- if you are a pregnant woman,  
20275 if you are parents with young children, if you are blind and  
20276 disabled, if you are low-income seniors, if you are patients  
20277 with mental health or substance use disorders -- and other  
20278 defined issues that people have. And what we are saying, if  
20279 you are not in any of those categories, if you are an able-  
20280 bodied working person, then if I am going to go to work, if  
20281 an American hard-working taxpayer is going to go to work and  
20282 pay their taxes, then you should do the same.

20283         And what we are requiring is -- think about this -- the  
20284 able-bodied is -- we just defined it -- 80 hours a month of  
20285 work, or training program, or actively searching for work,  
20286 for community service, for part-time education or school, or  
20287 any combination of the above to satisfy the work requirement.  
20288 And I just think if -- for our hard-working taxpayers, that

20289 is just fair. And maybe it is a philosophical difference,  
20290 but we just think it is fair.

20291 And I strongly support the bill, and I encourage to vote  
20292 against the amendment.

20293 And I will yield back. The gentlelady from Colorado,  
20294 for what purpose do you seek recognition?

20295 \*Ms. DeGette. I move to strike the last word.

20296 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

20297 \*Ms. DeGette. Well, Mr. Chairman, I am so glad that you  
20298 are hoping that nobody will be thrown off of Medicaid because  
20299 of the red tape that is involved with this work requirement.  
20300 But for the last number of hours you have heard example after  
20301 example of people who were thrown off because of this.

20302 And also, your counsel has refused -- well, hasn't  
20303 refused -- the fact is, the bill doesn't delineate how you  
20304 are going to decide, is somebody pregnant? Did somebody have  
20305 a miscarriage? How do we tell if somebody has a mental  
20306 health issue? There is all of these gaps in the bill.

20307 And so I do believe you, Mr. Chairman, that you don't  
20308 think that qualified people should be thrown off. But the  
20309 only experience we have is the experience of Georgia and  
20310 Arkansas, and you don't want it to be like that. But to be  
20311 honest, your bill is so vague that millions of people will be  
20312 thrown off because they can't meet these vague requirements  
20313 and the paperwork requirements. And so that is why this

20314 amendment is so important, and that is why I want to thank my  
20315 colleague from California for offering it.

20316         And I am -- I just -- these are real people, and these  
20317 are real people who need health care. And they are going to  
20318 lose their insurance, 8.6 million of them are going to lose  
20319 their insurance from this, and the other 5 million are going  
20320 to lose their insurance from the Medicaid expansion -- or  
20321 from the ACA expansion. And that is the way it is. And you  
20322 can describe it and sugarcoat it any way you can, but that is  
20323 what is going to happen to Americans.

20324         And I yield back.

20325         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is anyone  
20326 seeking purpose for -- speaking on the amendment?

20327         The gentlelady from California, Ms. Matsui, is  
20328 recognized for five minutes.

20329         \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
20330 the last word.

20331         \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

20332         \*Ms. Matsui. Republicans claim that people with  
20333 disabilities won't be harmed by the red tape requirements in  
20334 this bill because they are supposedly protected by their  
20335 disability status, but let's be clear. Two-thirds of adults  
20336 with disabilities on Medicaid are not eligible under the  
20337 primary disability pathway, and it is nearly impossible for  
20338 states to identify people with disabilities in the Medicaid

20339 expansion group. That includes many people with mental  
20340 health conditions.

20341         For example, Patricia. Patricia is 51 and has multiple  
20342 mental health diagnoses that left her unable to work. Thanks  
20343 to Medicaid, she was able to see a psychologist and be  
20344 prescribed medication to manage her conditions. But once she  
20345 had been stabilized, she was healthy again to find work. But  
20346 if the Republicans' bill was already law, Patricia might have  
20347 waited up to nine months, on average, to get an official  
20348 disability determination. She might have been overwhelmed by  
20349 the mountains of paperwork and regular eligibility checks  
20350 required to keep her coverage. Without Medicaid, she  
20351 wouldn't have been able to go back to work, threatening yet  
20352 another source of health care coverage.

20353         And we can't forget DOGE is also slashing staff at  
20354 Social Security Administration offices, which means people  
20355 with disabilities will have to work -- will have to wait even  
20356 longer for their paperwork to be approved.

20357         This bill is setting traps for people with disabilities  
20358 to lose their coverage, and that would be devastating for  
20359 patients like Patricia.

20360         I yield back.

20361         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
20362 further discussion?

20363         The gentlelady from Florida is -- Ms. Castor is

20364 recognized for five minutes --

20365 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you --

20366 \*The Chair. -- to speak on the amendment.

20367 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman, and I  
20368 want to thank my colleague from California for offering this  
20369 amendment.

20370 And I hear what you are saying, Mr. Chairman, but the  
20371 weight of the evidence -- I have been looking through all of  
20372 the expert groups that I respect very much on what they say  
20373 about this. I was very focused on the American Cancer  
20374 Society, Cancer Action Network. They say, "The magnitude of  
20375 cuts being considered cannot be implemented without  
20376 drastically limiting or, in many cases, severing access to  
20377 Medicaid coverage for millions of people across the country,  
20378 including cancer patients and survivors.'`

20379 But they get right to work requirements. They say the  
20380 vast majority of those with Medicaid who can work already do  
20381 so. Nationally, 92 percent of individuals with Medicaid  
20382 coverage under 65 who do not receive Social Security  
20383 disability benefits are either workers, they are caregivers,  
20384 they are students, or they are unable to work due to illness.  
20385 And despite this fact, there has been much discussion of  
20386 establishing the work requirements in Medicaid. But whenever  
20387 they have been implemented at the state level, these  
20388 requirements at a huge burden of tracking, recording, and



20389 paperwork to Medicaid offices and enrollees, and result in  
20390 people inappropriately losing their coverage or not gaining  
20391 coverage they otherwise would qualify for.

20392         The people who lose or do not gain coverage because of  
20393 paperwork mistakes or red tape will likely include some  
20394 people with cancer or cancer survivors who can't navigate the  
20395 process to prove they are working or deserve an exemption, in  
20396 addition to millions of individuals who need cancer  
20397 screenings or preventative services. And it echoes what the  
20398 Muscular Dystrophy Association is advising us. "Many  
20399 individuals from neuromuscular community with disabilities  
20400 will inevitably fall through the cracks. For example,  
20401 progressive muscle weakness due to neuromuscular disease make  
20402 working, volunteering, or attending school very difficult,  
20403 but the lack of visibility -- the lack of a visibly obvious  
20404 disability would result in members of our community losing  
20405 their Medicaid coverage due to unnecessary red tape.'`

20406         They point to the 2022 report by CBO that found that  
20407 work reporting requirements had no effect on employment, and  
20408 were more likely to just reduce benefits. "We urge the  
20409 committee to reject proposals that institute work or  
20410 community engagement reporting requirements, as they simply  
20411 impose immense administrative burdens on states and  
20412 beneficiaries alike.'`

20413         Here is another one from the National Health Law program

20414 that gets -- it is pretty dire. "The proposed work  
20415 requirement is more radical and punishing than any proposal  
20416 we have seen before. It would terminate coverage for,  
20417 literally, millions of low-income people, including workers,  
20418 people with disabilities and chronic conditions, and  
20419 caregivers who receive Medicaid through the adult expansion  
20420 group. The proposal essentially shuts the front door to  
20421 care, requiring an applicant to demonstrate compliance with  
20422 the work requirement before he or she can access coverage,  
20423 requiring people to verify their prior compliance with work  
20424 requirements before gaining access to coverage. It creates  
20425 enormous barriers to needed health care.'" It goes on.

20426 But you simply cannot ignore what everyone is advising  
20427 us, and I know -- I think it just -- it is just tremendously  
20428 troubling that you can -- even in the face of all of the  
20429 evidence, the prior experience in Georgia and Arkansas, what  
20430 advocates tell us and advise us, that you continue to go down  
20431 this road to rip health coverage away to pay for a tax cut  
20432 for the wealthy and the well-connected in America.

20433 \*Mr. Peters. Would the gentlelady yield?

20434 \*Ms. Castor. I will yield to Mr. Peters.

20435 \*Mr. Peters. I just wanted to comment. Thank you very  
20436 much for those comments.

20437 I listened to the chairman. And we didn't even talk  
20438 about New Hampshire, but he basically said what New Hampshire

20439 state officials said before they went down the work  
20440 requirements path. What happened in New Hampshire? Only 32  
20441 percent of their Medicaid population was able to complete the  
20442 work requirements with 100 percent accuracy and on time,  
20443 which is required to gain coverage. We haven't even  
20444 mentioned a third state, all three bad experiences.

20445 I yield back, thank you.

20446 \*Ms. Castor. And I yield back.

20447 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The chair  
20448 recognizes Mr. Crenshaw from Texas --

20449 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20450 \*The Chair. -- for five minutes to speak on the  
20451 amendment.

20452 \*Mr. Crenshaw. Mr. Chair, I move to strike the last  
20453 word.

20454 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

20455 \*Mr. Crenshaw. So I want to talk about the reality of  
20456 these work requirements.

20457 You know, earlier this year I introduced a bill  
20458 requiring work requirements on Medicaid, along with Senator  
20459 Kennedy, and I did that because I believe it is common sense,  
20460 and I am glad we included this concept in this bill. So  
20461 let's talk details.

20462 First of all, the requirement begins in 2029. That is a  
20463 long ways off, by the way. And it also gives states plenty

20464 of time to adjust to the concerns that were just brought up  
20465 about how to administer this. And here is what it means. It  
20466 just means that able-bodied, working-age adults without  
20467 children must show at least 80 hours of work, training,  
20468 looking for work, or community service per month. That is 20  
20469 hours a week to keep Medicaid coverage. This is not crazy.  
20470 This is fundamentally about independence, responsibility,  
20471 and, above all, dignity.

20472 I want to talk about that for a minute. There has never  
20473 been and never will be dignity in dependency. Now, one might  
20474 say that the longevity and prosperity of a society depends on  
20475 this critical truth, and maybe we have fundamental  
20476 disagreements about this, I don't know. Maybe that is the  
20477 real source of debate here. I think one side believes that  
20478 dignity is achieved only by infinite services at the expense  
20479 of others. And I don't fault you for genuine compassion, but  
20480 we have to be conscious of second and third-order effects, do  
20481 we not?

20482 I will tell you what I believe about dignity. Dignity  
20483 is achieved beyond shallow and temporary comforts. It is  
20484 found by charting your own path, and thus creating a sense of  
20485 meaning that drives one to be the best possible version of  
20486 themselves. I am not alone in this belief. Here is an  
20487 interesting data point. In 2023 an advisory referendum to  
20488 impose work requirements for welfare recipients was

20489 overwhelmingly approved by voters in Wisconsin, 80 percent  
20490 voted yes. The referendum asked very clearly, "Shall able-  
20491 bodied, childless adults be required to look for work in  
20492 order to receive taxpayer funded benefits?" Now, that is an  
20493 electorate of normal, independent-minded voters. It is a  
20494 swing state, after all.

20495         This debate isn't really about safety nets. It is about  
20496 how they are used. We believe that net should bounce you  
20497 back on your path toward dignity. And perhaps my colleagues  
20498 envisioned that net to be more like a hammock, locking more  
20499 and more able-bodied people, people with vast potential, into  
20500 a comfortable, government-crafted blanket from which they can  
20501 never escape. It is comfortable, sure, maybe, but comfort  
20502 without dignity.

20503         Let's be clear. Despite the misinformation and  
20504 fearmongering, we are not cruel. We are not telling everyone  
20505 to suck it up and pull it up by our bootstraps. This work  
20506 requirement has an exhausting number of exemptions. It  
20507 doesn't apply to kids, seniors, pregnant women, people with  
20508 substance abuse disorders, people with disabilities, and it  
20509 doesn't apply to people looking for work or volunteering. It  
20510 gives a 30-day grace period if you lose your job. It was  
20511 falsely stated before that if you lose your job suddenly you  
20512 don't qualify, but that is just not true.

20513         Now, there was once a Democrat Party that agreed with

20514 this simple concept. If you recall, it was led by President  
20515 Bill Clinton. I suppose this might be the problem with the  
20516 modern progressive disposition: progress followed by  
20517 progress toward what? No one really knows. That is what  
20518 happens when you don't have defining principles to anchor  
20519 your political belief system, principles like personal  
20520 responsibility, the concept of a meritocracy, and the  
20521 preservation of the dignity of work.

20522         Progressivism eventually progresses into a totally  
20523 unconstrained dependency on the power of government to meet  
20524 your every need. That is the logical conclusion of an  
20525 untethered philosophy. If one government benefit is good,  
20526 well then 10 more must be better, right? But here is the  
20527 kicker. This Utopian ideal of a perfect government that  
20528 provides for your every comfort is indeed nothing but a  
20529 Utopia, an imagined place that can never be real. And  
20530 because this notion is utterly impossible, as it directly  
20531 contradicts human nature and also happens to be antithetical  
20532 to our own Western values, well, the progressives can always  
20533 find new directions to run toward, new battles to fight. One  
20534 minute you can be for common sense work requirements, and  
20535 next minute that same idea violates some trendy notion of  
20536 social justice. Five minutes ago no one believed a five-  
20537 year-old could choose their own gender, but now the  
20538 progressives embrace it.

20539           Progressivism is progress, that is for sure, but it is  
20540 almost always progress in the wrong direction. I am proud to  
20541 be part of this body that is pushing us in the right  
20542 direction.

20543           I yield back.

20544           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
20545 further discussion?

20546           The gentleman from New Jersey, Mr. Menendez, is  
20547 recognized for five minutes.

20548           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I especially  
20549 appreciate a nice lengthy lecture at 7:40 in the morning from  
20550 our friends across the aisle.

20551           But if you want to talk about the way parties used to be  
20552 and refer to the Democratic Party from the early 1990s, there  
20553 was a Republican Party that used to be fiscally conservative,  
20554 and then George W. Bush gave tax cuts to the wealthiest one  
20555 percent that put us from a budget surplus and a balanced  
20556 budget into the deficits that we are facing today, tax cuts  
20557 that now we are trying to extend that Trump and his first  
20558 presidency enacted that are leading us further into a  
20559 deficit, things that you used to care about.

20560           You used to care about a good business environment, and  
20561 now you have tariffs that get turned on and off every single  
20562 day, which is a terrible thing for business. Predictability  
20563 no longer exists in this country. That used to be a

20564 foundational principle of the Republican Party.

20565         So if you want to lecture Democrats about the party that  
20566 we used to be, take a good, long, hard look in the mirror  
20567 because Republicans are just eroding the pillars that they  
20568 used to stand for, and this president is at the helm of it,  
20569 and you all stay silent while he does it.

20570         So let's talk about work requirements, because that is  
20571 what this amendment is about.

20572         As we have discussed in length, Medicaid is one of the  
20573 most powerful tools we have to protect the health and dignity  
20574 of American families. It helps ensure that children get  
20575 regular checkups, seniors can afford their medications, and  
20576 that working parents do not have to choose between caring for  
20577 their sick child or other necessities. But Republicans are  
20578 trying to undermine this vital program by pushing a made-up  
20579 narrative centered around the idea of so-called work  
20580 requirements.

20581         So you like dealing in facts? Here are facts.

20582         Fact one, nearly all people on Medicaid who can work  
20583 already work. You will hear Republicans talk about bringing  
20584 able-bodied people back to work. But make no mistake, this  
20585 is an entirely false narrative to gain support for a proposal  
20586 that would take away health care for caregivers, parents, and  
20587 sick Americans. It is simple: Americans want to work; those  
20588 who can do.



20589 Fact two, adding burdensome red-tape requirements does  
20590 not increase employment. It only takes health care away from  
20591 Americans. Study after study, including a report by the non-  
20592 partisan Congressional Budget Office, have shown that adding  
20593 burdensome red tape requirements do not increase employment  
20594 at all. When Arkansas tried work requirements in 2018, over  
20595 180,000 people lost coverage in just a few months. You may  
20596 not like that fact, but it is a reality. Not because they  
20597 didn't work, but because they missed a deadline or didn't  
20598 fill out a form.

20599 This is the problem. Some of the hardest-working people  
20600 in America who rely on Medicaid don't have the time to work  
20601 their job, take care of their children, take care of their  
20602 elders, put food on their family's table, and fill out  
20603 additional paperwork that you all want them to do because you  
20604 don't think that they are doing enough already in their  
20605 lives.

20606 Fact number three, red tape requirements lead to more  
20607 wasteful spending than there exists in the program. You will  
20608 hear Republicans talk a lot about waste, fraud, and abuse.  
20609 But as we have seen in states like Georgia, they spent more  
20610 money administering their program to kick people off Medicaid  
20611 than actually providing health care.

20612 Fact number four, as the largest source of Federal  
20613 funding for state budgets, Medicaid bolsters local economies

20614 and actually sustains jobs. Undermining Medicaid with  
20615 barriers and red tape makes it harder for people to work. I  
20616 visited with in-home care providers who do such critically  
20617 important work, and their work is supported by Medicaid. It  
20618 is just so frustrating to hear, especially one colleague  
20619 across the aisle, lecture us about who these people are on  
20620 Medicaid and able-bodied people.

20621         And here is the thing that Republicans have not talked  
20622 about. How many of the 13.7 million individuals who will  
20623 lose coverage under this bill, how many of them will lose  
20624 coverage because of these red tape requirements? Because if  
20625 you think the number is zero, then you are just not living in  
20626 reality. So what number, what percentage of the 13.7 million  
20627 people that will lose health care under this bill, will lose  
20628 it because of these red tape requirements, does the majority  
20629 have a number? Is it zero?

20630         Say it into the microphone so it can be attributed to  
20631 you, whoever said zero. Because you -- well, if you don't  
20632 like lectures, then you may want to tell your colleague not  
20633 to give one, either. But if you don't want to speak into the  
20634 microphone so people can have you on the record, then don't  
20635 say it under your breath, because the answer is not zero, and  
20636 you should all know that, based on what happened in Georgia  
20637 and Arkansas and, apparently, New Hampshire. It is just  
20638 obscene. You guys want to keep talking? It is just obscene,

20639 and you all know it.

20640 Listen, Democrats are united in creating better health  
20641 care outcomes for all Americans, including those in your  
20642 districts because you won't speak up for them.

20643 I yield back.

20644 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone  
20645 seeking discussion?

20646 The gentleman from Virginia is recognized for five  
20647 minutes.

20648 \*Mr. Griffith. So I have been listening to some of this  
20649 debate, and let me just get a couple things cleared up.

20650 Work requirements only apply to Medicaid expansion.  
20651 Therefore, by definition, work requirements do not apply to  
20652 the disabled. They are exempt. They don't have a work  
20653 requirement.

20654 Another thing that we often make a mistake -- and both  
20655 sides of the aisle have done this -- we hear the 80 hours a  
20656 month, and we make the mistake of dividing by 4. Now it is a  
20657 small matter, I grant you. It is a small matter. But as a  
20658 recovering divorce attorney back in the days when they didn't  
20659 have formulas for everything, and you had to calculate how  
20660 many expenses that your client, that mama with some kids, has  
20661 during the month so you can figure out child support and  
20662 spousal support, you know that it is 4.33 weeks in a month.  
20663 So an 80-hour requirement actually works out to 18.47 hours a

20664 week. So for those of you who are worried that they might  
20665 not be able to get to 20, you really only have to get to  
20666 18.5. Now that is a small point, I get it. And you all  
20667 don't like the work requirements on the other side of the  
20668 aisle, I get it.

20669 Let's talk about red tape for just a second. I would  
20670 assume, based on the things that I am hearing, that some of  
20671 the states might have a problem. We heard about a guy that -  
20672 - he doesn't even have a work requirement, but had red tape  
20673 problems in Massachusetts. We have heard about problems in  
20674 New Hampshire. We have heard about some other red tape  
20675 problems. So one can assume there will be some red tape  
20676 issues. But nobody has mentioned that not only do you have  
20677 the ability to go through that process, but if you are doing  
20678 the work requirement and it is a red tape issue not a  
20679 failure-to-move-forward issue, there is a 30-day lookback.  
20680 You are automatically eligible for Medicaid expansion and you  
20681 get a 30-day lookback. So you actually have the initial time  
20682 period, plus a 30-day time period that is built in.

20683 You have to follow the bouncing ball, but I assure you  
20684 that there are going to be hundreds, if not thousands of  
20685 people in every state who will counsel you on how to do this.  
20686 That is the way these programs have worked in the past, is  
20687 that there will be people who do that. It is kind of like  
20688 the -- and look, I am -- it is kind of like in any situation.

20689       There will be people who figure these things out, and they  
20690       help other people.

20691             And so I would submit to you that there will be a whole  
20692       lot more knowledge after the first 6 months, and that 30-day  
20693       period gives you a cushion which will help to alleviate any  
20694       issues that some of the states will have with red tape.

20695             And I yield back.

20696             \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentlelady  
20697       from Massachusetts is recognized for five minutes of the  
20698       amendment.

20699             \*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to  
20700       strike the last word.

20701             \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

20702             \*Mrs. Trahan. Okay, let's call this what it is,  
20703       paperwork requirements, not work requirements, because that  
20704       is all these so-called work reporting requirements are,  
20705       bureaucratic red tape designed not to encourage employment,  
20706       but to push eligible people out of the Medicaid program  
20707       altogether not because they are refusing to work, but because  
20708       they missed a deadline, they couldn't navigate a broken  
20709       website, or moved and didn't get the letter in time.

20710             And you don't have to take my word for it. We have seen  
20711       it happen before. In Arkansas, the first state to implement  
20712       these Republican paperwork requirements, more than 18,000  
20713       people lost their Medicaid coverage in just 5 months. Many

20714 of those folks were working. They were eligible for Medicaid  
20715 coverage, they just couldn't keep up with the paperwork.  
20716 That is not a success story; that is a warning.

20717         And now Republicans want to take that failed experiment  
20718 and make it national policy. If they succeed, nearly one  
20719 million people in my home state of Massachusetts, almost half  
20720 of all adults on MassHealth, could be at risk of losing  
20721 coverage. That includes both expansion and non-expansion  
20722 adults. And it would be devastating for the working families  
20723 this program is meant to serve. We saw a preview of this  
20724 just last year during the Medicaid redetermination process.  
20725 People were kicked off their coverage not because they no  
20726 longer qualified, but because they couldn't navigate a  
20727 complicated, opaque system. Paperwork traps replaced patient  
20728 care.

20729         Now, it has been said a few times already, but it bears  
20730 repeating, the majority of people on Medicaid are already  
20731 working. In my state over three-quarters of enrollees under  
20732 65 live in working families. They are home health aides,  
20733 restaurant workers, janitors, substitute teachers, people  
20734 doing jobs our economy depends on, jobs that often don't come  
20735 with health insurance. Others are caregivers or folks  
20736 dealing with serious health challenges. And yet, here we  
20737 are, debating whether they should have to jump through hoops  
20738 just to prove they deserve to have health care.

20739           This isn't about accountability. It isn't about cost  
20740 savings, either. In fact, it will raise costs. As more  
20741 people lose coverage, hospitals and states will shoulder  
20742 higher uncompensated care bills, and states will have to pour  
20743 resources into building systems to enforce these new rules,  
20744 systems most don't have and many can't afford. We can look  
20745 at Georgia again, the only state currently implementing a  
20746 partial paperwork requirement. It has been such a disaster  
20747 that officials are already offering -- or overhauling the  
20748 program. It is not protecting coverage, it is dismantling  
20749 it.

20750           So let's not pretend this is about improving Medicaid.  
20751 If it were, my Republican colleagues would be offering  
20752 funding, staffing, and real support to states. Instead, they  
20753 are pushing an unfunded mandate they know can't be  
20754 implemented. Why? I don't know, and maybe that is the  
20755 point. The goal isn't to improve Medicaid; it is to gut it  
20756 quietly, cruelly, systematically. These paperwork  
20757 requirements won't stop ineligible people from getting  
20758 Medicaid, they will strip eligible people of the coverage  
20759 they depend on by design. And who will pay the price?  
20760 Working families, sick kids, seniors, people doing everything  
20761 right, just trying to stay healthy and stay afloat.

20762           This policy isn't misguided, it is malicious. And we  
20763 will not stay silent while it threatens the lives and the

20764 livelihoods of the people we represent.

20765 I yield back.

20766 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
20767 further discussion, any further -- the gentlelady from  
20768 Virginia, Ms. McClellan, is recognized for five minutes on  
20769 the amendment.

20770 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20771 I think we all recognize and appreciate the dignity of  
20772 work. And the issue that we have on this side of the aisle  
20773 with the work requirements is unintended or intended  
20774 consequences of what happens if you don't get it right and it  
20775 is not implemented right, as we have seen in at least two  
20776 states that implemented work requirements and it did kick  
20777 people off who were eligible. We are trying to make sure  
20778 that doesn't happen here, because the consequences of losing  
20779 your health insurance can be catastrophic, whether it is a  
20780 day or a month. That person is one accident or illness away  
20781 from total economic devastation when they are already living  
20782 by a thread.

20783 And so when you get a bill less than 36 hours, and you  
20784 hear, well, just trust us -- I am a trust-but-verify kind of  
20785 person. And as I said to my colleague from Virginia, the one  
20786 thing you can count on is the Virginians are going to read  
20787 the bill. So I have read the bill, and I have some  
20788 questions, just -- I want to make sure I understand that



20789 there aren't going to be instances where people who are  
20790 eligible get kicked off because of the way this bill was  
20791 hastily written. So let me ask some questions about the  
20792 look-back period. And this is for counsel.

20793         So on page 70, line 8, if I am reading this correctly  
20794 and -- you know, it has been a long time since I pulled an  
20795 all-nighter, but as I read line 8, it essentially says that  
20796 when a person applies for Medicaid and needs to demonstrate  
20797 compliance with the work requirement, the state can look back  
20798 at compliance for one or more aspect -- one or more months,  
20799 as specified by the state consecutive.

20800         So my question -- my first question to counsel is, does  
20801 this allow states, for purposes of determining eligibility,  
20802 to look back as far as they want?

20803         \*Counsel. On page 70, line 8, the language specifies  
20804 for 1 or more months.

20805         \*Ms. McClellan. So it could look as long as it wants.  
20806 That is a yes?

20807         \*Counsel. The language specifies for one or more  
20808 months.

20809         \*Ms. McClellan. Okay. So could, under that language, a  
20810 state look back three months?

20811         \*Counsel. The bill specifies for one or more, as  
20812 specified by the state, consecutive months.

20813         \*Ms. McClellan. Six months?

20814           \*Counsel. If six is -- yes, six is more than one.

20815           \*Ms. McClellan. A year?

20816           \*Counsel. Twelves months would be more than one month.

20817           \*Ms. McClellan. And if they look back at the year, does  
20818 that person have to have been -- or three months or six  
20819 months -- do they have had a job or met one of those criteria  
20820 for the entire look-back period?

20821           \*Counsel. The applicable individual, as described under  
20822 the bill, would need to satisfy the community engagement  
20823 requirements for one or more consecutive months as specified  
20824 by the state.

20825           \*Ms. McClellan. So if I -- if the state -- if a state  
20826 sets a six-month look-back period, and I go and apply for  
20827 Medicaid coverage, and three months ago I lost my job but  
20828 three days ago I got a job, but they are looking back six  
20829 months, could I be denied Medicaid?

20830           \*Counsel. If the individual satisfies the community  
20831 engagement requirements which include work, job training,  
20832 education, volunteering, they would remain in compliance with  
20833 the community engagement requirements.

20834           \*Ms. McClellan. But that is not my question. Can a  
20835 state who sets a three-month look-back period look back at  
20836 three months? I wasn't employed three months ago, but I got  
20837 a job three days ago. Could that state deny me coverage?

20838           \*Counsel. If the individual was satisfying the

20839 community engagement requirements during the applicable look-  
20840 back period, then they would satisfy the eligibility  
20841 requirements.

20842 \*Ms. McClellan. I think that is not clear. What -- I  
20843 guess I don't understand what is the point of having a one or  
20844 more look-back period if you have somebody who may have been  
20845 employed and then unemployed within that look-back period.  
20846 Which date are you looking at?

20847 \*Counsel. Could you phrase the question -- is it a  
20848 policy question, or is it a question in regards to the --

20849 \*Ms. McClellan. I am just trying to understand what the  
20850 states can and cannot do. I don't know if that is a policy  
20851 question. I thought it was a legal question.

20852 \*Counsel. The states can look at one or more  
20853 consecutive months for eligibility.

20854 \*Ms. McClellan. Okay. I yield back.

20855 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. [Presiding] The gentlelady  
20856 yields back. Are there other members?

20857 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Oregon for five  
20858 minutes.

20859 \*Mr. Bentz. To the bill, Mr. Speaker -- Mr. Chair, so  
20860 there is a bunch of reasons why we are doing this work  
20861 requirement. One of them is that we don't want people to be  
20862 on this program for forever, and this is a really good way to  
20863 get off it, have a job. But another, and probably the most

20864 important thing, is that a majority of Americans want a work  
20865 requirement.

20866         The polling says that 80 percent of Republicans want a  
20867 work requirement, 60 percent of independents, and 47 percent  
20868 of Democrats want a work requirement. The taxpayers want a  
20869 work requirement. That is why we are doing this, because,  
20870 among other reasons, there is a really strong public opinion  
20871 in favor of people who get Medicaid working. And so we owe  
20872 it to the taxpayers to do our best to do what they want,  
20873 since they are paying for this program. So of course, we  
20874 should have a work requirement when so many of Americans want  
20875 us to do exactly what we are doing.

20876         And so those of you who are suggesting that there  
20877 shouldn't be one, and there are 1,000 excuses why there  
20878 shouldn't be, well, great. But the point is, the taxpayers  
20879 are paying for this program, and they want a work  
20880 requirement. And I happen to think, personally, it is a good  
20881 idea. And now, people may have all kinds of excuses for why  
20882 it is not going to work for them, but guess what? We are  
20883 paying somewhere around \$9,000 for each person on that  
20884 program. They better be trying to get a job.

20885         I yield back.

20886         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Is there  
20887 another member wanting to speak?

20888         The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Washington.

20889           \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have a  
20890 question for counsel.

20891           These red tape requirements leave a lot of unanswered  
20892 questions about how the people Republicans claim they are  
20893 protecting are actually, in real life, protected. For  
20894 example, states are permitted to provide short-term hardship  
20895 exemptions, but only if they decide to do so. And these  
20896 exceptions last just for one month. So counsel, one of these  
20897 short-term hardship exceptions is for someone who, during a  
20898 month or part of a month, receives "inpatient psychiatric  
20899 hospital services.'" Can you confirm this hardship exception  
20900 applies only while the person is receiving inpatient care in  
20901 a psychiatric hospital, or at least in the same month as they  
20902 are in that psychiatric hospital?

20903           \*Counsel. Yes, the short-term hardship event that is  
20904 defined on page 74 pertains to individuals that are in those  
20905 facilities.

20906           \*Ms. Schrier. So just for that one month, and then they  
20907 would need maybe to reapply.

20908           So just -- also to confirm, the text on page 73 said  
20909 that the individual would need to request this exception  
20910 themselves while they are an inpatient of a psychiatric  
20911 hospital, or at least in the same month as they are a  
20912 patient. I am just thinking about what this looks like in  
20913 real life. I am referring to line 20, where it says, "Upon

20914 the request of such individual under procedures established  
20915 by the state.'` Is that correct, yes or no?

20916 \*Counsel. That is what the text says, yes.

20917 \*Ms. Schrier. Okay. That is tough, if you think about  
20918 what it must be like for those patients to be in the hospital  
20919 and having to make these applications themselves. Okay.

20920 And then just to confirm, once a person is discharged  
20921 after having a severe-enough mental health crisis to land  
20922 them in the hospital, they are going to need to comply with  
20923 the work standard at least by the start of the next month.  
20924 So, like, if they were -- you know, if they were hospitalized  
20925 inpatient for a psychiatric crisis from, like, April 20 to  
20926 April 29, by May 1 they would have to have a job or they  
20927 would lose their insurance. Is that correct?

20928 \*Counsel. I would point you to two sections, one on  
20929 page 75, line 13, which includes such individual experiences,  
20930 any other short-term hardship, and -- as well as the  
20931 applicable exemptions under paragraph 9, which would include  
20932 other medical frail definitions.

20933 \*Ms. Schrier. Okay, so you are saying that, even if  
20934 they are not hospitalized, that having some, like, post-  
20935 hospital continuing psychiatric care or adjustment period,  
20936 that could also allow a state to provide an exception, but  
20937 not guarantee for that patient that they would have the  
20938 exception.

20939           \*Counsel. On page 85, line 8, there is a mandatory  
20940 exemption for -- with a disabling mental disorder.

20941           \*Ms. Schrier. Okay. So they are -- I am just -- I am  
20942 trying to get -- really drill down on this, because it is a -  
20943 - you know, I am a doctor. I have had patients who have had  
20944 this circumstance of being inpatient, coming out, they are  
20945 still not okay, they are just not needing to be in the  
20946 hospital 24/7. And so I guess it is just kind of a fine  
20947 point on what is considered disabling, where that extends to  
20948 who decides and if this is up to the states.

20949           \*Counsel. The definition of disabling mental disorder  
20950 is defined by the Secretary.

20951           And there is also, on page 86, line 15, as it pertains  
20952 -- I am sorry, I cited the wrong page there -- on page 85,  
20953 line 17, "subject to the approval of the Secretary, with any  
20954 other medical condition identified by the state that is not  
20955 otherwise identified under this clause.'`

20956           \*Ms. Schrier. All right, thank you for helping to  
20957 clarify that. I think we have already expressed our concern  
20958 about Secretary Kennedy labeling anybody with any sort of  
20959 illness and making a judgment on that, but that is -- this is  
20960 just one of the exemptions that Republicans are claiming will  
20961 protect people. And a person who is having a mental health  
20962 crisis that is serious enough for that person to be an  
20963 inpatient of a psychiatric hospital would now need to, on

20964 their own, request an exemption. And then, if they got that,  
20965 they would then have to get right back to work as soon as it  
20966 ticked over to the next month. And this is -- it is a tall  
20967 order to ask of somebody going through a real crisis.

20968 So thank you, I yield back.

20969 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. Are  
20970 there other members looking to speak?

20971 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio for five  
20972 minutes.

20973 \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

20974 We have been at this for, I don't know, 15, 20 hours, a  
20975 long time. And we have been asking questions of members, but  
20976 of counsel about the bill text and who is eligible, who is  
20977 not, you know what this -- you know, what the paperwork  
20978 requirements are. There have been scenario after scenario  
20979 after scenario. And I think I can speak for most of my  
20980 colleagues, at least over here. There is just pure  
20981 confusion.

20982 And I feel terrible for you, because this is an enormous  
20983 bill that has huge implications for millions of Americans who  
20984 rely on Medicaid for health insurance. And here we are,  
20985 asking pretty basic questions about eligibility. And the  
20986 answer is, well, just read this section, or I would refer you  
20987 to this sentence. Ultimately, you walk away very unclear as  
20988 to whether or not you are insured if you are eligible, which



20989 is precisely the point.

20990 And that is the only way you get to the number of \$700  
20991 billion in savings and millions and millions of people, most  
20992 of whom -- or a lot of whom -- are eligible, but don't get  
20993 the health insurance anymore because it is so confusing,  
20994 there is so much red tape, there is so much bureaucracy, and  
20995 people just give up. And that is what happened in Georgia,  
20996 and that is what is going to happen if this bill moves  
20997 forward, plus the cuts to states, you are just going to see  
20998 an enormous amount of people lose their health insurance.

20999 And when you take that much money out of the system,  
21000 everybody suffers. I mean, you know, we know that. We know  
21001 when you take nearly \$1 trillion out of the system, between  
21002 the cuts here and the subsidies that are going away as part  
21003 of ACA, then you are going to see hospitals shutter their  
21004 doors, you are going to see physicians close their practices.  
21005 Everyone will suffer. That is it.

21006 I just -- it is -- I think you have demonstrated,  
21007 unfortunately, that this is very confusing, maybe  
21008 intentionally so. But the result will be millions and  
21009 millions of people just don't get health insurance, and most  
21010 of whom are probably eligible.

21011 I yield back.

21012 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. The  
21013 chair now recognizes the gentleman from Texas for five

21014 minutes.

21015           \*Mr. Pfluger. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

21016           It is as if these are the first time these questions  
21017 have ever been asked, but there -- it is not. This isn't the  
21018 first time we have ever asked these questions. In fact, the  
21019 states that don't expand go through this process every single  
21020 day. And at one point in time every state made these  
21021 adjudications, and had these questions, and looked at these  
21022 eligibility requirements. So how disingenuous to act like  
21023 this is the first time we have ever asked these questions,  
21024 because it is not.

21025           The accusation that this is for cruelty purposes, give  
21026 me a break.

21027           And I actually am heartened, though, to hear my  
21028 colleagues talk about bureaucracy and red tape. I mean, that  
21029 is -- it is about time. So that is a good, positive thing  
21030 that has come out of this hearing.

21031           But when we are talking about work requirements, we have  
21032 established very clearly four or five hours ago in this  
21033 markup that the other side of the aisle is not in favor of  
21034 work requirements. They don't believe people should be able  
21035 to -- have to work to do any of this, get any of these  
21036 benefits. And I think that the American people have spoken  
21037 loud and clear.

21038           My district doesn't have people that are just sitting

21039 around not working or not looking for a job. They all are  
21040 looking for a job. They all are working. They all are  
21041 trying to do that. And if they can't because they have some  
21042 sort of disability, or they are a veteran or a pregnant  
21043 woman, then they are covered by Medicaid. And thank goodness  
21044 we are getting to a point where the delivery of health care  
21045 to them is going to be tailored, it is going to be  
21046 beneficial, it is going to be much better than it has been.

21047 And by the way, the people that are going to have some  
21048 work requirements are going to get a plan that is going to be  
21049 better for them, and it is going to allow them to continue to  
21050 live out that American dream.

21051 So it is hard to sit here and listen to this false  
21052 narrative that these are the first time -- this is the first  
21053 time we have ever had these questions, the first time that  
21054 the Secretary of HHS has ever had to weigh in on who is  
21055 eligible and who is not, because that is false.

21056 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Would the gentleman yield?

21057 \*Mr. Pfluger. And I will yield time after I am done  
21058 talking.

21059 That is a false narrative that in no way, shape, or form  
21060 should ever be insinuated that Medicaid has not had to ask  
21061 those questions.

21062 So I will yield 30 seconds.

21063 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Okay, so you mentioned the Secretary

21064 of Health and Human Services, and on this side, like, we are  
21065 -- we all kind of just instinctively laugh when we think  
21066 about RFK making scientifically-driven decisions.

21067 \*Mr. Pfluger. Okay.

21068 \*Mr. Auchincloss. But actually, let's set that aside  
21069 for a second.

21070 \*Mr. Pfluger. Let's set that -- if that is the purpose  
21071 of your question, then --

21072 \*Mr. Auchincloss. No, like, because I actually have a  
21073 -- I want to really dive into a very specific concern I have,  
21074 which is corruption, because the head of DOGE for the  
21075 healthcare department is a man named Brad Smith. And the  
21076 thing about Brad Smith is that he is the CEO of Main Street  
21077 Health, which provides primary care services to patients in  
21078 rural America. He is also the executive chairman of  
21079 CareBridge, which serves home-bound Medicaid patients. Now,  
21080 this is the guy who is in charge of CMS right now.

21081 Do you have any concerns that maybe there is a conflict  
21082 of interest about a guy who makes money off of Medicaid being  
21083 in charge of these decisions?

21084 \*Mr. Pfluger. We will stick to the work requirements  
21085 piece.

21086 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Well, I --

21087 \*Mr. Pfluger. I am going to take --

21088 \*Mr. Auchincloss. They are related.

21089           \*Mr. Pfluger. Mr. Auchincloss, I will take my time  
21090 back. I am sorry, the gentleman from Massachusetts, I will  
21091 take my time back. I would love to have that conversation at  
21092 some point, but right now we are talking about work  
21093 requirements.

21094           And I think the most important thing for all of those  
21095 that are in the audience right now, all of those that are  
21096 watching through the TV, the millions of people that are  
21097 watching through the TV, is that there is a healthy debate  
21098 that has happened, and two sides of this debate have emerged.  
21099 One side does not believe in work requirements. It has been  
21100 stated clearly that there is no belief that you have to  
21101 actually do anything to receive benefits, that you have to  
21102 show, if you are an able-bodied adult not previously covered  
21103 -- and that list has been clearly stated: pregnant women;  
21104 individuals under the age of 19 or over the age of 64; foster  
21105 youth; former foster youth under the age of 26; members of  
21106 tribes; individuals who are considered medically frail, which  
21107 includes but is not limited to individuals who are blind,  
21108 disabled, or have chronic substance use disorder; and that  
21109 goes on and on and on.

21110           Those folks that I just listed and more are not subject  
21111 to this. They are the ones that Medicaid was designed for,  
21112 and they will receive their benefits. And actually, they  
21113 will receive better benefits because the ones that it was not

21114 designed for are going to be subject to work requirements.

21115 And I yield back.

21116 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Is there  
21117 any other member looking to speak?

21118 The chair recognizes the gentleman from California for  
21119 five minutes.

21120 \*Mr. Ruiz. Yes, let me just be very clear. This side  
21121 does not believe in work requirements because of the red tape  
21122 barriers that force people off of the Medicaid rolls. That  
21123 is the only reason.

21124 And when the gentleman asked me, that is the reason why  
21125 I told him he is misconstruing the reason for his own  
21126 narrative. And so with that I just want to clear the record.  
21127 We are opposed to the -- I am opposed to the work  
21128 requirements because of the red tape. They are designed to  
21129 get people to fall off the Medicaid. Those are the eligible  
21130 individuals.

21131 And with that I yield back.

21132 \*Mr. Menendez. Will the gentleman yield? Will the  
21133 gentleman yield?

21134 \*Mr. Ruiz. No, I yield back.

21135 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields back. Is  
21136 there any other member looking to speak?

21137 The chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts  
21138 for five minutes.

21139           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Chairman.

21140           I would really just -- because we have to engage on the  
21141 question of the Secretary of Health and Human Services being  
21142 part of this bureaucracy that the Republicans are  
21143 implementing -- we have a brand new bureaucracy now, right,  
21144 that is cascading across the states. And the Secretary of  
21145 HHS and the office therein is part of it.

21146           So I would ask both the chairman of the Health Sub and  
21147 the chairman of the full committee, are you two concerned  
21148 about a guy who -- and I will -- again, I will give his job  
21149 description -- CEO of Main Street Health, which provides  
21150 primary care services to patients in rural America, and  
21151 executive chairman of CareBridge, which serves homebound  
21152 Medicaid patients. He is working right now at HHS, and he is  
21153 making money off HHS. Are either of you concerned about  
21154 that?

21155           \*The Chair. I am sorry, I wasn't -- I didn't hear you.  
21156 Could you say that again?

21157           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Okay, we will do it again. Brad  
21158 Smith, head of DOGE for health care, CEO of a company that  
21159 provides primary care services to patients in rural America,  
21160 and executive chairman of CareBridge, which serves homebound  
21161 Medicaid patients. Now, he is going to be part of this  
21162 apparatus, this bureaucracy that Republicans are creating.  
21163 He is front and center.

21164           \*The Chair. I don't believe we are creating a  
21165 bureaucracy. I don't think that is accurate.

21166           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Okay. He is part of this new schema  
21167 that Republicans are putting in place to make sure that  
21168 people are filling out paperwork sufficiently. Are you  
21169 concerned about his role in this, given that he is making  
21170 money off of CMS decisions?

21171           \*The Chair. I don't believe that DOGE is involved in  
21172 this, in this bill, in this decision-making process, so I --

21173           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Okay, because DOGE has been so hands-  
21174 off across the Federal Government to date?

21175           \*The Chair. They are not involved in this process.

21176           \*Mr. Auchincloss. So there is no concerns about a guy  
21177 who makes money off of CMS being front and center for  
21178 decisions about who gets care. He literally makes money off  
21179 Medicaid.

21180           \*The Chair. DOGE does not have decisions in this bill.  
21181 So, I mean --

21182           \*Mr. Pfluger. Will the gentleman yield?

21183           \*Mr. Auchincloss. That is fine.

21184           \*Mr. Pfluger. Are you against efficiencies and looking  
21185 at them?

21186           \*Mr. Auchincloss. I am for return on investment. And  
21187 when DOGE fires the guy at the FDA who makes sure that  
21188 eyedrops don't blind you, that is not an ROI, okay? That is



21189 foolish decision-making that creates uncertainty for business  
21190 and makes Americans less safe.

21191         And putting this guy, who has a direct conflict of  
21192 interest -- he runs a Medicaid business. Putting him front  
21193 and center in this opaque, complicated scheme that you are  
21194 all putting together for work requirements invites  
21195 corruption. And it is not like this administration has  
21196 exactly inspired confidence in their ability to keep their  
21197 private sector and public sector responsibilities separate.

21198         \*Mr. Weber. Will the gentleman yield?

21199         \*Mr. Auchincloss. Please.

21200         \*Mr. Weber. Explain to me. I am thinking back to when  
21201 Biden was Vice -- Biden was Vice President under Obama, and  
21202 he went to Ukraine and withheld a billion --

21203         \*Mr. Auchincloss. Oh, here we go.

21204         \*Mr. Weber. -- tax dollars. So that was okay in your  
21205 mind, but him trying to cut spending and find places is not  
21206 okay?

21207         \*Mr. Auchincloss. Taking back my time, the whataboutism  
21208 is not going to cut it in this room, and it is not going to  
21209 cut it with your constituents. It is not going to cut it  
21210 when they are losing home and community-based services so  
21211 that Brad Smith can make an extra billion dollars. The  
21212 whataboutism is going to get very stale very fast, and  
21213 eventually you all are going to have to do town halls, and it

21214 is not going to work.

21215 I will yield back my time.

21216 \*Mr. Menendez. Will the gentleman yield?

21217 \*Mr. Auchincloss. I will yield to the gentleman from  
21218 New Jersey.

21219 \*Mr. Menendez. Like what is -- against yielding to me.

21220 So just real quick, because my colleague from Texas was  
21221 sort of talking about our approach to red tape and how he --  
21222 one of his key takeaways was how Democrats feel about red  
21223 tape and about making government services more efficient, I  
21224 would just sort of go back. It feels like days ago, but it  
21225 was just hours ago when we had the markup on the energy  
21226 section of this bill. And with respect to working  
21227 individuals across all of our districts who are on Medicaid  
21228 who now have these additional red tape reporting obligations  
21229 that are part of this bill, you are sticking it to them.  
21230 They are probably going to lose health care insurance because  
21231 of it.

21232 When it comes to energy permitting reform and expediting  
21233 the system there, in that space you are just comfortable with  
21234 people paying a flat fee -- \$10 million, \$1 million, \$50,000  
21235 -- and you will greenlight the process there. So for the  
21236 uber-wealthy corporations in the energy sector, pay a one-  
21237 time fee and do as you please. For hard-working Americans  
21238 across the country, more reporting, more red tape, more of a

21239 burden on their day-to-day lives when they already are  
21240 working, taking care of their families, taking care of their  
21241 children, taking care of their elders, making sure they have  
21242 a roof over their family's head, making sure they can afford  
21243 groceries.

21244 But you know what? Let's stick them with some  
21245 additional work requirements like we saw in Georgia, like we  
21246 saw in Arkansas, so that way maybe they fall off Medicaid,  
21247 and that way we have to pay less into it so states have to  
21248 pay less into it. It is such an interesting approach, such  
21249 an interesting approach, that when it comes to workers across  
21250 America, make it harder, make it more burdensome. When it  
21251 comes to energy producers, giant energy companies? Just pay  
21252 a simple amount, and we will make it the easiest process in  
21253 the world. I think that says a lot about the values and  
21254 priorities of the Republican Party.

21255 I yield back to my colleague from Massachusetts.

21256 \*Mr. Auchincloss. I yield back to the chair.

21257 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Are any  
21258 other members looking to speak?

21259 Hearing none --

21260 \*Mr. Pallone. A roll call.

21261 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Okay, hearing none, the vote  
21262 occurs on the amendment. A recorded vote has been requested.  
21263 The clerk will call the roll.

21264           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta?  
21265           \*Mr. Latta.   No.  
21266           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.  
21267           Mr. Griffith?  
21268           \*Mr. Griffith.   No.  
21269           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
21270           Mr. Bilirakis?  
21271           [No response.]  
21272           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson?  
21273           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.  
21274           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
21275           Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
21276           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
21277           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
21278           Mr. Palmer?  
21279           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
21280           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
21281           Mr. Dunn?  
21282           \*Mr. Dunn.   No.  
21283           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.  
21284           Mr. Crenshaw?  
21285           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
21286           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
21287           Mr. Joyce?  
21288           [No response.]

21289           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber?  
21290           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
21291           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
21292           Mr. Allen?  
21293           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
21294           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
21295           Mr. Balderson?  
21296           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
21297           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
21298           Mr. Fulcher?  
21299           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
21300           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
21301           Mr. Pfluger?  
21302           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
21303           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
21304           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
21305           [No response.]  
21306           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger?  
21307           [No response.]  
21308           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
21309           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
21310           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
21311           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
21312           Mrs. Cammack?  
21313           [No response.]

21314           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
21315           [No response.]  
21316           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte?  
21317           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
21318           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
21319           Mr. James?  
21320           \*Mr. James.   No.  
21321           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
21322           Mr. Bentz?  
21323           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
21324           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
21325           Mrs. Houchin?  
21326           [No response.]  
21327           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin?  
21328           [No response.]  
21329           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry?  
21330           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
21331           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
21332           Ms. Lee?  
21333           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
21334           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
21335           Mr. Langworthy?  
21336           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
21337           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
21338           Mr. Kean?

21339           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
21340           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
21341           Mr. Rulli?  
21342           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
21343           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
21344           Mr. Evans?  
21345           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
21346           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
21347           Mr. Goldman?  
21348           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
21349           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
21350           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
21351           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
21352           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
21353           Mr. Pallone?  
21354           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
21355           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
21356           Ms. DeGette?  
21357           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
21358           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
21359           Ms. Schakowsky?  
21360           [No response.]  
21361           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky?  
21362           [No response.]  
21363           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui?

21364           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
21365           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
21366           Ms. Castor?  
21367           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
21368           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
21369           Mr. Tonko?  
21370           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
21371           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
21372           Ms. Clarke?  
21373           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
21374           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
21375           Mr. Ruiz?  
21376           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
21377           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
21378           Mr. Peters?  
21379           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
21380           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
21381           Mrs. Dingell?  
21382           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
21383           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
21384           Mr. Veasey?  
21385           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
21386           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
21387           Ms. Kelly?  
21388           \*Ms. Kelly.   Aye.



21389           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
21390           Ms. Barragan?  
21391           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
21392           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
21393           Mr. Soto?  
21394           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
21395           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
21396           Ms. Schrier?  
21397           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
21398           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
21399           Mrs. Trahan?  
21400           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.  
21401           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
21402           Mrs. Fletcher?  
21403           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
21404           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
21405           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
21406           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
21407           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
21408           Mr. Auchincloss?  
21409           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
21410           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
21411           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
21412           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.  
21413           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

21414 Mr. Menendez?

21415 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

21416 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

21417 Mr. Mullin?

21418 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

21419 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

21420 Mr. Landsman?

21421 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

21422 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

21423 Ms. McClellan?

21424 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

21425 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

21426 Chairman Guthrie?

21427 [No response.]

21428 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie?

21429 \*The Chair. No.

21430 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

21431 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. How is Mr. Bilirakis recorded?

21432 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis is not recorded.

21433 \*Mr. Bilirakis. Bilirakis votes no.

21434 \*The Clerk. Bilirakis votes no.

21435 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. How is Dr. Joyce recorded?

21436 \*The Clerk. Dr. Joyce is not recorded.

21437 \*Mr. Joyce. Joyce votes no.

21438 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

21439           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. How is Dr. Harshbarger  
21440 recorded?

21441           \*The Clerk. Dr. Harshbarger is not recorded.

21442           \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

21443           \*The Clerk. Dr. Harshbarger votes no.

21444           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the  
21445 results.

21446           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23  
21447 ayes and 28 noes.

21448           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The amendment is not agreed to.

21449           \*The Chair. [Presiding] Is there any further -- for  
21450 what purpose does gentlelady from Illinois seek recognition?

21451           \*Ms. Kelly. I have an amendment.

21452           \*The Chair. Designate your amendment.

21453           \*Ms. Kelly. Health-FCD-AMD\_053.XML.

21454           \*The Chair. Do you have that amendment?

21455           Could you say the amendment again? I guess --

21456           \*Ms. Kelly. FCD-AMD\_053.XML.

21457           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, I do not have that amendment  
21458 at the desk.

21459           \*Mr. Pallone. AMD\_053?

21460           \*Ms. Kelly. I said 053.

21461           \*The Chair. Zero five three?

21462           Do you have the amendment in front of -- okay, the clerk  
21463 will report.

21464           \*The Clerk. Health-FCD-AMD\_053, offered by Ms. Kelly.

21465       In section 44141, add at the end the following. F state

21466       audit requirement, beginning --

21467           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the

21468       amendment is dispensed with.

21469           [The amendment of Ms. Kelly follows:]

21470

21471       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

21472

21473           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
21474 minutes in support of the amendment.

21475           \*Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21476           We have spoken about forcing families to regularly  
21477 report their employment status to keep health coverage. My  
21478 amendment would require an annual audit of these requirements  
21479 to show who is losing coverage and why.

21480           We already know what audits will show: millions losing  
21481 their health care not because they failed to work, but  
21482 because they failed to navigate a confusing system. The  
21483 paperwork mandate is rooted in the false and cruel idea that  
21484 Medicaid recipients are not productive members of society.  
21485 My colleague from New Jersey and many of my colleagues  
21486 already told you that most people work: 44 percent work  
21487 full-time, another 20 percent work part-time. Those who  
21488 can't work are typically managing serious health issues or  
21489 caring for loved ones.

21490           And this is not just the beneficiaries who will suffer.  
21491 Providers will bear the burden of explaining complex  
21492 paperwork. Medicaid health plans will be forced to hire more  
21493 staff just to keep up. This means more bureaucracy, longer  
21494 phone hold times, and more barriers for people who are simply  
21495 trying to access care. These mandates, in practice, they  
21496 create an obstacle course, one that too often ends in someone  
21497 being dropped from care.

21498           We have seen this play out before. I am not going to  
21499 get into it because we already heard about Arkansas and  
21500 Georgia. We heard a little bit about New Hampshire. But in  
21501 New Hampshire, under former Republican Governor Sununu, tried  
21502 to avoid those mistakes by adding a curing process and a no-  
21503 wrong-door policy. The state spent \$130,000 on outreach  
21504 efforts. But right before implementation, 17,000 people were  
21505 on track to lose coverage. The governor hit pause, and the  
21506 courts later struck down the policy.

21507           If this policy becomes national, an estimated 344,000 to  
21508 633,000 Medicaid recipients in Illinois could lose coverage  
21509 due to administrative issues. Most would be non-disabled  
21510 adults aged 19 to 24. Women, especially women of color aged  
21511 50 to 64, would be among the hardest hit. As chair of the  
21512 CBC Health Brain Trust, this is very concerning to me.

21513           And let's be honest about where these policies come  
21514 from. Red tape requirements are rooted in racist myths,  
21515 particularly harmful narratives about who is on Medicaid.  
21516 Black Americans. This country was built on the backs of  
21517 Black people. We have always contributed to this economy,  
21518 and will still do so. As chair of the Health Brain Trust, I  
21519 will be -- continue to fight to dismantle these inequities  
21520 and ensure health equity is at the center of Federal health  
21521 policies.

21522           So I urge my colleagues to vote for my amendment that

21523 will require states to shut these programs down if more than  
21524 five percent of the people kicked off of coverage are people  
21525 who actually were meeting the work standard or people who  
21526 actually should have been exempt. If this is really about  
21527 what Republicans say it is about, then I encourage them to  
21528 join me in support of this amendment.

21529 Thank you, and I yield back.

21530 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
21531 from Georgia is recognized.

21532 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

21533 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized for five  
21534 minutes.

21535 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I don't know how  
21536 long the other side is planning on going on about this  
21537 particular subject, but we have discussed it ad nauseam at  
21538 this point.

21539 The community engagement policy provides numerous  
21540 exceptions and beneficiary protections to ensure that the  
21541 beneficiaries who are meeting the community engagement  
21542 requirements are not disenrolled. I believe we have covered  
21543 that. I don't know what else can be said. Mr. Chairman, you  
21544 yourself went over the exceptions and described them in  
21545 detail.

21546 This additional state burden that is being proposed here  
21547 is unnecessary. The section already includes the following

21548 state requirements to protect beneficiaries, incorporates the  
21549 verification process into the regular application process so  
21550 that beneficiaries are not burdened with unnecessary  
21551 reporting requirements and paperwork.

21552         It establishes outreach processes for states and MCOs to  
21553 alert beneficiaries about the requirements, it establishes  
21554 requirements for states to utilize ex-parte review processes  
21555 where states utilize existing data like payroll data to  
21556 support beneficiaries' verification process, and it  
21557 establishes due process rights for beneficiaries before they  
21558 are disenrolled from coverage, including providing an  
21559 additional 30 days to come into compliance with the  
21560 requirements before coverage is terminated. It goes to great  
21561 lengths, Mr. Chairman, to make sure that we are doing  
21562 everything we can to accommodate them here.

21563         This legislation will also provide grants to state  
21564 Medicaid programs to help them establish systems necessary to  
21565 carry out this section. Not only are we describing what we  
21566 are doing, we are also giving them grants to help them.

21567         This amendment is not necessary, and I urge my  
21568 colleagues to oppose it.

21569         And I yield back.

21570         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
21571 further discussion?

21572         Seeing none --



21573           \*Mr. Pallone. A roll call.

21574           \*The Chair. If there is no further discussion, the --  
21575 no further?

21576           The vote occurs on the amendment. A roll call being  
21577 requested, the clerk will call the roll.

21578           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

21579           \*Mr. Latta. No.

21580           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

21581           Mr. Griffith?

21582           \*Mr. Griffith. No.

21583           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

21584           Mr. Bilirakis?

21585           \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

21586           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

21587           Mr. Hudson?

21588           \*Mr. Hudson. No.

21589           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

21590           Mr. Carter of Georgia?

21591           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

21592           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

21593           Mr. Palmer?

21594           \*Mr. Palmer. No.

21595           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

21596           Mr. Dunn?

21597           [No response.]

21598           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
21599           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
21600           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
21601           Mr. Joyce?  
21602           [No response.]  
21603           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber?  
21604           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
21605           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
21606           Mr. Allen?  
21607           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
21608           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
21609           Mr. Balderson?  
21610           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
21611           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
21612           Mr. Fulcher?  
21613           [No response.]  
21614           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger?  
21615           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
21616           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
21617           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
21618           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
21619           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
21620           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
21621           [No response.]  
21622           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?

21623 [No response.]

21624 \*The Clerk. Mr. Oubernolte?

21625 [No response.]

21626 \*The Clerk. Mr. James?

21627 \*Mr. James. No.

21628 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.

21629 Mr. Bentz?

21630 \*Mr. Bentz. No.

21631 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.

21632 Mrs. Houchin?

21633 [No response.]

21634 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry?

21635 \*Mr. Fry. No.

21636 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.

21637 Ms. Lee?

21638 \*Ms. Lee. No.

21639 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.

21640 Mr. Langworthy?

21641 [No response.]

21642 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean?

21643 \*Mr. Kean. No.

21644 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.

21645 Mr. Rulli?

21646 \*Mr. Rulli. No.

21647 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.

21648 Mr. Evans?  
21649 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
21650 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.  
21651 Mr. Goldman?  
21652 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
21653 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
21654 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
21655 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.  
21656 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
21657 Mr. Pallone?  
21658 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
21659 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
21660 Ms. DeGette?  
21661 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
21662 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
21663 Ms. Schakowsky?  
21664 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
21665 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
21666 Ms. Matsui?  
21667 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
21668 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
21669 Ms. Castor?  
21670 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
21671 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
21672 Mr. Tonko?

21673           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
21674           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
21675           Ms. Clarke?  
21676           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
21677           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
21678           Mr. Ruiz?  
21679           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
21680           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
21681           Mr. Peters?  
21682           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
21683           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
21684           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
21685           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
21686           Mr. Veasey?  
21687           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
21688           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
21689           Ms. Kelly?  
21690           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
21691           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
21692           Ms. Barragan?  
21693           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
21694           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
21695           Mr. Soto?  
21696           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
21697           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.

21698 Ms. Schrier?  
21699 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
21700 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
21701 Mrs. Trahan?  
21702 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
21703 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
21704 Mrs. Fletcher?  
21705 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
21706 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
21707 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
21708 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
21709 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
21710 Mr. Auchincloss?  
21711 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
21712 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
21713 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
21714 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
21715 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
21716 Mr. Menendez?  
21717 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
21718 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
21719 Mr. Mullin?  
21720 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
21721 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
21722 Mr. Landsman?

21723           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

21724           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

21725           Ms. McClellan?

21726           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

21727           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

21728           Chairman Guthrie?

21729           \*The Chair.   No.

21730           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

21731           \*Mr. Dunn.   How is Dunn recorded?

21732           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn is not recorded.

21733           \*Mr. Dunn.   No.

21734           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.

21735           \*Mr. Joyce.   How is Dr. Joyce recorded?

21736           \*The Clerk.   Dr. Joyce is not recorded.

21737           \*Mr. Joyce.   Joyce votes no.

21738           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.

21739           \*Mr. Obernolte.   Obernolte, no.

21740           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.

21741           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.

21742           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.

21743           [Pause.]

21744           \*The Chair.   Is Mr. Dunn recorded?

21745           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn is recorded as no.

21746           \*The Chair.   Is Mr. Griffith recorded?

21747           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith is recorded as no.

21748           \*The Chair.   Seeing none on your side, the clerk will  
21749   report.

21750           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23  
21751   ayes and 26 noes.

21752           \*The Chair.   The amendment is not agreed to.  
21753   Are there any further amendments of the bill?

21754           \*Mr. Pallone.   There is one.

21755           \*The Chair.   The gentleman from Ohio is recognized.   For  
21756   what purpose does the gentleman from Ohio seek recognition?

21757           \*Mr. Landsman.   Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the  
21758   desk.

21759           \*The Chair.   Will you identify your amendment?

21760           \*Mr. Landsman.   Health-FCD-AMD\_044.

21761           \*The Chair.   Do you have that?

21762           The clerk will report the amendment.

21763           \*The Clerk.   Amendment -- strike -- FCD-AMD\_044, strike  
21764   section 44142.

21765           \*The Chair.   Without objection, the -- I think is the  
21766   reading of the amendment, right?   Okay, so we will not  
21767   dispense with the reading of the amendment, since you just  
21768   read the amendment.

21769           [The amendment of Mr. Landsman follows:]

21770

21771   \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

21772



21773           \*The Chair. Is there a discussion on the amendment?

21774           The gentleman from Ohio is recognized to discuss the  
21775 amendment.

21776           \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

21777           The amendment would strike section 44142 of this bill  
21778 that implements a mandatory cost sharing for folks in the  
21779 Medicaid expansion population making \$1,800 a month.  
21780 Currently, copays and co-insurance are only narrowly  
21781 permitted for certain services and in normal amounts.  
21782 However, in this bill you all want to raise health care costs  
21783 for the most vulnerable by implementing mandatory -- somebody  
21784 said earlier that it was permissible or allowable. It is  
21785 required. It is a required new payment, and it is going to  
21786 hurt those who are already struggling to pay their bills.  
21787 Under this section you would be requiring folks just above  
21788 the Federal poverty line to pay \$35, up to \$35, for all non-  
21789 exempt services. So, as a reminder, the Federal poverty line  
21790 is \$15,560 a year.

21791           And here is probably the larger point. Elsewhere in the  
21792 budget bill you are giving people who make \$5 million a year  
21793 a \$500,000 tax cut. But somehow, someone making \$16,000 a  
21794 year has to pay more for their health care. That is insane.

21795           These new copays will force low-income Medicaid  
21796 enrollees to lose their coverage or stop going to get the  
21797 health care they need. The plan will make people sicker, not

21798 healthier. The provision would mean that an adult in the  
21799 Medicaid expansion population who makes \$16,000 a year and is  
21800 undergoing cancer treatment would need to pay \$35 every time  
21801 they go to the doctor until they hit their cost sharing  
21802 limit.

21803       Even more problematically, the provision explicitly  
21804 permits states to allow providers to not serve the individual  
21805 who isn't able to pay the copay. These copays will add  
21806 financial burdens to families who cannot afford coverage and  
21807 put them at risk -- or further risk -- of medical debt if  
21808 they are not already in medical debt or have medical debt.  
21809 In the states that have tested cost sharing and Medicaid,  
21810 many enrollees have been sent to debt collectors due to  
21811 failure to pay.

21812       While Republicans say they want to address rising health  
21813 care costs, this provision absolutely raises costs on your  
21814 constituents. These rising costs will force families to  
21815 choose between a health -- between health care and paying for  
21816 groceries and rent. All of these changes are to accomplish  
21817 one thing: give tax breaks to the uber-wealthy. That is all  
21818 this is. It is cruel. It is unnecessary. And I ask my  
21819 colleagues to support this amendment and do away with these  
21820 unnecessary new payments.

21821       Thank you, and I yield back.

21822       \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman

21823 from Virginia, for what purpose do seek recognition?

21824 \*Mr. Griffith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I appreciate  
21825 that.

21826 As we went over a little bit earlier this morning, this  
21827 is a state option. For those people in Medicaid expansion  
21828 between 100 and 133 percent above the poverty limit or the  
21829 poverty -- of the poverty limit, those people, in other  
21830 words, at the very top of the expansion list, the ones with  
21831 the most income, the states -- what the bill says is the  
21832 states charge a copay.

21833 Now, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle always  
21834 want to talk about the \$35. And it is true, we cap it at  
21835 \$35, but it can be anywhere above 0 and -- for argument,  
21836 let's say \$1. It is arguable. Under the language of the  
21837 bill it could be \$0.50, but let's just say \$1 for the sake of  
21838 argument, up to \$35. The concept is that when that person at  
21839 the very top of the Medicaid expansion numbers or income, if  
21840 they were to get a pay raise or if they wanted to move  
21841 because they anticipated getting a pay raise or for whatever  
21842 reason to an Obamacare plan, they would have a copay.

21843 So if the states want to, they can have a copay. It has  
21844 -- they have to have one between -- above zero -- we will say  
21845 \$1, it could be \$0.50, as I have said -- all the way up to  
21846 \$35. We capped it at \$35. My understanding is the states  
21847 technically could have a copay now, and there is no cap.

21848 Now, that is -- that was new information I just got, so I am  
21849 happy for counsel to tell me I am wrong, but that is my  
21850 understanding. And that money then goes to the state for an  
21851 offset on Medicaid, so it helps them pay for it.

21852       You know, one of the complaints my colleagues have kept  
21853 making is that this is all going for purposes they think are  
21854 inappropriate, and why isn't it going to help with Medicaid.  
21855 Well, in this case, if the state chose to go to a number of  
21856 \$35, it would be an offset. They don't have to, they don't  
21857 have to. Unfortunately, my colleagues on the other side  
21858 consistently want to say that it is -- oh, we are charging  
21859 \$35. This is a state option. We are trying to give the  
21860 states tools that they can figure out what they want to do as  
21861 people start moving up.

21862       And the goal would be to have them move off of Medicaid  
21863 expansion and move on to one of the tax-subsidized Obamacare  
21864 plans. That is the concept. That is moving folks forward.  
21865 That is making sure that, as people get a little bit more  
21866 economically healthy, that they are in a position to move up  
21867 to the next level. And I would submit that, if the state  
21868 chose to, they might do that so that their folks in that top  
21869 tier of the Medicaid expansion population are prepared to  
21870 move to the next step, instead of getting a shock when they  
21871 move to the next step and suddenly they have got copays.

21872       \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

21873           \*Mr. Griffith. That is up to the states. That is up to  
21874 the states.

21875           And so I would submit --

21876           \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

21877           \*Mr. Griffith. Well, let me finish. I want to finish.

21878           \*Ms. DeGette. Okay.

21879           \*Mr. Griffith. But I would submit to you all that, you  
21880 know, we should be giving the states some tools. We are  
21881 doing some things where we don't give them leeway. Here is  
21882 one where we are giving them leeway. And unfortunately, as  
21883 my colleagues who have been at this all night can assure you,  
21884 if we give the states leeway somehow Republicans are evil,  
21885 and if we don't give the states leeway somehow Republicans  
21886 are evil. I just have to assume that you all are going to  
21887 think I am evil no matter what I do, and you all get to  
21888 choose which one of the poisons you want to dose on me.

21889           \*The Chair. Could you yield?

21890           \*Mr. Griffith. That being said, I think I have  
21891 explained it as best I can.

21892           \*The Chair. Could you yield to me right quick?

21893           \*Mr. Griffith. Yes, I yield to the chairman of the full  
21894 committee.

21895           \*The Chair. I just want to make sure, for counsel -- so  
21896 currently it is a state option, and they can go up to \$100 on  
21897 a copay, right, or on cost share. And this is -- states have

21898 to do this, but it drops that ceiling down to \$35.

21899 \*Counsel. That --

21900 \*The Chair. Is that correct?

21901 \*Counsel. That summary is correct.

21902 \*The Chair. So it is going from \$100 to \$35 in our  
21903 bill.

21904 \*Counsel. The maximum allowable cost sharing for a  
21905 service would be \$35.

21906 \*The Chair. Which -- currently, it is \$100 if a state  
21907 takes that option, right?

21908 \*Counsel. Yes, the maximum.

21909 \*The Chair. So we are lowering that.

21910 \*Counsel. The maximum.

21911 \*The Chair. And then the same populations sometimes are  
21912 available for the Affordable Care Act, and they have a two  
21913 percent income cost share and they could go up to five  
21914 percent?

21915 \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Chairman, taking back my time  
21916 just briefly, I would say that my understanding is that there  
21917 is a whole list in the existing bill, in section 1916, of  
21918 things where the copay does not apply, and that would still  
21919 be true in this bill, as well.

21920 \*The Chair. All right, our time has expired.

21921 \*Mr. Griffith. I yield.

21922 \*The Chair. The gentlelady from Colorado is recognized

21923 for five --

21924 \*Ms. DeGette. I move to strike the last word.

21925 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

21926 \*Ms. DeGette. So let me get this straight. Let me ask  
21927 counsel.

21928 Under current law it is optional for the states to have  
21929 a copay, correct?

21930 \*Counsel. Yes, for individuals above 100 percent.

21931 \*Ms. DeGette. And which states have a \$100 copay  
21932 currently?

21933 \*Counsel. I would have to direct you to CMS for  
21934 implementation of current law.

21935 \*Ms. DeGette. It is actually no states, right?

21936 \*Counsel. I would have to direct you to the states for  
21937 that answer.

21938 \*Ms. DeGette. Mr. Chairman, do you know how many states  
21939 have \$100?

21940 \*The Chair. I don't know, I couldn't tell you off the  
21941 top of --

21942 \*Ms. DeGette. Well, we will get that information.

21943 \*The Chair. But after this it would have to be 35.

21944 \*Ms. DeGette. Okay, well, except for --

21945 \*The Chair. Or less.

21946 \*Ms. DeGette. Except --

21947 \*The Chair. Thirty-five or less.

21948           \*Ms. DeGette. Excuse me, reclaiming my time.

21949           \*The Chair. Yes, you asked me a question.

21950           \*Ms. DeGette. Except for the fact that under this bill,  
21951 on page 89, it says -- and after Mr. Griffith read the bill  
21952 -- I am sorry, my colleague from Virginia read the bill --  
21953 then he realized it does, in fact, say required imposition of  
21954 cost sharing.

21955           So counsel, that is different than current law because  
21956 current law is optional. But this is required. Is that  
21957 correct?

21958           \*Counsel. That is correct.

21959           \*Ms. DeGette. And in the definition it says that states  
21960 could go up to -- from 0 up to \$35, \$35 is the most. But  
21961 then my colleague from Virginia said the states will want to  
21962 do this to offset the -- to do the offset to help pay for the  
21963 Medicaid.

21964           So I guess I would ask -- and this is sort of a  
21965 rhetorical question -- well, it is a rhetorical question. I  
21966 don't think that my colleagues on the other side of the aisle  
21967 have any data to support that they would have a zero percent  
21968 -- or, I mean, a zero-dollar copay. Because if the incentive  
21969 is for the states to make money, then they are going to  
21970 impose \$35 copays on everybody.

21971           And so really, this bill, it is not completely thought  
21972 through, but what we do know is that 8.6 million people are



21973 going to lose their insurance under this bill, and an  
21974 additional 5 more under the Medicaid expansion.

21975 And I yield back.

21976 \*Voice. Ms. DeGette, can I --

21977 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
21978 further -- the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. Joyce, is  
21979 recognized for five minutes.

21980 \*Mr. Joyce. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to speak  
21981 in opposition to this amendment.

21982 Recently I traveled throughout the Commonwealth of  
21983 Pennsylvania. I met with many different physicians. I met  
21984 with family doctors, with emergency room doctors. We talked  
21985 about what we were going to be doing here. And what they  
21986 brought up to me is how important they felt -- I didn't bring  
21987 this concept -- how important they felt that a copay for  
21988 individuals with Medicaid was.

21989 I heard this from emergency room doctors who said if  
21990 someone has an opportunity to be here and have a zero copay,  
21991 they will sit here for hours. But if they had skin in the  
21992 game, if they had the opportunity to have a copay, as we see  
21993 in other insurances like Medicare, that might allow them to  
21994 make other considerations of whether or not they were going  
21995 to spend the night in the emergency room or hours in the  
21996 emergency room, which, as we all have addressed, has led to  
21997 the crowding in emergency rooms.

21998           Again, reiterating what we have discussed, this copay  
21999   can be from anywhere to [sic] a penny to \$35. It doesn't  
22000   have to be a \$35. It is for the Medicaid expansion  
22001   population. It is not for children. It is not for pregnant  
22002   females. It is not for the disabled. It is a specific  
22003   population that needs to be addressed. States can make that  
22004   determination.

22005           I practiced medicine for 25 years in Pennsylvania, and  
22006   when I first started practicing there was a \$1 copay for  
22007   patients to come in for an office visit, a \$1 copay. That  
22008   doesn't exist right now. But as we look for the expansion  
22009   plan, as we look for those individuals at the top of their  
22010   game, getting back into the workforce to go on to the ACA  
22011   once again, they are going to be involved in plans that have  
22012   a copay. So introducing that copay, I think, is an  
22013   opportunity for individuals to step up and to be able to  
22014   move. And what I heard from the physicians, they felt that  
22015   that was important, as well, that that copay allowed the  
22016   responsibility to be shared by the patients.

22017           And reiterating what my colleagues have said here on  
22018   this side of the aisle, that does not have to be \$35. That  
22019   can be anywhere from a penny to \$35. It can be adjusted to  
22020   the appropriateness of that.

22021           And again, finalizing my comments here, it is not for  
22022   those on traditional Medicaid. Those individuals that are

22023 permanently disabled, that are children or pregnant females  
22024 will not have that copay, that co-share.

22025 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield.

22026 \*Mr. Griffith. Would you yield back?

22027 \*The Chair. The gentleman from Virginia --

22028 \*Mr. Joyce. I yield to Mr. Griffith -- I yield to my  
22029 colleague from the Commonwealth of Virginia.

22030 \*Mr. Griffith. I thank the gentleman from the  
22031 Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and appreciate his comments.

22032 I have to tell you, I love -- even in my addled, tired  
22033 state, I love sparring with the honorable lady from Colorado  
22034 who -- we often like to have interesting debates, and I  
22035 appreciate her greatly. And I would say that, if you follow  
22036 logic, if the states aren't charging the \$100 now, they are  
22037 not likely to charge the 35, because the \$100 would also be  
22038 an offset. They are not likely to charge the 35, but we are  
22039 just giving them that option in the event they want to do it  
22040 for the reasons I previously stated.

22041 They may. I don't know that they will. I would  
22042 anticipate that they would not start off at \$35, and I don't  
22043 know if they would ever get to \$35, but that would give them  
22044 an option if that is something that they chose to do.

22045 \*Ms. DeGette. Well --

22046 \*Mr. Griffith. And so I appreciate her greatly, and I  
22047 yield back to the gentleman from --

22048           \*Ms. DeGette. Well, if the gentleman from Pennsylvania  
22049 would yield, we don't know anywhere in statute where it says  
22050 \$100. It is more the overall cap, as I understand it, not  
22051 for each specific visit.

22052           So again, it is -- the bottom line is millions of people  
22053 are going to lose their insurance because of this.

22054           \*Mr. Griffith. And I don't agree.

22055           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields?

22056           \*Mr. Joyce. I yield back to the chair.

22057           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
22058 further discussion?

22059           The gentleman from New York is recognized for five  
22060 minutes to speak on the amendment.

22061           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to strike the  
22062 last word.

22063           You just can't make this stuff up. Republicans have  
22064 actually included now a sick tax on -- in their bill. They  
22065 actually wanted tax working-class people for having the  
22066 audacity to go to the doctor. Now, CBO scores this as a \$13  
22067 billion provision. As we know, this is in the bill, folks.  
22068 They are requiring states to impose a new sick tax on  
22069 Medicaid beneficiaries every time they see a specialist.

22070           My colleagues on the other side of the aisle are trying  
22071 to pretend like this provision is designed to prevent the  
22072 over-use of health care services. Give me a break. When is

22073 the last time you went to see your cardiologist for fun?  
22074 When is the last time you just went to your neighborhood  
22075 addiction clinic on a whim? These are not optional services.  
22076 These are places where sick people go to get better, and  
22077 Republicans want to tax you for that privilege.

22078 I just can't get over the fact that the Republicans are  
22079 asking working-class people struggling with addiction to pay  
22080 a new sick tax every time they go to the clinic. What is  
22081 that going to do to the progress that we have made on  
22082 combating the opioid epidemic? What is that going to do to  
22083 poor people's lives when they literally can't spare the extra  
22084 \$5 or \$35 to see the doctor this week? I will tell you what  
22085 will happen. People will get sicker and people will die.  
22086 And for what? Why are Republicans so hell bent on creating  
22087 this new sick tax on working-class folks?

22088 That is where the story gets even crazier. They are  
22089 doing all of this, literally nickel-and-diming poor, sick  
22090 people so that people like Elon Musk can get a massive tax  
22091 handout to buy another private jet that he doesn't need.  
22092 That is it. That is the whole ball game, folks, make poor,  
22093 sick people pay more so that Elon can steal your money and  
22094 buy whatever the hell he wants, including politicians.

22095 Republican colleagues, I can guarantee you that these  
22096 schemes are not popular in any congressional district in our  
22097 country. Per the rules of this committee, I apparently can't

22098 name those members who represent the constituents whose  
22099 stories I am going to share. Are my Republicans are too  
22100 scared to own these Medicaid cuts and how they will impact  
22101 their constituents? Do they not want their names attached to  
22102 this vote?

22103 I don't think that Alicia in Iowa City, who is  
22104 recovering from addiction, wants to hand Elon Musk an extra  
22105 \$5 every time she goes to pick up her MAT treatment. I don't  
22106 think Michelle in Elmira should have to pay more to manage  
22107 her chronic disease, just to give billionaires another tax  
22108 break. These are real people and real consequences. My  
22109 Republican colleagues should all be ashamed of themselves. I  
22110 urge everyone to support this amendment and repeal this  
22111 heinous sick tax.

22112 With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

22113 \*Mr. Pallone. No, Mr. -- would the gentleman yield to  
22114 me?

22115 \*Mr. Tonko. Yes, I will yield to the gentleman from New  
22116 Jersey.

22117 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you.

22118 You know, I just don't understand theory here. You  
22119 know, the bottom line is Republicans kept saying in the last  
22120 election, the president kept saying, oh, we are going to make  
22121 things more affordable, prices are going to go down on the  
22122 day that -- of my inauguration. And what we see is prices

22123 going up for everything. It is across the board.

22124 And everything that the Republicans do, whether it is --  
22125 or, you know, what Trump does, whether it is tariffs, you  
22126 know, eliminating LIHEAP -- a couple of years ago they  
22127 eliminated the Affordable Connectivity Program. You know, it  
22128 -- the bottom line is people are hurting. They can't afford  
22129 these extra costs.

22130 And to say that somehow that should be applied to the  
22131 health care arena -- the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Dr. --  
22132 I am not supposed to mention names -- the doctor from  
22133 Pennsylvania -- no, I know who -- I know he is Dr. Joyce, but  
22134 I am not supposed to say it.

22135 [Laughter.]

22136 \*Mr. Pallone. All right, whatever, Dr. Joyce. What I  
22137 am saying is this idea of creating a disincentive because  
22138 somehow people are going to seek out too much health care or  
22139 see a doctor too often, I mean, the whole idea of the  
22140 Affordable Care Act and health insurance and covering  
22141 everybody is that they actually see a doctor, and they don't  
22142 get sick because they are afraid or can't afford to see a  
22143 doctor. So to create a disincentive to see a doctor, to me,  
22144 makes absolutely no sense because then the person gets  
22145 sicker, they go to the hospital, they go to the emergency  
22146 room. All the costs go up for the government and everybody  
22147 else.

22148           I mean, in the healthcare arena, I mean, I understand  
22149 what you are saying, you want a skin in the game or  
22150 something. But to me, that makes no sense in the healthcare  
22151 arena. And particularly now, when people are hurting, a lot  
22152 of people are going to say, well, I can't afford that \$35.  
22153 And if you tell me the states aren't going to do that, that  
22154 is about what most people pay now for a copay, so the states  
22155 are going to say, sure, everybody else pays \$35, \$30 or \$40,  
22156 so that is what we will impose because we need the revenue.

22157           I just don't understand it. It is just another way of  
22158 making everything more expensive for everyone, for middle-  
22159 class, for low-income people.

22160           I yield back to the gentleman.

22161           \*Mr. Tonko. And I yield back, Mr. Chair.

22162           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone on  
22163 the Republican side seeking recognition?

22164           The gentlelady from Michigan.

22165           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have to  
22166 agree with my colleagues here very strongly.

22167           Thanks to the Affordable Care Act, states across the  
22168 country have been able to implement Medicaid expansion to  
22169 provide more people with health insurance coverage, which I  
22170 think all of us should want people to be able to do. Forty  
22171 states, including my home state of Michigan and the District  
22172 of Columbia, have adopted Medicaid expansion, extending



22173 coverage under the Affordable Care Act to over 24 million  
22174 vulnerable adults. This has resulted in a decrease in  
22175 uncompensated care, a historic decline in the uninsured rate,  
22176 and has resulted in significantly lowering costs for health  
22177 care coverage for millions of Americans. Any effort to roll  
22178 back coverage gains achieved by the ACA should be simply  
22179 unacceptable. We should be working to find bipartisan  
22180 solutions that lower costs for the American people and reduce  
22181 barriers to quality health coverage.

22182 In Michigan alone, Medicaid expansion has resulted in  
22183 over 740,000 Michiganders being covered after our Republican  
22184 Governor, Rick Snyder, implemented the Healthy Michigan  
22185 program. Michigan has seen uncompensated hospital care fall  
22186 by more than 50 percent, and boasts one of the best uninsured  
22187 rates in the nation, around 5.4 percent.

22188 Instead of building upon the success of Medicaid  
22189 expansion to address existing barriers to affordable care,  
22190 Republicans want to require states to impose cost sharing on  
22191 Medicaid expansion adults with incomes over 100 percent of  
22192 the Federal poverty level. But let's talk about that. Yes,  
22193 \$35 doesn't seem like a lot of money to you, but the  
22194 recipients that are making at or above the Federal poverty  
22195 level, which is \$15,560 -- that is it for a single individual  
22196 -- and \$21,150 for a 2-person household, would have to pay  
22197 more for coverage. This disproportionately hurts low-income

22198 families who rely on benefits provided through the Medicaid  
22199 expansion to afford their health care.

22200 We should be working -- these people are working. We  
22201 should be working to help lower health care -- improve health  
22202 care coverage for all Americans, lower the cost. And this  
22203 just takes us backward.

22204 I yield back.

22205 \*Ms. Barragan. Would the gentlewoman yield?

22206 \*Mrs. Dingell. Yes, I will.

22207 \*Ms. Barragan. You know, there was an exchange a second  
22208 ago from my colleague, my Republican colleague, who says,  
22209 well, they are not -- the states are not charging \$100. Why  
22210 would they start doing that now? Well, because Medicaid is  
22211 the largest source of Federal funds to the states. And the  
22212 Republican proposal to cut Medicaid will force costs onto the  
22213 states, leaving them with a massive budget hole that will  
22214 result in cutting people's health care coverage, slashing  
22215 their benefits, and shuttering hospitals, nursing homes, and  
22216 community health centers. So how do you think they are going  
22217 to try to make it up? They are going to have to raise costs.  
22218 They are going to have to cut benefits.

22219 So I agree with everything that my colleague just  
22220 mentioned, how \$35 for people that are low income every time  
22221 they go see somebody is a lot. It may not be a lot for you,  
22222 but you -- it is a -- very different when you are having a

22223 limited -- maybe Social Security. Maybe you are making  
22224 \$1,100, and that doesn't even cover the rent, doesn't cover  
22225 the food -- to then have additional costs.

22226 And so I just wanted to -- just to point out that the  
22227 big budget hole that the states are going to be left with is  
22228 going to result in higher costs all around.

22229 I yield back to my colleague, Dingell.

22230 \*Mrs. Dingell. And I yield back.

22231 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
22232 further discussion on the amendment?

22233 The gentleman from New Jersey is recognized for five  
22234 minutes to speak on the amendment.

22235 \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I speak to support  
22236 the amendment.

22237 I also want to address a comment from my colleague from  
22238 Virginia across the aisle. I think he said something along  
22239 the lines of -- that all of his Democratic colleagues think  
22240 he is evil or Republicans are evil, no matter what they do.  
22241 That is just not true. We really do want to work with you.  
22242 I have an immense amount of respect for so many folks across  
22243 the aisle, especially for Chairman Guthrie.

22244 I do want to point out, for anyone that wasn't tuned in  
22245 at 2:30 in the morning, I did introduce an amendment that  
22246 would prohibit this bill from going into effect if any of the  
22247 provisions result in the deaths of individuals stemming from

22248 reduced access to health care services. And my colleague  
22249 from Virginia didn't vote for it, nor did any other  
22250 Republicans. So I will leave it to your constituents to  
22251 decide how they feel about that vote.

22252 But I want to yield to my colleague from Ohio.

22253 \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Menendez. We are going  
22254 back to names, which is great.

22255 Just a couple of things. One is, first, we are confused  
22256 again, and it is a legitimate confusion, because I have heard  
22257 multiple things about this copay. It is not required. It is  
22258 required. It is the first time a copay has been mandated.  
22259 Oh, no, no, there was a copay. It was up to \$100. No, that  
22260 actually isn't in statute.

22261 There is now a copay. It is the first time that there  
22262 is a required copay. And we are not talking about something  
22263 insignificant. It -- as it has been said, it may seem  
22264 insignificant, \$35. It could be a penny. Just make it a  
22265 penny, if that is what you want it to be, just make it a  
22266 penny. Or support this and just be done with it. You don't  
22267 have to do the copay at all. Leave it as it is.

22268 But somebody who is making 15,000, \$20,000 a year, you  
22269 are talking about \$400 a week. These are the so-called folks  
22270 that are at the top of the rung. They are at the top of the  
22271 rung. They are making \$400 a week. Let's say they have  
22272 cancer and they go in for treatments. That is \$35 each time.

22273 At \$400 a week, they are not in a position to pay all their  
22274 bills. They are just not. They are already suffering  
22275 financially. They are probably in debt. Now they are in  
22276 medical debt.

22277 And the idea that then this will help them give them  
22278 skin in the game, get them motivated to move over to the  
22279 exchange -- they can't afford the exchange. They are not  
22280 getting health care in the ACA. There is no subsidy for  
22281 them. You just canceled a bunch of subsidies. They just  
22282 lose their health insurance. And that is how we arrive at  
22283 the seven or eight million people who are now going to be  
22284 uninsured.

22285 The only thing I know after nearly 20 hours is that you  
22286 all are cutting \$715 billion from Medicaid.

22287 I yield back.

22288 \*The Chair. The gentleman from New Jersey yields back.  
22289 Do you, or you --

22290 \*Mr. Menendez. I yield.

22291 \*The Chair. You still have time. You yield back?

22292 Any further discussion on the amendment?

22293 Seeing none --

22294 \*Mr. Pallone. Roll call.

22295 \*The Chair. You want a roll call? Okay.

22296 Oh, Ms. -- I am sorry, the gentlelady from Indiana. For  
22297 what purpose do you seek recognition?

22298           \*Mrs. Houchin. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike the last  
22299 word.

22300           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

22301           \*Mrs. Houchin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22302           You know, cost sharing is important because it does help  
22303 hold down costs by preventing utilization of unnecessary  
22304 care. My home state of Indiana knows this firsthand, and has  
22305 led the nation in proving it. Our Healthy Indiana plan  
22306 requires copays in certain situations like for non-emergency  
22307 care in emergency rooms, and puts patients in the driver's  
22308 seat for their own care. The results have been game-changing  
22309 for Hoosiers. The Healthy Indiana plan reduces emergency  
22310 room care, increases primary care visits, and saves the  
22311 system money.

22312           So let's talk a little bit about what we are proposing  
22313 here. The population that we are talking about here, people  
22314 making more than 100 percent of the Federal poverty line, in  
22315 theory they are already subject to cost sharing under the  
22316 Affordable Care Act when they aren't covered by Medicaid.  
22317 States can't impose cost sharing for prenatal care, pediatric  
22318 care, or emergency room care unless it is a co-pay for non-  
22319 emergency room care in the emergency room.

22320           Additionally, copays are capped at 5 percent of an  
22321 individual's annual income, and no more than \$100 per  
22322 service. That has been the law of the land for 20 years now.

22323 What we are doing today is keeping just about everything the  
22324 same, and just saying the states have to set a minimum amount  
22325 of cost sharing. It could be \$1 per service. The only thing  
22326 we are actually changing in a meaningful way is that we are  
22327 actually lowering the maximum per-service cost to \$35, which  
22328 our colleagues in the minority seem to think is a great price  
22329 for just about everything. This is more generous than every  
22330 other insurance in the country, including the ACA coverage  
22331 that these individuals are eligible for.

22332 What we are asking for is for Medicaid beneficiaries to  
22333 have a nominal amount of skin in the game to help reduce  
22334 costs and steer people toward better health care outcomes.  
22335 This is working for Hoosiers, and we should make these types  
22336 of reforms accessible for all states.

22337 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

22338 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
22339 further discussion?

22340 Seeing none, the motion -- seeing no further -- all --  
22341 the vote occurs on the amendment. I am sorry, the vote  
22342 occurs on the amendment. A roll call has been requested, and  
22343 the clerk will call the roll.

22344 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

22345 \*Mr. Latta. No.

22346 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

22347 Mr. Griffith?

22348           \*Mr. Griffith.   No.  
22349           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
22350           Mr. Bilirakis?  
22351           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.  
22352           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.  
22353           Mr. Hudson?  
22354           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.  
22355           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
22356           Mr. Carter?  
22357           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
22358           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.  
22359           Mr. Palmer?  
22360           [No response.]  
22361           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn?  
22362           \*Mr. Dunn.   No.  
22363           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.  
22364           Mr. Crenshaw?  
22365           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
22366           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
22367           Mr. Joyce?  
22368           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
22369           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
22370           Mr. Weber?  
22371           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
22372           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.



22373 Mr. Allen?

22374 \*Mr. Allen. No.

22375 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

22376 Mr. Balderson?

22377 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

22378 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

22379 Mr. Fulcher?

22380 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher, no.

22381 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

22382 Mr. Pfluger?

22383 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

22384 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

22385 Mrs. Harshbarger?

22386 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

22387 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

22388 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

22389 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

22390 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

22391 Mrs. Cammack?

22392 [No response.]

22393 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?

22394 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.

22395 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.

22396 Mr. James?

22397 \*Mr. James. No.

22398           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
22399           Mr. Bentz?  
22400           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
22401           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
22402           Mrs. Houchin?  
22403           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
22404           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
22405           Mr. Fry?  
22406           [No response.]  
22407           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee?  
22408           \*Ms. Lee.    No.  
22409           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
22410           Mr. Langworthy?  
22411           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
22412           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
22413           Mr. Kean?  
22414           \*Mr. Kean.    No.  
22415           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
22416           Mr. Rulli?  
22417           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
22418           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
22419           Mr. Evans?  
22420           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
22421           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
22422           Mr. Goldman?

22423 \*Mr. Goldman. No.

22424 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.

22425 Mrs. Fedorchak?

22426 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

22427 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

22428 Mr. Pallone?

22429 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.

22430 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

22431 Ms. DeGette?

22432 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.

22433 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

22434 Ms. Schakowsky?

22435 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

22436 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

22437 Ms. Matsui?

22438 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.

22439 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.

22440 Ms. Castor?

22441 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

22442 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

22443 Mr. Tonko?

22444 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.

22445 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

22446 Ms. Clarke?

22447 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

22448           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
22449           Mr. Ruiz?  
22450           [No response.]  
22451           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters?  
22452           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
22453           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
22454           Mrs. Dingell?  
22455           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
22456           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
22457           Mr. Veasey?  
22458           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
22459           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
22460           Ms. Kelly?  
22461           \*Ms. Kelly.    Aye.  
22462           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
22463           Ms. Barragan?  
22464           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
22465           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
22466           Mr. Soto?  
22467           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
22468           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
22469           Ms. Schrier?  
22470           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
22471           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
22472           Mrs. Trahan?

22473 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
22474 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
22475 Mrs. Fletcher?  
22476 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
22477 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
22478 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
22479 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
22480 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
22481 Mr. Auchincloss?  
22482 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
22483 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
22484 Mr. Carter?  
22485 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
22486 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
22487 Mr. Menendez?  
22488 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
22489 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
22490 Mr. Mullin?  
22491 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
22492 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
22493 Mr. Landsman?  
22494 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
22495 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
22496 Ms. McClellan?  
22497 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

22498           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
22499           Chairman Guthrie?  
22500           \*The Chair.   No.  
22501           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
22502           \*The Chair.   How is the gentleman from California  
22503 recorded?  
22504           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz is not recorded.  
22505           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Yea.  
22506           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
22507           \*The Chair.   The gentleman from Alabama.  
22508           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
22509           \*Mr. Palmer.   Palmer votes no.  
22510           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
22511           \*The Chair.   Is there anyone here for the roll call?  
22512           Seeing none on the Republican side, none on the Democrat  
22513 side, the clerk will report.  
22514           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
22515 noes and 28 ayes.  
22516           \*The Chair.   The amendment is not agreed to.  
22517           Are there any further amendments?  
22518           The gentlelady from California, for what purpose do you  
22519 seek recognition?  
22520           \*Ms. Barragan.   Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the  
22521 desk.  
22522           \*The Chair.   Would the gentlelady state her amendment?

22523           \*Ms. Barragan. It is Health-FCD-AMD\_088.

22524           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.

22525           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Ms. Barragan.

22526           \*Ms. Barragan. Can I speak? You can --

22527           [Pause.]

22528           \*The Clerk. Add at the following, at the end of the  
22529 following, prohibiting certain eligibility and enrollment  
22530 restrictions under CHIP, notwithstanding any other provision  
22531 of this subtitle and any amendments made by this subtitle --

22532           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
22533 amendment is dispensed with.

22534           [The amendment of Ms. Barragan follows:]

22535

22536           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

22537

22538           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
22539 minutes --

22540           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you --

22541           \*The Chair. -- in support of the amendment.

22542           \*Ms. Barragan. -- Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Mr.  
22543 Chairman.

22544           Not only does the House Republican budget cut Medicaid,  
22545 which will impact children across the country, their plan  
22546 also attacks access to health care for kids directly. You  
22547 heard that right. It attacks access to health care for kids.

22548           In this disastrous bill there is a 10-year delay on a  
22549 Biden Administration regulation that would improve access and  
22550 remove coverage barriers in the Children's Health Insurance  
22551 Program, also known as CHIP. CHIP provides low-cost health  
22552 coverage to children in families that earn too much to  
22553 qualify for Medicaid but not enough to purchase private  
22554 insurance. Medicaid and CHIP provide health coverage for  
22555 over 37 million children and 41 percent of all births in our  
22556 nation.

22557           My straightforward amendment, common sense amendment,  
22558 would provide three protections to kids under CHIP.

22559           Number one, it prohibits lock-out periods. In 14  
22560 states, if a family loses CHIP coverage due to a missing  
22561 premium payment, they are locked out of re-enrolling for one  
22562 to two months. This is a gap where kids have no health



22563 coverage. The Biden rule fixed this.

22564       Number two, prohibits waiting periods. Second, the  
22565 amendment prohibits waiting periods. Some states have  
22566 waiting periods of time that a child had to be uninsured  
22567 before enrolling in CHIP. This has been used to prevent  
22568 families from switching to CHIP after losing employer-  
22569 sponsored insurance. The Biden rule fixed this.

22570       Number three. Third, the amendment prohibits annual and  
22571 lifetime limits on benefits. Some state CHIP programs had  
22572 annual or lifetime limits on specific benefits, particularly  
22573 for services like dental benefits. These limits restricted  
22574 the amount of care a child could receive in a year,  
22575 regardless of their needs. The Biden rule fixed this.

22576       A tax on Medicaid and CHIP represent real harm to  
22577 children's health, nutrition, and economic security. If a  
22578 child is enrolled in Medicaid and family income increases, he  
22579 or she may no longer be eligible for Medicaid, but is  
22580 eligible for CHIP. Republicans are relentless in their  
22581 betrayal to the American people, gutting hundreds of billions  
22582 of funds to Medicaid while at the same time making it harder  
22583 for kids to get care under CHIP. Where will our children  
22584 have left to go?

22585       Alicia, a constituent of mine, is a mother of two boys  
22586 with autism. She says, and I quote, "I can't express the  
22587 gratitude I have for the service that Medicaid has provided

22588 my children. My children have been given a chance of  
22589 normalcy in our community. Children with disabilities  
22590 deserve a chance to be loved and respected by others, not  
22591 discriminated because they can't express themselves or ask  
22592 for help. Imagine a world of disabled children and adults  
22593 left to fend for themselves because their families cannot  
22594 provide a service to help them understand daily life skills  
22595 or advocating for themselves. For them to understand that  
22596 they have a voice and someone is willing to hear them out and  
22597 help, I ask you to reconsider and take the time to meet a  
22598 child or an adult with autism and see how curious and  
22599 brilliant they are.'`

22600 Parents and families should never be faced with the  
22601 decision to risk their financial security for their child's  
22602 health. The policies in my amendment are already prohibited  
22603 in Medicaid, so it simply aligns CHIP policies with  
22604 longstanding Medicaid policies to remove barriers to health  
22605 care coverage for kids.

22606 Republicans' devastating proposed cuts to health care  
22607 would put millions of children at risk of losing coverage.  
22608 Why are Republicans trying to make it harder for their  
22609 constituents' children to get health insurance and keep it?  
22610 It is to fund their scheme to give huge tax breaks to  
22611 billionaires.

22612 Let's take a look at Colorado's 8th district. A member

22613 who I haven't heard speak at all in this hearing has 86,400  
22614 children in his district that are covered by Medicaid, and  
22615 just total silence; 176,000 people in Colorado's 8th district  
22616 rely on Medicaid for health coverage. That is 24 percent of  
22617 all district residents. Oh, boy.

22618 I urge my Republicans, colleagues to find the compassion  
22619 and the heart to care for kids. It is about the kids. And  
22620 vote yes on my amendment to protect kids and not punish them.

22621 I yield back.

22622 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back, and I will  
22623 recognize myself.

22624 You know, we talked about the eligibility rules earlier,  
22625 and the rules and the criteria for being eligible for  
22626 Medicaid have been set in statute and have -- I assume  
22627 through regular order -- and have been well thought out. And  
22628 so the rules were in place.

22629 And so I know everyone knows this, but Medicaid is a  
22630 jointly-financed program between states and the Federal  
22631 Government. So when the Federal Government requires or  
22632 doesn't allow states to take people off the Medicaid rolls  
22633 that don't qualify for Medicaid, there is a \$170 billion  
22634 price tag for this rule. But it -- that is just the Federal  
22635 side. Remember, there could be as much as 50 to 100 billion  
22636 in additional state costs that states will have to match in  
22637 spending because of the requirements of this rule.

22638           And my colleagues have expressed concerns about the  
22639           impact on state budgets. The eligibility rule threatens to  
22640           crowd out necessary breathing room to ensure that states can  
22641           continue to pay doctors and maintain coverage.

22642           This amendment would allow this burdensome rule to go  
22643           forward to -- this amendment that would allow this burdensome  
22644           rule to go forward will lead to untenable costs for states  
22645           over the next 10 years. When Congress considers new spending  
22646           in Medicaid, we offset the cost. We appreciate the balance,  
22647           but the Biden Administration rule didn't do any of that.  
22648           They demanded top-down mandates on states that didn't care  
22649           about the costs they would bear for the Federal Government or  
22650           the states. Rolling back these rules that CBO has confirmed  
22651           result in Medicaid covering ineligible beneficiaries is just  
22652           common sense.

22653           And I will yield back. Is there any further discussion  
22654           on the amendment?

22655           Seeing none -- oh, there is -- the gentleman from  
22656           California, Dr. Ruiz, is recognized for five minutes.

22657           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

22658           You know, the Biden-Harris Administration -- you  
22659           mentioned the rules -- finalized two important rules to make  
22660           it easier for eligible people -- primarily children, seniors,  
22661           and people with disabilities -- to access and retain  
22662           Medicaid. Republicans are calling to repeal these rules,

22663 seeking to pay for their misguided priorities by reinstating  
22664 barriers that make it harder for eligible people to access  
22665 Medicaid coverage.

22666         Repealing the rules would cut Medicaid and save the  
22667 government funding not because doing so would tamp down on  
22668 waste, fraud, and abuse, but because it would shift higher  
22669 healthcare costs onto people, and fewer people would enroll  
22670 in coverage they are eligible for. The cost savings from  
22671 repealing the Medicaid eligibility rules will come at the  
22672 expense of low-income people's access to health care.

22673         For example, the Children's Health Insurance Program is  
22674 a lifeline that keeps health care affordable for children and  
22675 families that earn too much to qualify for Medicaid but may  
22676 not have access to affordable coverage. Repealing the rule  
22677 will block children from CHIP coverage. The rule was  
22678 designed to help improve access to CHIP to keep kids healthy  
22679 and covered by prohibiting lock-out periods, annual lifetime  
22680 benefits limitations, and waiting periods.

22681         So in regards to seniors, today too many seniors have  
22682 trouble affording prescription drugs and other lifesaving  
22683 care they receive through Medicare. Repealing the rules  
22684 would undo a recent change designed to help Medicare  
22685 enrollees afford their care. The Medicare savings programs  
22686 are part of state Medicaid programs, and help seniors with  
22687 low income pay for essential health care costs, including

22688 Medicare premiums and other cost sharing charges. Despite  
22689 the value of these programs, administrative barriers mean  
22690 that only about half of those who are eligible are enrolled  
22691 in MSPs.

22692         The rule that Republicans are seeking to repeal  
22693 simplifies the process for low-income seniors and people with  
22694 disabilities who receive Medicare to access Medicare savings  
22695 programs. Republicans have pledged not to cut Medicare, but  
22696 repealing these rules that help seniors afford their coverage  
22697 and care by increasing the cost they will pay for health care  
22698 is a de facto cut to Medicare, and will harm seniors.

22699         Now on to people with disabilities. The Affordable Care  
22700 Act implemented key changes to streamline eligibility for  
22701 Medicaid enrollees, but seniors and people who are eligible  
22702 for Medicaid based on disability were left behind. And once  
22703 fully implemented, the eligibility and enrollment rules will  
22704 mean that seniors and people with disabilities would also  
22705 benefit from a streamlined process and face less government  
22706 bureaucratic interference in the enrollment process.

22707         Repealing the rules will reinstate barriers to  
22708 eligibility for people with disabilities and make it harder  
22709 for people who meet existing eligibility criteria to get  
22710 coverage. The rules prevent states from requiring in-person  
22711 interviews of seniors and people with disabilities, just like  
22712 in-person interviews are currently prohibited for other

22713 Medicaid enrollees.

22714       The rules also require seniors and people with  
22715 disabilities to complete complicated renewal processes every  
22716 12 months instead of every 6 months, which will help keep  
22717 eligible people from turning off the program. Enrollees are  
22718 still required to report changes in their income that  
22719 occurred during eligibility period, but since income among  
22720 this group is likely to be relatively stable, requiring  
22721 renewal processes only once a year will cut down on  
22722 bureaucracy, increase government efficiency, and reduce the  
22723 burden faced by overwhelmed caseworkers and call centers.

22724       So repealing the rules will not only add red tape for  
22725 enrollees, it would also add to states' administrative  
22726 workloads by requiring more paperwork and more work for over-  
22727 burdened eligibility workers. So if Republicans are focused  
22728 on reducing waste, they should realize that repealing these  
22729 rules will do the opposite.

22730       So let's not let the Republican messaging about these  
22731 rules distract from the real impact of making it harder for  
22732 eligible children, seniors, and people with disabilities to  
22733 get and keep coverage. The rules are not expanding  
22734 eligibility to new groups of people. The rules still require  
22735 people to verify their eligibility at regular intervals. And  
22736 repealing them will not address fraud, waste, and abuse. In  
22737 fact, repealing them will reinstate burdensome processes that

22738 are likely to add administrative costs for states and to  
22739 create more eligibility errors that result from an overly  
22740 complicated process.

22741 And with that I yield back my time.

22742 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
22743 further discussion?

22744 The gentlelady from Massachusetts, for what purpose do  
22745 you seek recognition?

22746 \*Mrs. Trahan. I move to strike the last word.

22747 \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized for five  
22748 minutes.

22749 \*Mrs. Trahan. So while we are talking about kids, I am  
22750 glad to see my bill, the Accelerating Kids' Access to Care  
22751 Act, a long-overdue bipartisan policy, finally moving  
22752 forward. But it is deeply disappointing that it is being  
22753 used as a political cover for a bill that will devastate the  
22754 very program it aims to fix.

22755 The way I see it is Republicans took a Medicaid  
22756 improvement they already supported, one that was on the brink  
22757 of becoming law months ago, before Elon Musk torpedoed it,  
22758 and stapled it to a bill that guts Medicaid for millions of  
22759 working families.

22760 The Accelerating Kids' Access to Care Act is a smart,  
22761 simple fix. It tears down red tape so children on Medicaid  
22762 can get the care they need, no matter where they live. But



22763 what good is faster access across state lines if the  
22764 destination states are forced to cut critical services just  
22765 to stay afloat because of the policies in this bill? We have  
22766 world-renowned providers like Boston Children's Hospital.  
22767 But if Massachusetts has to slash services because of this  
22768 bill, then where will those kids go?

22769         The Accelerating Kids' Access to Care Act, it passed  
22770 this committee, it passed the House. It was included in the  
22771 end-of-year funding package that was negotiated in part by  
22772 members of this committee. And when Elon Musk took his  
22773 chainsaw to that package, not a single one of my colleagues  
22774 on the other side spoke up to protect it. Now, instead of  
22775 passing it cleanly like we just did a couple of weeks ago  
22776 with the renaming of the Gulf of Mexico, it is being used as  
22777 a fig leaf, a way to say, see, we helped kids, even as the  
22778 rest of the bill strips coverage from their parents, their  
22779 caregivers, and their communities.

22780         But helping kids in one paragraph doesn't excuse hurting  
22781 their families in the rest of the bill. We had a chance to  
22782 do this the right way, with unity, with integrity. Instead,  
22783 this good-faith bipartisan policy is being used to disguise a  
22784 reckless, partisan attack on Medicaid.

22785         If you have supported this bill before, don't let it be  
22786 used as a shield for policies that make it harder for  
22787 families to get the care they need. I urge you to do right

22788 by the kids and by the parents who fight every day to get the  
22789 care they need. Oppose this monstrosity of a bill and join  
22790 us to pass the Accelerating Kids' Access to Care Act. We  
22791 could do it right now, if the chairman would call a vote on  
22792 that standalone bill. I don't think a single member of this  
22793 committee would object to that.

22794 I yield back.

22795 \*Ms. Barragan. Will the gentleman --

22796 \*The Chair. The gentlelady --

22797 \*Mrs. Trahan. I will yield to the congresswoman from  
22798 California.

22799 \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you.

22800 I just wanted to reiterate this hearing has gone for  
22801 many hours. But over the course of this hearing we have had  
22802 my colleagues across the aisle -- our Republican colleagues  
22803 have basically voted to say, who cares about air pollution at  
22804 schools and our kids health, and now they are basically  
22805 saying, who cares about kids on health care, we are okay with  
22806 throwing kids off of health care.

22807 If there is one group of people that you would think  
22808 should have access -- everybody should have access to health  
22809 care -- you would think it would be children. You would  
22810 think that the party that talks about family values would  
22811 follow through and actually provide benefits like health  
22812 care, basic human-right health care to kids. But I guess

22813 not, because my colleague said -- it cost too much money is  
22814 what he said. And I don't know about you, but when you --  
22815 when I see kids that are sick, my first thought is what can  
22816 we do to help? How can I make them feel better? Could I  
22817 trade places? It is not, oh, it costs too much money to  
22818 provide care.

22819         The rule costs -- one of the complaints was it cost too  
22820 much, the rule cost, because it was estimated to increase  
22821 Medicaid and CHIP enrollment by 1.5 million children in 2028.  
22822 And, of course, it made it easier for kids to get and keep  
22823 their coverage, which is a goal we should all aim for, is to  
22824 cover every kid.

22825         With that I yield back.

22826         \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time has -- yield back,  
22827 okay, the gentlelady yields back. Is there a further  
22828 discussion on the amendment?

22829         Seeing none --

22830         \*Mr. Pallone. I ask for a roll call.

22831         \*The Chair. -- the vote occurs on the amendment. A  
22832 roll call vote has been requested, and the clerk will call  
22833 the roll.

22834         \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

22835         \*Mr. Latta. No.

22836         \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

22837         Mr. Griffith?

22838           \*Mr. Griffith.   No.  
22839           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
22840           Mr. Bilirakis?  
22841           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   No.  
22842           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.  
22843           Mr. Hudson?  
22844           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.  
22845           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
22846           Mr. Carter?  
22847           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
22848           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.  
22849           Mr. Palmer?  
22850           [No response.]  
22851           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn?  
22852           \*Mr. Dunn.   No.  
22853           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.  
22854           Mr. Crenshaw?  
22855           [No response.]  
22856           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce?  
22857           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
22858           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
22859           Mr. Weber?  
22860           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
22861           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
22862           Mr. Allen?

22863           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
22864           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
22865           Mr. Balderson?  
22866           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
22867           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
22868           Mr. Fulcher?  
22869           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher, no.  
22870           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
22871           Mr. Pfluger?  
22872           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
22873           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
22874           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
22875           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
22876           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
22877           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
22878           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.  
22879           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
22880           Mrs. Cammack?  
22881           [No response.]  
22882           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte?  
22883           [No response.]  
22884           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James?  
22885           \*Mr. James.   No.  
22886           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
22887           Mr. Bentz?

22888 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
22889 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
22890 Mrs. Houchin?  
22891 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
22892 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
22893 Mr. Fry?  
22894 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
22895 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
22896 Ms. Lee?  
22897 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
22898 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
22899 Mr. Langworthy?  
22900 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
22901 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
22902 Mr. Kean?  
22903 \*Mr. Kean. No.  
22904 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.  
22905 Mr. Rulli?  
22906 \*Mr. Rulli. No.  
22907 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.  
22908 Mr. Evans?  
22909 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
22910 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.  
22911 Mr. Goldman?  
22912 \*Mr. Goldman. No.

22913           \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
22914           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
22915           \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.  
22916           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
22917           Mr. Pallone?  
22918           \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
22919           \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
22920           Ms. DeGette?  
22921           \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
22922           \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
22923           Ms. Schakowsky?  
22924           \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
22925           \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
22926           Ms. Matsui?  
22927           \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
22928           \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
22929           Ms. Castor?  
22930           \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
22931           \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
22932           Mr. Tonko?  
22933           \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
22934           \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
22935           Ms. Clarke?  
22936           \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
22937           \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

22938 Mr. Ruiz?  
22939 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
22940 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
22941 Mr. Peters?  
22942 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
22943 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
22944 Mrs. Dingell?  
22945 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
22946 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
22947 Mr. Veasey?  
22948 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
22949 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
22950 Ms. Kelly?  
22951 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
22952 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
22953 Ms. Barragan?  
22954 \*Ms. Barragan. Yes.  
22955 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
22956 Mr. Soto?  
22957 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
22958 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
22959 Ms. Schrier?  
22960 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
22961 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
22962 Mrs. Trahan?



22963 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
22964 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
22965 Mrs. Fletcher?  
22966 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
22967 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
22968 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
22969 [No response.]  
22970 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss?  
22971 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
22972 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
22973 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
22974 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
22975 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
22976 Mr. Menendez?  
22977 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
22978 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
22979 Mr. Mullin?  
22980 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
22981 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
22982 Mr. Landsman?  
22983 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
22984 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
22985 Ms. McClellan?  
22986 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
22987 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

22988 Chairman Guthrie?

22989 \*The Chair. No.

22990 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

22991 \*Mr. Griffith. [Presiding] How is Mr. Obernolte  
22992 recorded?

22993 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte is not recorded.

22994 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.

22995 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.

22996 \*Mr. Griffith. All right, do we have anyone on the  
22997 Democrat side that needs to vote?

22998 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw.

22999 \*Mr. Griffith. Oh, Mr. Crenshaw.

23000 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

23001 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

23002 \*Mr. Griffith. All right. Seeing no one else who needs  
23003 to vote, the clerk will report the roll.

23004 \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23  
23005 noes and 28 ayes.

23006 I am sorry, there was -- sorry, there was 23 ayes and 28  
23007 noes.

23008 \*Mr. Griffith. The amendment is not agreed to.

23009 All right, and I believe we have another amendment. Mr.  
23010 Tonko, do you have an amendment at the desk?

23011 \*Mr. Tonko. Yes, I do, Mr. Chair. I have an amendment  
23012 labeled Health-FCD-AMD\_055.

23013           \*Mr. Griffith. Oh, five, five.

23014           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mr. Tonko. In this  
23015 section add at the end of the following, conditional  
23016 effectiveness. This section will --

23017           \*Mr. Griffith. The clerk will dispense with the  
23018 reading, without objection.

23019           [The amendment of Mr. Tonko follows:]

23020

23021           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

23022

23023           \*Mr. Griffith. And Mr. Tonko, you are recognized for  
23024 five minutes to explain your amendment.

23025           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23026           I introduce this amendment today on behalf of all of my  
23027 constituents in New York's 20th congressional district who  
23028 have benefitted from Medicaid and on behalf of all Americans  
23029 who rely on Medicaid for access to behavioral health care,  
23030 including substance use disorder treatment and mental health  
23031 treatment.

23032           This amendment would require that states stop  
23033 implementation and operations of the red tape requirements if  
23034 access to substance use disorder treatment services among  
23035 low-income adults in the state decreases. This would be  
23036 determined by the number of available SUD providers in the  
23037 state that participate in Medicaid, the geographical distance  
23038 for beneficiaries to access an SUD provider that participates  
23039 in Medicaid, and rates of SUD treatment amongst low-income  
23040 residents of the state.

23041           As part of Republicans' new additional paperwork and red  
23042 tape requirements, they want us to believe that this won't  
23043 impact treatment for addiction and behavioral health.  
23044 However, if you look at the evidence you will see that  
23045 Medicaid is the single largest payer for behavioral health  
23046 services. We know that these red tape requirements would rip  
23047 coverage away from millions of insured individuals struggling

23048 with addiction and behavioral health needs.

23049 But don't take it from me. The American Society of  
23050 Addiction Medicine, ASAM, shared a statement entitled,  
23051 "Sweeping Medicaid Reforms Could Weaken America's Addiction  
23052 Treatment Efforts, Pose a National Security Threat.'" ASAM  
23053 said, and I quote, "We maintain serious concerns over how  
23054 this and other exemptions will be implemented. Time and  
23055 energy spent on excessive bureaucratic red tape and  
23056 surveillance could be better used to ensure that more  
23057 Americans with low incomes can readily access and afford the  
23058 medical care they need and deserve, including through  
23059 programs like Medicaid expansion.'"

23060 Now, Medicaid expansion is a powerful weapon against  
23061 addiction and the drug cartels, because it can reduce demand  
23062 for illicit substances and help more Americans with addiction  
23063 enter treatment. It must be protected, especially as we  
23064 continue to lose tens of thousands of lives each year to the  
23065 nation's addiction and overdose crisis. If these Medicaid  
23066 cuts are put in place, states will be forced to take on more  
23067 of the burden and shift further resources away from other  
23068 services, including prevention, treatment, and recovery.

23069 Additionally, most Medicaid enrollees struggling with  
23070 substance use disorder find their way to treatment after  
23071 getting on Medicaid, not before. If you require a diagnosis  
23072 before you provide someone with access to Medicaid, then how

23073 do the undiagnosed ever get care? Under your plan, they  
23074 won't get access to substance use treatment.

23075         Additionally, requiring a re-certification every six  
23076 months is especially problematic for this population. The  
23077 continual reevaluation and documentation will discourage  
23078 Medicaid coverage for a lot of people who need help to access  
23079 treatment for addiction. How many lives need to be lost  
23080 before you consider -- re-consider the true cost of the  
23081 Republican plan to limit access to substance use disorder  
23082 treatment?

23083         The cost sharing requirements are also life-threatening  
23084 for those living with the disease of addiction. ASAM spoke  
23085 to this point when they said, and I quote, "ASAM firmly  
23086 opposes any harmful Medicaid reforms which threaten to make  
23087 lifesaving addiction treatment less accessible to Americans.  
23088 Should the out-of-pocket cost of treatment services for low-  
23089 income Americans with addiction exceed the price of legal or  
23090 illicit addictive substances due to health insurance loss or  
23091 new Medicaid requirements, we risk losing valuable ground in  
23092 our addiction and recovery efforts. In particular, we are  
23093 greatly concerned that proposals to impose cost sharing  
23094 requirements on Medicaid expansion enrollees, including those  
23095 with substance use disorders, could make addiction-related  
23096 treatment services even more costly than cheaper tobacco  
23097 products, alcohol, and illicit drugs.'`

23098           The United States Conference of Mayors wrote a letter to  
23099   this committee's leadership, and shared how the Republican  
23100   plan jeopardizes public safety and progress in reducing  
23101   overdoses and getting people access to treatment. The United  
23102   States Conference of Mayors shared, and I quote, "We write on  
23103   behalf of America's mayors to urge you to preserve and  
23104   strengthen the Medicaid program, not cut it, as you mark up  
23105   the reconciliation bill. The cuts being considered by  
23106   Congress will not only hurt Medicaid beneficiaries and our  
23107   health system, but also jeopardize public safety and the  
23108   progress we have made in reducing violent crime. As you  
23109   stand in support of our police during Police Week, please  
23110   bear in mind that the Medicaid cuts and eligibility changes  
23111   you are considering will limit the ability of our police  
23112   officers to focus on violent crime.'`

23113           So Medicaid cuts will exponentially increase the  
23114   instances of officers responding to people suffering from  
23115   mental health crises, substance abuse addiction, housing  
23116   instability, and more who otherwise would have had access to  
23117   health care services through Medicaid ensuring their  
23118   stability.

23119           With that, Mr. Chair, I yield back and encourage the  
23120   support of this amendment.

23121           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. I now  
23122   recognize myself for five minutes in opposition to the

23123 amendment.

23124           Republicans have led the charge in tackling and -- have  
23125 led the charge in tackling substance use disorder, working in  
23126 a bipartisan way last Congress to lift the IMD exclusion for  
23127 substance use disorder in Medicaid and permanent coverage of  
23128 medication-assisted treatment in Medicaid.

23129           More recently, we advanced the SUPPORT Act out of  
23130 committee a couple of weeks ago -- sadly, without full  
23131 Democrat support.

23132           Earlier in the year we passed the Halt Fentanyl Act,  
23133 which Mr. -- excuse me, the gentleman from Ohio and I led,  
23134 which will get illicit fentanyl off our streets and save  
23135 lives with -- and we did so with little Democrat support.

23136           Our Democrat friends want you to believe that they are  
23137 alone in fighting for those working to overcome substance use  
23138 disorder, but actions tell a little bit different story. We  
23139 have been working hard on this.

23140           In this particular bill our goals have been clear from  
23141 the beginning. We are eliminating fraud, waste, and abuse in  
23142 the Medicaid program to protect and preserve access to care  
23143 for vulnerable populations such as those working to overcome  
23144 substance use disorder. To that end, we are taking a  
23145 compassionate approach to maintain access to care for  
23146 individuals working to overcome substance use disorder. We  
23147 exempt individuals with substance use disorder from our



23148 community engagement standards.

23149       To take these exemptions to step further, our work  
23150 requirements exempt those in inpatient rehabilitation  
23151 programs and individuals leaving incarceration for up to 90  
23152 days, both groups from which might be more at risk of  
23153 substance use disorder.

23154       So we are fighting to protect those with substance use  
23155 disorder, and will continue to do so, and make no mistake  
23156 about it.

23157       Now, the amendment itself causes some questions not only  
23158 in that it is offered to a bill where it mucks things up, but  
23159 -- I am trying to figure it out. I have been sitting here  
23160 trying to figure it out. It says that beginning on the date  
23161 which access to substance use disorder treatment services for  
23162 low-income individuals residing in such state has decreased  
23163 as determined on the basis of one, two, and three -- and  
23164 number two says the distance that an individual enrolled  
23165 under such state plan or waiver is required to travel in  
23166 order to access treatment from such a substance use disorder  
23167 treatment provider. Well, who decides what the distance is?  
23168 Is that distance based in miles? Is that distance based in  
23169 the time of travel?

23170       I will tell you, if you look at the map between Haysi in  
23171 Dickenson County and Clintwood in Dickenson County in my  
23172 district, you would think, well, there are only a stone's

23173 throw apart, but there is a mountain in the middle. And so I  
23174 have been told by leading officials in the town of Haysi that  
23175 sometimes they drive the other way to get to healthcare  
23176 providers because they have to allot an hour. It doesn't  
23177 always take that long, it depends on weather, but they have  
23178 to allot an hour to drive what on the map appears to be just  
23179 a small distance because of the winding mountain roads. If  
23180 the weather is bad, if they get caught behind a timber truck,  
23181 it is going to take a long time.

23182 So is distance based -- in this, is it based on actual  
23183 distance, or is it based on time that it takes you to travel  
23184 to a certain area? The amendment is not clear on that.

23185 Further, it doesn't -- it says that the -- that residing  
23186 in such state has decreased. But then, on the second factor,  
23187 it doesn't say whether the distance has -- how much it has to  
23188 increase to say that you have had a decrease in that state  
23189 for substance use treatment.

23190 So it is rather confusing, and I would ask my colleagues  
23191 to vote no. And let's get this bill moving out of committee.

23192 And I yield back and recognize the gentlelady from  
23193 California for five minutes.

23194 \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
23195 the last word.

23196 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady has the floor.

23197 \*Ms. Matsui. As my colleagues well know, we are in the

23198 midst of a crisis in this country when it comes to mental  
23199 health and addiction. Both the administration and  
23200 congressional Republicans have said it is a priority to  
23201 combat these dual crises, yet the massive cuts proposed to  
23202 Medicaid in the bill before us would directly undercut these  
23203 efforts.

23204 I have long worked to address mental health in this  
23205 committee by creating new grants to expanding mental health  
23206 services delivery to integrating mental and physical health.  
23207 But do you know the single most significant thing we have  
23208 done to address mental health in this country? Expanding  
23209 Medicaid.

23210 Medicaid is the single largest payer for behavioral  
23211 health services in the country. It covers 40 percent of all  
23212 Americans with opioid use disorder and 1 in 3 adults with  
23213 mental illness. Unfortunately, most mental health services  
23214 covered by Medicaid have -- are optional benefits, meaning  
23215 they are not required for all Medicaid beneficiaries. That  
23216 means they will also be the first ones on the chopping block  
23217 if Medicaid is cut.

23218 We also know the cruel red tape requirements in this  
23219 bill will kick almost five million people off their coverage.  
23220 That would undoubtedly include people with mental health  
23221 issues. These paperwork requirements are designed to be  
23222 overwhelmingly for everyone, but imagine how burdensome they

23223 could be for someone struggling with their mental health who  
23224 is struggling to just get out of bed in the morning or  
23225 struggling to just make it through the day without a panic  
23226 attack.

23227         Let me be blunt. Expanding Medicaid was the best thing  
23228 we did for the mental health crisis in this country. But  
23229 slashing Medicaid is the single worst mistake we could make  
23230 right now when it comes to supporting people with mental  
23231 health needs. The cuts in this bill will devastate people  
23232 who just need a little support to get back on their feet,  
23233 people like Tara from California.

23234         Tara has struggled with her mental health since she was  
23235 a teenager. When Tara was kicked off her parents' health  
23236 insurance, she didn't know how she would be able to afford  
23237 care. She managed -- she reached -- she needed to manage her  
23238 depression and anxiety. That only set her into a deeper  
23239 panic. Luckily, she qualified for Medicaid. Because of  
23240 Medicaid, she was able to continue therapy, see a  
23241 psychiatrist, and afford the medications that help manage and  
23242 stabilize her condition.

23243         Tara describes the eight years she relied upon Medicaid  
23244 as some of the most challenging and transformative of her  
23245 life. With the right mental health care and consistent  
23246 treatment, she was able to manage her symptoms and focus on  
23247 her future. Tara even earned her master's degree and started

23248 her first full-time job. Tara says Medicaid did not just  
23249 cover her appointments and prescriptions, it gave her the  
23250 ability and stability to succeed. Tara is no longer on  
23251 Medicaid, but shared her story because she knows firsthand  
23252 how critical it is for those who rely upon it, and Tara's  
23253 story is like so many others across this country.

23254         In fact, we know that 15 million Medicaid beneficiaries  
23255 struggle with a mental health condition. Without Medicaid,  
23256 people with [sic] Tara would be left out in the cold to deal  
23257 with their mental health issues alone. That means less  
23258 people overcoming those challenges, contributing to their  
23259 communities, and continuing with their families. That means  
23260 more people will turn to self-harm, substance use, and even  
23261 suicide.

23262         I want to end with Tara's own words: "Medicaid isn't  
23263 just a government program. It is the difference between hope  
23264 and despair, between stability and crises. I am proof of  
23265 what is possible when people have access to mental health  
23266 care, and I urge policy-makers to protect and strengthen  
23267 Medicaid so others can have the same chance I did.'`

23268         I urge my colleagues not to turn their backs on people  
23269 like Tara, and I support the amendment.

23270         With that I yield the balance of my time.

23271         \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Do I see  
23272 anyone on the Republican side desiring time?

23273           Seeing none, do I see any other Democrats who desire  
23274   time on this amendment?  
23275           \*Mr. Pallone. Roll call.  
23276           \*Mr. Griffith. A roll call vote is requested. Will the  
23277   clerk please call the roll?  
23278           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?  
23279           \*Mr. Latta. No.  
23280           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.  
23281           Mr. Griffith?  
23282           \*Mr. Griffith. No.  
23283           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.  
23284           Mr. Bilirakis?  
23285           \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.  
23286           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.  
23287           Mr. Hudson?  
23288           \*Mr. Hudson. No.  
23289           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.  
23290           Mr. Carter?  
23291           [No response.]  
23292           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?  
23293           \*Mr. Palmer. No.  
23294           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.  
23295           Mr. Dunn?  
23296           \*Mr. Dunn. No.  
23297           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

23298 Mr. Crenshaw?

23299 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

23300 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

23301 Mr. Joyce?

23302 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

23303 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

23304 Mr. Weber?

23305 [No response.]

23306 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen?

23307 \*Mr. Allen. No.

23308 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

23309 Mr. Balderson?

23310 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

23311 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

23312 Mr. Fulcher?

23313 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.

23314 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

23315 Mr. Pfluger?

23316 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

23317 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

23318 Mrs. Harshbarger?

23319 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

23320 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

23321 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

23322 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

23323           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
23324           Mrs. Cammack?  
23325           [No response.]  
23326           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte?  
23327           \*Mr. Oubernolte.   No.  
23328           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
23329           Mr. James?  
23330           [No response.]  
23331           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz?  
23332           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
23333           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
23334           Mrs. Houchin?  
23335           [No response.]  
23336           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry?  
23337           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
23338           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
23339           Ms. Lee?  
23340           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
23341           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
23342           Mr. Langworthy?  
23343           [No response.]  
23344           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy?  
23345           [No response.]  
23346           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean?  
23347           \*Mr. Kean.   No.



23348           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
23349           Mr. Rulli?  
23350           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
23351           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
23352           Mr. Evans?  
23353           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
23354           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
23355           Mr. Goldman?  
23356           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
23357           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
23358           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
23359           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
23360           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
23361           Mr. Pallone?  
23362           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
23363           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
23364           Ms. DeGette?  
23365           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
23366           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
23367           Ms. Schakowsky?  
23368           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
23369           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
23370           Ms. Matsui?  
23371           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
23372           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.

23373 Ms. Castor?

23374 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

23375 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

23376 Mr. Tonko?

23377 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.

23378 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

23379 Ms. Clarke?

23380 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

23381 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

23382 Mr. Ruiz?

23383 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.

23384 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.

23385 Mr. Peters?

23386 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

23387 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

23388 Mrs. Dingell?

23389 [No response.]

23390 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell?

23391 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.

23392 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

23393 Mr. Veasey?

23394 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

23395 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

23396 Ms. Kelly?

23397 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

23398 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
23399 Ms. Barragan?  
23400 [No response.]  
23401 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto?  
23402 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
23403 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
23404 Ms. Schrier?  
23405 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
23406 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
23407 Mrs. Trahan?  
23408 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
23409 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
23410 Mrs. Fletcher?  
23411 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
23412 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
23413 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
23414 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
23415 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
23416 Mr. Auchincloss?  
23417 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
23418 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
23419 Mr. Carter?  
23420 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
23421 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
23422 Mr. Menendez?

23423           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.

23424           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.

23425           Mr. Mullin?

23426           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.

23427           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.

23428           Mr. Landsman?

23429           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

23430           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

23431           Ms. McClellan?

23432           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

23433           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

23434           Chairman Guthrie?

23435           \*The Chair.   No.

23436           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

23437           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   How is Carter --

23438           \*The Clerk.   Carter is not recorded.

23439           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Carter votes no.

23440           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.

23441           \*Mr. Weber.   How is my vote recorded?

23442           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber is not recorded.

23443           \*Mr. Weber.   I am voting no.

23444           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.

23445           \*Mr. James.   How is James recorded?

23446           \*The Clerk.   James is not recorded.

23447           \*Mr. James.   No.

23448           \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.

23449           \*Mrs. Houchin. How is Mrs. Houchin recorded?

23450           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin is not recorded.

23451           \*Mrs. Houchin. Mrs. Houchin votes no.

23452           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.

23453           \*Mr. Langworthy. How is Langworthy recorded?

23454           \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy is not recorded.

23455           \*Mr. Langworthy. Votes no.

23456           \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

23457           [Pause.]

23458           \*Mr. Griffith. All right, seeing no additional votes,

23459 the clerk will close the roll and report, please.

23460           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23

23461 ayes and 29 noes.

23462           \*Mr. Griffith. With 23 ayes, 29 noes, the amendment is

23463 not agreed to.

23464           Is there another amendment?

23465           The gentlelady from Texas.

23466           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an

23467 amendment at the desk.

23468           \*Mr. Griffith. Would you tell us what the amendment is,

23469 please --

23470           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Sure.

23471           \*Mr. Griffith. -- so the clerk can find it?

23472           \*Mrs. Fletcher. It is Health-FCD-AMD\_104.

23473           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mrs. Fletcher. Strike  
23474 section 44126.

23475           \*Mr. Griffith. All right. I would say dispense, but  
23476 that is the amendment.

23477           [The amendment of Mrs. Fletcher follows:]

23478

23479           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

23480

23481           \*Mr. Griffith. And the gentlelady of Texas is  
23482 recognized for five minutes to explain her amendment.

23483           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Yes, my  
23484 amendment is simple. The entire text is strike section  
23485 44126.

23486           What is section 44126? It is a 10-year ban on payments  
23487 to any non-profit organization that is an essential community  
23488 provider that is primarily engaged in family planning  
23489 services, reproductive health, and related medical care, and  
23490 provides for abortions for which the total amount of Federal  
23491 and state expenditure exceeded \$1 million in fiscal year  
23492 2024.

23493           I guess you can't just say we want to defund Planned  
23494 Parenthood under the rules, but, make no mistake, that is  
23495 what this provision says. There is only one non-profit  
23496 essential community provider primarily engaged in family  
23497 planning services, reproductive health and related medical  
23498 care, including abortion care, for which the total amount of  
23499 expenditures exceeded \$1 million in fiscal year 2024. It is  
23500 a category of one. Defunding Planned Parenthood is a  
23501 terrible idea. And sadly, my home state of Texas provides a  
23502 cautionary tale.

23503           Before I get to that, I want to make one important thing  
23504 clear. This isn't about abortion, even though it is  
23505 referenced in the definition. It is all about all the other

23506 things that more than two million people go to Planned  
23507 Parenthood for every year. As the provision says, these are  
23508 payments for essential preventative health care, reproductive  
23509 health care, cancer screenings, pap smears, breast exams,  
23510 wellness exams, birth control, STI testing and treatment, and  
23511 more. For many people, their annual well-woman exam may be  
23512 one of the only times that they get their overall health  
23513 screening to check their blood pressure, cholesterol, and  
23514 other things.

23515         And to be clear, it is many people. The data shows that  
23516 one in three women have been to a Planned Parenthood health  
23517 center for care at some point in their lives, and one in four  
23518 Americans has been to Planned Parenthood, because Planned  
23519 Parenthood provides care for everybody. Recent polls show  
23520 that Planned Parenthood is popular. More probably -- more  
23521 popular, probably, than most of us, and certainly more  
23522 popular than Congress. People like Planned Parenthood,  
23523 patients like Planned Parenthood. They know they can go to  
23524 Planned Parenthood for quality, affordable, non-judgmental  
23525 reproductive health care, which is what they deserve.

23526         People don't like this effort and others like it to  
23527 defund Planned Parenthood. Recent polls show that nearly  
23528 three out of four voters, including half -- more than half of  
23529 Trump voters, oppose Congress taking away funds from Planned  
23530 Parenthood health centers for birth control, wellness exams,



23531 and cancer screenings. And it is true in districts across  
23532 the country. I know it is true in mine. When I first ran  
23533 for Congress in 2018, I did my research, as we say, and  
23534 Planned Parenthood came out at the top of the list as the  
23535 most trusted community serving organization in my R+7 seven  
23536 district. Republicans and Democrats alike support Planned  
23537 Parenthood, and my Republican colleagues on this committee  
23538 should know that because 19 of them have Planned Parenthood  
23539 centers in their district, some have more than 1.

23540 As I said before, Texas is a cautionary tale. And as  
23541 much as I love my home state, when it comes to health care  
23542 Texas should not be our model. We have the highest uninsured  
23543 rate in the country. We have one of the highest maternal  
23544 mortality rates in the country. A recent study shows that of  
23545 -- looking at maternal mortality, insurance access, and other  
23546 factors, Texas ranked 50th overall in the study, 46 percent  
23547 of counties in Texas are defined as maternity care deserts.

23548 Over the last two decades there has been a relentless  
23549 effort in Texas to strip Planned Parenthood from our state's  
23550 Medicaid program. And it happened. And before Texas removed  
23551 Planned Parenthood from the program, Planned Parenthood  
23552 provided care to more than 40 percent of Texas's Medicaid  
23553 family planning program members all across our state. The  
23554 care could not be replaced, despite what the people urging  
23555 the legislature to do it said. Women in Texas lost access to

23556 health care. Enrollment was down 24 percent. Actually,  
23557 getting health care was down 39 percent. Access to birth  
23558 control was down even more.

23559 Texas experienced a reduction in the provision of  
23560 highly-effective methods of contraception and an increased  
23561 rate of Medicaid births. And that last point I made is  
23562 consistent with another important thing for you to consider.  
23563 The Congressional Budget Office estimates that the provisions  
23564 in this bill defunding Planned Parenthood will increase the  
23565 deficit by \$300 million. If that is important to you, you  
23566 should vote yes on my amendment.

23567 Make no mistake, the cautionary lessons from Texas will  
23568 apply here. To make up the gap, federally-qualified health  
23569 centers would need to increase their capacity by an  
23570 additional one million clients. This is just another way  
23571 people will lose access to health care. Defunding Planned  
23572 Parenthood is an assault on the health, dignity, and freedom  
23573 of women across this country, and that is why I urge everyone  
23574 on this committee to vote yes on this amendment.

23575 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. I now  
23576 recognizes the gentlelady of east Tennessee for five minutes.

23577 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. Okay, thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
23578 rise in opposition to this amendment.

23579 The underlying bill prohibits Medicaid funds from being  
23580 paid to big abortion providers that meet certain criteria.

23581 This language simply puts -- pulls funding back from large  
23582 abortion providers, and removes the benefit of certain  
23583 taxpayer dollars from large abortion providers if they  
23584 continue to conduct abortions outside of the Hyde Amendment.  
23585 It does not cut Medicaid funding for women.

23586 Under this legislation, big abortion providers can  
23587 continue their activities with private dollars, but the  
23588 organization would no longer be subsidized by the Federal  
23589 Government. This bill does not change the availability of  
23590 funds for women's health, it simply establishes a safeguard  
23591 so that the nation's largest abortion providers are not the  
23592 one providing such services through Medicaid. Should these  
23593 entities stop participating in abortion services, they would  
23594 again be eligible to receive funding.

23595 And, you know, there is a lot of community health  
23596 centers which outnumber those big abortion providers 15 to 1,  
23597 and they offer better value to patients by offering a wider  
23598 range of care to clients all in one location.

23599 And I looked at statistics with these abortion  
23600 providers. And since 2010 cancer screenings, breast exams,  
23601 pap smears have all dropped by 70 percent. And they don't  
23602 even do mammograms. And while these screenings, breast  
23603 exams, and contraceptive services have been on a steep  
23604 decline, the big abortion providers are not a health care  
23605 provider; they are an abortion business. Contraception is

23606 far more widely available and affordable than ever before,  
23607 including over-the-counter and at community health centers.

23608 And another statistic says that 96 percent of abortions  
23609 that happen are for pure elective reasons, when mom is  
23610 healthy and the baby is healthy. And women do deserve the  
23611 best care possible, and every pro-life law in the nation  
23612 allows doctors to act in emergency situations to give  
23613 appropriate care to women and girls.

23614 And with that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

23615 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Now I  
23616 recognize somebody -- I will go with the gentlelady from  
23617 Colorado for five minutes.

23618 \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you so much.

23619 Well, let me say this. Under current law, Planned  
23620 Parenthood or any other medical provider is not allowed to  
23621 use Medicaid funds for abortion. I don't like that because  
23622 abortion is health care. But however, that is the law. So  
23623 when my colleague from Tennessee claims that you are just  
23624 stopping them from providing abortions by defunding Planned  
23625 Parenthood from using Medicaid, that is incorrect. Because  
23626 what it is doing is it is saying that Planned Parenthood --  
23627 not these big abortion providers, but if you look at the  
23628 definition -- Planned Parenthood cannot use the Medicaid  
23629 money that it gets to provide essential health care services  
23630 other than abortion.

23631           Now, I want to talk -- I want to echo what my colleague  
23632 from Texas told us so eloquently is Planned Parenthood is  
23633 providing health care to more than two million Americans, and  
23634 more than half of those two million Americans -- so more than  
23635 a million of those people -- are enrolled in Medicaid.  
23636 Planned Parenthood of the Rocky Mountains, for example, which  
23637 serves my state, provides care to about 60,000 Coloradoans  
23638 annually. And 64 percent of Planned Parenthood clinics are  
23639 in health deserts or other underserved areas.

23640           I am going to repeat what my colleague from Texas said,  
23641 because it is important to put this in the record. Services  
23642 include cancer screening, wellness exams, pep and prep  
23643 preventative HIV care, birth control, sexually transmitted  
23644 infection testing and treatment, and family planning  
23645 counseling. This does not include abortion, folks. When you  
23646 cut Planned Parenthood funding, you are cutting essential  
23647 health care to over a million people.

23648           Now, my colleagues across the aisle -- I have heard this  
23649 argument before. My colleagues across the aisle say, well,  
23650 don't worry, federally-qualified health centers could just  
23651 readily replace Planned Parenthood. But in fact, yesterday,  
23652 May 13, 2025, the Guttmacher Institute issued a survey which  
23653 shows that federally-qualified health centers offering  
23654 contraceptive care would have to increase their capacity to  
23655 provide these services by 56 percent or an additional 1

23656 million contraceptive clients. Health department sites  
23657 offering contraceptive care would have to increase their  
23658 capacity to provide the services by 28 percent, or 344,000  
23659 contraceptive clients, and so on.

23660         And so what the Guttmacher Institute found in its survey  
23661 is that asking federally-qualified health centers to become  
23662 the main source of publicly-funded family planning care is  
23663 not a viable policy proposal. And what is worse, they say  
23664 the push is happening against the backdrop of efforts to  
23665 drastically cut the Medicaid program and eliminate the title  
23666 10 National Family Planning Program entirely. So not only  
23667 are we going to take everybody's other health care away, not  
23668 only are we going to have the \$35 copayments, now we are  
23669 going to take people's birth control away.

23670         I just want to ask my friends on the other side of the  
23671 aisle, do you really want to make this bill a vehicle to take  
23672 away birth control and family planning for over a million  
23673 American women in your districts? I don't think so.

23674         So let me close by saying the room has filled up back  
23675 again because it is 10:00 in the morning. But we had an  
23676 intrepid group of women's healthcare advocates who sat with  
23677 us all night long, and I want to thank you for your  
23678 commitment, and I want to thank you for caring about women's  
23679 health. And I will assure you, you have many allies up here  
23680 on the podium who will never, ever stop fighting for your

23681 rights.

23682 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

23683 Oh, wait. I ask unanimous consent to put the Guttmacher  
23684 report in the record.

23685 \*Mr. Griffith. Without objection --

23686 \*Ms. DeGette. With that I yield back.

23687 \*Mr. Griffith. -- so ordered.

23688 [The information follows:]

23689

23690 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

23691

23692           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back, and, yes,  
23693 gentlelady from Indiana has the floor for five minutes.

23694           \*Mrs. Houchin. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23695           Every life is precious. Every life is worth living.  
23696 Our goal is to protect moms and babies, including the unborn.  
23697 We must protect critical healthcare programs like Medicaid so  
23698 women can access adequate prenatal care, regular OB/GYN  
23699 visits, counseling, and related services.

23700           The language in this bill prohibits Medicaid funding for  
23701 large abortion providers. Some of these providers have faced  
23702 accusations of unsanitary and unsafe conditions. In this  
23703 bill we are not saying that we are outlawing abortion, we are  
23704 just saying that tax dollars shouldn't pay for abortion.

23705           But let's be very clear. You can't pour water into only  
23706 one part of a bucket. The American taxpayers should not be  
23707 subsidizing abortion. We should be focusing our efforts on  
23708 maintaining the solvency of health care programs that support  
23709 moms and babies at every stage of life. I am hopeful that we  
23710 can come together to value the sanctity and dignity of every  
23711 human life.

23712           Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

23713           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. The  
23714 gentlelady from California is recognized for five minutes.

23715           \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
23716 the last word.



23717           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady has the floor.

23718           \*Ms. Matsui. It is like we have used a time machine to  
23719 go back to 2017 because, once again, Republicans are trying  
23720 to defund Planned Parenthood.

23721           Republicans pretend this is about preventing any  
23722 taxpayer dollars from being spent on abortions, but that is  
23723 not the case. Medicaid is already barred from paying for  
23724 abortions. This is just another attempt to rip health care  
23725 away from the most vulnerable patients and punish  
23726 Republicans' enemies.

23727           According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, one in three  
23728 women have been to Planned Parenthood Health Center for care  
23729 because, apart from abortion services, Planned Parenthood  
23730 provides essential and basic health careservices, basic  
23731 health care like annual wellness exams, STI testing and  
23732 treatment, lifesaving cancer screenings including pap smears  
23733 and breast exams, contraceptive care, and preventive and  
23734 productive health care. Defunding Planned Parenthood seems  
23735 more like cancers -- we will have more cancers go undetected,  
23736 a tragedy that almost happened to Navalyn.

23737           Navalyn is from California and has used Planned  
23738 Parenthood services for 28 years. She first went when she  
23739 was 16 years old. She suffered from debilitating periods,  
23740 and was told by a friend that Planned Parenthood was a safe  
23741 place to openly discuss her health. Navalyn used their

23742 services throughout college and into her early thirties. She  
23743 relied on Planned Parenthood for women's wellness care and  
23744 pap smears, breast exams, cancer screenings, family planning  
23745 education and birth control. She even used it when she found  
23746 a lump in her right armpit. In fact, Planned Parenthood was  
23747 her first call she made. Navalyn was able to make a quick  
23748 appointment to see a nurse practitioner. Within two days of  
23749 that visit she was able to get a mammogram and ultrasound  
23750 appointment, and a week later she was diagnosed with breast  
23751 cancer. This would not have been possible without Planned  
23752 Parenthood.

23753         Defunding Planned Parenthood has devastating  
23754 implications. It also disproportionately affects low-income  
23755 families, women of color, immigrants, and young people,  
23756 groups that are already vulnerable and historically  
23757 marginalized.

23758         Planned Parenthood also disproportionately supports  
23759 patient in the most vulnerable regions. Sixty-four percent  
23760 of Planned Parenthood health centers are in rural areas,  
23761 medically underserved areas, or areas with health  
23762 professional shortages. Planned Parenthood health centers  
23763 provide primary and preventive health care to people that  
23764 otherwise would have nowhere to go. Not only is this  
23765 harmful, it is just bad policy.

23766         The American people understand that the services Planned

23767 Parenthood provides are critical. Almost 75 percent of  
23768 voters, including 55 percent of Trump voters, oppose Congress  
23769 taking away funds from Planned Parenthood health centers for  
23770 providing health, birth control, wellness exams, and cancer  
23771 screening.

23772         And what is more, defunding Planned Parenthood wouldn't  
23773 save any taxpayer dollars. According to a 2015 CBO  
23774 calculation, defunding Planned Parenthood would actually cost  
23775 the government \$136 million over 10 years.

23776         Let me reiterate. This provision still leaves millions  
23777 of patients with nowhere to go for health care. So I am  
23778 grateful to my colleague for offering this amendment to  
23779 strike this ridiculous provision, and I urge my colleagues to  
23780 support it.

23781         With that I yield the balance of my time.

23782         \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Is anyone  
23783 on the Republican side wishing to speak?

23784         I recognize the gentlelady of North Dakota for five  
23785 minutes.

23786         \*Mrs. Fedorchak. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I too want  
23787 to associate my comments with the gentlewoman from Tennessee  
23788 and the gentlewoman from Indiana.

23789         I too care deeply about wide access to high-quality care  
23790 for women, health care, for women of all ages. And I want to  
23791 emphasize that this bill does not in any way cut or reduce

23792 Medicaid benefits for women, including for birth control or  
23793 family planning. This bill does not change the availability  
23794 of funds, it simply establishes a safeguard so the nation's  
23795 largest abortion providers are not the one providing health  
23796 care services to women through Medicaid. Should these  
23797 entities stop participating in abortion services, they would  
23798 again be eligible to receive funding.

23799 I urge my colleagues to reject this amendment. We  
23800 should prevent Medicaid dollars from being used to bankroll  
23801 organizations whose primary purpose is providing abortion  
23802 procedures that are morally objectionable to a large number  
23803 of American taxpayers.

23804 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

23805 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. I now  
23806 recognize the gentlelady of Illinois for five minutes.

23807 \*Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

23808 First of all, I want to thank Representative Fletcher  
23809 for this amendment. Thank you so much.

23810 And second of all, I want to thank Planned Parenthood  
23811 for all of your services, all of your well-rounded services,  
23812 all the education and information especially that you give to  
23813 women in college. How do I know that? Because I was a woman  
23814 in college that came to Planned Parenthood. You were my  
23815 first entree into women's health, and thank you for the  
23816 comfort level that you provide people.

23817           And also from feedback, thank you for not being one-  
23818 sided. I know I have a Planned Parenthood in my district,  
23819 and right next to the Planned Parenthood is the other  
23820 supposed health care group that only tells you one option,  
23821 and -- or I should say keep or give up for adoption. That is  
23822 your option.

23823           But thank you for all that you do, and thank you for the  
23824 comfort that you bring women. And also, in poll after poll  
23825 after poll after poll, most people are for choice. They are  
23826 not anti-choice. They may not want to have an abortion  
23827 themselves, but anti-choice means -- or, you know, you are  
23828 making decisions for other people. And most people, they do  
23829 not poll like that. So I just really wanted to thank you.

23830           And also, you serve men and women, not just women. So I  
23831 just want to thank you, thank you, thank you for what you do.  
23832 And the bulk of what you do is not abortion. Thank you.

23833           I yield back, or whoever wants my time.

23834           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
23835 somebody else?

23836           Yes, the gentlelady from California is recognized for  
23837 five minutes.

23838           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

23839           It is kind of hard to sit here and listen to some of the  
23840 hypocrisy that I am hearing. I have heard my colleagues from  
23841 the other side of the aisle say we want to take care of women

23842 and babies at all stages -- and I am quoting here -- yet they  
23843 voted to take away health care for kids. I mean, it is just  
23844 mind-boggling.

23845 I know we have been here for a long time, but I am not  
23846 going crazy. It is mind-boggling to me to hear the words  
23847 coming out of the mouths of my colleagues across the aisle.  
23848 One of my other colleagues says, "I care about quality access  
23849 of health care to women." Oh, but there is a big but.  
23850 Unless you are going to get it at Planned Parenthood.

23851 I mean, it is just remarkable to hear the starters of  
23852 what my colleagues are saying. They are for quality health  
23853 care for women so long as it is not at Planned Parenthood.  
23854 Basically, we want to punish Planned Parenthood because they  
23855 provide a service that they don't agree with, one service out  
23856 of many services.

23857 The House Republicans' budget scheme defunds Planned  
23858 Parenthood. This robs lifesaving care like prenatal care and  
23859 cancer screenings for millions of women. Of course, they  
23860 also provide access to care for men, everything from STDs to  
23861 -- how do you say it -- vasectomies, cancer screenings, and  
23862 more. This is not policy. This is cruelty that hurts women  
23863 and families and even men. House Republicans would rather  
23864 hand out huge tax breaks for the ultra-wealthy than provide  
23865 reproductive care to their constituents.

23866 Reproductive care is more than just abortion. It is

23867 also preventive care that saves lives. Planned Parenthood  
23868 provides over two million patients a year with essential  
23869 preventive reproductive health care like birth control,  
23870 lifesaving cancer screenings, wellness exams, STI testing and  
23871 treatment, and more.

23872       I want to share a story from one of my constituents.  
23873 Shaday from California was recently a college graduate  
23874 without health insurance. Planned Parenthood provided  
23875 medication for her severe bladder infection. The bladder  
23876 infection came unexpectedly before she landed a job with  
23877 health insurance. As a healthy 22-year-old, a condition like  
23878 a bladder infection was the last thing on her mind. That is  
23879 why she went to Planned Parenthood. By the time she arrived  
23880 for her appointment, she was urinating blood, which means the  
23881 infection had reached her kidneys. Planned Parenthood gave  
23882 her the necessary antibiotics to treat the infection and  
23883 fully recover. Shaday described her experience and her --  
23884 rather, her importance of Planned Parenthood.

23885       She says, "They provide health services to women who  
23886 otherwise could not afford them. They literally save women's  
23887 lives. And to think that some of our elected officials are  
23888 trying to dismantle such a useful and needed resource for  
23889 teen girls and women is absolutely sickening.'`

23890       Jennifer from New Hampshire is alive today because  
23891 Planned Parenthood caught her cervical cancer early through a

23892 screening. She said, and I am quoting, "Planned Parenthood  
23893 has saved another woman's life. Mine. They caught my  
23894 cervical cancer caused by HPV just in time, before it fully  
23895 spread. I knew something was off in my body. I listened to  
23896 my intuition and I booked an appointment with Planned  
23897 Parenthood.'"

23898 I, myself -- when I was in high school, two of my  
23899 sisters got pregnant at an early age. I, myself, walked into  
23900 a facility. I had no idea where to go, but I walked in, very  
23901 much like a Planned Parenthood, and asked to see somebody.  
23902 It was about planning. It was about preparing. It was about  
23903 making decisions for myself. And this is what my colleagues  
23904 across the aisle want to take away. They want to take  
23905 people's ability to make decisions for themselves away.  
23906 Supposedly the party that doesn't want government to make  
23907 decisions for them, they are okay with it here. They are  
23908 okay with allowing government to decide what women should do  
23909 with their bodies, even if it is just getting access to  
23910 contraceptive. It is shameful. It is also hypocritical and  
23911 it is wrong, and it is why I support the amendment.

23912 If Republican -- if the Republican bill to defund  
23913 Planned Parenthood passes, women like Jennifer and Shaday  
23914 will suffer. And yet House Republicans, the so-called pro-  
23915 life party, see health care for women who want to start  
23916 families or receive reproductive health care services as



23917 wasteful government spending. What will be the consequences?  
23918 Women will get sick and die from preventable health  
23919 conditions.

23920 I urge my colleagues to support the amendment and I  
23921 yield back.

23922 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Now I  
23923 recognize the gentlelady from the State of Washington for  
23924 five minutes.

23925 \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you to  
23926 my colleague, Representative Fletcher, for bringing up this  
23927 important amendment to protect women's health, to protect  
23928 Planned Parenthood.

23929 I was reflecting as I was listening to her speak and  
23930 listening to some of my colleagues about when I first decided  
23931 to run for Congress. This was back in 2017. And I have been  
23932 reflecting a lot on 2017, because that is when the  
23933 Republicans first tried to kill the Affordable Care Act, to  
23934 take health care away from people with pre-existing  
23935 conditions. And yes, part of that package was defunding  
23936 Planned Parenthood.

23937 And I also remember a photograph of 13 men sitting  
23938 around a table making decisions about women's health care.  
23939 And it ticked me off. And it is one of the reasons that I am  
23940 sitting here today as a woman doctor, standing up for Planned  
23941 Parenthood, standing up for women's health. And I am joined

23942 by so many of my colleagues here who share this value.

23943 I want to be really clear. Like, this really feels like  
23944 an attack on women's health care across the board. I mean,  
23945 we can start with Planned Parenthood, since that is where  
23946 they are starting, and talk about taking away the HPV  
23947 vaccines, cervical cancer screenings, breast cancer  
23948 screenings, well-women exams, contraception, you name it, but  
23949 we can also go on to the other things that they are doing.

23950 I mean, we just spent, I don't know, almost 24 hours  
23951 talking about Medicaid. Medicaid funds women's health care.  
23952 Also, when you make cuts to Medicaid, the first department  
23953 that rural hospitals will close is labor and delivery. That  
23954 is an attack on women's health care and an attack on their  
23955 babies.

23956 I want to tell you that in rural areas, on average,  
23957 women have to drive 30 to 60 minutes to get to the nearest  
23958 labor and delivery location. In my district there are areas  
23959 between two mountain passes where that is not even feasible,  
23960 especially if those mountain passes close. And so cutting  
23961 Medicaid is a direct line to another attack on women and  
23962 women's health care and their well-being.

23963 And then I can't help but also talk about what happened  
23964 after the Dobbs decision, when half the states in this  
23965 country put in very draconian rules about abortion, so much  
23966 that there has been an exodus of obstetricians and

23967 gynecologists from Idaho, our neighboring state, and that has  
23968 left a healthcare desert for women. It has made pregnancy --  
23969 I mean, it has made pregnancy dangerous now in the State of  
23970 Idaho, and Texas, and other places in this country.

23971         So I just wanted to put the perspective of a woman, of a  
23972 mom, a woman doctor on this and say that this is just another  
23973 attempt to make a political point, but that it puts women's  
23974 lives, women's health, pregnancies, and newborns all at risk,  
23975 and I want to encourage all my colleagues to support this  
23976 amendment.

23977         Thank you, I yield back.

23978         \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. I recognize  
23979 the gentlelady from Massachusetts for five minutes.

23980         \*Mrs. Trahan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to  
23981 strike the last word, and I want to thank my colleague from  
23982 Texas for introducing this important amendment.

23983         Every one of us has heard stories from constituents,  
23984 mothers, daughters, families, about how hard it is to access  
23985 the care they need. And yet this bill, crafted behind closed  
23986 doors by Republicans on this committee, will only deepen that  
23987 crisis.

23988         At a time when maternal health outcomes are worsening  
23989 across our country, when we are dead last in maternal  
23990 mortality among developed countries, this bill doesn't just  
23991 turn a blind eye, it pours gasoline on a fire that is already

23992 consuming our hospitals, our providers, and our patients.  
23993 Cutting Medicaid means cutting off care when women are most  
23994 vulnerable. Pregnancy is not a luxury. Safe childbirth  
23995 isn't a partisan issue.

23996         Maternal health is life or death. And right now, far  
23997 too many women are dying because our health care system is  
23998 failing them. In my district that failure is not  
23999 theoretical. We don't have sprawling hospital systems with  
24000 billion-dollar reserves. We have community hospitals that  
24001 barely survived COVID and now face impossible decisions. In  
24002 2023 the only maternity ward in the western part of my  
24003 district shut down due to staffing shortages. Last year two  
24004 more hospitals closed during the Steward Health crisis,  
24005 including one that served as the primary care provider for  
24006 thousands of families.

24007         These aren't hypothetical losses. These are real  
24008 delivery rooms, real emergency rooms closed for good.  
24009 Hallways dark. Doors locked. Services gone. When a  
24010 maternity ward shuts down, it sends a chilling message that a  
24011 community's needs aren't worth the investment, that we are  
24012 okay forcing mothers to drive two or three hours just to give  
24013 birth, that we will accept more premature births, more  
24014 untreated complications, and more babies who never take their  
24015 first breath.

24016         According to the March of Dimes, one in every 25

24017     obstetric units has closed in just the last two years. Over  
24018     1,000 counties in America are now classified as maternity  
24019     health deserts, meaning 2.3 million women live in places  
24020     where there isn't a single birthing facility, not one  
24021     obstetrician.

24022             These women are not numbers on a chart. They are real  
24023     people, women who fear bleeding out in labor with the nearest  
24024     hospital 90 minutes away, women who skip prenatal care  
24025     because they can't afford the gas, women who bury their  
24026     babies because help came too late. And now Republicans want  
24027     to gut the very program that keeps these fragile systems  
24028     afloat just to pay for tax cuts for billionaires like Elon  
24029     Musk, who loves to talk about falling birth rates but refuses  
24030     to fund the health care that women need to give birth safely.

24031             It doesn't stop there. This bill targets Planned  
24032     Parenthood, blocking their health centers from receiving  
24033     Medicaid dollars in states where abortion is already banned.  
24034     I want to be clear. These centers aren't performing  
24035     abortions. What they are doing is delivering cancer  
24036     screenings, birth control, STI testing, and preventative care  
24037     in places where there is no other option. So let's call this  
24038     what it is, not a fight over abortion but a deliberate  
24039     campaign to dismantle reproductive health care altogether,  
24040     and it is happening while maternal mortality is rising and  
24041     Black women are three times more likely to die from

24042 pregnancy-related causes than White women.

24043       Cutting Medicaid, which covers half of all births in  
24044 this country, will only make that crisis worse. We will lose  
24045 coverage, we will lose hospitals, and we will lose lives. If  
24046 you care about healthy moms and babies, if you care about  
24047 rural communities surviving, if you care about the basic  
24048 dignity of giving birth safely in America in 2025, then you  
24049 cannot support the bill as written.

24050       Give us a meaningful Mother's Day gift this year.  
24051 Support this amendment and do not balance your budget on the  
24052 backs of mothers.

24053       I yield back.

24054       \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Now I  
24055 recognize the gentleman from Massachusetts.

24056       \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Chairman. I yield my time  
24057 to the gentlewoman from Texas.

24058       \*Mrs. Fletcher. Thank you to my friend from  
24059 Massachusetts.

24060       I have now heard several things from my colleagues on  
24061 the other side of the aisle, and do want to respond, as my  
24062 colleagues have so much, and I want to join in all of their  
24063 comments.

24064       I want to join -- in particular, Congresswoman DeGette's  
24065 thanks to everyone who is here from Planned Parenthood and  
24066 supporting Planned Parenthood who is with us through the

24067 night for your commitment and for your work.

24068 But given my deep concerns with this provision, I do  
24069 have some questions for counsel that I think are really  
24070 important to cover.

24071 First, to understand the impact and what this language  
24072 means in the bill, under this section the provision defines a  
24073 prohibited entity that will be barred from receiving Federal  
24074 funds if it meets certain criteria. The criteria are very  
24075 specific, as I said before, and they appear to be narrowly  
24076 tailored to achieve a very specific goal. They also closely  
24077 mirror a similar provision that this committee considered in  
24078 2017 to ban Planned Parenthood from the Medicaid program. It  
24079 didn't become law, but it appears that that is exactly what  
24080 Republicans are trying to do again now.

24081 So given these issues, my questions are as follows.

24082 To the counsel, does the definition of "prohibited  
24083 entity" under this bill mean that Medicaid reimbursements  
24084 for contraception care, cervical and breast cancer  
24085 screenings, screenings for sexually-transmitted infections  
24086 would be banned if these services were performed by a  
24087 provider who happened to work at a Planned Parenthood health  
24088 center that separately provides abortion services?

24089 \*Counsel. Thank you for the question.

24090 If the facility that you described met the definition of  
24091 a prohibited entity, then Medicaid payments would not be

24092 permitted to that entity.

24093       \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, and that is my question. So a  
24094 lot of Planned Parenthoods -- for example, in my state --  
24095 have separate entities. But this definition calls for  
24096 affiliates and other entities. So given that this definition  
24097 says a prohibited entity includes affiliates, subsidiaries,  
24098 successors, and clinics, does that mean that even in states  
24099 where abortion is banned, like Texas, where abortion care is  
24100 not taking place, if a patient goes to Planned Parenthood for  
24101 a pap smear they can't be compensated for that care, that  
24102 cancer screening that is absolutely critical, as we heard  
24103 about from Representative Barragan? Could the provider not  
24104 receive Medicaid reimbursements for those services because it  
24105 is performed at a Planned Parenthood affiliate that does not  
24106 provide abortions?

24107       \*Counsel. If the facility you described, whether it is  
24108 affiliates or not, met the definition, then that would be  
24109 correct.

24110       \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, that is my question about what is  
24111 in the definition. So I am asking you what is in the  
24112 definition.

24113       \*Counsel. I apologize. Could you clarify in regards  
24114 to --

24115       \*Mrs. Fletcher. Sure. If a Planned Parenthood facility  
24116 does not provide abortions -- in Houston, Texas -- if you



24117 don't provide abortions at the Planned Parenthood, but it is  
24118 a Planned Parenthood affiliate, does that mean it is covered  
24119 under this provision because it is affiliated with Planned  
24120 Parenthood, and in other states Planned Parenthood clinics  
24121 provide abortion care?

24122 \*Counsel. If the entity you are describing or its  
24123 affiliates -- it would apply to the affiliates of any of the  
24124 prohibited entities being described.

24125 \*Mrs. Fletcher. So even if you don't provide abortion,  
24126 no money for Planned Parenthood, correct?

24127 \*Counsel. It would --

24128 \*Mr. Griffith. That is a policy, I believe.

24129 \*Counsel. -- apply to the affiliates, as well.

24130 \*Mr. Griffith. That would be a policy of this  
24131 committee.

24132 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Oh, that is a policy of the committee?

24133 Well, Mr. Chairman, can I ask you, is that what we are  
24134 doing here? There is there is no money for Planned  
24135 Parenthood, Mr. Chairman?

24136 \*Mr. Griffith. I am weighing my question. I believe  
24137 you are asking a legal opinion. And since I am currently in  
24138 senior status, I am not sure I can give you one.

24139 \*Mrs. Fletcher. I don't know actually what senior  
24140 status is, so that is probably another question for me, but I  
24141 am going to hold that. Maybe we can circle back to it. It

24142 certainly sounds like counsel has said this is a policy  
24143 decision, and it certainly seems to me like this is a policy  
24144 decision.

24145         This is a decision that is driven by special interest  
24146 groups that have, as their stated purpose, defunding what my  
24147 colleague from Tennessee said was sort of an abortion, you  
24148 know, sort of big abortion. I don't know if anyone on the  
24149 other side of the aisle can name anybody other than Planned  
24150 Parenthood that meets this definition.

24151         Can anyone name an organization besides Planned  
24152 Parenthood here?

24153         \*Mr. Griffith. So if I --

24154         \*Mrs. Fletcher. I don't --

24155         \*Mr. Griffith. I am going back to the last question. I  
24156 have been advised that CBO has given the opinion that the  
24157 answer to your question -- the previous question -- was yes.

24158         \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Thank you very much, Mr.  
24159 Chairman. I am running low on time, so I will yield back to  
24160 my colleague from Massachusetts. And if any of my other  
24161 colleagues have time, we have a few more questions for  
24162 counsel. Thank you.

24163         \*Mr. Auchincloss. I yield to the chair.

24164         \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. I now  
24165 recognize the gentleman from California for five minutes.

24166         \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you. I support this amendment as a

24167 physician, a community advocate, and a public health expert.

24168 I have worked in very rural and underserved communities,  
24169 and sometimes in many cases Planned Parenthood clinics are  
24170 the only clinics in those areas taking care of patients in  
24171 primary care services like cervical cancer screenings, breast  
24172 cancer screenings, STI treatments, and prostate cancer.  
24173 There is a lot of men who are treated in these clinics, as  
24174 well. So targeting them will put health care for children,  
24175 disabled, pregnant women, seniors in jeopardy, and will add  
24176 to the lack of access, higher morbidity, and higher  
24177 mortality.

24178 And with that I want to yield my time to Congresswoman  
24179 Fletcher.

24180 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, thank you so much, Mr. Ruiz, for  
24181 yielding, because I do think these questions are critically  
24182 important.

24183 So counsel, I want to follow up on something that Mr.  
24184 Ruiz just said. Given the definition of prohibited entity,  
24185 will this include providers who serve patients in areas like  
24186 the ones he just described that have limited medical  
24187 facilities, have a shortage of health professionals, are in  
24188 rural areas where the majority of Planned Parenthood health  
24189 centers are located?

24190 \*Counsel. If the facility met the definition of the  
24191 prohibited entity.

24192           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. So that is, yes, it contemplates  
24193 that we will defund Planned Parenthood everywhere, even  
24194 despite these challenges. Is that correct?

24195           \*Counsel. I am sorry. Could you repeat the question  
24196 again?

24197           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, I think you have answered it. We  
24198 will move on, because I also want to know whether the bill  
24199 contemplates where those patients should get reproductive  
24200 health care or health care of any kind once they are no  
24201 longer able to get that health care and reproductive health  
24202 care at Planned Parenthood. Does the bill contemplate where  
24203 they should go?

24204           \*Mr. Griffith. I don't believe the gentleman can answer  
24205 the contemplation of a bill.

24206           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Does the bill identify where they can  
24207 go?

24208           \*Counsel. The bill -- the question would be a policy  
24209 question as to where -- how that would apply to individuals.

24210           \*Mrs. Fletcher. And Mr. Chairman, can you answer that  
24211 question for me? Where --

24212           \*Mr. Griffith. I don't think it --

24213           \*Mrs. Fletcher. -- are these people supposed to go?

24214           \*Mr. Griffith. -- specifically states in the bill where  
24215 someone would go if a large abortion provider was the  
24216 provider they had previously used.

24217           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, to my point earlier about states  
24218 like mine, Planned Parenthood, where I live, can't provide  
24219 abortions, by law, right? So they are not providing  
24220 abortions. But under your understanding of the definition,  
24221 because it is a Planned Parenthood, even though it doesn't  
24222 provide abortions, you can't get care there and you don't  
24223 know where they can go.

24224           \*Mr. Griffith. Well, there are multiple facilities that  
24225 can provide health care across the country. I don't know  
24226 your specific area well enough to tell you, but there are  
24227 federally-qualified health centers, there are other medical  
24228 facilities across the country. But I don't -- I am not  
24229 familiar with your particular district.

24230           \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, I appreciate that, and I am not  
24231 as familiar with yours, so I appreciate that. But I would  
24232 point out -- I mentioned this when I introduced the bill --  
24233 that Texas is a cautionary tale because, when Texas defunded  
24234 Planned Parenthood, what we found was that there weren't  
24235 providers to make up that gap.

24236           And I went through a little bit of those statistics  
24237 earlier, but there were all these providers that on paper  
24238 said that they could do it, but the bottom line was they  
24239 couldn't. They weren't located in the places where the  
24240 planned Parenthoods were located, they didn't have the  
24241 ability to serve those populations, they didn't have the same

24242 number of people enrolled, they couldn't provide the  
24243 services, and we saw a huge drop and an increase -- a  
24244 decrease in contraceptive care, an increase in Medicaid  
24245 births. That is more expenses. That is why I already ran  
24246 over the CBO's comments that this is going to increase the  
24247 deficit by \$300 million, because there are not services in  
24248 place to make up for the care that Planned Parenthood  
24249 provides across the country.

24250 I also want to point out, I mean, nobody has been able  
24251 to identify anything -- any entity other than Planned  
24252 Parenthood that provides these services, and there isn't one  
24253 that can. You mentioned FQHCs. The fact is they would have  
24254 to increase their capacity by 56 percent and have a million  
24255 new visits to cover what Planned Parenthood covers. It  
24256 cannot be done.

24257 And I want to point out, as well, before I yield back to  
24258 Mr. Ruiz, that there are so many other things to say, but the  
24259 bottom line here is that this bill is banning qualified  
24260 providers for the program because of the animosity of some  
24261 special interests for Planned Parenthood, which is the  
24262 provider of choice for more than two million Americans every  
24263 year, and that is a choice that the Medicare statute  
24264 guarantees by law, free choice of provider. And that is what  
24265 this bill is taking away.

24266 And I yield back to Mr. Ruiz.

24267           \*Mr. Griffith. And I would -- the gentleman yields  
24268 back, and I would advise that the committee that -- I have  
24269 been advised that there are multiple providers of abortion  
24270 services, not just Planned Parenthood, that would be affected  
24271 by the language of the bill.

24272           Do I see someone else wishing to speak on the measure?

24273           I recognize the gentleman from New Jersey for five  
24274 minutes.

24275           \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman.

24276           I thank my colleague from Texas for introducing this  
24277 amendment. I thank my colleagues on this side of the aisle  
24278 for their thoughtful remarks and speaking in favor of the  
24279 amendment.

24280           For all Americans, we are living in a post-Dobbs world.  
24281 We have seen how access to reproductive health care has  
24282 become more of a challenge for women across this country. We  
24283 know that Medicaid, which is the core of this health section,  
24284 it funds 40 percent of all births in the U.S. and 75 percent  
24285 of publicly-funded family planning services. So the point  
24286 that we have been making throughout this entire debate is  
24287 that the purpose of this bill is not to make health care more  
24288 accessible, whether it is with respect to Medicaid or with  
24289 respect to access to reproductive health care.

24290           We know that more than two million people every year  
24291 rely on Planned Parenthood to get affordable, reliable

24292 reproductive health care. We know that slashing funding for  
24293 these programs won't make us more healthy or protect the  
24294 taxpayers from fraud, waste, or abuse.

24295         We already know we have so many challenges that we have  
24296 to deal with across the country. We know that we have a  
24297 maternal mortality crisis in this country, especially among  
24298 Black women. We know that, instead of discussing cuts to  
24299 Planned Parenthood, we should be discussing the bills that  
24300 Democrats have introduced to address these disparities. We  
24301 know that would make women across this country healthier, but  
24302 we are not doing that.

24303         We also need to dispel the myth that Planned Parenthood  
24304 only performs abortion. That seems to be a fixation of the  
24305 Republicans. But Planned Parenthood also provides birth  
24306 control, cancer screenings, wellness exams, and STI testing  
24307 and treatment, and it represents a very large portion of the  
24308 work that they do. And as has been previously stated, it is  
24309 health care for both men and women.

24310         But for -- if we are going to talk about families in  
24311 this country, I think it is -- the fact that this bill text  
24312 was introduced the evening of Mother's Day, to me, is just  
24313 such a difficult fact to comprehend, that the Republican  
24314 Party would do that. When so many mothers and families are  
24315 celebrating parenthood in this country, when so many  
24316 individuals and families so desperately want to bring and



24317 raise a family in this country, but every day they are seeing  
24318 an erosion of the health care that they need, of the family  
24319 planning services that they need to make those decisions  
24320 together.

24321         The fact that in other committees we are discussing  
24322 reducing SNAP benefits -- we know that we need nutrition to  
24323 have healthy families. This Congress and this administration  
24324 has nothing to do -- has done nothing on housing, but we know  
24325 that we can't have healthy births if women are living in  
24326 their cars. There is so much work that we have to do. And  
24327 what we can't do is take the baseline health care that we  
24328 have today and make it -- and scale it back.

24329         We have already seen post-Dobbs New Jersey Planned  
24330 Parenthood has patients from across the country because  
24331 states have made it so hard to have access to reproductive  
24332 health care.

24333         So if we want healthy births, we want healthy children,  
24334 healthy mothers, then why would we not vote for this  
24335 amendment to strike this language that would cut funding for  
24336 an organization that does such incredible work?

24337         It has been hours where we have listened to Republicans  
24338 talk about how they want to create better health care, more  
24339 accessible health care. They have talked about children,  
24340 they have talked about pregnant women. But you are going to  
24341 sit here and cut funding to Planned Parenthood.

24342           Now, listen, I actually don't think it is a good fact  
24343   that there is other organizations that would not receive  
24344   funding. That is actually a bad fact. I think that is  
24345   actually a terrible one, because where are women supposed to  
24346   go? Where are families supposed to go across this country  
24347   who desperately want to have access to the health care and  
24348   family planning services that will enable them to make  
24349   informed, healthy decisions?

24350           I am just so tired of the Republican hypocrisy about  
24351   talking about families, about talking about making America  
24352   healthy again, and then doing things like this. Between the  
24353   17 million people that will be bumped for Medicaid, some of  
24354   whom we know will be people that are looking to start  
24355   families that will be negatively impacted because they lose  
24356   health care before they can make those decisions.

24357           We know that this bill takes us in the wrong direction.  
24358   This amendment would be a step in getting us back on the  
24359   right path to doing the work that we have to do. We have  
24360   taken so many steps back since the Dobbs decision. It is  
24361   time we take a step forward. Voting for this amendment would  
24362   do just that.

24363           Thank you, and I yield back.

24364           \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. Now I  
24365   recognize the ranking member of the full committee, Mr.  
24366   Pallone, for five minutes.

24367           You have the floor.

24368           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
24369 want to -- I just wanted to say a brief comment, and then I  
24370 would like to yield the rest of the time to Ms. DeGette -- or  
24371 the gentlewoman from Colorado.

24372           I want -- the gentlewoman from Texas, from Houston, I  
24373 thought, was right on point when she was talking about the  
24374 specialty care and access to women's health care that Planned  
24375 Parenthood provides. I can't characterize my district in any  
24376 way as a health desert. I mean, we have plenty of hospitals,  
24377 community health centers. But what Planned Parenthood  
24378 provides in my district is a place where women can go -- I  
24379 mean, I am sure there is some men, but I am talking about  
24380 women can go -- and feel comfortable and have access to  
24381 specialty women's health care and specialists that are not  
24382 easily obtained elsewhere. And that is the difference.

24383           This isn't about abortion. This is about a place -- a  
24384 welcoming place, if you will -- where you can go and you have  
24385 someone who you know is a specialist who deals with women's  
24386 health issues on a regular basis, and that is not necessarily  
24387 available anywhere else in my district. There may be some, I  
24388 am not saying there isn't, but it is a very -- it is a  
24389 special place, if you will, not related to abortion. And if  
24390 you don't have that, it is going to be hard for women, even  
24391 in my district, where we have a lot of health care options,

24392 to find something similar.

24393 And it just seems to me it is just so unfair. It is  
24394 sexist, frankly, to say that these places are not going to be  
24395 available anymore for some ideological reason related to  
24396 abortion. It is just not fair. It is a terrible thing.

24397 I yield the balance of my time to Ms. DeGette.

24398 \*Ms. DeGette. Thanks. Thank you to the ranking member.

24399 So Mr. Chairman, section 44126, which is what we are  
24400 discussing, B, it sets out in very, very, very detailed  
24401 definition the organizations that would be banned from  
24402 providing all of these medical services -- not abortion, but  
24403 these other medical services under Medicaid. And as the  
24404 gentlelady from Texas said, we have been down this road  
24405 before. The way this is written, the only organization that  
24406 it would apply to, because of the size, is Planned  
24407 Parenthood.

24408 So I guess, Mr. Chairman, I would ask you. Can you tell  
24409 me what the multiple organizations that would be defunded  
24410 are? What are the other organizations that meet this  
24411 definition, Mr. Chairman?

24412 \*Mr. Griffith. I would say to the gentlelady I don't  
24413 have the list --

24414 \*Ms. DeGette. You don't have it.

24415 \*Mr. Griffith. -- but the CBO did indicate to our  
24416 committee that there are others that would --

24417           \*Ms. DeGette. Well, so --

24418           \*Mr. Griffith. -- qualify under this definition.

24419           \*Ms. DeGette. Okay. So if there are others, I would  
24420 like to get that list.

24421           But also, is that really a good argument for the  
24422 Republicans to make? Don't worry, we are not just defunding  
24423 Planned Parenthood, we are funding [sic] other organizations  
24424 that provide women's health care, too. That is the worst  
24425 argument I ever heard, especially in light of the fact that  
24426 the CBO also said that this is not going to save any money,  
24427 like the rest of this bill. It is actually going to cost 300  
24428 million more dollars.

24429           So to prove their ideological point, my colleagues on  
24430 the other side of the aisle are actually now admitting that  
24431 they are going to defund Planned Parenthood and "other  
24432 multiple organizations'' that's name will be provided in the  
24433 future, and they are going to spend 300 million more dollars  
24434 to deny women health care services. What a great idea. And  
24435 I hope that this is spread far and wide, what the intent of  
24436 this committee is.

24437           And the reason why, Mr. Chairman, people don't want to  
24438 say Planned Parenthood anymore -- I guess we have made  
24439 ,progress because in the past they just said we are going to  
24440 defund Planned Parenthood. Now I guess people realize  
24441 Planned Parenthood is wildly popular because two million

24442 American women get their health care there, and almost half  
24443 of them will lose that health care under this amendment  
24444 because they are on Medicaid.

24445 I yield back.

24446 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman from New Jersey yields  
24447 back?

24448 I recognize the gentlelady from Virginia for five  
24449 minutes.

24450 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24451 You may remember that April 29 was my daughter's  
24452 birthday. She turned 10. And I always remember her birth  
24453 because we both almost died. I mean, you remember every  
24454 birth, but we both almost died in childbirth. And that  
24455 crystallized for me our maternal mortality crisis in a way it  
24456 hadn't been crystallized before.

24457 But the next day, on April 30, the CDC released  
24458 preliminary maternal mortality data that showed maternal  
24459 deaths went up in the past year, and continue to go up as  
24460 America has the highest -- or one of the highest, if not the  
24461 highest -- maternal death rates of any industrialized nation.

24462 There is a correlation, no surprise, between the states  
24463 that have abortion restrictions and the states that have the  
24464 highest maternal death rates. Now, there are a wide variety  
24465 of reasons. And yes, part of it is the number of women who  
24466 have been denied access to abortion services, even where

24467 there are exemptions for the life of the mother consistent  
24468 with the Hyde Amendment. Because when a woman shows up at a  
24469 hospital in Texas or Georgia in the middle of a miscarriage,  
24470 the hospital is like, why are you close enough to death  
24471 [sic]? Sit in the parking lot until you are septic. And we  
24472 have seen women die as a result.

24473         We have seen women die because they were forced to carry  
24474 a pregnancy that is non-viable longer than necessary under  
24475 abortion bans. But we have also seen women dying because  
24476 they were not healthy before they got pregnant. Among the  
24477 highest causes of maternal deaths are cardiovascular issues.  
24478 Often a woman will have her first heart attack as a result of  
24479 being pregnant or in the postpartum phase, or her first  
24480 stroke, substance abuse issues, cancer. These are among the  
24481 leading causes of maternal deaths right now, and that is why  
24482 Planned Parenthood provides so much more than abortion  
24483 services.

24484         Cancer screenings, diabetes screenings, high blood  
24485 pressure screenings. In many cases, they are the only  
24486 pharmacy in a pharmacy desert that provides comprehensive  
24487 contraception, and not just the one that the local pharmacist  
24488 approves of. Because if you are like me and you almost died  
24489 in childbirth and you are -- I am going to tell you my age --  
24490 you are 52, but you are technically still in childbearing  
24491 years, but you know if you get pregnant again you are likely

24492 to die, and your doctor says, you know what, you are more  
24493 likely to have adverse complications from the pill, you need  
24494 the IUD, but there are some pharmacists who say, I don't  
24495 approve of the IUD, I don't care what your doctor says, I am  
24496 not giving it to you, Planned Parenthood doesn't do that.  
24497 Planned Parenthood says the choice of contraception that you  
24498 and your provider think is right for you, we are going to  
24499 give to you.

24500 And oh, by the way, you are defunding a provider that in  
24501 some areas is the only OB nearby because now we have so many  
24502 OB deserts, primary care deserts, pharmacy deserts where  
24503 Planned Parenthood fills that gap for non-abortion services,  
24504 while you are -- for women of childbearing ages who fit in  
24505 the Medicaid expansion universe but aren't pregnant yet --  
24506 you are making it more difficult for them. If they make \$300  
24507 a week, they got to pay a copay now to go get their  
24508 preventative care.

24509 I mean, the cumulative effect of everything we are doing  
24510 is not going to make our maternal mortality rate go down, but  
24511 go up.

24512 And let's talk about the Hyde Amendment, because you  
24513 know what is excluded are those fetal abnormalities or non-  
24514 viable births where you know -- and we have heard these  
24515 stories -- where the minute the umbilical cord is cut in some  
24516 cases, that that baby is going to suffocate. And these are



24517 uninsured under Federal health plans. And therefore, when  
24518 they are in the hospital and the hospital says we -- they  
24519 treat them as if they are uninsured, and they have to pay  
24520 full freight under the Hyde Amendment -- I would love to have  
24521 a larger conversation about that one day, but not now.

24522 So I yield back.

24523 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone  
24524 else wish to speak on the measure?

24525 The gentlelady from New York is recognized for five  
24526 minutes. She has the floor.

24527 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

24528 You know, we have been here since 2:00 yesterday  
24529 straight, no breaks, discussing everything from the energy  
24530 provisions that are being gutted to, most importantly, health  
24531 care that is on the chopping block. And for a lot of this  
24532 discussion in the last almost 24 hours, some of the  
24533 justification for these cuts have been about populations and  
24534 people who are undeserving of Medicaid and health care, who  
24535 are not worthy of it, who are fraudulent, et cetera. You  
24536 know, the list goes on.

24537 But, you know, at the end of the day it is about who is  
24538 not deserving of care. And I would like my colleagues to sit  
24539 with the feeling of having this legislation come before us,  
24540 and imagine what it feels like as a woman to have health care  
24541 and clinics that are dedicated to the full spectrum of

24542 women's care beyond the chopping block, because the  
24543 implication is that we are undeserving.

24544         The implication here is that Planned Parenthood is being  
24545 defunded because women are undeserving of the full spectrum  
24546 of care that can save their life. Because, as the gentlelady  
24547 from Virginia noted, in states that have banned, outlawed,  
24548 restricted, defunded abortion services and care, women die at  
24549 much higher rates. It kills women. It kills women to defund  
24550 care, reproductive care. It kills women to restrict it, to  
24551 ban it, to defund it. And this legislation will kill women.  
24552 That is not a hyperbole. It is not a hyperbole. Pregnant  
24553 women can enter complications really fast, really fast. And  
24554 in many places in many communities, a Planned Parenthood  
24555 clinic is the closest, only, and most available place that a  
24556 woman can go to for care.

24557         My own mother got prenatal care for me at a Planned  
24558 Parenthood. All of her ultrasounds, all of her prenatal care  
24559 was at a Planned Parenthood. And without a Planned  
24560 Parenthood, I don't know what kind of care she would have  
24561 gotten.

24562         Women who are menopausal are getting hormone replacement  
24563 therapy, helping ease an enormous amount of pain in their  
24564 life, an enormous amount of discomfort in their life. Young  
24565 women are learning about the reproductive and birth control  
24566 options that are available to them. People are figuring out

24567 what to do in terms of what to avail themselves. The point  
24568 has been made many times that abortion is not the only  
24569 service that is provided by Planned Parenthood, but it is a  
24570 critical one because, in the event where a woman's life is  
24571 threatened and a DNC is the only option that you have to save  
24572 her life, defunding Planned Parenthood will take her life.

24573 And this provision that defunds Planned Parenthood is  
24574 telling every woman in the country that you are part of an  
24575 undeserving class, that you are part of waste, fraud, and  
24576 abuse as a human being. And we do not believe that women are  
24577 disposable in this country. We do not believe that our lives  
24578 are disposable at all, whatsoever.

24579 You know, earlier today and earlier this evening I was  
24580 chastised for looking at a camera. I was told to look at my  
24581 colleagues. And I am looking over, and none of them have  
24582 been looking at me in the eyes this entire time.

24583 Our lives matter, and we are worthy of respect. Please  
24584 vote for the gentlelady's provision that eliminates this  
24585 deeply harmful recision that will hurt the women in your  
24586 communities.

24587 And with that I yield back.

24588 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentlelady yields back. Do I have  
24589 someone else that wishes recognition?

24590 I see, Mr. Tonko.

24591 \*Mr. Tonko. Yes, thank you, Mr. Chair. I move to

24592 strike --

24593 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman from New York.

24594 \*Mr. Tonko. -- the last word. Thank you, sir.

24595 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman has the floor.

24596 \*Mr. Tonko. You know, I look around the room and, with  
24597 all of our colleagues here, you know, reflecting on the fact  
24598 that we are supposed to be where the people are at, this one  
24599 seems to miss the mark.

24600 Seventy-three percent of voters oppose Congress taking  
24601 away funds from Planned Parenthood, and that includes over  
24602 half of people who voted for President Trump. Did you all  
24603 know that Planned Parenthood consistently polls more  
24604 favorably than any one of us in Congress, that it is more  
24605 popular than either of our parties, Democrat or Republican?  
24606 Maybe that is because Planned Parenthood serves people. It  
24607 serves women, men, and families. But here in this committee,  
24608 this Congress, we aren't serving Americans. We are harming  
24609 them. Why are you choosing to go against your constituents?

24610 I know that right now the phones in your offices are  
24611 ringing with people begging you not to take away their access  
24612 to lifesaving health care. One in three women in this  
24613 country have accessed medical care at a Planned Parenthood.  
24614 That includes exams and screenings for breast and cervical  
24615 cancer, STI treatments, and birth control. Most Planned  
24616 Parenthood patients live with incomes at or below the Federal

24617 poverty level. Half are patients of color. Sixty-four  
24618 percent of Planned Parenthood health centers are located in  
24619 rural areas or areas without healthcare access.

24620 Why do you want to take away cancer screenings from poor  
24621 people, from people who live in rural communities, from those  
24622 who don't have other healthcare options?

24623 How can you possibly defend that? I will tell you how.  
24624 You simply can't.

24625 And with that I yield back, or perhaps the gentlewoman  
24626 from Texas would want the remaining time.

24627 I will yield to the representative from Texas.

24628 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Yes, thank you so much, Mr. Tonko, for  
24629 yielding your time, because I do think there are some  
24630 critically important questions that we haven't covered,  
24631 despite the fact that we have covered so much. And I am so  
24632 grateful to my colleagues for their really thoughtful and  
24633 impassioned arguments supporting Planned Parenthood and the  
24634 people who provide reproductive health care -- quality, non-  
24635 judgmental reproductive health care -- for women across the  
24636 country.

24637 And as I said before, people, patients trust Planned  
24638 Parenthood, and it is their right to get care at Planned  
24639 Parenthood under this statute.

24640 That said, understanding that this is an effort that  
24641 doesn't seem to be -- I don't -- it doesn't look like people

24642 across the aisle are convinced. I wish you would be. I wish  
24643 we weren't talking past each other. I wish you could hear  
24644 what we are saying.

24645         So counsel, I am going to direct this question to you.  
24646 How, as we are talking about what are these entities that are  
24647 going to get defunded, if it is more than Planned Parenthood,  
24648 how should it be determined under the second prong of this  
24649 definition if an essential community provider is "primarily  
24650 engaged in family planning services, reproductive health, and  
24651 related medical care," what is the threshold for making the  
24652 determination that an entity is primarily engaged in this  
24653 care?

24654         \*Counsel. I believe the answer would be that the  
24655 Secretary would have to make that determination.

24656         \*Mrs. Fletcher. The Secretary of Health and Human  
24657 Services?

24658         \*Counsel. Yes.

24659         \*Mrs. Fletcher. Would make the determination as to who  
24660 is primarily engaged in this?

24661         Do you know, has that determination been made?

24662         \*Counsel. I would have to direct you to HHS for that  
24663 question.

24664         \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay. Does anyone on this committee --  
24665 is the chairman back in the room?

24666         Mr. Chairman, I know you have been answering questions

24667 all day, but do you know or are you aware, as you have  
24668 reviewed this provision, what -- how that definition would be  
24669 written?

24670 We have heard now that there are other entities that may  
24671 fall under this definition. It has multiple sub-parts. How  
24672 is that determination to be made, and have you made an  
24673 assessment of who those groups are?

24674 We are hearing there are other groups. I only know of  
24675 Planned Parenthood falling under this definition.

24676 \*The Chair. Okay. Our bill gives a clear criteria for  
24677 who qualifies, and HHS would make a determination on how that  
24678 applies and who qualifies.

24679 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Of how they primarily are engaged in  
24680 family planning services?

24681 \*The Chair. Yes.

24682 \*Mrs. Fletcher. So it could be a broader group. But is  
24683 it correct, as one of my colleagues, I believe -- I believe  
24684 it was my colleague from Tennessee said earlier that it is an  
24685 across-the-board exclusion on any group that meets this  
24686 definition and provides abortion services in any of its  
24687 affiliates.

24688 \*The Chair. I am sorry, I didn't hear what she said,  
24689 but I think you described that accurately, yes.

24690 \*Mrs. Fletcher. And I believe she also said that, if  
24691 they stopped providing abortion, they could get back into

24692 this program. They would no longer be covered.

24693 \*Voice. If they qualify under the criteria laid out in  
24694 the law.

24695 \*The Chair. Yes, if they qualify for the criteria laid  
24696 out in law, they would be banned. But if they --

24697 \*Voice. If they stop or change --

24698 \*The Chair. -- they change the criteria and they don't  
24699 meet the criteria in law, then they would be able to  
24700 participate.

24701 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, we heard earlier, Mr. Chairman,  
24702 that the CBO had made a determination already. Did they get  
24703 that definition --

24704 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman's time has expired.

24705 \*Mrs. Fletcher. -- from HHS, and could we get that?

24706 \*Mr. Griffith. Sorry.

24707 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Oh, okay. Well, just a point of  
24708 clarification, then. Can we get that definition from HHS  
24709 that CBO used?

24710 \*Voice. It was a preliminary analysis by CBO.

24711 \*Mrs. Fletcher. If they used it.

24712 \*The Chair. It was a parliamentary [sic] analysis by  
24713 CBO. And when they are able to publish, they will publish  
24714 the information. And I -- and if it is public, we will  
24715 certainly -- and we have it, we will make sure you have it.

24716 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, thank you so much, Mr. Chairman,



24717 for --

24718 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back.

24719 \*Mrs. Fletcher. -- answering my questions. I yield  
24720 back, and --

24721 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman --

24722 \*Mrs. Fletcher. -- appreciate the time.

24723 \*Mr. Tonko. I yield back, Mr. Chair.

24724 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman from Louisiana wishes to  
24725 be recognized.

24726 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24727 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman has the floor for five  
24728 minutes.

24729 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
24730 yield my time to the gentlewoman from Texas.

24731 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Okay, well, everyone is giving me their  
24732 time, and I really appreciate it.

24733 And Mr. Carter, I particularly appreciate it from you,  
24734 as you and I share a Planned Parenthood affiliate across the  
24735 Gulf Coast in Texas and Louisiana, and we are so well served  
24736 in our region by Planned Parenthood Gulf Coast.

24737 And so I think that I got the answer to the question,  
24738 which is we don't have a definition from HHS. If we get it,  
24739 if -- we don't know whether CBO used it. If CBO used the  
24740 definition, they will publish it. We will get it at some  
24741 point.

24742           But I have heard a couple of things here that I think  
24743   should really raise red flags for everybody about the policy  
24744   that is being -- the choice that is being made here to  
24745   exclude organizations that provide legal health care in  
24746   states, because this is another thing that we have sent back  
24747   to the states according to the Supreme Court and the  
24748   President, who says the states should decide. I don't agree  
24749   with that, and that is why I support the Women's Health  
24750   Protection Act to make sure that women across the country, no  
24751   matter where they live, have access to the full range of  
24752   reproductive health care options and quality care.

24753           But that said, it sounds to me like there is a list  
24754   somewhere -- and maybe it has come from one of these special  
24755   interest groups that is touting this provision in the bill --  
24756   that is excited that they have attacked the abortion  
24757   providers, as they call them -- or big abortion, I think, is  
24758   what I am seeing now. We would like to know who that is and  
24759   who else can't get care across the country. It certainly  
24760   sounds like that is the driver here, and that those policy  
24761   choices are driving this, which does have this hugely  
24762   negative increase in the deficit.

24763           The other thing I just want to point out while I have  
24764   the floor -- and I am about to give it back -- my colleague  
24765   from North Dakota made a comment that also struck me saying,  
24766   you know, we are not defunding anything, we are just

24767 defunding this organization. But just wait. For anybody who  
24768 is wondering what is going to happen next, watch what is  
24769 happening in the appropriations process. Look at the  
24770 President's budget request that zeros out title 10 family  
24771 planning funding for low-income Americans.

24772         And I am particularly proud of the title 10 family  
24773 planning program. I think many of you all have heard me say  
24774 -- and are probably tired of hearing me say -- title 10 was  
24775 born in Texas 7. It was introduced in the United States  
24776 House of Representatives by my predecessor in this seat a few  
24777 members removed, but George H.W. Bush introduced that  
24778 legislation in the Congress, and it shows this longstanding  
24779 bipartisan support for Planned Parenthood and for family  
24780 planning for people across the country.

24781         And what we see now is that now we are talking about the  
24782 providers, but in another bill happening at another time in  
24783 short order we are going to be talking about not having the  
24784 money, not appropriating the funds. And it is really  
24785 important to not just be myopic, but to understand the big  
24786 picture here. As my colleagues have said, this is an all-out  
24787 assault on women's health care and on the freedom, the  
24788 dignity of women and families across this country, our  
24789 ability to make our own decisions, which I have heard  
24790 championed over and over from folks on the other side of the  
24791 aisle that, you know, we should be free to make our own

24792 decisions about whether and when to have and grow our  
24793 families, that we should be able to make decisions about our  
24794 own lives, our own bodies, our own futures. And that is what  
24795 we are talking about here.

24796         And it is really important to understand that -- in  
24797 response to this comment that we will still have coverage,  
24798 coverage does not equal access. Even if you have the right  
24799 on paper, even if you have the providers on paper, that  
24800 doesn't mean people are getting the health care they need.  
24801 And we need to bring it back every time to the people, the  
24802 people that we are here to serve, the people that we all  
24803 represent.

24804         And we know that people in congressional districts  
24805 across the country already said 19 of my colleagues on the  
24806 other side of the aisle have Planned Parenthoods in their  
24807 districts, and they are popular, as everyone has said,  
24808 because people trust Planned Parenthood, and we should trust  
24809 the people to make their own decisions about where they get  
24810 their reproductive health care.

24811         And with that, I will yield back to my friend from  
24812 Louisiana.

24813         \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you very much.

24814         And listen, it has all been said, but if you didn't  
24815 know, now you know that Planned Parenthood is a full-scale,  
24816 holistic approach to providing vital health care to women all

24817 over our country. You have heard it said repeatedly and I  
24818 will echo, thank you, thank you, thank you for the incredible  
24819 work that you do.

24820 Mr. Chairman, I yield.

24821 \*Mr. Griffith. The gentleman yields back. I now  
24822 recognize the most junior gentlelady from Florida on the  
24823 committee for five minutes.

24824 You have the floor.

24825 \*Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

24826 At this point it is necessary to return to the basics of  
24827 our discussion on Medicaid reform because the efforts to  
24828 mislead, and the scare tactics, and the name-calling have  
24829 gone on all night, not just efforts to mislead about the  
24830 contents and the substance of this legislation, but wholesale  
24831 attacks on the motives and the integrity of the Republicans  
24832 sitting on this committee and the Republicans in Congress.

24833 The facts are that Republican legislation is about  
24834 making Medicaid stronger, not weaker. It is about protecting  
24835 those who truly need it -- seniors, people with disabilities,  
24836 women, low-income families -- by ensuring that the program  
24837 works as it is intended and remains viable, solvent, and  
24838 secure. Our reforms are targeted, common sense, and urgently  
24839 needed.

24840 First, restoring work requirements for able-bodied  
24841 Americans without dependents, requirements that can include

24842 work or training. We know that this works in the states who  
24843 use it. And let us not forget that the value of work  
24844 requirements, as a concept, the value of including these  
24845 provisions as part of eligibility for government benefits is  
24846 a concept that was once agreed on both sides of the aisle.

24847         Second, we are proposing that we work together to try to  
24848 identify and stop fraud, waste, and abuse in the program.  
24849 This is an effort that should have wholesale support across  
24850 the aisle, whether it is applied to Medicaid or any other  
24851 government program.

24852         And third, we are advocating ending Medicaid payments  
24853 going to people who are deceased or not eligible. These are  
24854 not cuts. These are corrections.

24855         And here is the most important fact. These reforms are  
24856 what allows us to direct vital resources where they are truly  
24857 needed. And it is incorrect to suggest that community health  
24858 services can only be provided by big abortion. There are  
24859 community health providers and other health providers  
24860 operating across America.

24861         We have a responsibility to be honest with America.  
24862 Republican reforms to Medicaid do not take away from the  
24863 vulnerable. They strengthen and preserve Medicaid, directing  
24864 benefits to those who need them instead of directing them to  
24865 those who do not. Doing this is what will ensure that  
24866 Medicaid is a successful, solvent program for those who need

24867 it in America today and those who will need it in America  
24868 tomorrow.

24869 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield the balance of my  
24870 time.

24871 \*The Chair. [Presiding] The gentlelady yields back. Is  
24872 there anyone -- any further discussion?

24873 The gentleman from California, Mr. Peters.

24874 \*Mr. Peters. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just had a  
24875 question for counsel.

24876 So, just to be clear, did HHS provide a definition to  
24877 CBO of essential community provider that is primarily engaged  
24878 in family planning services, reproductive health, and related  
24879 medical care?

24880 \*Counsel. I am sorry, can you clarify the question?  
24881 Can you repeat it, please?

24882 \*Mr. Peters. So you said that this is an interpretation  
24883 for HHS to tell us what is an essential community provider  
24884 that is primarily engaged in family planning services,  
24885 reproductive health, and related medical care.

24886 You know where in the bill I am referring to, right?

24887 \*Counsel. Is that page 59?

24888 \*Mr. Peters. Yes. And did HHS provide a definition to  
24889 CBO of what that meant?

24890 \*Counsel. Yes, I can't speak to any conversations that  
24891 CBO had with the agency in their analysis.

24892           \*Mr. Peters. If they didn't, how would CBO know which  
24893 clinics this applies to?

24894           \*Counsel. I mean, CBO has modeled based off of the  
24895 language in the bill, so they have looked at organizations  
24896 that could be described as a 501(c)(3) --

24897           \*Mr. Peters. In another response to another question,  
24898 that was a determination for HHS to make.

24899           \*Counsel. Right. So --

24900           \*Mr. Peters. So how would CBO know, for purposes of its  
24901 analysis, if HHS didn't tell them?

24902           \*Counsel. CBO -- again, that is really more of a  
24903 question for CBO to explain their modeling. I don't feel  
24904 like I can speak to --

24905           \*Mr. Peters. Do you know if they ever talked to HHS  
24906 about what this means?

24907           \*Counsel. I don't have specific knowledge of them  
24908 talking to HHS about this specific piece. I do know that it  
24909 is standard practice for CBO to engage with the agency with  
24910 any clarifying questions that they have about implementation  
24911 of provisions broadly. But I can't -- again, I am not going  
24912 to speak for CBO's process here.

24913           \*Mr. Peters. Okay, thank you very much.

24914           I yield back.

24915           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
24916 further discussion?



24917           The gentlelady from Washington, for what purpose do you  
24918 seek -- excuse me, the gentlelady from Washington is  
24919 recognized for five minutes on the amendment.

24920           \*Ms. Schrier. Actually, I already spoke on this, so I  
24921 don't think I am allowed for another five, but I did have a  
24922 question for you.

24923           \*The Chair. Okay, well, I need to have somebody yield  
24924 you time.

24925           \*Ms. Schrier. Somebody -- yes.

24926           \*The Chair. Yes, we will have to get somebody to yield  
24927 your time.

24928           The gentlelady from Florida --

24929           \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I --

24930           \*The Chair. -- is recognized --

24931           \*Ms. Castor. -- Dr. Schrier.

24932           \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you very much. This is still just  
24933 a very brief question for you.

24934           I just want to know in general -- we have been here for  
24935 almost 24 hours --

24936           \*The Chair. Twenty-one.

24937           \*Ms. Schrier. -- talking about Medicaid and cutting  
24938 13.7 million Americans off Medicaid, and I just want to pose  
24939 a big-picture question, which is how does kicking or shifting  
24940 13.7 million Americans off of their health insurance make  
24941 America healthy again?

24942           \*The Chair. Well, so the question is -- you are getting  
24943 -- you are asking is, one, that we are looking at reforming  
24944 the program, and we are saying are people eligible under the  
24945 standards of the program. And we do think that getting  
24946 people to work that have the ability to work is good for  
24947 them, it is healthier for them. I would put that in the  
24948 category. And so we -- that is where -- the numbers you are  
24949 coming from.

24950           And then we do believe that people with illegal -- that  
24951 aren't here in a legal presence should have health care.

24952           So -- but I do think people going to work and being  
24953 formally -- being engaged and employed, a lot of studies will  
24954 tell you that I have read over the years -- I couldn't cite  
24955 one -- that makes people healthier. Having a purpose makes  
24956 people --

24957           \*Ms. Schrier. That doesn't hold water with me, as a  
24958 physician. I will just say, like, you might want to consider  
24959 the fact that people who are healthy are best able to work,  
24960 and you are only looking at the other way.

24961           And I would also say that, you know, if you don't cover  
24962 people who need health care, it does impact all of our  
24963 health. If kids don't get vaccinated, as we have seen with  
24964 these measles outbreaks, every one of us is put at risk. And  
24965 so I would just ask you, you know, as you think about the  
24966 bigger picture of what this administration is focused on and

24967 what you are focused on, if that is your North Star, I want  
24968 you to think about what it will mean for making America  
24969 healthy again to take health care away from 13.7 million  
24970 Americans.

24971 And I will yield back.

24972 \*The Chair. The gentlelady from Florida's time. The  
24973 gentlelady from Florida, Ms. Castor, your time, I am sorry.

24974 \*Ms. Castor. I yield back.

24975 \*The Chair. You yield back, the gentlelady yields back.  
24976 Is there any further discussion on the amendment?

24977 Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote  
24978 occurs on the amendment. A roll call vote has been  
24979 requested, and the clerk will call the roll.

24980 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

24981 \*Mr. Latta. No.

24982 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

24983 Mr. Griffith?

24984 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

24985 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

24986 Mr. Bilirakis?

24987 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

24988 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

24989 Mr. Hudson?

24990 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

24991 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

24992 Mr. Carter?  
24993 [No response.]  
24994 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?  
24995 [No response.]  
24996 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?  
24997 \*Mr. Dunn. No.  
24998 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.  
24999 Mr. Crenshaw?  
25000 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.  
25001 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
25002 Mr. Joyce?  
25003 \*Mr. Joyce. No.  
25004 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.  
25005 Mr. Weber?  
25006 [No response.]  
25007 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen?  
25008 \*Mr. Allen. No.  
25009 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.  
25010 Mr. Balderson?  
25011 \*Mr. Balderson. No.  
25012 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.  
25013 Mr. Fulcher?  
25014 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
25015 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
25016 Mr. Pfluger?

25017           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
25018           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
25019           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
25020           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
25021           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
25022           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
25023           [No response.]  
25024           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
25025           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
25026           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
25027           Mr. Obernolte?  
25028           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
25029           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
25030           Mr. James?  
25031           \*Mr. James.   No.  
25032           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
25033           Mr. Bentz?  
25034           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
25035           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
25036           Mrs. Houchin?  
25037           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
25038           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
25039           Mr. Fry?  
25040           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
25041           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.

25042 Ms. Lee?

25043 \*Ms. Lee. No.

25044 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.

25045 Mr. Langworthy?

25046 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.

25047 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.

25048 Mr. Kean?

25049 \*Mr. Kean. No.

25050 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.

25051 Mr. Rulli?

25052 \*Mr. Rulli. No.

25053 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.

25054 Mr. Evans?

25055 [No response.]

25056 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman?

25057 \*Mr. Goldman. No.

25058 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.

25059 Mrs. Fedorchak?

25060 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

25061 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

25062 Mr. Pallone?

25063 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.

25064 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

25065 Ms. DeGette?

25066 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.

25067           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
25068           Ms. Schakowsky?  
25069           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
25070           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
25071           Ms. Matsui?  
25072           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
25073           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
25074           Ms. Castor?  
25075           \*Ms. Castor.   Yes.  
25076           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
25077           Mr. Tonko?  
25078           \*Mr. Tonko.   Aye.  
25079           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
25080           Ms. Clarke?  
25081           \*Ms. Clarke.   Aye.  
25082           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
25083           Mr. Ruiz?  
25084           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
25085           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
25086           Mr. Peters?  
25087           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
25088           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
25089           Mrs. Dingell?  
25090           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
25091           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

25092 Mr. Veasey?

25093 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

25094 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

25095 Ms. Kelly?

25096 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

25097 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

25098 Ms. Barragan?

25099 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.

25100 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.

25101 Mr. Soto?

25102 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

25103 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.

25104 Ms. Schrier?

25105 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

25106 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

25107 Mrs. Trahan?

25108 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

25109 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

25110 Mrs. Fletcher?

25111 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.

25112 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

25113 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

25114 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

25115 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

25116 Mr. Auchincloss?



25117           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.

25118           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

25119           Mr. Carter?

25120           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.

25121           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes aye.

25122           Mr. Menendez?

25123           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.

25124           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.

25125           Mr. Mullin?

25126           \*Mr. Mullin.   Aye.

25127           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin votes aye.

25128           Mr. Landsman?

25129           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

25130           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

25131           Ms. McClellan?

25132           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

25133           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

25134           Chairman Guthrie?

25135           \*The Chair.   No.

25136           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

25137           \*The Chair.   How is Mr. Carter recorded?

25138           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter is not recorded.

25139           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Carter votes no.

25140           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.

25141           \*Mr. Weber.   I vote no.

25142           \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

25143           \*Mr. Palmer. Palmer --

25144           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.

25145           \*Mr. Palmer. No.

25146           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

25147           [Pause.]

25148           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24

25149 ayes and 20 -- no, 28 noes.

25150           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to. For what

25151 purpose does gentlelady from Illinois seek recognition?

25152           \*Ms. Kelly. Mr. Chairman --

25153           \*The Chair. The south side of Chicago, Illinois.

25154           \*Ms. Kelly. -- amendment at the desk.

25155           \*The Chair. Southern Chicago, Illinois. We got two

25156 ladies from Illinois, so --

25157           \*Ms. Kelly. I have an amendment at the desk.

25158           \*The Chair. The clerk will report the amendment.

25159           \*The Clerk. FCD --

25160           \*The Chair. I am sorry, the gentlewoman.

25161           \*Ms. Kelly. FCD-AMD\_94.XML.

25162           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.

25163           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Ms. Kelly. Add at the

25164 end of the following --

25165           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the

25166 amendment is dispensed with.

25167           [The amendment of Ms. Kelly follows:]

25168

25169       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

25170

25171           \*The Chair. And the gentleman -- excuse me, the  
25172 gentlelady is recognized for five minutes in support of the  
25173 amendment.

25174           \*Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Mr. -- excuse my voice. Thank  
25175 you, Mr. Chair.

25176           My amendment is simple and requires 12 months of  
25177 continuous Medicaid and CHIP coverage with full benefits for  
25178 pregnant and postpartum women. This amendment would codify  
25179 what we already know is essential, that one year of  
25180 postpartum care is just medically necessary. It is a matter  
25181 of life and death.

25182           And as we celebrated Mother's Day this past weekend,  
25183 let's remember that the United States' maternal death rate  
25184 remains far higher than other high-income countries, and  
25185 nearly two out of three maternal deaths occur during the  
25186 postpartum period. And 80-plus percent are preventable.

25187           Our nation is facing a maternal health crisis and has  
25188 been for years. The United States has the highest maternal  
25189 mortality rate among developed countries. The maternal  
25190 mortality and morbidity epidemic is particularly dangerous  
25191 for people with disabilities, who face a maternal death rate  
25192 that is 11 times higher than the rate for non-disabled  
25193 people. Black women are three times more likely to die from  
25194 pregnancy-related causes than White women, and American  
25195 Indian and Alaskan Native women are twice as likely to die of

25196 complications.

25197 Medicaid improves maternal health outcomes and ensures  
25198 access to vital pregnancy services. Medicaid covers almost  
25199 half of all births in this country, and it covers more than  
25200 half of all births in rural communities. When we talk about  
25201 cutting funding, you are cutting into the care that supports  
25202 mom and babies during the most vulnerable time of their  
25203 lives. We are talking about fewer pre-natal checkups, more  
25204 life-threatening deliveries. In Illinois, 40 percent of  
25205 births are covered by Medicaid, which promotes a healthy  
25206 start in life. We should be expanding care, not gutting it.

25207 In 2023 the March of Dimes reported that 39.6 percent of  
25208 mothers in Illinois had Medicaid at the time of birth. The  
25209 harsh reality is that most maternal deaths do not happen  
25210 during childbirth. Instead, they happen in the months that  
25211 follow. One in three pregnancy-related deaths occurs between  
25212 one week and one year postpartum. This is precisely why we  
25213 need guaranteed continuous coverage for a year.

25214 I have worked with many doctors, many nurses, doulas,  
25215 midwives, and families of victims. The amendment codifies 12  
25216 months of full Medicaid and CHIP benefits to postpartum  
25217 individuals, no more state-by-state patchwork, no more  
25218 expiration dates on care. No more new mothers being dropped  
25219 from coverage just 60 days after giving birth, right when  
25220 they are still at high risk for complications like infection,

25221 postpartum depression, and more.

25222       The proposals in this reconciliation bill will worsen  
25223 maternal health outcomes. We cannot expect someone to  
25224 recover from childbirth, return to work, and care for  
25225 newborns while also scrambling to reapply for coverage. That  
25226 is not health care; it is chaos, and it disproportionately  
25227 harms low-income families and communities of color.

25228       We have already seen how powerful this policy can be.  
25229 Thanks to the American Rescue Plan, Democrats proudly  
25230 delivered the option to extend postpartum coverage to 12  
25231 months. And today 49 states have already implemented. But  
25232 optional is not enough. We need to make this coverage  
25233 permanent, mandatory, and nationwide. This is about saving  
25234 lives, supporting families, and finally treating maternal  
25235 health as the national priority it should be.

25236       My amendment ensures that every postpartum woman,  
25237 regardless of their zip code, can access the care they need  
25238 to survive and thrive in the year after birth.

25239       And the worst states in our country, Mississippi,  
25240 Louisiana, Georgia, Alabama, North Carolina, and Virginia.

25241       I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and help  
25242 us build a stronger, safer future for all mothers and  
25243 families so that people are not being shut out of coverage  
25244 because we have made it too complicated for them.

25245       I want to thank the staff of the ranking member for

25246 working with me on this language.

25247           If Republicans claim they want to strengthen Medicaid  
25248 for mothers and make America healthier, as they asserted in  
25249 their press release announcing this markup, then we should be  
25250 a -- this should be a no-brainer and something we all can  
25251 support. Again, 49 states have expanded.

25252           I urge my colleagues to support this amendment and I  
25253 yield back.

25254           \*The Chair. Thank you, the gentlelady yields back and  
25255 the chair recognizes Mrs. Harshbarger -- excuse me, the  
25256 gentlelady from Tennessee, for five minutes.

25257           \*Mrs. Harshbarger. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
25258 appreciate my colleagues' interest in the issue.

25259           As you know, Congress already enacted a permanent state  
25260 option to provide 12 months of continuous coverage of full  
25261 benefits for pregnant and postpartum women under Medicaid and  
25262 CHIP. It has been a bipartisan area of interest, and was  
25263 passed in the Consolidated Appropriations Act of 2023. And  
25264 to date, the overwhelming majority of states, as my colleague  
25265 said, have already extended this coverage, including  
25266 Tennessee, and it was effective in April of 2022.

25267           As we have noted during the markup, we are working to  
25268 strengthen and sustain the Medicaid program so states can  
25269 devote more resources toward pregnant and postpartum women  
25270 and other vulnerable populations. By reducing this burden

25271 and removing ineligible beneficiaries, we clear the way for  
25272 states to provide greater investment for these women.

25273 And because of all that, I don't believe the amendment  
25274 is necessary. And for that reason I urge my colleagues to  
25275 oppose the amendment.

25276 And I yield back.

25277 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. And for what  
25278 purpose -- so the gentlelady from Florida is recognized for  
25279 five minutes to speak on the amendment.

25280 \*Ms. Castor. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25281 First of all, I would like to thank Congresswoman Robin  
25282 Kelly of -- excuse me, the gentlewoman from Illinois -- for  
25283 her steadfast and long-time leadership on the issue of  
25284 tackling the maternal mortality crisis in America because,  
25285 colleagues, is there anything more important than ensuring  
25286 that a mother and baby and family have a healthy start in  
25287 life? It sets the entire trajectory for that child.

25288 And what we know here in America, unfortunately,  
25289 compared to other developed countries across the world, we  
25290 are not getting the job done for our moms. The high rates of  
25291 maternal mortality, especially among our African American  
25292 neighbors, is just atrocious.

25293 So why is this pertinent now to this entire debate of  
25294 the GOP tax giveaway as they cut Medicaid? It is because  
25295 Medicaid is one of the primary providers for prenatal care



25296 and births. So when you propose to cut Medicaid, you are  
25297 saying to women, largely, you are going to make the maternal  
25298 mortality crisis worse.

25299 But it doesn't have to be this way, because we have  
25300 actually worked on a bipartisan basis in this committee. But  
25301 first it was the Democrats in the American Rescue Plan. We  
25302 gave states the option to extend coverage to new moms one  
25303 year postpartum, improving maternal health outcomes. And  
25304 then the Congress made the option permanent in 2023.  
25305 Thankfully, Florida was among the many states that chose that  
25306 option.

25307 And thank you to the gentlewoman from Illinois, who has  
25308 been tracking it. Forty-nine states now.

25309 So it is time to provide that consistency, that  
25310 continuity by making it permanent. And I think this is where  
25311 we start with passing one bipartisan amendment here today. I  
25312 think that makes an enormous amount of sense, because we have  
25313 already worked together on passing the bipartisan Preventing  
25314 Maternal Deaths Act. We passed it unanimously through this  
25315 committee. It was ready to be signed into law at the end of  
25316 last year, until Elon Musk decided it was part of a package  
25317 that was just too long, and he killed it. But we can get it  
25318 back on track. We can get that bill back on track, but we  
25319 can send an important signal to moms and families all across  
25320 America by passing the gentlewoman from Illinois's amendment.

25321           But here is the thing. We can't cut Medicaid on top of  
25322 all of this. That would mean increases in adverse health  
25323 outcomes, deaths that could be prevented. We can do better  
25324 when tackling maternal health disparities.

25325           We know we are facing a shortage of providers and  
25326 doctors here. If we provide continuity of care and they  
25327 understand that this is going to be their life's work, they  
25328 will devote themselves to taking care of moms and babies  
25329 before, during, and after pregnancy.

25330           So again, to the gentlewoman from Illinois, thank you  
25331 for being a leader.

25332           This is something I hope, Mr. Chairman, we can all agree  
25333 on, maybe begin to face the facts that here in America moms  
25334 and babies need help. They don't need Medicaid cuts, they  
25335 need consistent coverage that they can rely on.

25336           Thank you, and I yield back.

25337           \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Are there any  
25338 further discussion?

25339           The gentlelady from Virginia is recognized for five  
25340 minutes to discuss the amendment.

25341           \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

25342           So if we are going to make any progress in addressing  
25343 the maternal mortality crisis, we need to first make sure  
25344 that we are having healthy moms before they get pregnant,  
25345 which we talked about in part with the last amendment. We

25346 need to make sure they are healthy during pregnancy, which  
25347 is, as my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have  
25348 said, has always been a goal of Medicaid. And we need to  
25349 make sure that they stay healthy in the postpartum period.

25350         And thanks to data collected by the CDC and analyzed by  
25351 the CDC, we know what causes -- what the leading causes of  
25352 death are by race, by zip code. We know, you know,  
25353 socioeconomic class. We know what types of death occur when  
25354 in pregnancy. And we can use that to create public policies  
25355 to help address it, and we have done that, in part, by  
25356 expanding Medicaid to the first full year postpartum.  
25357 Because in America, 12 percent of the deaths occur in the  
25358 first six days postpartum; 23 percent of the deaths occur in  
25359 the first 42 days, the 7 to 42 days; and 30 percent of the  
25360 deaths occur after day 43 and the full year. And most of  
25361 those are cardiovascular, or accidental overdose, or  
25362 substance abuse, or suicide.

25363         And we have used our Medicaid program to help address  
25364 those causes by providing substance abuse treatment for women  
25365 before they get pregnant, during pregnancy, and after, by  
25366 making sure we connect women to medical homes so they are  
25367 getting their preventative care to identify and treat  
25368 cardiovascular issues early, and diabetes and high blood  
25369 pressure early before they lead to maternal deaths.

25370         And the total actions of the Trump Administration and

25371 this bill are making that harder to do, because in the last  
25372 markup we had, even though it was a bipartisan bill that  
25373 passed on a bipartisan basis, it ignored the fact that  
25374 Secretary Kennedy has fired the very people who were helping  
25375 track the data and provide the services to address the  
25376 underlying causes of maternal mortality, that some of the  
25377 funding, rescissions or blocks by the administration were  
25378 addressing those very programs. Now there are going to be  
25379 requirements, whether it is a copay for somebody that makes  
25380 \$300 a week or work reporting requirements that are going to  
25381 make it harder for some people to get access to care before  
25382 they get pregnant.

25383         And I think if you don't remember anything else I have  
25384 said in the last 20-however-many hours, this bill is not  
25385 happening in a vacuum. This bill is happening as part of a  
25386 broader effort to shift Federal funding to tax cuts. This  
25387 bill is part of a broader effort by the Trump Administration  
25388 and DOGE to shrink the Federal Government and Federal  
25389 spending, particularly in the health and human services  
25390 space. And these are impacting people's lives, especially  
25391 our mothers and our babies.

25392         And I heard on the other side of the aisle that you want  
25393 to work together to fix some of these issues, but Democrats  
25394 have been cut out of the process from day one. We are doing  
25395 reconciliation to avoid Democrats having a seat at the table.

25396 We weren't given an opportunity to discuss any of these  
25397 issues before we saw this bill. None of our amendments are  
25398 being adopted. This bill will leave here and go to several  
25399 other committees before it makes it to the floor. So this is  
25400 our opportunity to say please think about the holistic  
25401 picture of how we help keep people in this country healthy  
25402 and safe.

25403 I yield back.

25404 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there  
25405 further discussion on the amendment?

25406 Seeing none, the --

25407 \*Mr. Pallone. Roll call.

25408 \*The Chair. Okay, the vote occurs on the amendment. A  
25409 roll call has been requested, and the clerk will call the  
25410 roll.

25411 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

25412 \*Mr. Latta. No.

25413 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

25414 Mr. Griffith?

25415 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

25416 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

25417 Mr. Bilirakis?

25418 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

25419 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

25420 Mr. Hudson?

25421           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.

25422           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.

25423           Mr. Carter?

25424           [No response.]

25425           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer?

25426           [No response.]

25427           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn?

25428           \*The Chair.   You okay, Bob?

25429           \*Mr. Dunn.    No.

25430           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.

25431           Mr. Crenshaw?

25432           \*The Chair.   I am sorry, I am sorry.

25433           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.

25434           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

25435           Mr. Joyce?

25436           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber?

25437           \*Mr. Weber.    No.

25438           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.

25439           Mr. Allen?

25440           \*Mr. Allen.    Allen votes no.

25441           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.

25442           Mr. Balderson?

25443           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.

25444           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.

25445           Mr. Fulcher?

25446           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
25447           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
25448           Mr. Pfluger?  
25449           [No response.]  
25450           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger?  
25451           [No response.]  
25452           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
25453           [No response.]  
25454           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
25455           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
25456           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
25457           Mr. Obernolte?  
25458           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
25459           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
25460           Mr. James?  
25461           \*Mr. James.   No.  
25462           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
25463           Mr. Bentz?  
25464           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
25465           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
25466           Mrs. Houchin?  
25467           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
25468           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
25469           Mr. Fry?  
25470           \*Mr. Fry.   No.

25471           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
25472           Ms. Lee?  
25473           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
25474           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
25475           Mr. Langworthy?  
25476           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
25477           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
25478           Mr. Kean?  
25479           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
25480           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
25481           Mr. Rulli?  
25482           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
25483           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
25484           Mr. Evans?  
25485           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
25486           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
25487           Mr. Goldman?  
25488           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
25489           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
25490           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
25491           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
25492           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
25493           Mr. Pallone?  
25494           [No response.]  
25495           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone?



25496 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
25497 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
25498 Ms. DeGette?  
25499 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
25500 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
25501 Ms. Schakowsky?  
25502 [No response.]  
25503 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui?  
25504 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
25505 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
25506 Ms. Castor?  
25507 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
25508 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
25509 Mr. Tonko?  
25510 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
25511 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
25512 Ms. Clarke?  
25513 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
25514 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
25515 Mr. Ruiz?  
25516 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
25517 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
25518 Mr. Peters?  
25519 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
25520 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

25521 Mrs. Dingell?  
25522 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
25523 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
25524 Mr. Veasey?  
25525 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
25526 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
25527 Ms. Kelly?  
25528 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
25529 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
25530 Ms. Barragan?  
25531 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
25532 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
25533 Mr. Soto?  
25534 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
25535 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
25536 Ms. Schrier?  
25537 [No response.]  
25538 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan?  
25539 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
25540 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
25541 Mrs. Fletcher?  
25542 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
25543 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
25544 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
25545 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

25546           \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
25547           Mr. Auchincloss?  
25548           [No response.]  
25549           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter?  
25550           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
25551           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
25552           Mr. Menendez?  
25553           [No response.]  
25554           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin?  
25555           \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
25556           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
25557           Mr. Landsman?  
25558           [No response.]  
25559           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan?  
25560           \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
25561           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
25562           Chairman Guthrie?  
25563           \*The Chair. No.  
25564           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
25565           \*The Chair. How is Mr. Carter recorded?  
25566           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter is not recorded.  
25567           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Carter votes no.  
25568           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter --  
25569           \*The Chair. Mr. Joyce?  
25570           \*The Clerk. -- votes no.

25571           \*Mr. Joyce.   Joyce votes no.

25572           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.

25573           \*The Chair.   Mr. Pfluger?

25574           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.

25575           \*The Chair.   Is anyone on the Democrat side?

25576           Mr. Menendez?   Oh, I got you.   Mr. Menendez?

25577           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez is not recorded.

25578           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.

25579           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Menendez votes aye.

25580           \*The Chair.   Dr. Schrier?

25581           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.

25582           \*The Clerk.   Dr. Schrier votes aye.

25583           \*The Chair.   Mr. Mullin, is he looking to be -- Mr.

25584   Landsman?   You are --

25585           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Mullin -- yes.

25586           \*The Chair.   I got it.   Mrs. Harshbarger.

25587           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Auchincloss is aye.

25588           \*The Chair.   Ms. Auchincloss -- Mr. Auchincloss.

25589           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss is an aye.

25590           \*The Chair.   Mr. Auchincloss.

25591   Landsman?

25592           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

25593           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

25594           \*The Chair.   Landsman.

25595           Mr. -- or Mrs. Harshbarger?

25596           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger is not recorded.  
25597           \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
25598           \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
25599           \*The Chair. Is anyone else seeking to be at the roll  
25600 call?  
25601           Seeing none, the clerk will report.  
25602           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23  
25603 ayes and 28 noes.  
25604           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.  
25605           Are there any other amendments?  
25606           The gentlelady from Michigan, for what purpose do you  
25607 seek recognition?  
25608           \*Mrs. Dingell. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the  
25609 desk labeled Health\_161.  
25610           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.  
25611           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mrs. Dingell. At the  
25612 end of the following new section, sense --  
25613           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
25614 amendment is dispensed with.  
25615           [The amendment of Mrs. Dingell follows:]  
25616  
25617           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*  
25618

25619           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
25620 minutes in support of the amendment.

25621           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

25622           This amendment is a simple sense of Congress regarding  
25623 drug prices that I believe can garner and should get  
25624 bipartisan support. My amendment states that it is the sense  
25625 of Congress that the United States shouldn't pay more for  
25626 drugs when purchased overseas.

25627           President Trump signed an executive order attempting to  
25628 slash drug prices and reduce Medicare spending through his  
25629 Most Favored Nation clause. I believe it is important to  
25630 support a sense of Congress to support that effort.

25631           President Trump often discusses that his administration has  
25632 been unsuccessful in its attempts to convince House  
25633 Republicans to include this provision to cut drug spending.

25634           The U.S. spends significantly more on drug research and  
25635 development than most other countries, both in absolute terms  
25636 and per capita. U.S. drug prices are also considerably  
25637 higher than other countries, ranging from 1.72 to 10.28 times  
25638 higher, according to a 2024 RAND report. Our spending drives  
25639 innovation that ultimately benefits patients worldwide, but  
25640 Americans shouldn't pay the price for the world. Back home,  
25641 I hear from many Michiganders, especially seniors, who can't  
25642 conveniently access or afford the prescriptions they need.

25643           I know that part of this is harmful PBM practices,

25644 complicated access to the local pharmacies they depend on.  
25645 Last year we reached a bipartisan agreement to implement  
25646 common-sense reforms to the PBM industry that would put a  
25647 stop to some of the tactics that distort prices for patients.  
25648 In addition, if you live where I do, you can go across a  
25649 bridge and see hundreds of dollars of difference in the cost  
25650 of a drug in Michigan versus Canada.

25651 Last Congress we had a bipartisan deal to come together  
25652 to open the door -- and by the way, it is more expensive here  
25653 than Canada -- to open the door for a solution to lower drug  
25654 costs for Americans. Now we are trying -- Republicans are  
25655 trying to pass a bill with no meaningful change that will  
25656 lower drug costs, and instead rips coverage away from  
25657 millions of Americans.

25658 Passing this resolution --

25659 \*The Chair. Will the gentlelady suspend?

25660 The room will come to order. The gentlelady deserves to  
25661 be heard.

25662 Please proceed.

25663 \*Mrs. Dingell. Passing this shows we care about drug  
25664 costs and lowering the cost of prescription drugs in this  
25665 country. Too many people in this country are still choosing  
25666 between putting food on the table or affording their  
25667 medicine. I hope everybody could support this amendment.

25668 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

25669           \*The Chair. Thank you.

25670           The gentlelady yields back, and I will recognize myself,  
25671 and I want to speak in opposition, and I want to start with -  
25672 - the gentlelady from Michigan is correct, the President is  
25673 100 percent correct when he says that American taxpayers --  
25674 and the lady from Michigan just said, my friend from Michigan  
25675 just said, the American taxpayers subsidized innovation for  
25676 other developed nations. Research shows that other countries  
25677 pay 24 percent of the price that patients in the United  
25678 States pay for brand-name drugs.

25679           The result of -- but as frustrated as we are because we  
25680 pay for the world's research, we still want the research.  
25681 And the result of foreign price controls have led  
25682 manufacturers to invest billions of dollars in the United  
25683 States in research and development. Between 1988 and 2022,  
25684 78 percent of global research and development was conducted  
25685 in the United States. Before widespread price controls were  
25686 implemented in Europe, R&D investment in Europe -- European  
25687 nations led the United States by 24 percent.

25688           And I always say you can't pay what Europe pays without  
25689 getting what Europe gets.

25690           This shows that the market undoubtedly responds to  
25691 market conditions. To that end, imposing foreign price  
25692 controls on top of the price controls established in  
25693 Inflation Reduction Act, which every Republican on this



25694 committee opposed, would give the Chinese Communist Party a  
25695 significant competitive advantage.

25696       Clinical trial starts from companies headquartered in  
25697 China are now 30 percent of the total global trial starts,  
25698 which is a substantial increase from 5 percent in 2014.

25699       For even greater context, 35 percent of clinical trials  
25700 starts take place in the United States. Research and  
25701 development investments are also pouring into the Chinese  
25702 biotech sector, and at a much faster clip than the United  
25703 States. China is nipping at our heels, and we cannot afford  
25704 to cede our global biotech leadership to the Chinese  
25705 Communist Party.

25706       We also saw the real-world impacts on our over-  
25707 surveillance on China throughout COVID-19 pandemic -- or our  
25708 over-reliance on China through the COVID-19 pandemic. This  
25709 amendment doesn't just threaten our economic prosperity, but  
25710 could significantly undermine our national security.

25711       And finally, depending on foreign price controls, also  
25712 uses drug assessments and effectiveness assessments in  
25713 foreign countries such as quality-adjusted life years, or  
25714 QALYs. Academics justify the use of QALYs to help ensure  
25715 patients aren't unnecessarily paying for treatments that may  
25716 be ineffective. And in practical terms, that means that a  
25717 terminally ill cancer patient doesn't deserve chemotherapy  
25718 that may extend their life a few months and give them a few

25719 more precious memories with their loved ones because the  
25720 price to pay for those few months is too high. No one  
25721 deserves to have a price put on their life. For an  
25722 individual with disabilities or chronic conditions, life is  
25723 worth just as much as any other person.

25724 For the stated reasons, I oppose the amendment and urge  
25725 my colleagues to do the same, and I yield back.

25726 Is there a further discussion on amendment?

25727 The gentleman from Massachusetts is recognized for five  
25728 minutes to speak on the amendment.

25729 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Chairman, thank you.

25730 First, it is so refreshing to hear a senior Republican  
25731 talk about the merits of biomedical research and development.  
25732 I would really strongly encourage the Republican Party to do  
25733 something about it, because the President has just proposed,  
25734 as part of his budget, a 50 percent reduction in the National  
25735 Institutes of Health. If you want to out-compete China to  
25736 dominate the industries of the future, whether it is biotech  
25737 or AI or quantum, just about the worst way you can do that is  
25738 by taking the National Institutes of Health and gouging it.  
25739 So I hope to see congressional Republicans speak out  
25740 forcefully against this President's attacks on our education  
25741 and medical enterprise.

25742 I would also like to see Republicans follow through on  
25743 the China Task Force report from the 116th Congress, which

25744 called to double science and technology funding. That was a  
25745 Republican-only report. And there are actually a lot of  
25746 elements in that report that were quite good. Republicans  
25747 called to double our science and technology funding over the  
25748 next decade, and then proceeded to offer a series of  
25749 appropriation bills in the 117th and 118th Congresses that  
25750 reduced in inflation-adjusted terms our R&D spending as a  
25751 country.

25752         So Republicans need -- are talking the talk when it  
25753 comes to R&D, but they are not walking the walk. And then we  
25754 bring in Secretary of Health and Human Services Kennedy, who  
25755 is not only hostile to the scientific enterprise at the NIH,  
25756 but is an active conspiracist when it comes to the Food and  
25757 Drug Administration. He is purging the career scientists  
25758 whose job it is to provide certainty, safety, and regulatory  
25759 clarity to the biopharmaceutical industry. And we haven't  
25760 had a single hearing about it.

25761         I mean, if we want to leap ahead in biomedical  
25762 innovation, I can tell you I represent the state that is the  
25763 home of some of the best biotech companies in the world.  
25764 They don't want to see the FDA get beaten up. They want to  
25765 see the FDA be task organized with very strong, independent  
25766 scientists who have high, clear, and predictable standards.  
25767 They want a fast response time, for sure, but they are not  
25768 rooting for the FDA to get beaten up. And I haven't seen the

25769 congressional Republicans on this committee do a single thing  
25770 to stand up for the NIH or the FDA. And so, Mr. Chairman, I  
25771 would hope that you would substantiate your support for  
25772 biomedical R&D with actions as the chair of this committee.

25773       You have also said that you don't support the United  
25774 States importing foreign price controls, and I don't think  
25775 the United States should adopt the European methodology for  
25776 pricing drugs, either. I don't think it has worked for  
25777 Europe particularly well. But that is not actually how I  
25778 read this amendment. What this amendment says is that  
25779 patients should not pay more for their drugs than those in  
25780 other countries. And I agree with that because, for  
25781 appropriately prescribed medications, patients should pay  
25782 zero in out-of-pocket costs because patients pay premiums to  
25783 their health insurance corporations. And when you pay a  
25784 premium to a health insurance corporation, that is a  
25785 contract. It is a contract that says, okay, I am healthy and  
25786 I am paying a premium so that when I get sick and a doctor  
25787 tells me I need something to get better, I am going to be  
25788 able to get it without having to pay you again.

25789       There is no moral hazard with prescription drugs.  
25790 Nobody is over-using their chemotherapy. Nobody is over-  
25791 using their asthma inhaler. They don't need skin in the game  
25792 with out-of-pocket costs, so there should be zero out-of-  
25793 pocket costs or copays for appropriately-prescribed

25794 prescription drugs.

25795           And to the extent that we want other countries to not be  
25796 free-riding off of R&D, we actually have a bipartisan  
25797 initiative for this. It was under H.R. 19, the Grassley-  
25798 Wyden bill, where you had a pharmaceutical negotiator as part  
25799 of the United States Trade Representative. That was a good  
25800 idea. We should bring that idea back. I am happy to work  
25801 with the Republicans on this committee on that idea. And it  
25802 is a way to induce more R&D spending in allied and partner  
25803 nations and, again, making sure that we can have the  
25804 biomedical R&D that we want without reducing access for  
25805 patients.

25806           So this amendment supports and does not preclude any of  
25807 what I just said. And so I will be supporting it, and I  
25808 would encourage Republicans to, as well.

25809           I yield my time to the gentleman from California.

25810           \*Mr. Peters. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts  
25811 who stole what I was going to say and said it better, so I  
25812 won't say much more, other than I will say, Mr. Chairman, I  
25813 appreciate the -- your acknowledgment that we lead the world  
25814 in science and in discovery in this area. We should hold on  
25815 to that, and be careful about how we get to the goal that Mr.  
25816 Auchincloss just endorsed.

25817           And with that I yield back.

25818           \*The Chair. The gentleman from Massachusetts yields

25819 back?

25820 \*Mr. Auchincloss. I yield back.

25821 \*The Chair. Is there discussion?

25822 The gentleman from North Carolina is recognized for five  
25823 minutes to speak on the amendment.

25824 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I appreciate my  
25825 colleague's sentiment and desire to lower drug prices. That  
25826 is exactly what some of the provisions of this underlying  
25827 bill are trying to do.

25828 I have repeatedly voiced my concerns, though, about this  
25829 particular policy, which will have the opposite effect and I  
25830 think my colleagues across the aisle intended it to have.  
25831 Our country is known for innovation, competition, and ground-  
25832 breaking discoveries, including therapeutics, drugs, and  
25833 cures. This policy alone would bring innovation and cures to  
25834 a standstill.

25835 Government price controls are not the answer. And I am  
25836 sorry, this is a government price control. When you say we  
25837 are going to set the price, we are the government, that is a  
25838 price control. A policy like this would jeopardize progress  
25839 on lifesaving drugs and therapeutics for illnesses like  
25840 Alzheimer's, cancer, and so many rare diseases. In fact,  
25841 because of ill-advised policies like the ones included in the  
25842 so-called Inflation Reduction Act, there has already been a  
25843 reduction of almost 40 percent of clinical trials and a

25844 reduction of 70 percent of R&D for small molecule medicines.

25845 Not only would we be leveling to countries that deny  
25846 their own citizens access to lifesaving treatments, but a  
25847 policy like this would threaten global leadership in  
25848 biomedical innovation, reduce investment. And as our  
25849 chairman said earlier, it would be a gift to China.

25850 Now, I want to associate myself with the words of our  
25851 chairman earlier. President Trump is 100 percent correct  
25852 when he says that American taxpayers subsidize innovation for  
25853 other developed nations. But we need to fix first the  
25854 problem that was created by the IRA that is crushing  
25855 innovation, and we need to look for solutions to address  
25856 this.

25857 The gentleman was also correct when he said that foreign  
25858 price controls actually drove manufacturing to America. He  
25859 cited the numbers from 1998 to 2022: 78 percent of global  
25860 research and development was conducted in the United States.  
25861 But before that, before widespread price controls in Europe,  
25862 R&D investments in European nations led the United States by  
25863 24 percent. So government price controls drove manufacturing  
25864 and the innovation to America. If we implement price  
25865 controls now here, it will drive that innovation to China,  
25866 and that is the problem.

25867 And so I strongly oppose this proposal, and look forward  
25868 to our country and my home state of North Carolina

25869 maintaining its role as leaders in innovation.

25870 \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield?

25871 \*Mr. Hudson. Sure.

25872 \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you. So is what you are saying you  
25873 agree with President Trump's executive order telling the  
25874 prescription drug companies to cut their drug costs by  
25875 aligning them with the cost of medications in the other  
25876 countries that he signed last week?

25877 \*Mr. Hudson. I agree with the President's sentiment and  
25878 his belief that the American taxpayers are subsidizing  
25879 innovation for other developed nations. I don't agree with  
25880 his solution.

25881 \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you.

25882 \*Mr. Hudson. And I have been very clear about that.  
25883 With that, Mr. Chairman, I will yield back.

25884 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
25885 from New Jersey, the ranking member, is recognized for five  
25886 minutes to speak on the amendment.

25887 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support this  
25888 amendment for a number of reasons.

25889 But I have to say, you know, I respect the gentleman  
25890 from North Carolina, but I don't see anything in this bill  
25891 that is going to lower prescription drug prices or lower  
25892 prices for anybody. In fact, it seems to me it does just the  
25893 opposite, right? You either -- you get kicked off your



25894 Medicaid and so you don't have health insurance. You can't  
25895 buy a subsidized policy on the ACA. You have to make a \$35  
25896 copayment every time you go to the doctor in some cases. And  
25897 all this, of course, is just going to lead to higher premiums  
25898 for people in the private sector who buy their insurance and  
25899 with the affordable care market, as well, because, you know,  
25900 there is uncompensated care that is going to have to be paid  
25901 for somehow. So there is no affordability issue here.

25902         You know, Republicans keep talking about affordability,  
25903 but they don't do anything about it. In fact, everything  
25904 since Trump was inaugurated seems to be going up. Maybe not  
25905 everything, but a lot of things.

25906         You know, the thing that disturbs me the most? When I  
25907 heard that President Trump -- I think he met with the  
25908 chairman. I am not taking a -- but there was reports that he  
25909 met with you, Mr. Chairman, the President. And he actually  
25910 proposed this idea of the lowest prices from other countries.  
25911 And I got all excited. I thought, oh, this is going to be  
25912 incorporated into the reconciliation bill as a way for saving  
25913 money and, you know, it might be a great thing as opposed to  
25914 having to cut Medicaid.

25915         But no, of course it didn't get in, because, obviously,  
25916 as the gentleman from North Carolina said, the Republicans --  
25917 or at least enough of them on this committee -- don't support  
25918 it, so they didn't put it in, right? I don't know, maybe

25919 Trump doesn't care.

25920 But then he comes up with this executive order. Again,  
25921 nice idea, but when I read that executive order it didn't  
25922 really say anything. He gave it to Kennedy to -- Secretary  
25923 Kennedy to decide what to do with it. The last time he did  
25924 it, when he was first president, it was limited, I think, to  
25925 part B, you had to go to a doctor's office, and then he  
25926 shelved it at some point anyway. So I think this is probably  
25927 going nowhere.

25928 You know, it is -- again, it is the same thing.  
25929 Republicans talk about affordability, but they don't do  
25930 anything about it. And their policies simply actually make  
25931 things more expensive. So I think if you really want to show  
25932 that you care about affordability -- I know this is a sense  
25933 of Congress, but if you really want to show that your  
25934 sensibility is in favor of lowering drug prices, then you  
25935 should support the Dingell amendment, and you won't. And so  
25936 that is just another indication of the fact that you really  
25937 don't want to address affordability, not for drug prices, not  
25938 for health insurance, not for copays, not for anything that  
25939 is, you know, going outside the healthcare sector.

25940 And it is just sad, because there is this, you know,  
25941 impression that the President tries to give and that the  
25942 Republican leadership tries to give that somehow they are  
25943 addressing affordability, but they don't. If you do really

25944 believe in that, then you should simply support this  
25945 amendment.

25946         And with that, unless somebody -- yes, I will yield to  
25947 the gentlewoman from Michigan.

25948         \*Mrs. Dingell. I just want to share some facts here  
25949 about international pricing.

25950         Across all drugs, U.S. prices were 278 percent of other  
25951 countries' drug prices. U.S. gross prices for brand-name  
25952 originator drugs were 422 percent of prices in comparison  
25953 countries. After applying an adjustment for manufacturer  
25954 rebates, U.S. prices for brand-name drugs are still three  
25955 times higher than in other countries.

25956         So I do think that we need to be doing something, and I  
25957 understand what you are saying. But should we be paying -- I  
25958 want to compete with China, but China doesn't pay what  
25959 America pays for drugs, either. We need to protect the  
25960 consumer. We say we want to lower prices. We need to lower  
25961 prices.

25962         Thank you, and I yield back to Mr. Pallone.

25963         \*Mr. Pallone. And unless somebody wants my time, I  
25964 yield back, Mr. Chairman.

25965         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
25966 further discussion on the amendment?

25967         Seeing none --

25968         \*Mr. Pallone. Roll call.

25969           \*The Chair. -- the vote occurs on the amendment. All  
25970 those -- the -- a roll call vote has been requested, and the  
25971 clerk will call the roll.

25972           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

25973           [No response.]

25974           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith?

25975           \*Mr. Griffith. No.

25976           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

25977           Mr. Bilirakis?

25978           [No response.]

25979           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson?

25980           \*Mr. Hudson. No.

25981           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

25982           Mr. Carter?

25983           [No response.]

25984           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer?

25985           [No response.]

25986           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?

25987           [No response.]

25988           \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw?

25989           \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

25990           \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

25991           Mr. Joyce?

25992           \*Mr. Joyce. No.

25993           \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

25994 Mr. Weber?

25995 [No response.]

25996 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen?

25997 \*Mr. Allen. Allen votes no.

25998 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

25999 Mr. Balderson?

26000 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

26001 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

26002 Mr. Fulcher?

26003 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.

26004 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

26005 Mr. Pfluger?

26006 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

26007 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

26008 Mrs. Harshbarger?

26009 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

26010 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

26011 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

26012 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

26013 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

26014 Mrs. Cammack?

26015 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.

26016 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.

26017 Mr. Obernolte?

26018 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.

26019           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
26020           Mr. James?  
26021           \*Mr. James.   No.  
26022           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
26023           Mr. Bentz?  
26024           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
26025           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
26026           Mrs. Houchin?  
26027           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
26028           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
26029           Mr. Fry?  
26030           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
26031           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
26032           Ms. Lee?  
26033           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
26034           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
26035           Mr. Langworthy?  
26036           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
26037           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
26038           Mr. Kean?  
26039           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
26040           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
26041           Mr. Rulli?  
26042           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
26043           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.

26044 Mr. Evans?  
26045 [No response.]  
26046 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman?  
26047 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
26048 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
26049 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
26050 [No response.]  
26051 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone?  
26052 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
26053 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
26054 Ms. DeGette?  
26055 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
26056 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
26057 Ms. Schakowsky?  
26058 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
26059 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
26060 Ms. Matsui?  
26061 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
26062 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
26063 Ms. Castor?  
26064 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
26065 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
26066 Mr. Tonko?  
26067 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
26068 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

26069 Ms. Clarke?

26070 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

26071 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

26072 Mr. Ruiz?

26073 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.

26074 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.

26075 Mr. Peters?

26076 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

26077 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

26078 Mrs. Dingell?

26079 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.

26080 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

26081 Mr. Veasey?

26082 [No response.]

26083 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey?

26084 [No response.]

26085 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly?

26086 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

26087 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

26088 Ms. Barragan?

26089 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.

26090 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.

26091 Mr. Soto?

26092 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

26093 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.



26094 Ms. Schrier?  
26095 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
26096 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
26097 Mrs. Trahan?  
26098 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
26099 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
26100 Mrs. Fletcher?  
26101 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
26102 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
26103 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
26104 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
26105 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
26106 Mr. Auchincloss?  
26107 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
26108 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
26109 Mr. Carter?  
26110 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
26111 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
26112 Mr. Menendez?  
26113 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
26114 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
26115 Mr. Mullin?  
26116 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
26117 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
26118 Mr. Landsman?

26119           \*Mr. Landsman.   Aye.

26120           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Landsman votes aye.

26121           Ms. McClellan?

26122           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

26123           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

26124           Chairman Guthrie?

26125           \*The Chair.   No.

26126           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

26127           Mr. Latta is not recorded.

26128           \*Mr. Latta.   No.

26129           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.

26130           Mr. Carter is not recorded.

26131           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Carter votes no.

26132           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.

26133           Mr. Weber is not recorded.

26134           \*Mr. Weber.   Weber votes no.

26135           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.

26136           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer is not recorded.

26137           \*Mr. Palmer.   Palmer votes no.

26138           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.

26139           \*Mr. Dunn.   Dunn, no.

26140           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.

26141           Mr. -- yes, Mr. Langworthy voted aye -- or voted no,

26142   sorry, voted no.

26143           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   Bilirakis, no.

26144 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

26145 [Pause.]

26146 \*Mr. Veasey. Chairman, how am I recorded?

26147 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey is not recorded.

26148 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

26149 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

26150 Mrs. Fedorchak is not recorded.

26151 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

26152 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

26153 [Pause.]

26154 \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24

26155 ayes and 29 noes.

26156 \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.

26157 \*Mr. Pallone. Schrier.

26158 \*The Chair. Dr. Schrier? For what purpose does the

26159 gentlelady from Washington seek recognition?

26160 \*Ms. Schrier. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the

26161 desk.

26162 \*The Chair. The clerk -- do you have the amendment?

26163 \*Ms. Schrier. Amendment 128.

26164 \*The Chair. The clerk will report.

26165 \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Ms. Schrier. At the

26166 end of the following section requirements with respect to

26167 cost sharing --

26168 \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the

26169 amendment is dispensed with.

26170 [The amendment of Ms. Schrier follows:]

26171

26172 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

26173

26174           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
26175 minutes in support of the amendment.

26176           \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

26177           Republicans are here again trying to convince us that  
26178 this bill, their so-called big, beautiful bill, will save the  
26179 taxpayers money. But of course it won't, as we have already  
26180 discussed multiple times over the past almost 24 hours. It  
26181 will kick 13.7 million Americans off their insurance, and  
26182 will use those savings to pay for giant tax credit for  
26183 billionaires.

26184           But there are ways we can help people who lose their  
26185 insurance, and also those with private insurance who see  
26186 their own costs rise because of this. And as someone with  
26187 type 1 diabetes who relies on my health insurance to access  
26188 affordable insulin, I would love to focus on that.

26189           As mentioned, we are going to see health care costs  
26190 increase dramatically for all of us if we boot 13.7 million  
26191 people off their Medicaid insurance. Those kicked off  
26192 Medicaid will still get care, of course, but they will be  
26193 sicker, they will be treated in the emergency room, the care  
26194 will be more complicated, more expensive. And since they  
26195 can't pay for it, all of us will make up that difference. So  
26196 our insurance rates are going to go up.

26197           Now, think about this in the narrow context of diabetes.  
26198 I read part of this letter from an endocrinologist in

26199 Wenatchee, Washington last night. She talks about how she  
26200 worked as an endocrinologist before the Affordable Care Act  
26201 and after, and what she saw after the Affordable Care Act was  
26202 enacted is that she had many more new patients with type 1  
26203 diabetes just coming out of the woodworks. And these were  
26204 not new diagnoses, they were just people who had been getting  
26205 by for years by purchasing over-the-counter insulin,  
26206 syringes, NPH and regular, which is what I used back in the  
26207 1980s. They had just been getting by. And because they  
26208 didn't have all the supplies they needed and the technology,  
26209 they already had developed permanent complications of  
26210 diabetes. So now, with the Affordable Care Act, they finally  
26211 had insurance for the first time in their adult lives, and  
26212 she could get them on treatment with better insulins, newer  
26213 insulins, insulin pumps, continuous glucose sensors.

26214 And then she talks also about how now she also diagnoses  
26215 adult new type 1 -- people with type 1 diabetes, also most on  
26216 Medicaid. And those patients are getting such great care  
26217 because they can start right off with the newest insulins,  
26218 the insulin pumps, the continuous glucose monitors, and this  
26219 allows for optimal care.

26220 So of course, I worry about them losing their care, but  
26221 the bottom line for all of us is that insulin is still really  
26222 expensive. So as we talk about saving money and using  
26223 dollars effectively, we first need to think about the

26224 affordability of insulin, insulin pumps, glucose monitors,  
26225 and how much that costs -- so the upfront costs -- versus  
26226 having to pay for much more expensive treatment of  
26227 complications later. And it is not just the medical costs,  
26228 it is also that many people with these severe complications  
26229 will not be able to work.

26230         My amendment is simple. It would cap the cost of  
26231 insulin at \$35 for those with private health insurance. We  
26232 were so successful when we placed a cap on insulin prices for  
26233 Medicare recipients a few years ago. I mean, it was life-  
26234 changing and lifesaving, and that is not an over-statement.

26235         So if my Republican colleagues are going to take health  
26236 care away from millions of people and raise costs for the  
26237 rest of us who are not on Medicaid, the least they can do is  
26238 agree with us that we should lower the cost of insulin for  
26239 everyday Americans. And I urge everyone, including my  
26240 Republican colleagues, to vote yes on this amendment.

26241         I yield back.

26242         \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back and  
26243 I will recognize myself.

26244         So while I do share some of my colleague's concerns  
26245 around the out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs, a  
26246 sweeping commercial market mandate is not the best pathway  
26247 forward. That is why we have included a number of Medicaid  
26248 and Medicare PBM reforms in this bill. These PBM policies

26249 will lower drug prices for patients and improve our Medicaid  
26250 system, just like we have been focused on doing throughout  
26251 the process.

26252 I will say that it is kind of interesting that this bill  
26253 asks for a \$35 out-of-pocket when it has been argued that  
26254 paying \$35 max out of cost for Medicaid for people in the  
26255 expanded Medicaid is not -- one of those things aren't  
26256 considered as equivalent.

26257 But anyway, I will urge my colleagues to oppose this  
26258 amendment and I yield back.

26259 \*Ms. Schrier. And just for clarification, it is \$35 for  
26260 people on private insurance who will see other costs go up.

26261 \*The Chair. If there no further discussion, no further  
26262 questions, the vote occurs on the amendment. A roll call has  
26263 been requested, and the clerk will call the roll.

26264 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

26265 [No response.]

26266 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith?

26267 [No response.]

26268 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis?

26269 [No response.]

26270 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson?

26271 [No response.]

26272 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter?

26273 [No response.]



26274           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer?  
26275           \*Mr. Palmer.   Palmer votes no.  
26276           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
26277           Mr. Dunn?  
26278           [No response.]  
26279           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw?  
26280           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
26281           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
26282           Mr. Joyce?  
26283           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
26284           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
26285           Mr. Weber?  
26286           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
26287           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
26288           Mr. Allen?  
26289           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
26290           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
26291           Mr. Balderson?  
26292           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
26293           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
26294           Mr. Fulcher?  
26295           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
26296           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
26297           Mr. Pfluger?  
26298           [No response.]

26299           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger?  
26300           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
26301           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
26302           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
26303           [No response.]  
26304           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
26305           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
26306           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
26307           Mr. Obernolte?  
26308           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
26309           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
26310           Mr. James?  
26311           \*Mr. James.   No.  
26312           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
26313           Mr. Bentz?  
26314           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
26315           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
26316           Mrs. Houchin?  
26317           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
26318           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
26319           Mr. Fry?  
26320           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
26321           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
26322           Ms. Lee?  
26323           \*Ms. Lee.   No.

26324           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
26325           Mr. Langworthy?  
26326           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
26327           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
26328           Mr. Kean?  
26329           \*Mr. Kean.    No.  
26330           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
26331           Mr. Rulli?  
26332           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
26333           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
26334           Mr. Evans?  
26335           [No response.]  
26336           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman?  
26337           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
26338           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
26339           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
26340           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
26341           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
26342           Mr. Pallone?  
26343           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
26344           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
26345           Ms. DeGette?  
26346           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
26347           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
26348           Ms. Schakowsky?

26349           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
26350           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
26351           Ms. Matsui?  
26352           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
26353           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
26354           Ms. Castor?  
26355           \*Ms. Castor.   Aye.  
26356           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes aye.  
26357           Mr. Tonko?  
26358           [No response.]  
26359           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke?  
26360           [No response.]  
26361           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz?  
26362           \*Mr. Ruiz.    Aye.  
26363           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
26364           Mr. Peters?  
26365           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
26366           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
26367           Mrs. Dingell?  
26368           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
26369           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
26370           Mr. Veasey?  
26371           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
26372           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
26373           Ms. Kelly?

26374           \*Ms. Kelly.   Aye.  
26375           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
26376           Ms. Barragan?  
26377           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
26378           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
26379           Mr. Soto?  
26380           \*Mr. Soto.   Aye.  
26381           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
26382           Ms. Schrier?  
26383           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
26384           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
26385           Mrs. Trahan?  
26386           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.  
26387           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
26388           Mrs. Fletcher?  
26389           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
26390           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
26391           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
26392           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
26393           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
26394           Mr. Auchincloss?  
26395           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
26396           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
26397           Mr. Carter?  
26398           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Aye.

26399           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
26400           Mr. Menendez?  
26401           \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
26402           \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
26403           Mr. Mullin?  
26404           \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
26405           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
26406           Mr. Landsman?  
26407           \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
26408           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
26409           Ms. McClellan?  
26410           \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
26411           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
26412           Chairman Guthrie?  
26413           \*The Chair. No.  
26414           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
26415           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. How is Carter recorded?  
26416           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter is not recorded.  
26417           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Carter votes no.  
26418           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes no.  
26419           \*Mr. Latta. How is Latta recorded?  
26420           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta is not recorded.  
26421           \*Mr. Latta. No.  
26422           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.  
26423           \*Mr. Griffith. Mr. Griffith votes no.

26424           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

26425           \*Mr. Bilirakis. Bilirakis votes no.

26426           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

26427           \*Mr. Hudson. Hudson votes no.

26428           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

26429           \*Mr. Dunn. Dunn, no.

26430           \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

26431           [Pause.]

26432           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. [Presiding] You okay? The

26433 clerk will report the results.

26434           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 22

26435 ayes and 27 noes.

26436           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The amendment is not agreed to.

26437           Are there further amendments?

26438           The chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

26439           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment is

26440 titled Health-FCD-AMD\_121.xml.

26441           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the

26442 amendment.

26443           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mr. Pallone. At the

26444 end of the following, establishing --

26445           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection, the reading

26446 of the amendment is dispensed with.

26447

26448

26449           [The amendment of Mr. Pallone follows:]

26450

26451       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

26452



26453           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And the gentleman is recognized  
26454 for five minutes in support of the amendment.

26455           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

26456           My amendment will establish a \$2,000 out-of-pocket cap  
26457 on prescription drug costs for consumers with private health  
26458 insurance, and this is part of a long-term Democratic effort  
26459 to try to bring down costs and address affordability, which I  
26460 keep stressing that the bill before us today does not do.

26461           Prescription drug prices are rising at an alarming pace,  
26462 and the problem is widespread. Annual drug spending in the  
26463 United States has reached \$487 billion, and the U.S. spends  
26464 more than other countries for prescription drugs. Consumers'  
26465 out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs has grown by 25  
26466 percent over the past 5 years, and in 2024 Americans spent  
26467 \$98 billion out of pocket on prescription drugs. This  
26468 increase is having a very real impact on American families,  
26469 with one out of four Americans unable to afford the cost of  
26470 their prescriptions. According to a survey by the Kaiser  
26471 Family Foundation, 30 percent of Americans say they haven't  
26472 taken their medication as prescribed, due to cost.

26473           And throughout the country there is bipartisan support  
26474 for action to lower the cost of prescription drugs and make  
26475 treatments more affordable for patients and their families.  
26476 Thanks to the Biden Administration and congressional  
26477 Democrats, we passed the Inflation Reduction Act, which

26478 helped lower the cost of prescription drugs for millions of  
26479 seniors. The Inflation Reduction Act created the first-ever  
26480 annual cap on drug costs for seniors in Medicare, capped the  
26481 cost of insulin at \$35 per month, and granted Medicare the  
26482 power to directly negotiate drug prices. It was a historic  
26483 achievement that lifted restrictions that had been in place  
26484 for nearly 20 years preventing Medicare from negotiating drug  
26485 prices.

26486         Unfortunately, Republicans today are working to  
26487 undermine the IRA by blowing a hole in the IRA's negotiation  
26488 rules to allow manufacturers to game negotiation and allow  
26489 blockbuster drugs like Humira to stay off the negotiation  
26490 list. And I kind of -- it is kind of shocking to me, since  
26491 your own President claims he wants to lower drug prices with  
26492 his executive order last week, but I guess this is one  
26493 explanation, that Republicans want to benefit from suggesting  
26494 or pretending they are going to lower prices because it is  
26495 popular, but your actions show that we actually don't do  
26496 that, you don't care about affordability. But -- and I think  
26497 that is clear today because you are cutting Medicaid for low-  
26498 income Americans.

26499         Now, here is what the Democrats stand for. My amendment  
26500 builds upon the historic progress made by the Inflation  
26501 Reduction Act to further lower drug prices for American  
26502 families by capping out-of-pocket costs for those with

26503 private insurance. So in the same way that Ms. Schrier --  
26504 Dr. Schrier had the -- wanted to bring the insulin provision  
26505 from the IRA with regard to insulin, I want to bring the  
26506 provision with regard to the \$2,000 cap for seniors in  
26507 Medicare Part D over to the private insurance market so that  
26508 every American who has insurance can benefit from the \$2,000  
26509 cap.

26510 And while my Republican colleagues are still, you know,  
26511 pursuing the goal, in my opinion today, of sabotaging the ACA  
26512 with this budget reconciliation and taking away coverage from  
26513 millions of Americans between Medicaid and the ACA, Democrats  
26514 are committed to lowering health care prices for patients.  
26515 The Medicare 2000 out-of-pocket cap has resulted in real  
26516 savings for seniors, and we must expand this to all Americans  
26517 with private market coverage so Americans are not forced to  
26518 forego lifesaving medication.

26519 The vast majority of Republican and Democratic voters  
26520 all agree that one of the most important healthcare issues is  
26521 making prescription drugs affordable for those that need  
26522 them. So if that is what you believe in, then you should  
26523 vote for this amendment, and I urge all my colleagues on both  
26524 sides of the aisle to support this amendment.

26525 And with that, Mr. -- oh, it looks like the gentleman  
26526 from Massachusetts would like my last minute. I yield to the  
26527 gentleman.

26528           \*Mr. Auchincloss. Thank you, Ranking Member. I just  
26529 want to extend my appreciation for you introducing this,  
26530 because it really is an opportunity for both parties,  
26531 actually, to demonstrate to American families that we are  
26532 willing to fight health insurance corporations to lower their  
26533 out-of-pocket costs. Because I can tell you right now, the  
26534 only institutions in America that don't like this are  
26535 UnitedHealth Group, Cigna, Express Scripts, and CVS Caremark.  
26536 Everybody else thinks this is a great idea, because everybody  
26537 else understands that there is no moral hazard, there is no  
26538 need for skin in the game when it comes to appropriately-  
26539 prescribed prescription drugs.

26540           When a doctor prescribes a drug to a patient, that  
26541 patient needs it. They are not going to take more of it,  
26542 they are not going to take less of it, they are going to take  
26543 the appropriately prescribed amount of it. And so having an  
26544 out-of-pocket cost to try to induce the patient to use less  
26545 of it makes no sense, it is simply the insurance company  
26546 trying to pass on the cost that they rightfully should bear,  
26547 having been paid premiums every single month while that  
26548 patient was healthy.

26549           And so we now have a clear-cut opportunity to say to  
26550 American families, we think you should be paying less for  
26551 prescription drugs, and to tell the health insurance  
26552 companies that they cannot keep price-gouging patients and

26553 pharmacists and taxpayers the way they have over the last  
26554 decade. So I would expect that all parties can agree to this  
26555 amendment.

26556 I yield back.

26557 \*Mr. Pallone. And I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

26558 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. The  
26559 chair now recognizes himself for five minutes.

26560 While I share the ranking member's concerns around the  
26561 out-of-pocket costs for prescription drugs, this policy is  
26562 not the best path forward. That is why we included it --  
26563 bills that I had sponsored dealing with PBMs on Medicaid and  
26564 Medicare reform policies that are in this bill, reform  
26565 policies that would result in lower prescription drug costs,  
26566 like doing -- eliminating spread pricing in Medicaid, where  
26567 drug companies are -- excuse me, where PBMs charge one price  
26568 and pay for much less than that. That kind of spread pricing  
26569 will be eliminated in Medicaid, and will result in  
26570 significant savings for patients and for the Federal  
26571 Government.

26572 These PBM policies will lower drug price for patients  
26573 and improve our Medicaid system, just like we have been  
26574 focused on doing throughout this process. Yes, prescription  
26575 drug prices do need to come down. There is no question about  
26576 that. Out-of-pocket costs need to come down. The savings  
26577 that are being garnered now by the middlemen, by the PBMs,

26578 need to be passed on to the patients. That is the way we  
26579 bring drug prices down.

26580 So I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment because  
26581 I do believe it is the wrong way for us to bring drug prices  
26582 down. But I do applaud the ranking member's attempts to  
26583 bring drug prices down, and I pledge to work with him to do  
26584 just that.

26585 Does anyone else want any time?

26586 Hearing none, I will yield back. Are there any other  
26587 members who want to speak on this bill?

26588 Hearing none --

26589 \*Mr. Pallone. I will ask for a roll call.

26590 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Okay. Hearing none, no further  
26591 discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment. A recorded  
26592 vote has been has been called for. The clerk will call the  
26593 roll.

26594 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

26595 [No response.]

26596 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith?

26597 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

26598 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

26599 Mr. Bilirakis?

26600 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

26601 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

26602 Mr. Hudson?

26603 [No response.]

26604 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

26605 Mr. Carter?

26606 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

26607 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes no.

26608 Mr. Palmer?

26609 \*Mr. Palmer. Palmer votes no.

26610 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

26611 Mr. Dunn?

26612 \*Mr. Dunn. No.

26613 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

26614 Mr. Crenshaw?

26615 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.

26616 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

26617 Mr. Joyce?

26618 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

26619 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

26620 Mr. Weber?

26621 \*Mr. Weber. No.

26622 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

26623 Mr. Allen?

26624 \*Mr. Allen. No.

26625 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

26626 Mr. Balderson?

26627 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

26628           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
26629           Mr. Fulcher?  
26630           [No response.]  
26631           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger?  
26632           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
26633           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
26634           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
26635           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
26636           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
26637           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
26638           [No response.]  
26639           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
26640           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
26641           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
26642           Mr. Obernolte?  
26643           \*Mr. Obernolte.   No.  
26644           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
26645           Mr. James?  
26646           \*Mr. James.   No.  
26647           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
26648           Mr. Bentz?  
26649           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
26650           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
26651           Mrs. Houchin?  
26652           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.



26653           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
26654           Mr. Fry?  
26655           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
26656           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
26657           Ms. Lee?  
26658           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
26659           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
26660           Mr. Langworthy?  
26661           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
26662           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
26663           Mr. Kean?  
26664           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
26665           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
26666           Mr. Rulli?  
26667           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
26668           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
26669           Mr. Evans?  
26670           [No response.]  
26671           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman?  
26672           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
26673           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
26674           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
26675           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
26676           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
26677           Mr. Pallone?

26678 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
26679 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
26680 Ms. DeGette?  
26681 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
26682 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
26683 Ms. Schakowsky?  
26684 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
26685 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
26686 Ms. Matsui?  
26687 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
26688 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
26689 Ms. Castor?  
26690 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
26691 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
26692 Mr. Tonko?  
26693 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
26694 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
26695 Ms. Clarke?  
26696 [No response.]  
26697 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz?  
26698 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
26699 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
26700 Mr. Peters?  
26701 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.  
26702 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

26703 Mrs. Dingell?

26704 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.

26705 \*Ms. Clarke. Hey, what about me?

26706 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

26707 [Laughter.]

26708 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey?

26709 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

26710 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

26711 Ms. Kelly?

26712 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

26713 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

26714 \*Ms. Clarke. Okay, I will be back.

26715 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan?

26716 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.

26717 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.

26718 Mr. Soto?

26719 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.

26720 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.

26721 Ms. Schrier?

26722 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.

26723 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.

26724 Mrs. Trahan?

26725 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

26726 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

26727 Mrs. Fletcher?

26728 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
26729 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
26730 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
26731 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
26732 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
26733 Mr. Auchincloss?  
26734 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
26735 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
26736 Mr. Carter?  
26737 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
26738 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
26739 Mr. Menendez?  
26740 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
26741 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
26742 Mr. Mullin?  
26743 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
26744 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
26745 Mr. Landsman?  
26746 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
26747 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
26748 Ms. McClellan?  
26749 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
26750 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
26751 Chairman Guthrie?  
26752 \*The Chair. No.

26753           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
26754           \*Mr. Latta.   How is Latta recorded?  
26755           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta is not recorded.  
26756           \*Mr. Latta.   No.  
26757           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Latta votes no.  
26758           \*Mr. Hudson.   Hudson, no.  
26759           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
26760           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
26761           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
26762           \*Ms. Clarke.   Mr. Chairman?  
26763           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke is not recorded.  
26764           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   I am sorry, where?   I can't  
26765   see, who is --  
26766           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke?  
26767           \*Ms. Clarke.   I vote aye.  
26768           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
26769           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   I am sorry, I couldn't see.  
26770           [Pause.]  
26771           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   The clerk will report the  
26772   results.  
26773           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
26774   ayes to 28 noes.  
26775           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   The amendment is not agreed to.  
26776           Are there further amendments?  
26777           The chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida.

26778           \*Mr. Soto. To introduce an amendment, Health-FCD-  
26779   AMD\_221.

26780           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the  
26781   amendment.

26782           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Mr. Soto. At the end  
26783   of the following --

26784           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection, the reading  
26785   of the amendment is dispensed with.

26786           [The amendment of Mr. Soto follows:]

26787

26788           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

26789

26790           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And the gentleman is recognized  
26791 for five minutes in support of the amendment.

26792           \*Mr. Soto. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

26793           [Chart]

26794           \*Mr. Soto. You know, members, in 2022, in the Inflation  
26795 Reduction Act, we were able to pass the ACA Enhancement Act,  
26796 creating the premium tax credit. This made Obamacare more  
26797 affordable to middle-class families. And we saw enrollment  
26798 surge: 4.6 million Floridians get their health care through  
26799 the Obamacare exchange. We had the largest exchange in the  
26800 nation, primarily because we have a lot of people who work  
26801 for small to mid-sized businesses that find it more  
26802 economically efficient for them to get their health care on  
26803 the exchange.

26804           In Florida's 9th congressional district, we have the  
26805 second most enrollment in the nation. In fact, all five of  
26806 the top Obamacare enrollment districts are all in Florida,  
26807 including four in south Florida.

26808           But coming up at the end of the year, this premium tax  
26809 credit will lapse. And what that can mean is real increases  
26810 in people's health insurance bills. Looking at the Kaiser  
26811 Family Foundation, a couple in my district in their early 60s  
26812 making about \$100,000, right now they pay 8,500 a year with  
26813 the premium tax credit for a silver plan. But without it,  
26814 that will go up to \$18,000 a year, a nearly \$10,000 increase.

26815           Take a median couple in my district making \$78,000 a  
26816   year with two kids. Their silver plan right now costs them  
26817   \$3,120. But without it, without the premium tax credit, it  
26818   would go up to \$20,000. We don't need to have a huge bill  
26819   come due to so many of our constituents who are on Obamacare  
26820   and who are getting private insurance through this public  
26821   exchange.

26822           Now, I know this reconciliation package is the primary  
26823   vehicle where this premium tax credit extension can happen.  
26824   I recognize Ways and Means already had a vote on this, and it  
26825   may be more proper in their committee, but I want to make  
26826   sure we at least were able to talk about it in this  
26827   committee, since it means so much to my constituents and so  
26828   many others.

26829           And with that, I withdraw the amendment.

26830           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman withdraws the  
26831   amendment. Are there any other amendments?

26832           \*Mr. Pallone. Ocasio-Cortez.

26833           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The chair recognizes the  
26834   gentlelady from New York.

26835           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an  
26836   amendment at the desk labeled AMD\_220.

26837           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The clerk will report the  
26838   amendment.

26839           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. At



26840 the end of the following, section --

26841 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Without objection, the reading  
26842 of the amendment is dispensed.

26843 [The amendment of Ms. Ocasio-Cortez follows:]

26844

26845 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

26846

26847           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. And the gentlelady is  
26848 recognized for five minutes in support of her amendment.

26849           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

26850           You know, for months we have been hearing the Republican  
26851 majority talk about addressing waste, fraud, and abuse in our  
26852 healthcare systems and in government systems writ large. One  
26853 of the things I have found interesting in the discussions  
26854 around waste, fraud, and abuse is that it curiously omits  
26855 corporate waste, corporate fraud, corporate profiteering, and  
26856 corporate abuse of public tax dollars all the time.

26857           And whether it is the failed audits of the Pentagon that  
26858 get glossed over, whether it is the immense -- and we have  
26859 seen this, you know, in plenty of oversight hearings on a  
26860 bipartisan basis -- contractors that are -- defense  
26861 contractors that are defrauding the public dime. But in --  
26862 we have this in the healthcare space, as well, particularly  
26863 in the form of Medicare Advantage and what happens within  
26864 Medicare Advantage.

26865           As, you know, many people know, Medicare itself is a  
26866 health insurance program run by the Federal Government that  
26867 covers people over the age of 65 and some people with  
26868 disabilities. But Medicare Advantage is not the same thing  
26869 as Medicare. Medicare Advantage is for-profit insurance.  
26870 Medicare is public insurance.

26871           And listen, Medicare Advantage plans can be popular at

26872 first. These insurance companies will make the health  
26873 insurance plans look good because up front, when you are  
26874 healthy and don't need to go to the doctor, it looks like you  
26875 save a few bucks compared to Medicare. But then, when you  
26876 get sick, that is when the sky falls down. That is when  
26877 costs skyrocket. And when you really need care, you either  
26878 can't get it in Medicare Advantage, or you have to pay so  
26879 much more out of your own pocket on a program that is  
26880 ostensibly supposed to be done with public dollars.

26881         And these Medicare Advantage programs, the reason it  
26882 happened, this unfolds in this way, is because they are run  
26883 by for-profit insurance companies, companies like Cigna,  
26884 Humana, and UnitedHealthcare. They will take public taxpayer  
26885 dollars that are intended for caring for Medicare-eligible  
26886 populations, and then they will take all of that money, they  
26887 will make people look sicker than they are -- because there  
26888 is an incentive to what is known as upcode -- and then they  
26889 pocket the difference because they will deny people the care  
26890 that they need.

26891         Traditional Medicare, real Medicare, pays doctors and  
26892 hospitals directly for the medical services they provide.  
26893 Medicare Advantage is a middleman that denies people care,  
26894 then upcodes them to make them to look sicker, and then they  
26895 pocket all of that public money. They pocket the difference  
26896 in their own profit to pay their CEOs and to yield

26897 shareholder profit. And then, when people actually do need  
26898 more care, private insurance companies under Medicare  
26899 Advantage don't want to pay for it.

26900 And all of this adds up to private insurance companies  
26901 under Medicare Advantage taking somewhere between 80 billion  
26902 and \$140 billion per year from the Federal Government that  
26903 they then pocket in their own profits. That is a lot of your  
26904 waste, fraud, and abuse margin right there, 80 to \$140  
26905 billion per year.

26906 So my amendment today is a fusion of several Republican  
26907 and Democratic-supported pieces of legislation. Today I  
26908 would like -- Representative Ruiz and myself are offering up  
26909 the bipartisan No UPCODE Act, originally presented by the  
26910 Senate Health Committee chair, Senator Cassidy of Louisiana,  
26911 as an amendment to this bill. It will go after that 80 to  
26912 \$140 billion in corporate waste, fraud, and abuse, and then  
26913 it will take that money back in what is being pocketed, and  
26914 it will reinvest it in actual Medicare and health care for  
26915 everyday Americans to get enhanced and better health care  
26916 that they need and deserve. It will save American taxpayers  
26917 an estimated \$124 billion over 10 years. It is fiscally  
26918 responsible.

26919 Those savings, instead of going to tax breaks for  
26920 billionaires and corporations, will then be reinvested in  
26921 Medicare. This reinvestment in funds, which is from a

26922 bipartisan policy championed by my colleagues, Representative  
26923 Ruiz -- in fact, we have a Republican representative who is  
26924 also a cosponsor on that bill -- will ensure doctors are  
26925 receiving adequate payment for the lifesaving services that  
26926 they provide, that our seniors and people with disabilities  
26927 get the care that they need, and that profiteering companies  
26928 no longer are getting away with this loophole.

26929         So I hope we can all agree on that, and I yield back.

26930         \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields. The  
26931 chair now recognizes himself for five minutes.

26932         I rise in opposition to the amendment. While I  
26933 recognize the spirit of the amendment and agree that we need  
26934 to more closely examine the Medicare Advantage program, these  
26935 policies would make structural changes to the Medicare  
26936 Advantage program that warrant further discussion outside the  
26937 scope of this markup.

26938         We are also fixing the broken Medicare physician fee  
26939 schedule in the underlying bill, which is one of the most  
26940 historic investments in the fee schedule in recent history.

26941         While I appreciate my Democratic colleague's commitment  
26942 to our physicians and seniors in Medicare, we should work  
26943 together on these issues beyond reconciliation, and I urge my  
26944 colleagues to therefore vote no on this amendment.

26945         Are any other members looking to be recognized?

26946         \*Mr. Ruiz. Here.

26947           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I will yield back and recognize  
26948 the gentleman from California.

26949           \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and thank you,  
26950 Representative Ocasio-Cortez, for bringing attention to this  
26951 important issue and for your work to strengthen our nation's  
26952 health care system, especially when so many here are trying  
26953 to weaken it.

26954           My Republican colleagues keep talking about wanting to  
26955 go after waste, fraud, and abuse, but so far all they seem  
26956 interested in is going after working families' healthcare  
26957 coverage. If you want to go after real fraud, there are  
26958 appropriate channels to do so, and the appropriate channels  
26959 does not include harming patients so that you can pay for tax  
26960 cuts for the wealthy.

26961           As Ms. Ocasio-Cortez explained, this amendment would  
26962 rein in real fraud in the healthcare system by cracking down  
26963 on upcoding in Medicare Advantage. And instead of using the  
26964 savings it would generate for the program to enrich a handful  
26965 of billionaires and millionaires, this amendment would create  
26966 -- would require that those savings are reinvested back into  
26967 health care, into strengthening Medicare for patients and  
26968 providers.

26969           Specifically, the savings will reinvest -- will be  
26970 reinvested to increase physician reimbursement in Medicare to  
26971 address a pressing patient access issue. This is from my

26972 bipartisan bill, the Strengthening Medicare for Patients and  
26973 Providers Act, which ties physician reimbursements to the  
26974 medical inflation rate, or the MEI, fully at 100 percent.

26975         For years physicians have been experiencing cuts to  
26976 their Medicare reimbursements, even while other Medicare  
26977 providers have experienced increases for inflation. From  
26978 2001 to 2023, inflation-adjusted payments for physicians  
26979 declined by 26 percent, even amid the rising costs of running  
26980 a medical practice. The fee -- the physician fee schedule is  
26981 broken, and this has led some physicians to struggle to keep  
26982 their practice doors open and turn away new Medicare  
26983 patients. This needs to be resolved to ensure access to  
26984 care.

26985         This amendment, tying reimbursements fully to inflation,  
26986 would enable physicians to keep up with the rising costs of  
26987 practicing medicine by tying the Medicare physician payment  
26988 rate to the Medicare Economic Index. The "doc fix" in the  
26989 underlying bill is sub-optimal. It is not a doc fix. It  
26990 ties the first year to 75 percent of Medicaid, and then the  
26991 subsequent years only 10 percent of the MEI -- I mean 75  
26992 percent to the MEI. And so this is woefully under-funding  
26993 the needs to address inflation.

26994         So we can't afford for more practices to close their  
26995 doors or to take fewer Medicare patients because they can't  
26996 afford to treat them. The Medicare physician fee schedule

26997 needs a permanent fix, not this temporary, short-changed fix  
26998 which the Medicare provision in the reconciliation bill does  
26999 not provide.

27000       So we can all agree that we need to strengthen the  
27001 healthcare system, not weaken it, and I urge my colleagues to  
27002 fully, fully tie the reimbursements to the full MEI, not a  
27003 partial fix, not a little, itty bitty 10 percent fix, not a  
27004 sub-par fix, not a fix -- not a lack of fix that is going to  
27005 have physician groups coming here every year again to tie the  
27006 fee schedule to the full MEI in order to fully take care of  
27007 Medicare patients.

27008       With that I thank you, and I yield the remainder of my  
27009 time.

27010       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentleman yields. Are  
27011 there any other members looking to speak on this amendment?

27012       The chair recognizes the gentlelady from Washington.

27013       \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am  
27014 enthusiastically supporting Representative Ocasio-Cortez's  
27015 amendment.

27016       I mean, I could not agree more about the Medicare  
27017 Advantage abuses of patients in the form of pre-  
27018 authorizations, and denials, and delays, and appeals, and  
27019 dragging their feet, and not providing the care promised.

27020       And then there is the abuses of the Federal Government,  
27021 which is the abuse of taxpayers, by padding the diagnoses for



27022 patients in order to make them look sicker in order to be  
27023 able to get more money from the Federal Government. I mean,  
27024 they are taking more and they are paying less, and that is  
27025 abuse and requires oversight.

27026 I will tell you that the doctors from both parties have  
27027 met and talked about this. We are all outraged. We all want  
27028 oversight hearings. And so I hope our committee can pursue  
27029 that.

27030 And then, you know, we are also talking about the  
27031 physician fee schedule, and it is wrong. I mean, over 30  
27032 years physicians have essentially taken a 26 percent pay cut  
27033 from Medicare, and that is not fair compensation. And it has  
27034 meant that doctors retire early or their practices close,  
27035 especially in rural areas.

27036 But here is the thing. This fix, this is not an  
27037 adequate fix. It doesn't even balance for this year, and  
27038 then it doesn't keep up with inflation, as my colleague, Dr.  
27039 Ruiz just said. It only provides 10 percent of inflation.  
27040 So, like, 0.3 percent on average. That is peanuts, okay?  
27041 Let's add to that that when patients lose Medicaid, that  
27042 means that those physicians are losing patients whose  
27043 insurance pays.

27044 But, you know, we all went into medicine because we want  
27045 to take care of our patients. So it is not like we are going  
27046 to leave them hanging. We are going to take care of them

27047 with no compensation. Let me tell you, that hurts physician  
27048 compensation far more. And here we are in a committee  
27049 hearing that wants to take Medicaid away from 13.7 million  
27050 Americans.

27051 So I just want to say that, to me, as a physician, it is  
27052 unthinkable that you would try to put a really inadequate fix  
27053 on the Medicare reimbursement rates for physicians and have  
27054 that be on the backs of our most vulnerable patients. It  
27055 doesn't make sense. I would call it morally bankrupt. And  
27056 we should all support this amendment, and we should all  
27057 support aggressive oversight of the abuses of Medicare  
27058 Advantage.

27059 Thank you, and I yield back.

27060 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. The gentlelady yields back.  
27061 Are there any other members wanting to be recognized to speak  
27062 on this amendment?

27063 Hearing none, the vote occurs on the amendment.

27064 \*Voice. A recorded vote.

27065 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. A recorded vote has been  
27066 requested. The clerk will call the roll.

27067 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

27068 \*Mr. Latta. No.

27069 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

27070 Mr. Griffith?

27071 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

27072           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes no.  
27073           Mr. Bilirakis?  
27074           [No response.]  
27075           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson?  
27076           \*Mr. Hudson.   No.  
27077           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
27078           Mr. Carter?  
27079           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
27080           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.  
27081           Mr. Palmer?  
27082           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
27083           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
27084           Mr. Dunn?  
27085           \*Mr. Dunn.    No.  
27086           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.  
27087           Mr. Crenshaw?  
27088           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
27089           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
27090           Mr. Joyce?  
27091           [No response.]  
27092           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber?  
27093           \*Mr. Weber.    No.  
27094           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
27095           Mr. Allen?  
27096           [No response.]

27097           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson?  
27098           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
27099           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
27100           Mr. Fulcher?  
27101           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
27102           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
27103           Mr. Pfluger?  
27104           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
27105           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
27106           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
27107           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
27108           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
27109           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
27110           [No response.]  
27111           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack?  
27112           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
27113           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
27114           Mr. Oubernolte?  
27115           \*Mr. Oubernolte.   No.  
27116           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
27117           Mr. James?  
27118           \*Mr. James.   No.  
27119           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
27120           Mr. Bentz?  
27121           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.

27122           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
27123           Mrs. Houchin?  
27124           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
27125           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
27126           Mr. Fry?  
27127           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
27128           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
27129           Ms. Lee?  
27130           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
27131           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
27132           Mr. Langworthy?  
27133           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
27134           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
27135           Mr. Rulli?  
27136           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
27137           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
27138           Mr. Kean?  
27139           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
27140           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
27141           Mr. Evans?  
27142           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
27143           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
27144           Mr. Goldman?  
27145           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
27146           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.

27147 Mrs. Fedorchak?

27148 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

27149 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

27150 Mr. Pallone?

27151 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.

27152 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

27153 Ms. DeGette?

27154 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.

27155 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

27156 Ms. Schakowsky?

27157 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

27158 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

27159 Ms. Matsui?

27160 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.

27161 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.

27162 Ms. Castor?

27163 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

27164 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

27165 Mr. Tonko?

27166 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.

27167 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

27168 Ms. Clarke?

27169 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

27170 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

27171 Mr. Ruiz?

27172           \*Mr. Ruiz.   Aye.  
27173           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
27174           Mr. Peters?  
27175           \*Mr. Peters.   Aye.  
27176           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes aye.  
27177           Mrs. Dingell?  
27178           \*Mrs. Dingell.   Aye.  
27179           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
27180           Mr. Veasey?  
27181           [No response.]  
27182           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey?  
27183           \*Mr. Veasey.   Aye.  
27184           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
27185           Ms. Kelly?  
27186           \*Ms. Kelly.   Aye.  
27187           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
27188           Ms. Barragan?  
27189           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
27190           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
27191           Mr. Soto?  
27192           \*Mr. Soto.   Aye.  
27193           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
27194           Ms. Schrier?  
27195           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
27196           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.

27197 Mrs. Trahan?

27198 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.

27199 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.

27200 Mrs. Fletcher?

27201 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.

27202 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

27203 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

27204 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

27205 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

27206 Mr. Auchincloss?

27207 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.

27208 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

27209 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

27210 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.

27211 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

27212 Mr. Menendez?

27213 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

27214 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

27215 Mr. Mullin?

27216 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

27217 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

27218 Mr. Landsman?

27219 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

27220 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

27221 Ms. McClellan?



27222           \*Ms. McClellan.   Aye.

27223           \*The Clerk.   Ms. McClellan votes aye.

27224           Chairman Guthrie?

27225           \*The Chair.   No.

27226           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie votes no.

27227           \*The Chair.   [Presiding] How is Mr. Bilirakis --

27228           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis is not recorded.

27229           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   Bilirakis, no.

27230           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

27231           \*The Chair.   Mr. Allen?   How about Mr. Allen of Georgia?

27232           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen is not recorded.

27233           \*Mr. Allen.   Allen votes no.

27234           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.

27235           \*The Chair.   Is anyone else on the Republican side

27236 seeking recognition?

27237           Seeing none, any member of the Democrat side?

27238           The lady from New York, are you -- the gentlelady from

27239 New York, how is she recorded?

27240           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Oh, sorry, I thought we were

27241 talking about --

27242           \*The Chair.   Oh, for amendment, okay.   I will -- that

27243 will be right next.

27244           All right, seeing none, the clerk will report.

27245           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24

27246 ayes and 28 noes.

27247           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.

27248           Are there any other amendments?

27249           It looks like we have one from the gentlelady from New  
27250 York.

27251           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you.

27252           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

27253           Oh, excuse me, for what purpose does the gentlelady from  
27254 New York seek recognition?

27255           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I have an amendment at the desk  
27256 labeled AMD\_085.

27257           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.

27258           \*The Clerk. Amendment offered by Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. In  
27259 section 44121 --

27260           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
27261 amendment is dispensed with.

27262           [The amendment of Ms. Ocasio-Cortez follows:]

27263

27264           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

27265

27266           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady from New York is  
27267 recognized for five minutes in support of the amendment.

27268           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27269           I think continuing on theme of corporate profiteering  
27270 that we have going on here, I want to address some of the  
27271 very concerning cuts and gutting of nursing home safety  
27272 provisions in order to pay for these further tax cuts.  
27273 Because across the country, for-profit and private-equity-  
27274 owned nursing homes are operating with skeleton crews and  
27275 dramatically reducing quality of care for people who are in  
27276 nursing homes in order to, again, pocket the difference.

27277           Staff in nursing homes often have to care for 30  
27278 residents at a time on their own, and it is not because  
27279 nursing homes don't have the money. Nursing homes receive  
27280 tens of billions of taxpayer dollars each year. And instead  
27281 of investing in higher worker pay and better care, they often  
27282 take that money and pocket the difference. There are cases  
27283 of nursing home residents laying soiled in their beds for  
27284 hours, being drugged or physically restrained, and suffering  
27285 from pressure sores and falls because there are not enough  
27286 staff to care for them. Many of these nursing homes just pay  
27287 workers poverty wages and they subject them to dangerous  
27288 working conditions.

27289           Now, the nursing home industry will tell you that  
27290 requiring a minimum number of nurses is too costly and that

27291 it is too burdensome. But what they are not telling you is  
27292 how nursing homes funnel billions of dollars meant for  
27293 patient care through other companies that they own. They are  
27294 funneling right now \$11 billion annually, to be exact. And  
27295 they do this to make it look like they are less profitable  
27296 than they really are so that they can tell legislators like  
27297 us that they don't have the money to hire more staff, or pay  
27298 them more, or provide better care. And there doesn't appear  
27299 to be much Federal scrutiny over this.

27300 This amendment asks that the rule around safe staffing  
27301 ratios be reinstated in any state for which there is an  
27302 occurrence of an adverse event including death or a temporary  
27303 harm event that is due to inadequate staffing levels that  
27304 would not have been permitted under the nursing home staffing  
27305 rule.

27306 And with that I yield back.

27307 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there a  
27308 further discussion on the amendment?

27309 The gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Carter, is recognized  
27310 for five minutes.

27311 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I move to strike the last word.

27312 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

27313 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in  
27314 opposition to the amendment.

27315 I would like to submit the following for the record. It

27316 is a study from ABT Associates, and was commissioned by CMS  
27317 to form the basis of the minimum staffing rule.

27318 So to be clear --

27319 \*The Chair. Without objection.

27320 [The information follows:]

27321

27322 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

27323

27324           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. So to be clear, this is not  
27325 just some outside group's independent study. This is what  
27326 the Biden Administration paid for and used when writing the  
27327 minimum staffing rule. The study found that for the nursing  
27328 homes in the 25th quartile and the 50th percentile for safety  
27329 and quality in this country, if you require staffing ratios  
27330 like those that were finalized by the Biden Administration, a  
27331 whopping one percent of those lower-performing nursing homes  
27332 would see an increase in safety and quality. One single  
27333 percent.

27334           And that is not just theoretical analysis.  
27335 Massachusetts actually tested this out. How did it turn out  
27336 for Massachusetts? The report found that the impacts of the  
27337 requirement on quality and safety were not statistically  
27338 significant. So we are talking about, at best, a one percent  
27339 increase in safety and, at worst, no increase in safety.  
27340 Meanwhile, CMS estimates that 80 percent of all nursing homes  
27341 are not able to meet the staffing ratio requirements, and the  
27342 CBO expects that the rule will cost \$22 billion, \$22 billion.

27343           Now, look, I support people getting the quality care  
27344 they need and deserve, but the math just doesn't add up here.  
27345 I have heard from nursing homes. In fact, my profession was  
27346 in nursing homes. I was a nursing home pharmacist consultant  
27347 for many, many years. I have heard from them. I have seen  
27348 it myself about this rule, and I know you all have, too. The

27349 cost of the rule simply does not add the value that they are  
27350 already providing, and they are not at risk of closing.

27351 And to me, the threat of closure is the greatest cost of  
27352 all. Nursing homes will close if this rule goes into effect.  
27353 If that happens, more seniors will die if nursing homes close  
27354 and they have nowhere to go for long-term care. More seniors  
27355 will die in hospitals as they await to be discharged to a  
27356 facility for post-acute care.

27357 This rule adds billions of dollars to the deficit and  
27358 reduces access -- essential -- and reduces access to  
27359 essential, long-term care.

27360 This amendment is nothing more than a politically-  
27361 motivated delay tactic. As we have discussed at length, the  
27362 underlying bill would not change coverage populations that  
27363 are legally enrolled in Medicaid like children, pregnant  
27364 women, seniors, and people with disabilities.

27365 We are shifting the focus back to the populations that  
27366 Medicaid was intended to serve. That is what we need to be  
27367 doing.

27368 I urge my colleagues to oppose this amendment, and I  
27369 yield back.

27370 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back, and the  
27371 gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking member, is recognized  
27372 for five minutes on the amendment.

27373 \*Mr. Pallone. I want to speak in favor of this

27374 amendment, because it really pains me to think that we are  
27375 going to repeal this nursing home rule.

27376         First of all, the bottom line is, look, nursing homes  
27377 have made a lot of major strides. I have -- some of you have  
27378 heard me talk so many times about a long time ago now in the  
27379 1970s, when we had terrible nursing homes, we had fires in  
27380 New Jersey in my hometown, and -- where people were killed in  
27381 these fires because conditions, safety, health conditions  
27382 were so bad. And I would suggest to you that the nursing  
27383 homes have come a long way since then.

27384         But the bottom line is many states, including my state,  
27385 have looked into the issue of staffing. And we realize that  
27386 if you don't have adequate staffing for nurses and even for,  
27387 you know, home health aides -- although I don't think this  
27388 rule covers it, it is just nurses -- then you really run the  
27389 risk of bad treatment, unhealthy situations, and it is  
27390 unsafe. It is unsafe, it is unhealthy, whatever, unless you  
27391 have an adequate staffing ratio.

27392         And what really bothers me, and I have said it before  
27393 today, is that, you know, here you have a situation where  
27394 people are going to be kicked off Medicaid, millions. They  
27395 are not going to be able, many of them, to go on and get  
27396 coverage under the ACA. They are going to pay more, in many  
27397 cases, to go see a doctor, \$35, whatever. And at the same  
27398 time, now you are going to say that the quality of services



27399 go down. It is going to be bad enough, because if states  
27400 can't find -- you know, can't get Medicaid, have all these  
27401 people kicked off Medicaid, they are going to have less  
27402 money, a lot of uncompensated care. Some may just, you know,  
27403 they may just raise premiums for people, but in other cases  
27404 they are just going to drop services or the quality of  
27405 services are going to go down.

27406 But this is the worst example of it because you are  
27407 literally saying, we don't -- we are going to get rid of this  
27408 nurse staffing ratio. And I think you are saving, like, \$22  
27409 billion over 10 years as part of this -- or the life of this  
27410 reconciliation, and that is why you are doing it. You are  
27411 not doing it because you think that this is going to help  
27412 nursing homes. I mean, you may think it does, but I think it  
27413 is not accurate. It is just a savings to pay for tax cuts  
27414 for billionaires and large corporations, and it shouldn't be  
27415 at the expense of the people living in nursing homes. It  
27416 just isn't right.

27417 Now, we can argue all day long, and tomorrow -- well,  
27418 hopefully we will be done here fairly soon, and we won't be  
27419 here tomorrow. But my point is that, again, why are we just  
27420 talking about numbers? Why are we just talking about how  
27421 much we are going to save so we can pay for these tax cuts?  
27422 We should be talking about the quality of service, the  
27423 quality of health care, affordability for people that have to

27424 buy insurance or get insurance. That is what this should be  
27425 about, and it is not. And it really scares me to think that  
27426 the progress that we have made with nursing homes with mostly  
27427 good actors over the years -- it is literally 50 years, if I  
27428 can go back to the 1970s -- is now going to start to  
27429 seriously erode because we don't have an adequate nurse  
27430 staffing ratio.

27431         And if you say, well, we need more nurses, I wouldn't  
27432 argue with that, but, you know, then we should have a better  
27433 program to get more nurse slots and, you know, not have to  
27434 bring so many nurses from overseas, which is what we have  
27435 been doing, as well. We should be making it easier and less  
27436 costly for people to go to nursing school so we have more  
27437 nurses. Now, I understand that is a long-term project which  
27438 I would like to see.

27439         But everything that is being done here with this  
27440 reconciliation is just so terrible. It is the opposite of  
27441 what you say on the Republican side. It is making people  
27442 lose their health insurance, pay more for health care -- for  
27443 insurance, and at the same -- if they can get it, and then at  
27444 the same time now reduce services and, you know, making it  
27445 more difficult to have a safe and healthy environment in  
27446 nursing homes.

27447         I think that our seniors deserve better. We should be  
27448 looking at ways to improving the quality of care, not only at

27449 nursing homes and hospitals, and community health centers,  
27450 providing more access, providing greater services. That is  
27451 what the Democrats have been doing, you know, as long as we  
27452 have been around here, when we were in the majority, and even  
27453 when we weren't, trying to work with you on a bipartisan  
27454 basis to improve health care. And this goes in the opposite  
27455 direction.

27456         So I yield back, Mr. Chairman.

27457         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back, and the chair  
27458 recognizes Mr. Griffith for five minutes to speak on -- the  
27459 gentleman from Virginia for five minutes to speak on the  
27460 amendment.

27461         \*Mr. Griffith. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

27462         My colleague -- and I have no doubt that it is his  
27463 opinion that we are just looking at the money. It is not  
27464 what we are just looking at, at least not for me.

27465         What I worry about, representing a large, rural area in  
27466 Virginia, which is 4 hours to start from D.C. and another 4  
27467 to 4.5 hours to the other end of the district, what I worry  
27468 about when the gentleman from Georgia talks about 80 percent  
27469 of the nursing homes won't be able to meet these standards, I  
27470 worry about losing a fair number of my rural nursing home  
27471 facilities for people who don't want to leave the county that  
27472 they have spent their whole life in, who don't want to go 45  
27473 minutes, an hour, or 2 hours away because their friends and

27474 their neighbors and their church are right there. That is  
27475 what I am worried about, and that is why I really like us  
27476 getting rid of the staffing standard. And if it wasn't a  
27477 part of reconciliation, I would be looking at an independent  
27478 bill, because this is going to hurt the people it is intended  
27479 to help.

27480         Now, I can't speak for -- you know, when you get closer  
27481 up here to northern Virginia -- and they may not be able to  
27482 afford to be right in the heart of the wealthy areas in  
27483 northern Virginia -- but you don't have to go too far out.  
27484 They might be able to make it happen. I can't say, one way  
27485 or the other. But when I look at the data that we have seen  
27486 and that the gentleman from Georgia mentioned, I have to  
27487 worry about those nursing homes.

27488         Now, do we want to maybe come up with a comprehensive  
27489 plan over years to come up with things where we are allowed  
27490 to put -- you know, have more staffing standards outside of  
27491 the house that the children or the nieces and nephews live  
27492 in? And that is authorized in Virginia, but Medicaid doesn't  
27493 pay for that. Well, maybe we should be looking at that. But  
27494 right now I need to take care of the folks who are already in  
27495 the nursing homes. And if we want to do something  
27496 comprehensive later, Mr. Chairman, we can.

27497         But for right now, I think this amendment does harm. I  
27498 don't think it intends to. I think it is intended to do

27499 good. But for my district, with the demographics of my  
27500 district, with the rural lay of the land in my district, this  
27501 amendment hurts the people in the 9th congressional district  
27502 of Virginia, and I urge everybody to help me out and to vote  
27503 no.

27504 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Does anyone  
27505 else -- the gentlelady from Michigan, you were going to  
27506 dinner -- the gentlelady from Virginia -- I think the  
27507 gentlelady from Michigan, you raised your finger first,  
27508 right?

27509 \*Ms. McClellan. She can go first, yes.

27510 \*The Chair. And then I will do --

27511 \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you.

27512 \*The Chair. -- Virginia next.

27513 The gentlelady from Michigan.

27514 \*Mrs. Dingell. Look, I want us to finish by 1:30, so I  
27515 am going to try to be short.

27516 But I think residents deserve the best of care, and yet  
27517 chronic under-staffing continues in nursing homes, and the  
27518 elderly and disabled Americans living in nursing homes have  
27519 suffered as a result. In fact, people have died. And we saw  
27520 too many stories during COVID and coming out of it where  
27521 people have died. Our long-term care system is broken.

27522 Caregiving is the foundation of our economy and allows  
27523 for our work to be possible. I could read to you -- and

27524 would maybe ask if I could put into the record later --  
27525 comments that were submitted to CMS by workers and patients  
27526 that, you know, rolled out of their beds, and fell onto the  
27527 floor, and couldn't get anybody to answer. They weren't  
27528 found until 5:00 a.m. One night a friend was having symptoms  
27529 of a heart attack, there was no aide to come and help them.  
27530 A nursing aide talked about -- I am a shower aide, and there  
27531 is only 2 of us against 95 residents. Hey, this isn't -- we  
27532 need to do something.

27533 Seniors deserve to have -- live with dignity and  
27534 respect. We have a nursing home -- a caregiving crisis. My  
27535 next amendment is also going to talk about that. And I think  
27536 that we need to be thinking about how we protect seniors in  
27537 our country. This is a 10-year savings, and how many people  
27538 are going to die during those 10 years? So we got to work to  
27539 get more caregivers. We have got to work to get more people  
27540 in there, and we have got to address the problem.

27541 With that I will yield back.

27542 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
27543 from -- is there anybody on the Republican side?

27544 The gentlelady from Virginia is recognized for five  
27545 minutes.

27546 \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

27547 I just want to bring back the faces of some of the  
27548 people that are impacted by the lack of sufficient staffing

27549 in rehab facilities, long-term care facilities, nursing home  
27550 facilities. And we have got to do something about it, not 10  
27551 years from now, now. Because people are dying.

27552       You have heard a story after story after story of  
27553 Medicaid recipients here who want to care for family members  
27554 at home and are struggling to do that. And again, I remind  
27555 you, the exploding cost of Medicaid is because of long-term  
27556 care and seniors who are going to end up in long-term care or  
27557 rehab, or the disabled who are in these facilities.

27558       But this is what happens when you don't have sufficient  
27559 staffing. Eddie Bernice Johnson, who was a member of the  
27560 Science Committee last year -- I was so proud to sit across  
27561 from a portrait of her as the first Black woman to chair that  
27562 committee -- did not die because she had spinal surgery. She  
27563 died because she sat in her own urine for God knows how long,  
27564 got an infection, and the infection killed her.

27565       In my district, there is a rehab facility that has been  
27566 in the news lately over issues like inadequate staffing  
27567 leading to inadequate wound care. And it is not just nurses,  
27568 it is the people who work there overnight and help care for  
27569 the folks. And one woman, Cindy Wilson, a constituent of  
27570 mine who is a caregiver for a veteran named John Hill, says  
27571 she came to the facility and had concerns about her loved  
27572 one. He was crying. He was upset. He wanted to get out of  
27573 there so bad. I wanted the same for him because of the lack

27574 of care. Inspectors found that, for multiple reasons, staff  
27575 failed to maintain the call light in a position where  
27576 residents could access it. And so many times when residents  
27577 press the call light, nobody is there to come because they  
27578 are under-staffed, and in other areas they can't get through.

27579         So when my father, who after a breeding -- bleeding,  
27580 metastatic brain tumor was in a rehab facility, I saw his  
27581 mental health decline because of how often he is in his bed,  
27582 pressing the call button, waiting for somebody to take him to  
27583 the bathroom, brush his teeth, do any of the things he was  
27584 used to doing on his own. I watched the same happen to my  
27585 mother when she had to go in memory care.

27586         We can keep kicking the can down the road all we want,  
27587 but this is going to explode as a problem in our Medicaid, in  
27588 our Medicare, and our private insurance -- although most of  
27589 these folks can be covered by Medicaid or Medicare -- if we  
27590 don't do something about it now.

27591         And if the problem is there is not enough people to fill  
27592 these positions, let's address that. This bill does nothing  
27593 to do that. Let's address the fact that many of these  
27594 people, who are caregivers in their own right, don't make  
27595 enough money to pay their own bills or take care of their own  
27596 family. Maybe we need to do something about that. Maybe we  
27597 need to incentivize worker pipeline programs to get more  
27598 people in these jobs -- again, not just nurses, but the care



27599 partners and the people who were there overnight helping take  
27600 people out of their own urine and feces.

27601 That is all we are asking for here. That is all we are  
27602 asking for here. And if this bill doesn't do anything about  
27603 it, we better not kick the can down the road 10 years because  
27604 there will be a lot more Eddie Bernice Johnsons who we are  
27605 mourning the indignity of how such a dignified woman left  
27606 this Earth.

27607 I yield back.

27608 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Is there any  
27609 further discussion?

27610 Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote  
27611 occurs on the amendment. A roll call has been requested.  
27612 The clerk will call the roll.

27613 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

27614 \*Mr. Latta. No.

27615 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

27616 Mr. Griffith?

27617 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

27618 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

27619 Mr. Bilirakis?

27620 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

27621 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

27622 Mr. Hudson?

27623 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

27624           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes no.  
27625           Mr. Carter?  
27626           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   No.  
27627           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter votes no.  
27628           Mr. Palmer?  
27629           \*Mr. Palmer.   No.  
27630           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes no.  
27631           Mr. Dunn?  
27632           \*Mr. Dunn.   No.  
27633           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes no.  
27634           Mr. Crenshaw?  
27635           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
27636           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
27637           Mr. Joyce?  
27638           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
27639           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
27640           Mr. Weber?  
27641           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
27642           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
27643           Mr. Allen?  
27644           [No response.]  
27645           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson?  
27646           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
27647           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
27648           Mr. Fulcher?

27649 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.  
27650 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
27651 Mr. Pfluger?  
27652 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.  
27653 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
27654 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
27655 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.  
27656 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
27657 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
27658 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.  
27659 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
27660 Mrs. Cammack?  
27661 [No response.]  
27662 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?  
27663 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.  
27664 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.  
27665 Mr. James?  
27666 \*Mr. James. No.  
27667 \*The Clerk. Mr. James votes no.  
27668 Mr. Bentz?  
27669 \*Mr. Bentz. No.  
27670 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.  
27671 Mrs. Houchin?  
27672 \*Mrs. Houchin. No.  
27673 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Houchin votes no.

27674 Mr. Fry?  
27675 \*Mr. Fry. No.  
27676 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry votes no.  
27677 Ms. Lee?  
27678 \*Ms. Lee. No.  
27679 \*The Clerk. Ms. Lee votes no.  
27680 Mr. Langworthy?  
27681 \*Mr. Langworthy. No.  
27682 \*The Clerk. Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
27683 Mr. Kean?  
27684 \*Mr. Kean. No.  
27685 \*The Clerk. Mr. Kean votes no.  
27686 Mr. Rulli?  
27687 \*Mr. Rulli. No.  
27688 \*The Clerk. Mr. Rulli votes no.  
27689 Mr. Evans?  
27690 \*Mr. Evans. No.  
27691 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.  
27692 Mr. Goldman?  
27693 \*Mr. Goldman. No.  
27694 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.  
27695 Mrs. Fedorchak?  
27696 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.  
27697 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
27698 Mr. Pallone?

27699 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.  
27700 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
27701 Ms. DeGette?  
27702 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.  
27703 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
27704 Ms. Schakowsky?  
27705 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.  
27706 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
27707 Ms. Matsui?  
27708 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.  
27709 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.  
27710 Ms. Castor?  
27711 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.  
27712 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.  
27713 Mr. Tonko?  
27714 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.  
27715 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.  
27716 Ms. Clarke?  
27717 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.  
27718 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.  
27719 Mr. Ruiz?  
27720 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.  
27721 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.  
27722 Mr. Peters?  
27723 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

27724 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.  
27725 Mrs. Dingell?  
27726 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
27727 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
27728 Mr. Veasey?  
27729 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
27730 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
27731 Ms. Kelly?  
27732 [No response.]  
27733 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan?  
27734 \*Ms. Barragan. Yes.  
27735 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
27736 Mr. Soto?  
27737 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
27738 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
27739 Ms. Schrier?  
27740 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
27741 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
27742 Mrs. Trahan?  
27743 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
27744 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
27745 Mrs. Fletcher?  
27746 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
27747 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
27748 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

27749 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
27750 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
27751 Mr. Auchincloss?  
27752 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
27753 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
27754 Mr. Carter?  
27755 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.  
27756 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter votes aye.  
27757 Mr. Menendez?  
27758 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.  
27759 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
27760 Mr. Mullin?  
27761 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
27762 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
27763 Mr. Landsman?  
27764 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
27765 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
27766 Ms. McClellan?  
27767 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
27768 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
27769 Chairman Guthrie?  
27770 \*The Chair. No.  
27771 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
27772 \*The Chair. Anyone seeking to answer the roll call?  
27773 Mr. Allen --

27774           \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen is not recorded.  
27775           \*Mr. Allen. No.  
27776           \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.  
27777           \*The Chair. Is there anybody on our side?  
27778           The clerk will report.  
27779           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 23  
27780 ayes and 29 noes.  
27781           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.  
27782           Are there any other amendments?  
27783           The gentlelady from Michigan, for what purpose do you  
27784 week to be recognized?  
27785           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I have an  
27786 amendment at the desk labeled Health\_228.  
27787           \*The Chair. Does the desk have the amendment?  
27788           \*The Clerk. Can you repeat the number?  
27789           \*Mrs. Dingell. Two two eight, the HCBS. Do you have  
27790 it?  
27791           \*The Chair. Would you repeat it again? I am sorry,  
27792 Mrs. Dingell, would you --  
27793           \*Mrs. Dingell. Health\_228, ensuring HCBS services.  
27794           [Pause.]  
27795           \*Voice. It is not 228.  
27796           \*Voice. She keeps saying 228.  
27797           \*The Chair. Have we got the right number?  
27798           \*Mrs. Dingell. Sixty-six. They changed the number,



27799       sorry.

27800           \*The Chair.   Okay.   Route 66.   That doesn't go through  
27801   Detroit.

27802           [Laughter.]

27803           \*The Chair.   I am sorry, my mike is on, I apologize.

27804           \*The Clerk.   Amendment offered by Mrs. Dingell.   At the  
27805   end of the --

27806           \*The Chair.   The clerk will report.

27807           \*The Clerk.   Amendment offered by Mrs. Dingell.   At the  
27808   end of the following new section --

27809           \*The Chair.   Without objection, the reading of the  
27810   amendment is dispensed with.

27811           [The amendment of Mrs. Dingell follows:]

27812

27813       \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

27814

27815           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady from Michigan is  
27816 recognized for five minutes in support of the amendment.

27817           \*Mrs. Dingell. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

27818           My amendment -- look, we all need to accept that -- I  
27819 accept it, and my colleagues over here -- long-term care is  
27820 broken in this country. And you don't understand it until  
27821 somebody you love is in it. And we are luckier than 99 and  
27822 9/10 of the people in this country. And when you can't --  
27823 when we can't make a broken, fractured system work, you know  
27824 we are -- we got a problem.

27825           My amendment assures that home and community-based  
27826 services would not be cut or reduced under current laws.  
27827 This amendment matters because with the impending cut and  
27828 changes we are seeing, we have to ensure that the law the  
27829 Republicans are offering isn't going to make any patients'  
27830 lives worse.

27831           This is an issue I have been fighting for since I first  
27832 got myself into the long-term care system taking care of a  
27833 man that I loved, and I was lucky enough to be able to keep  
27834 him at home -- that he was able to stay at home and function  
27835 and be there and get the support he wants.

27836           We know that the majority of elderly people and  
27837 individuals with disabilities would prefer to receive care in  
27838 their homes, where they can maintain an independent life and  
27839 remain engaged in their communities. No one should have to

27840 sit for years on a waiting list to get the care that they  
27841 deserve, and caregivers shouldn't have to live in poverty to  
27842 do their critical work.

27843 In the past reconciliation bill I fought to strengthen  
27844 long-term care for nearly one million Americans on the HCB  
27845 [sic] waiting list.

27846 You know, and the fact of the matter is home care is  
27847 cheaper than long-term care in an institution. We need to  
27848 prioritize robust investments to improve our broken care  
27849 system by clearing waiting lists, ensuring more people can  
27850 access home care, strengthening wages, and giving support to  
27851 home care workers. I had one home care worker that was  
27852 working several jobs at the same time, working seven days a  
27853 week, and was still below the poverty line, and I paid a  
27854 decent wage.

27855 My amendment would not impose stricter eligibility  
27856 standards, methodologies, or procedures for HCBS programs and  
27857 services than were in place, are in place, and preserve  
27858 covered HCBS, including the services themselves and the  
27859 amount and duration.

27860 Finally, it would also maintain HCBS provider payments  
27861 at a rate no less than those in place as of April 1, 2025.

27862 Thank you, Mr. Chair, and I yield back.

27863 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
27864 from Georgia seeks recognition to speak on the -- he is

27865 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

27866 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. I ask to strike the last word.

27867 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

27868 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my  
27869 colleague's interest in home and community-based services.  
27870 Access to care for Medicaid beneficiaries like home and  
27871 community-based services is linked to the cost of the  
27872 program.

27873 This isn't just theoretical. HCBS services are optional  
27874 for states to provide, so when waste, fraud, and abuse crowd  
27875 out spending, our most vulnerable suffer. It has been kind  
27876 of theme of what we have been trying to say here. We are  
27877 trying to save money through waste, fraud, and abuse so that  
27878 we can save Medicaid, so that we can sustain it, so that we  
27879 can stabilize it for future generations for the most  
27880 vulnerable in our society.

27881 So when waste, fraud, and abuse crowd out spending, our  
27882 most vulnerable suffer. Our policies focus on reducing fraud  
27883 and removing eligible beneficiaries, ensuring able-bodied  
27884 adults are engaging with their community, and ending coverage  
27885 for people who do not -- or who are in this country  
27886 illegally.

27887 We have also been focused on restoring the integrity of  
27888 Federal-state Medicaid financing through reform to provider  
27889 taxes and directed payments. But what we do this -- but what

27890 -- we do this in a way that grandfathers in these changes.  
27891 These aren't cuts to benefits or funding. By strengthening  
27892 and sustaining the Medicaid program in these ways, states can  
27893 devote more resources to home and community-based services in  
27894 our nation's most vulnerable populations.

27895 Again, this is what we are trying to achieve here, to  
27896 stabilize this, to secure it, to save it. And that is why I  
27897 oppose this amendment.

27898 And I yield back.

27899 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there  
27900 anybody seeking to -- the gentleman from Louisiana is  
27901 recognized to speak on the amendment.

27902 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I  
27903 move to strike the last word.

27904 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

27905 [Pause.]

27906 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

27907 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Oh, I am sorry.

27908 I want to thank my colleague for offering this very,  
27909 very important amendment.

27910 Under Republicans' budget reconciliation bill, this  
27911 committee is being forced to make cuts to Medicaid that will  
27912 hurt millions of children and adults with disabilities who  
27913 rely on Medicaid's home and community-based services program.  
27914 Republicans say these cuts won't impact people with

27915 disabilities, but that is exactly what they are doing. There  
27916 is no way to protect people with disabilities from hundreds  
27917 of billions of dollars in cuts to Medicaid.

27918         On behalf of -- over half of Medicaid spending goes  
27919 toward people who are eligible for Medicaid because of old  
27920 age or disability. In fact, people with Medicaid have  
27921 disabilities -- qualify because of eligibility pathways like  
27922 Medicaid expansion established by the Affordable Care Act,  
27923 not through disability pathways. Yet Republicans on the  
27924 committee are falsely referring to this eligibility group as  
27925 able-bodied while spewing false narratives about fraud,  
27926 waste, and abuse.

27927         Medicaid is the reason that people with disabilities can  
27928 have access to home and community-based services that are not  
27929 -- that allow them to live in their homes and communities  
27930 with the support they need, including bathing, medication  
27931 management, and food preparation. In Louisiana, in my state,  
27932 over 11,400 people are on the waiting list for Medicaid home  
27933 and community-based services. Under this proposal that  
27934 number will continue to grow. Home and community-based  
27935 services are exactly the type of services that no other payer  
27936 typically covers and will be cut if Republicans gut Medicaid  
27937 funding.

27938         Let's be clear. Let's be clear about this. These are  
27939 people's lives.

27940 [Slide]

27941 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Mr. Chairman, I want to  
27942 remind you that we were joined yesterday and again joined  
27943 today. We have Connor and Katie here with us. Corey and  
27944 Cooper hopefully are getting some rest, but we know that  
27945 Connor is a trooper and Katie is a trooper.

27946 And we thank you for your courage. We will continue to  
27947 fight for you and so many others that are similarly situated  
27948 because we believe in you. And just know this. While Connor  
27949 may not be able to fight for himself, he has got a fighting  
27950 mom, and a fighting dad, and a fighting brother, and a  
27951 fighting Members of Congress -- at least on this side of the  
27952 aisle. Hopefully we will get more on the other side of the  
27953 aisle to recognize that these cuts have faces and they  
27954 matter.

27955 I yield back.

27956 \*The Chair. Thank you.

27957 [Applause.]

27958 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. And the  
27959 committee welcomes our guests today.

27960 Is there anybody seeking further recognition? Is  
27961 anybody seeking recognition on the bill?

27962 Seeing none on the Republican side, Mr. Pallone, the  
27963 gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking member, is recognized  
27964 for five minutes on the bill.

27965           \*Mr. Pallone. I just want to also indicate my support  
27966 for this.

27967           I know that, Mrs. Dingell -- or the gentlewoman from  
27968 Michigan, I guess I should say -- has been working on, you  
27969 know, home-based care or home-based services for a long time,  
27970 as well as trying to find solutions for long-term care, you  
27971 know, so that it is not -- you don't have to spend down and  
27972 -- you know, there are so many problems with being able to  
27973 pay for nursing homes, you know, the way it works where you  
27974 have Medicare coverage and then you go on Medicaid after a  
27975 month or so.

27976           But I do think that, you know, if I listen to what the  
27977 gentleman from Georgia said, Mr. Carter, the bottom line is  
27978 that you are making a statement that, you know, money should  
27979 be available to the states, you know, that whatever you are  
27980 doing is not going to make all these cuts or make it possible  
27981 for states to, you know, to continue services. So I don't  
27982 see any reason how -- why you shouldn't say that a  
27983 maintenance of effort with regard to these home-based  
27984 services can't be mandated under this legislation if, in  
27985 fact, what you are saying is true, which is that you think  
27986 the states will be able to continue to provide services  
27987 because of the way you are handling the program. I doubt  
27988 that, but if they -- if you say that that is true, then there  
27989 is no reason not to provide some sort of maintenance of



27990 effort the way Mrs. Dingell has described.

27991           And so I think this is an important amendment, and I  
27992 would support it and ask everyone to support on both sides of  
27993 the aisle.

27994           I yield to Mr. Tonko.

27995           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you, Mr. Pallone. I rise in support  
27996 of this amendment.

27997           What we are dealing with in this bill through provisions  
27998 like the provider tax and FMAP cuts to New York are a  
27999 straightforward cut of hundreds of billions of dollars to  
28000 states to run their Medicaid programs, a pure and simple cut.  
28001 There is no amount of spin that can get you away from the  
28002 fact that this bill would cut hundreds of billions of dollars  
28003 out of state Medicaid programs.

28004           And despite what my colleagues say, there are no  
28005 protections or guarantees that this massive cut won't harm  
28006 care for those they deem to be the deserving Medicaid  
28007 beneficiaries: those in nursing homes, pregnant moms, those  
28008 with disabilities. That would include programs like home and  
28009 community-based services. In the years to come, as states  
28010 grapple with this massive cut that Republicans in this room  
28011 have gifted them, they will have to respond in one of three  
28012 ways: cutting Medicaid benefits, kicking people off the  
28013 program altogether, or raising taxes. That is it. Those are  
28014 the choices that our colleagues are going to force states to

28015 make.

28016 I would be happy to yield to any of my colleagues who  
28017 want to tell me which choice they would make.

28018 No takers? I didn't think so.

28019 When states have to make these massive cuts to their  
28020 Medicaid programs, where do you think they are going to look  
28021 first? To the most expensive patients: the elderly, the  
28022 sick, and the disabled. You know, and that is home and  
28023 community-based services.

28024 So I think, you know, that the very people that my  
28025 Republican colleagues claim they are trying to protect are  
28026 those individuals I just listed. And so to my colleagues on  
28027 the other side of the aisle, don't try to tell me that you  
28028 are protecting Medicaid for those that deserve it. It is  
28029 just not true. These impossible choices that you are forcing  
28030 on states with this abomination of a bill will result in a  
28031 worse system for everyone, and you will own that.

28032 And I urge all of my colleagues to support this  
28033 amendment and stop the assault on Medicaid.

28034 And with that, Mr. Chair, I yield back.

28035 \*The Chair. The gentleman from New Jersey controls the  
28036 time.

28037 \*Mr. Pallone. Yes, I will yield back. I don't think  
28038 anybody else wants my time, so I yield back, Mr. --

28039 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any

28040 other seeking recognition?

28041       Seeing none, if there is no further discussion, the vote  
28042 occurs on the amendment. A roll call vote has been  
28043 requested, and the clerk will call the roll.

28044       \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

28045       \*Mr. Latta. No.

28046       \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

28047       Mr. Griffith?

28048       \*Mr. Griffith. No.

28049       \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

28050       Mr. Bilirakis?

28051       \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

28052       \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

28053       Mr. Hudson?

28054       \*Mr. Hudson. No.

28055       \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

28056       Mr. Carter of Georgia?

28057       \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

28058       \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

28059       Mr. Palmer?

28060       [No response.]

28061       \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?

28062       \*Mr. Dunn. No.

28063       \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

28064       Mr. Crenshaw?

28065           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   No.  
28066           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
28067           Mr. Joyce?  
28068           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
28069           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes no.  
28070           Mr. Weber?  
28071           \*Mr. Weber.   No.  
28072           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes no.  
28073           Mr. Allen?  
28074           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
28075           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
28076           Mr. Balderson?  
28077           \*Mr. Balderson.   No.  
28078           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes no.  
28079           Mr. Fulcher?  
28080           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Fulcher is no.  
28081           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes no.  
28082           Mr. Pfluger?  
28083           \*Mr. Pfluger.   No.  
28084           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes no.  
28085           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
28086           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   No.  
28087           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
28088           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
28089           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   No.

28090           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.  
28091           Mrs. Cammack?  
28092           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.  
28093           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.  
28094           Mr. Oubernolte?  
28095           \*Mr. Oubernolte.   No.  
28096           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
28097           Mr. James?  
28098           \*Mr. James.   No.  
28099           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
28100           Mr. Bentz?  
28101           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
28102           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
28103           Mrs. Houchin?  
28104           [No response.]  
28105           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry?  
28106           [No response.]  
28107           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee?  
28108           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
28109           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
28110           Mr. Langworthy?  
28111           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
28112           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
28113           Mr. Kean?  
28114           \*Mr. Kean.   No.

28115           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
28116           Mr. Rulli?  
28117           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
28118           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
28119           Mr. Evans?  
28120           \*Mr. Evans.   No.  
28121           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes no.  
28122           Mr. Goldman?  
28123           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
28124           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
28125           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
28126           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
28127           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
28128           Mr. Pallone?  
28129           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
28130           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.  
28131           Ms. DeGette?  
28132           \*Ms. DeGette.   Aye.  
28133           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes aye.  
28134           Ms. Schakowsky?  
28135           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   Aye.  
28136           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.  
28137           Ms. Matsui?  
28138           \*Ms. Matsui.   Aye.  
28139           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes aye.

28140 Ms. Castor?

28141 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

28142 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

28143 Mr. Tonko?

28144 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.

28145 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

28146 Ms. Clarke?

28147 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

28148 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

28149 Mr. Ruiz?

28150 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.

28151 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.

28152 Mr. Peters?

28153 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

28154 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

28155 Mrs. Dingell?

28156 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.

28157 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

28158 Mr. Veasey?

28159 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

28160 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

28161 Ms. Kelly?

28162 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

28163 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

28164 Ms. Barragan?

28165           \*Ms. Barragan.   Aye.  
28166           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
28167           Mr. Soto?  
28168           \*Mr. Soto.    Aye.  
28169           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Soto votes aye.  
28170           Ms. Schrier?  
28171           \*Ms. Schrier.   Aye.  
28172           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
28173           Mrs. Trahan?  
28174           \*Mrs. Trahan.   Aye.  
28175           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
28176           Mrs. Fletcher?  
28177           \*Mrs. Fletcher.   Aye.  
28178           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
28179           Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
28180           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.  
28181           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.  
28182           Mr. Auchincloss?  
28183           \*Mr. Auchincloss.   Aye.  
28184           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
28185           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
28186           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana.   Yes.  
28187           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.  
28188           Mr. Menendez?  
28189           \*Mr. Menendez.   Aye.



28190           \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.  
28191           Mr. Mullin?  
28192           \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.  
28193           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.  
28194           Mr. Landsman?  
28195           \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.  
28196           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.  
28197           Ms. McClellan?  
28198           \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.  
28199           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.  
28200           Chairman Guthrie?  
28201           \*The Chair. No.  
28202           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.  
28203           \*The Chair. Is anyone seeking recognition for -- the  
28204 gentleman from Alabama.  
28205           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer is not recorded.  
28206           \*Mr. Palmer. Palmer votes no.  
28207           \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.  
28208           \*The Chair. Okay, anyone else on the Democrat side that  
28209 hasn't called the order?  
28210           Seeing none, the clerk will report.  
28211           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were  
28212 24 ayes and 28 noes.  
28213           \*The Chair. The amendment is not agreed to.  
28214           Are there any other amendments?

28215           \*Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the  
28216 desk.

28217           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized. The chairman  
28218 has amendment -- he has amendment -- please state the  
28219 amendment.

28220           \*Mr. Ruiz. It is Health-FCD-AMD No. 212.

28221           \*The Chair. The clerk will report.

28222           \*The Clerk. Health-FCD --

28223           \*The Chair. Without objection, the reading of the  
28224 amendment is dispensed with.

28225           [The amendment of Mr. Ruiz follows:]

28226

28227           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

28228

28229           \*The Chair. And the gentleman is recognized for five  
28230 minutes in support of the amendment.

28231           \*Mr. Ruiz. Mr. Chairman, the amendment would require  
28232 the Congressional Budget Office to certify that this bill  
28233 will not worsen consumer medical debt before going into  
28234 effect.

28235           Medical debt can be a crushing financial burden on  
28236 American families with dire consequences financially,  
28237 emotionally, and mentally. Families with lower incomes, the  
28238 disabled, and those with chronic medical conditions are the  
28239 most likely to experience medical debt. But medical debt can  
28240 affect everyone, even the relatively healthy and the insured.

28241           Major illnesses and accidents can cause medical bills to  
28242 pile up quicker than folks can imagine. According to the  
28243 Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, 100 million Americans  
28244 owe \$220 billion in medical debt. And according to another  
28245 survey, 66.5 percent of all bankruptcies had a medical cause.  
28246 According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, approximately 20.4  
28247 million Americans had medical debt in 2021. Out of the 20  
28248 million who owe medical debt, about 11 million owe more than  
28249 \$2,000.

28250           Thanks to the Affordable Care Act and the expansion  
28251 subsidies included in the Inflation Reduction Act, more  
28252 Americans have health coverage today than ever before.  
28253 Studies show that the ACA is making a real difference.

28254 According to one study published by the National Bureau of  
28255 Economic Research, the ACA has reduced medical debt among  
28256 Medicaid expansion enrollees by about 600 to \$1,000 per year.  
28257 These reductions in medical debt make it more likely that  
28258 Americans can get the care that they need when they need it.

28259         The ACA is having a real impact in reducing the burden  
28260 of medical debt on American families, but we still need to do  
28261 more. Even with the ACA, too many families are continuing to  
28262 struggle with the financial burden of medical care, and high  
28263 health care costs and affordability continue to be a  
28264 challenge for consumers. This is creating a significant  
28265 financial burden, and preventing some families from getting  
28266 the necessary medical care. More than 40 percent of American  
28267 adults say they have either delayed or forgone medical care  
28268 because of high costs, and half of adults have reported  
28269 difficulty affording health care.

28270         Unfortunately, this bill moves us in the wrong  
28271 direction, and rips health coverage from millions of  
28272 Americans. It takes away coverage from individuals enrolled  
28273 in Medicaid and the ACA, which has helped low-income families  
28274 reduce their medical debt. It reduces financial assistance  
28275 for working American families to purchase health insurance.  
28276 It makes health coverage more expensive for all Americans,  
28277 and it will increase the ranks of the uninsured, resulting in  
28278 more families struggling with medical debt. And it makes

28279 coverage less generous and raises out-of-pocket costs, which  
28280 will result in more Americans ending up in bankruptcy court,  
28281 and more people going into medical debt.

28282         So it is particularly galling -- is that while many low  
28283 and middle-income Americans will be facing skyrocketing costs  
28284 and possibly bankruptcy court, this bill provides tax breaks  
28285 for the wealthiest individuals and corporations. If this  
28286 bill passes, less people will have health coverage and be at  
28287 a higher risk of experiencing medical debt.

28288         This bill is a bad deal for working American families.  
28289 It will make us sicker and less economically secure. And I  
28290 urge my colleagues to vote for this important amendment.

28291         Thank you, and I yield back the rest of my time.

28292         \*The Chair. Is there further discussion on the  
28293 amendment?

28294         Well, if there is further discussion, we are going to  
28295 probably have to recess and come back after votes, so --

28296         Okay, so -- yes, so since there is further discussion --  
28297 I thought there weren't any and we could go ahead and vote  
28298 this, but since there is further discussion, the committee  
28299 will stand in recess until 15 minutes after the last vote on  
28300 the floor is called.

28301         The committee is in recess.

28302         [Recess.]

28303         \*The Chair. The committee will come to order.

28304           I believe when we left, we were on the amendments and  
28305   the gentleman from New Jersey, the ranking member, was about  
28306   to be recognized to speak, and so the gentleman is  
28307   recognized.

28308           \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I just wanted  
28309   to say that I do think that this amendment by Dr. Ruiz about  
28310   the -- or the gentleman from California about a medical debt  
28311   is important.

28312           You know, you have heard me speak over the last 24 hours  
28313   or so about the issue of affordability and my concern that  
28314   the reconciliation act that is before us today will actually  
28315   increase costs for many Americans. Either they, you know,  
28316   lose their health insurance and they have to pay more for  
28317   that, if they can even get it, or they have to have copays  
28318   when they go see a doctor. We talked about the nursing  
28319   homes.

28320           But in the middle of all this is the issue of medical  
28321   debt, which hasn't got, I think, as much attention in this  
28322   committee and in the House as it should because the  
28323   consequence, of course, of things becoming less affordable  
28324   and not having health insurance is that you, you know, rack  
28325   up, whatever the word is, medical debt. And you -- you know,  
28326   people can't pay the deductibles, they can't pay the co-  
28327   insurance, or they have no insurance, and they just, you  
28328   know, go to the emergency room and then they get a bill.

28329 Many people don't pay it, but it still goes down as medical  
28330 debt.

28331 And I just think that the effort to reduce medical debt,  
28332 to try to erase medical debt, if possible, all that is really  
28333 important in the context of the issue of affordability. And  
28334 actually, Mr. -- Dr. Ruiz mentioned specifically the Consumer  
28335 Financial Protection Bureau and the report that they put out.

28336 And I would point out that -- you know, the President's  
28337 efforts to essentially abolish the Consumer Financial  
28338 Protection Bureau and fire everybody, which -- some of us  
28339 were actually at that event. If you remember, the  
28340 gentlewoman from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, we were there that  
28341 day across from the White House when there was a  
28342 demonstration, because all of the people that worked at the  
28343 agency or at the Bureau were actually given pink slips and  
28344 were told not to come to work.

28345 And so I only highlight that, again, because that was an  
28346 agency that actually was trying to avoid the medical debt  
28347 problem, and actually did a report -- if I am not mistaken,  
28348 Dr. Ruiz -- about the problem with medical debt that you  
28349 cited, and now we don't even have that, right? Or maybe we  
28350 do in some form, but it seems to be crippled to a large  
28351 extent.

28352 So I think this amendment which basically strikes --  
28353 basically says that this title shall not go into effect if it

28354 has the effect of increasing medical debt for consumers  
28355 should be supported by all of us. The Republicans say that  
28356 there is not going to be increased costs, and that people are  
28357 not going to be kicked off their health insurance. I don't  
28358 believe that. But if they do believe it, again, why not say  
28359 that we are not going to let this title go into effect if it  
28360 has the effect of increasing medical debt, because that is a  
28361 major problem for so many people.

28362 And with that, unless someone else wants my time, I will  
28363 yield back the balance of my time.

28364 \*The Chair. Is there further discussion on the  
28365 amendment?

28366 Seeing none, then the --

28367 \*Mr. Pallone. Yes, we --

28368 \*The Chair. The roll call has been asked for. If there  
28369 is no further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment.  
28370 The roll call has been requested, and the clerk will call the  
28371 roll.

28372 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

28373 \*Mr. Latta. No.

28374 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

28375 Mr. Griffith?

28376 \*Mr. Griffith. I will vote no.

28377 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

28378 Mr. Bilirakis?



28379 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.  
28380 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.  
28381 Mr. Hudson?  
28382 [No response.]  
28383 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
28384 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.  
28385 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.  
28386 Mr. Palmer?  
28387 [No response.]  
28388 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn?  
28389 \*Mr. Dunn. No.  
28390 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.  
28391 Mr. Crenshaw?  
28392 \*Mr. Crenshaw. No.  
28393 \*The Clerk. Mr. Crenshaw votes no.  
28394 Mr. Joyce?  
28395 [No response.]  
28396 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber?  
28397 \*Mr. Weber. No.  
28398 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.  
28399 Mr. Allen?  
28400 [No response.]  
28401 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson?  
28402 \*Mr. Balderson. No.  
28403 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

28404 Mr. Fulcher?

28405 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.

28406 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

28407 Mr. Pfluger?

28408 \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

28409 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

28410 Mrs. Harshbarger?

28411 [No response.]

28412 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

28413 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

28414 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

28415 Mrs. Cammack?

28416 \*Mrs. Cammack. No.

28417 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes no.

28418 Mr. Obernolte?

28419 \*Mr. Obernolte. No.

28420 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes no.

28421 Mr. James?

28422 [No response.]

28423 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz?

28424 \*Mr. Bentz. No.

28425 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bentz votes no.

28426 Mrs. Houchin?

28427 [No response.]

28428 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fry?

28429           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
28430           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
28431           Ms. Lee?  
28432           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
28433           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
28434           Mr. Langworthy?  
28435           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
28436           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
28437           Mr. Kean?  
28438           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
28439           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
28440           Mr. Rulli?  
28441           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
28442           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.  
28443           Mr. Evans?  
28444           [No response.]  
28445           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman?  
28446           \*Mr. Goldman.   No.  
28447           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes no.  
28448           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
28449           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   No.  
28450           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.  
28451           Mr. Pallone?  
28452           \*Mr. Pallone.   Aye.  
28453           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes aye.

28454 Ms. DeGette?

28455 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.

28456 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

28457 Ms. Schakowsky?

28458 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

28459 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

28460 Ms. Matsui?

28461 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.

28462 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.

28463 Ms. Castor?

28464 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

28465 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

28466 Mr. Tonko?

28467 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.

28468 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

28469 Ms. Clarke?

28470 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

28471 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

28472 Mr. Ruiz?

28473 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.

28474 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.

28475 Mr. Peters?

28476 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

28477 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

28478 Mrs. Dingell?

28479 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.  
28480 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.  
28481 Mr. Veasey?  
28482 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.  
28483 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.  
28484 Ms. Kelly?  
28485 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.  
28486 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.  
28487 Ms. Barragan?  
28488 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
28489 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
28490 Mr. Soto?  
28491 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
28492 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
28493 Ms. Schrier?  
28494 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
28495 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
28496 Mrs. Trahan?  
28497 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
28498 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
28499 Mrs. Fletcher?  
28500 [No response.]  
28501 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher?  
28502 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
28503 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.

28504 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

28505 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.

28506 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes aye.

28507 Mr. Auchincloss?

28508 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.

28509 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.

28510 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

28511 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Aye.

28512 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

28513 Mr. Menendez?

28514 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

28515 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

28516 Mr. Mullin?

28517 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

28518 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

28519 Mr. Landsman?

28520 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

28521 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

28522 Ms. McClellan?

28523 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

28524 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

28525 Chairman Guthrie?

28526 \*The Chair. No.

28527 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

28528 \*The Chair. How is Mr. Allen recorded?

28529           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen is not recorded.  
28530           \*Mr. Allen.   No.  
28531           \*The Chair.   Dr. Joyce?  
28532           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes no.  
28533           Dr. Joyce is not recorded.  
28534           \*Mr. Joyce.   No.  
28535           \*The Chair.   Mrs. Houchin?  
28536           \*The Clerk.   Dr. Joyce votes no.  
28537           \*The Chair.   Mrs. Houchin?  
28538           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin is not recorded.  
28539           \*Mr. James.   Mr. Chairman, how is James recorded?  
28540           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
28541           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
28542           \*The Chair.   Mr. James?  
28543           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James --  
28544           \*Mr. James.   Mr. James votes no.  
28545           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes no.  
28546           \*The Chair.   On the Democrat side?  
28547           Oh, Mrs. Harshbarger, how is she recorded?  
28548           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger is not recorded.  
28549           Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.  
28550           \*The Chair.   How is Mrs. Houchin recorded?  
28551           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin recorded as no.  
28552           \*The Chair.   Okay.   Is anyone on the Democrat side here?  
28553   Everybody was -- yes, we are all in our places.

28554           So the clerk will call the roll.

28555           \*The Clerk.   Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were  
28556   24 ayes and 27 noes.

28557           \*The Chair.   The agreement is not -- the amendment is  
28558   not -- agreement -- the amendment is not agreed to.

28559           So are there -- for what purpose does the gentlelady  
28560   from Florida seek recognition?

28561           \*Ms. Castor.   I have an amendment at the desk.   It is  
28562   Health-FCD-AMD\_126.

28563           \*The Chair.   The clerk will report.

28564           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, could the gentlelady please  
28565   repeat the amendment?

28566           \*Ms. Castor.   One two six.

28567           \*The Clerk.   Thank you.   Health --

28568           \*The Chair.   The clerk will report.

28569           \*The Clerk.   -- FCD-AMD\_ --

28570           \*The Chair.   Without objection, the reading of the  
28571   amendment is dispensed with.

28572           [The amendment of Ms. Castor follows:]

28573

28574   \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

28575



28576           \*The Chair. And the gentlelady is recognized for five  
28577 minutes in support of the amendment.

28578           \*Ms. Castor. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

28579           This amendment says that none of the provisions of this  
28580 title shall take effect if any of the provisions result in  
28581 reduced access to coverage under the health title.

28582           And as we bring this debate in for a landing today, I  
28583 want to say to my Democratic colleagues, I am so proud to  
28584 stand with you. You are eloquent and fearless.

28585           And to Chairman Guthrie and my Republican colleagues, I  
28586 want to thank you. I appreciate your respectful tenor of the  
28587 debate.

28588           But we have learned a lot since the Republicans sprung  
28589 this cruel and costly tax and spending package on Americans  
28590 late in the dark of night -- on Mother's Day, no less --  
28591 rushing it to committee without a hearing, shrouding the  
28592 health care debate, starting that at 1:00 a.m. in the middle  
28593 of the night.

28594           But here is what we know. Almost 14 million Americans  
28595 will lose their health coverage to give the richest Americans  
28596 a large, permanent tax cut while working families will see  
28597 eventual tax increases.

28598           They are going to add \$5 trillion to the debt. It is  
28599 fiscally irresponsible, and it is morally wrong.

28600           Fourteen million Americans -- that is the combined

28601 population of the States of Kentucky and Virginia -- some of  
28602 the largest healthcare cuts ever proposed in American  
28603 history, harming not just our neighbors, but providers,  
28604 doctors, nurses, hospitals, therapists who provide care. So  
28605 this is going to impact all Americans.

28606         Here is how. They are going to bury people in costly  
28607 paperwork. You slip up? No care. You are going to make it  
28608 harder to enroll. No care. They are going to shrink the  
28609 enrollment periods. No care. They are going to choke off  
28610 the ability of states and providers to fund care. So no care  
28611 there, either. They are going to raise premiums and price  
28612 people out so they lose care. Eligible parents and families  
28613 will be forced to jump through hoops, when instead they  
28614 should be focused on setting their kids up for success in  
28615 life. It will be harder for families to access long-term  
28616 care or stay in their homes and live in dignity.

28617         Now, at the outset of our hearing that began over 24  
28618 hours ago, we -- the Democrats highlighted folks back home  
28619 who rely on Medicare or Medicaid. And the Republicans  
28620 protested. They said none of those people are going to lose  
28621 their health care. Well, here is what we know. The non-  
28622 partisan, independent CPO -- CBO says 14 million Americans  
28623 will lose care.

28624         And why will not -- why won't people believe what the  
28625 Republicans are saying? It is because the Republicans have a

28626 track record of opposing affordable health care, while  
28627 Democrats have championed health, the health of our  
28628 neighbors. We do not believe that you should be bankrupt if  
28629 you get a diagnosis. This is smart policy. We want people  
28630 to be productive and healthy. In fact, you can go all the  
28631 way back to the 1960s, when it was a Democratic president and  
28632 a Democratic Congress who originally passed Medicaid and  
28633 Medicare into law, or maybe something more in the modern era,  
28634 2010, when a Democratic president and a Democratic Congress,  
28635 as the rolls of the uninsured reached 25 percent in the State  
28636 of Florida, we passed the Affordable Care Act to outlaw  
28637 discrimination for pre-existing conditions.

28638         We passed a law that said kids can stay on their  
28639 parents' plan until age 26. We expanded Medicaid: 21  
28640 million Americans now have health coverage because of  
28641 Medicaid expansion. That ultimately cut the uninsured rate  
28642 in half. We are now at a historic low in the number of  
28643 uninsured. We were constraining spending. But see, the  
28644 Republicans have a track record because they fought it every  
28645 step of the way. There wasn't one Republican vote for the  
28646 Affordable Care Act.

28647         And then go to 2017, the first Trump Administration.  
28648 Republicans in this committee fought to repeal the ACA.  
28649 Contrast that to the Democratic record. We passed the  
28650 Inflation Reduction Act, key reforms to lower health care

28651 costs, direct Medicare to negotiate prices for the highest  
28652 cost drugs. We capped the price of insulin at \$35, a \$2,000  
28653 cap for everyone on Medicare, and enhance premium tax  
28654 credits. The track record, again, not one GOP vote here. In  
28655 2021, in the midst of a maternal mortality crisis, we gave  
28656 states a new option to provide Medicaid postpartum coverage.

28657         In 2025 now, here at the outset of this Congress,  
28658 Republicans are turning a blind eye. They are going down the  
28659 same old path to rip health coverage away.

28660         It doesn't have to be like this. People in America  
28661 deserve affordable, reliable care, and that is what we intend  
28662 to fight for from this day forward. No matter if you pass  
28663 this bill out of this committee, we are not going to give up.  
28664 We are going to stand up for our neighbors back home, see  
28665 them, see them, listen to them, empower them, support them.

28666         Don't rip away their coverage to fund a massive tax  
28667 giveaway for the wealthy.

28668         \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time has expired.

28669         \*Ms. Castor. I yield back my time.

28670         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The chair will  
28671 now recognize himself to speak on the amendment.

28672         So the American people need to know what my Democrat  
28673 colleagues are prioritizing. When they say they are against  
28674 any coverage loss, what they are saying -- really saying is  
28675 4.88 million people who refuse to work a part-time job or

28676 volunteer in their communities are entitled to free health  
28677 care paid for by hard-working taxpayers. When they say they  
28678 are against any coverage loss, what they are really saying is  
28679 that the 1.4 million illegals who are a drain on our health  
28680 care system should be prioritized over U.S. citizens. And  
28681 when they say they are against coverage loss, what they are  
28682 really saying is that people who aren't actually eligible for  
28683 Medicaid should be prioritized over children, mothers, or  
28684 people with disabilities who this program was designed for.

28685 Let's be honest about who we are fighting for here  
28686 today. House Republicans are fighting for America's  
28687 children. We are fighting for pregnant women and mothers.  
28688 We are fighting for individuals with disabilities, and we are  
28689 fighting for the seniors who need long-term care. We believe  
28690 this is who Medicaid is intended for, not illegal immigrants,  
28691 not able-bodied adults who choose not to work. Not people  
28692 fraudulently enrolled. We want to root out the waste, fraud,  
28693 and abuse in the system, and make Medicaid stronger and more  
28694 secure for generations to come.

28695 And I will yield back, and we will recognize the ranking  
28696 member for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

28697 \*Mr. Pallone. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, I  
28698 think there is a fundamental disagreement here about what  
28699 this bill does.

28700 It is clear to me that, contrary to what you say, this

28701 this is very much like the Georgia situation, and that is  
28702 that you have a group of people -- in the case of Georgia I  
28703 think it was about 400,000 Georgians -- and you had, like,  
28704 something like 5,000 of them that ended up being covered by  
28705 Medicaid with all this red tape that you put forth in this  
28706 bill.

28707         Now you say, well, only those 4,000, you know, probably  
28708 were eligible. And I would say no, I think the 400,000 were  
28709 eligible, but the problem was you put so many roadblocks in  
28710 their way -- or not in this case, in the case of Georgia --  
28711 but so many roadblocks in their way and spent so much of an  
28712 effort not on providing them health care, but rather on  
28713 making sure that they weren't able to get health care.

28714         Now, I am not trying to say there is anything  
28715 intentional here. I don't want to go -- I don't want you to  
28716 get the wrong impression. The fact of the matter is that if  
28717 you put together a system which is in this bill, where people  
28718 have to constantly face all kinds of red tape in order to,  
28719 you know, get their health insurance under Medicaid, you  
28720 know, to the tune of having to file papers every month if the  
28721 state decides to do that, and then say, oh, don't worry,  
28722 there are all these exceptions, you know, if you are  
28723 pregnant, you are an exception, if you are disabled, you are  
28724 an exception -- but again, it goes back to the situation like  
28725 that in Georgia, where people couldn't qualify, they couldn't

28726 show that they qualified for these exemptions. So either you  
28727 missed the actual initial test of whether or not you filed  
28728 the paper to show that you are eligible or you missed the  
28729 test of showing that you are exempt and didn't have to file  
28730 the paper, but you had to file more paper for that. It ends  
28731 up that, you know, less than five percent of the people that  
28732 are actually eligible end up getting on Medicaid. Everyone  
28733 else is thrown off.

28734 And, you know, you can talk about the undocumented and  
28735 the people that are in two different states and all that, but  
28736 I think we have shown rather dramatically that that is a very  
28737 small number overall compared to this 13.7 million that the  
28738 CBO says is actually going to lose their health insurance.  
28739 And that is not only because of the 8.5 million or so that  
28740 would clearly lose their health insurance under this bill,  
28741 but also because of another 5 who will lose it because they  
28742 will lose the subsidy because you are not renewing it for the  
28743 ACA.

28744 So if you think that, you know, 13.7 or 8.5 million  
28745 people are not eligible, I mean, you can think that, but I  
28746 think it is a fiction. The reality is that you are making it  
28747 so that people who would normally be eligible are not. And  
28748 then, in addition to that, you have all kinds of other things  
28749 that make the system even more unaffordable, causing people  
28750 to pay -- in certain categories to pay \$35 a month -- I mean,

28751 \$35 each time they go to the doctor or, in the case of  
28752 nursing homes, you know, reducing the quality of care because  
28753 you get rid of the nurse staffing rule.

28754       There is all these little, little things that -- they  
28755 add up to this almost \$1 trillion of which, you know, over  
28756 700 billion of that is for health care alone. I am not even  
28757 getting into the environmental issues and the energy issues  
28758 and the spectrum issues and other things that we talked about  
28759 today, because I think the main thrust of this is that you  
28760 are making it almost impossible for most of the people -- for  
28761 a significant number of the people who would be eligible for  
28762 Medicaid to actually receive it, and that is not fair.

28763       I don't think it is fair to suggest that, you know, that  
28764 there is any reason for this, other than the fact that you  
28765 are trying to save money in order to pay for these tax cuts  
28766 for the very wealthy and for large corporate interests. And  
28767 we, as Democrats, believe that we should be expanding health  
28768 insurance and health opportunities.

28769       Now, I just want to thank, if I can, all of the people  
28770 who have stayed with us all night fighting for their health  
28771 care and the health care of their families and neighbors. I  
28772 do believe the voices of the people in the audience are  
28773 powerful, and Democrats will do everything that we can to  
28774 protect your health care, and we will win this fight.

28775       And lastly, Mr. Chairman, if I could say we have about



28776 200-plus letters expressing opposition or concern with this  
28777 Republican bill representing thousands of organizations, and  
28778 I would ask that that be entered into the record.

28779 I am not going to throw this book at you.

28780 \*The Chair. I don't see any -- throw the book at me. I  
28781 don't see any objection.

28782 [The information follows:]

28783

28784 \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

28785

28786           \*Mr. Pallone. And I yield back. Thank you.

28787           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Are there any  
28788 others seeking recognition?

28789           Are you ready? The gentleman from Texas seeks  
28790 recognition to speak on the amendment.

28791           \*Mr. Crenshaw. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to  
28792 strike the last word.

28793           \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

28794           \*Mr. Crenshaw. I want to commend you on running a great  
28795 hearing, and running a great markup, and running a great  
28796 reconciliation bill. I am very proud of the work we have  
28797 done here.

28798           [Applause.]

28799           \*The Chair. There is a specific provision in this bill  
28800 that I am particularly proud of. I have been fighting for  
28801 this for a long time. And I noticed that there is actually  
28802 no amendments to strike it, which makes me maybe  
28803 idealistically or foolishly think that we all agree on it.  
28804 Maybe that is the case now. But this is the provision that  
28805 ends the use of Medicaid, CHIP, and Affordable Care Act  
28806 dollars for gender transition procedures on minors. This  
28807 will become law, and I couldn't be happier about it.

28808           Now, gender transition procedures are the lobotomy of  
28809 our generation. People will look back on this period, I  
28810 think, with disbelief. I guarantee it. That gender-

28811 affirming care, it is not health care, it is fringe science  
28812 with no proven benefit and enormous risks.

28813 Americans agree with us, by the way. Hence, maybe the  
28814 lack of amendments to strike it because poll after poll shows  
28815 overwhelming opposition to giving kids drugs or surgical  
28816 interventions.

28817 It should also be stated very clearly the following  
28818 provision has a direct budgetary effect, since it amends the  
28819 list of payment prohibitions under section 1903(I) of the  
28820 Social Security Act. It limits medically unnecessary  
28821 procedures, which is exactly what gender transition  
28822 procedures are.

28823 People wonder how we got to this place in the -- to  
28824 begin with. It started in sociology departments, went to med  
28825 schools, flooded our institutions like the American Academy  
28826 of Pediatrics. It finally landed in children's hospitals.  
28827 Even though the most recent studies and systematic reviews  
28828 have effectively debunked this foolish practice, it continues  
28829 on. A Reuters investigation showed prescriptions for puberty  
28830 blockers and cross-sex hormones have risen by over 120  
28831 percent in just a few years. This is a textbook social  
28832 contagion.

28833 The truth is that many of these kids are wrestling with  
28834 issues that kids wrestle with, or have comorbid psychiatric  
28835 diagnoses. They have fleeting ideations, peer pressure,

28836 online echo chambers. It is not a condition that demands a  
28837 prescription and a scalpel. But instead of asking why that  
28838 is happening or why it especially affects young girls, we are  
28839 told to just affirm and fast-track, no questions asked.  
28840 Parents need to shut up and do what the crazy doctor says.  
28841 That is not care, that is malpractice, and the science  
28842 doesn't support it.

28843         In 2024 the UK commissioned the Cass Review, an  
28844 independent audit by top pediatricians of more than 100  
28845 studies on gender transitions from minors. Its verdict?  
28846 Evidence for puberty blockers, cross-sex hormones, and  
28847 surgeries is weak, at best, and doctors can't predict which  
28848 children will even continue to experience gender dysphoria.  
28849 There is no conclusions on whether these treatments improve  
28850 psychiatric conditions or prevent suicide.

28851         Worse, only 2 of those 100 studies even met the basic  
28852 research standards. One would expect they lacked randomized  
28853 control, they had poor follow-up rates, used sample  
28854 populations that weren't minors. Most of these so-called  
28855 studies resembled narratives without any real objectivity.  
28856 Most of them were just surveys with severe selection bias.  
28857 The standards of care widely used were actually found to have  
28858 severe circular referencing on one another, as well. It was  
28859 all a scam.

28860         And these bogus narratives also ignore the stories of

28861 regret, people like Chloe Cole, who was put on Lupron at 13  
28862 and lost healthy breast tissue at 15. Lupron, by the way, is  
28863 used to chemically castrate child sex predators. But hey,  
28864 let's give it to a child because they tell a doctor they are  
28865 in the wrong body?

28866 Now, thankfully, the Trump Administration has published  
28867 its own initial systematic review -- HHS is doing that -- and  
28868 found, again, no evidence of benefits. No surprise there.

28869 Here is the conclusion. When the science is this weak,  
28870 the only ethical answer for us is first do no harm. We are  
28871 supposed to protect the kids, full stop. Our peer nations  
28872 have already pivoted. We are catching up, and we are making  
28873 permanent policy. That is thanks to President Trump and  
28874 thanks to what we are doing today. And I don't think this  
28875 debate is about compassion versus cruelty. I really don't.  
28876 I think it is just about medical ethics, safeguarding  
28877 children, and demanding that real science and not activism  
28878 guides our public health, and I could not be more proud that  
28879 we are finally taking action.

28880 And I yield back.

28881 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Seeing -- the  
28882 gentlelady from California, from Los Angeles -- the  
28883 gentlelady from California -- I will it -- Barragan next, and  
28884 then Ms. Matsui.

28885 She already asked for recognition, all right.

28886           Thank you.

28887           \*Ms. Barragan. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I am not going  
28888 to respond to all the gibberish I heard, but I will respond  
28889 to a few.

28890           I heard safeguarding children. First do no harm. That  
28891 is exactly what House Democrats are trying to do by fighting  
28892 against these Medicaid cuts. I will remind everybody when  
28893 there were amendments to protect kids getting access to  
28894 health care, every single one of them, including the person  
28895 who just said this, voted no. And having a chance to protect  
28896 kids and having a chance to protect the most vulnerable and  
28897 having a chance to do no harm, my colleagues across the aisle  
28898 have shown that they are not interested. So to hear that is  
28899 quite laughable and unbelievable.

28900           And my colleague from Florida did a great job of  
28901 outlining why Republicans can't be trusted. The history of  
28902 not even supporting the Affordable Care Act to trying to  
28903 repeal it to now kicking millions of people off of Medicaid,  
28904 they want to use the word shifting people off. Whatever word  
28905 salad word you want to use, millions of Americans are going  
28906 to lose their health care coverage because of this bill,  
28907 which they are, by the way, proud of. And remember that if  
28908 you lose your coverage, when you lose your coverage because  
28909 of this, that they ended today and said that they were proud  
28910 of it.

28911           Now, why -- well, the other thing my colleague, when she  
28912 did her outline of why Republicans can't be trusted, you all  
28913 remember the hearings in the budget resolution we had in this  
28914 committee? Do you remember what my Republican colleagues  
28915 said? They said the word "Medicaid" doesn't even appear in  
28916 the text. "This is not about Medicaid. We are not going to  
28917 touch Medicaid." You remember those ridiculous allegations  
28918 that were made then? That is why they can't be trusted,  
28919 because here we are, after 25-hour hearing, they refused to  
28920 have the health care conversation the day of light. They  
28921 waited until 2:00 in the morning to do it, and they did a  
28922 total 180. So why can't they be trusted? Because they  
28923 themselves said months ago during the budget resolution  
28924 conversation the word "Medicaid" wasn't even in the  
28925 resolution. They were not going to touch it.

28926           Yes, we just saw a chart, a chart by the chair showing  
28927 how many millions of people they are going to kick off. It  
28928 is not a totally accurate chart. It is missing a whole  
28929 nother chunk of five million people they want to throw off  
28930 that -- again, the Affordable Care Act, because this is their  
28931 way of attacking the Affordable Care Act.

28932           So let's just remember why they can't be trusted. Let's  
28933 remember their own words and actions matter. And these  
28934 actions in the last 25 hours show us who they really are  
28935 fighting for. It is not the children, because they voted

28936 against them. And they are not voting for it because it  
28937 costs too much money. And why? Because they got to find  
28938 places to cut, to save money, to then turn around and give it  
28939 to their billionaire friends because that is who is going to  
28940 benefit from these tax cuts. The lowest earning people are  
28941 going to get, like, 90 bucks. But their billionaire friends,  
28942 they are going to get another a private jet trip, right?

28943         So talk about unequal access, who they are really  
28944 fighting for. It is the rich. It is not the American  
28945 people. And they had a chance to show that they were willing  
28946 to do the right thing, to fight for kids, to fight for people  
28947 to have access to health care, but they just don't believe  
28948 it. We have a totally different value system, and your  
28949 budget shares your values, where you are going to put your  
28950 money. They would rather put their money in more defense  
28951 spending, they would rather put that money in budget cuts --  
28952 I mean, rather, tax cuts for the rich instead of investing in  
28953 our kids, our schools. And when I say schools, I am talking  
28954 about even something as simple as fighting air pollution at  
28955 schools for kids.

28956         So I think it is very evident on where they are and why  
28957 they can't be trusted. And I just want to urge everybody to  
28958 continue the fight because this is not over. We are hearing  
28959 at least one Republican Senator who is admitting that this is  
28960 slashing health care, this GOP plan is slashing health care,



28961 and that it is morally wrong and it is suicide. And so,  
28962 hopefully, that person can stand up and fight back to stop  
28963 this from happening.

28964 Keep up the work. Keep up the fight. We are going to  
28965 keep fighting. House Democrats will.

28966 With that I yield back.

28967 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
28968 there any discussion on -- oh, I have the gentleman from  
28969 Texas, Mr. Weber, for five minutes.

28970 \*Mr. Weber. Well, I won't need five minutes, Mr.  
28971 Chairman, thank you. It has been a great time for us to be  
28972 here together and working hard together.

28973 I have the 14th district of Texas. Most of you all know  
28974 that. And there is a gentlelady here from New York who has  
28975 the 14th district in New York.

28976 And Alexandria, you didn't deserve what I hit you with  
28977 last night at 3:00, so I just --

28978 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Oh, well, that is very kind.

28979 \*Mr. Weber. I just wanted to say I thought I would get  
28980 your attention, and I did, all right. So I shouldn't have  
28981 done that, and I apologize.

28982 And I yield back.

28983 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Oh, well, I -- will the gentleman  
28984 yield?

28985 \*Mr. Weber. Yes, ma'am.

28986           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Well, I completely accept. And,  
28987   you know, these markups, they run late into the night. We  
28988   are at 3:00 in the morning, we are tired, and it is what it  
28989   is. But we are -- you know, we are all here because we are  
28990   fighting for what we believe in. And I sincerely appreciate  
28991   the graciousness and generosity with which you extend that.  
28992   So --

28993           \*Mr. Weber. Thank you, ma'am.

28994           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. I kindly accept. Thank you.

28995           \*Mr. Weber. Thank you.

28996           \*The Chair. Is there any discussions?

28997           I know the gentlelady from California -- Ms. Matsui is  
28998   recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

28999           \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you very much. Mr. Chairman, I move  
29000   to strike the last word.

29001           \*The Chair. The gentlelady is recognized.

29002           \*Ms. Matsui. Mr. Chairman, we have been here for over  
29003   24 hours now, and Republicans have rejected every amendment  
29004   offered today, every amendment that would protect vulnerable  
29005   patients, every amendment that would reinvest savings into  
29006   health care and more because they are still claiming, despite  
29007   the evidence we have laid out, that this bill won't hurt  
29008   kids, hurt people with disabilities, hurt parents, and hurt  
29009   millions of Medicaid recipients.

29010           So let's be clear. Over 24 hours later, the bill before

29011 us would still rip critical benefits away from millions of  
29012 people.

29013 [Slide]

29014 \*Ms. Matsui. Now I would like to bring the focus back  
29015 to those patients, specifically Nicholas. Here is Nicholas,  
29016 a handsome person.

29017 Today, as you see in this photo, Nicholas is preparing  
29018 to graduate high school and head to community college in the  
29019 fall. As his mom, Leandra, put it, he has beaten the odds of  
29020 Duchenne, and without Medicaid he would not be here today.  
29021 Medicaid has provided life-changing and lifesaving care to  
29022 Nicholas. For example, when private insurance refused to  
29023 cover a powerchair, calling it not medically necessary,  
29024 Medicaid paid for it. Now Nicholas can get around without  
29025 assistance. When you think about it, for an 18-year-old boy,  
29026 you can imagine how much that independence means.

29027 Medicaid also pays for Nicholas to receive the first  
29028 approved therapy for Duchenne, which has helped him regain  
29029 his strength. Nicholas can still walk short distances,  
29030 something that would have been unthinkable, impossible when  
29031 he was diagnosed. And as Nicholas gets older and needs more  
29032 help to stay independent, Medicaid pays for in-home  
29033 supportive services.

29034 Republicans claim that this bill won't harm kids like  
29035 Nicholas. But we are not fools, and neither are the

29036 advocates who have filled these halls, flooded our office  
29037 phones and inboxes, and showed up in this room all day and  
29038 night.

29039         Thank you so much for being here to fight. I want you  
29040 to know -- and you know this -- the fight is not over.  
29041 Please keep showing up. We are with you. We will keep  
29042 fighting with you. This is not over.

29043         I yield back.

29044         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. The gentleman  
29045 from Michigan --

29046         \*Ms. Matsui. Thank you.

29047         \*The Chair. -- is recognized to speak on the amendment  
29048 for five minutes.

29049         \*Mr. James. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I move to strike  
29050 the last word.

29051         \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

29052         \*Mr. James. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to take a  
29053 second to address my constituents and the millions of folks  
29054 across the country who rely on Medicaid.

29055         You are being misled.

29056         In Michigan, nearly half the seniors rely on Medicaid to  
29057 age with dignity. Medicaid covers 40 percent of U.S. births  
29058 and 38 percent of Michigan births. The impact of this needed  
29059 program truly cannot be overstated. We are hearing a lot  
29060 about fighting to protect Medicaid from my Democrat

29061 colleagues. And to be honest, they are fighting to protect  
29062 Medicaid. They are fighting tooth and nail to protect  
29063 Medicaid, but not for you, but for illegal aliens, gender  
29064 transition surgeries for children, ineligible recipients, and  
29065 able-bodied adults who choose not to work. Democrats are  
29066 absolutely fighting, but they are fighting for the wrong  
29067 people. Republicans are fighting to ensure Medicaid is  
29068 protected and upheld for generations now and in the future.

29069 I was recently contacted by Kirsten from Shelby Township  
29070 who said, "My son has cerebral palsy and relies on Medicaid  
29071 every single day not just for health care, but to live with  
29072 independence, dignity, and purpose. Medicaid makes it  
29073 possible for him to live outside of an institution.'" I am  
29074 fighting to protect Medicaid so Kirsten, her son, and her  
29075 family can live together in dignity.

29076 I heard from Barbara from St. Clair Shores, who is a  
29077 special ed teacher who works with disabled students. I am  
29078 fighting to protect Medicaid so Barbara's students get the  
29079 opportunity and education that they need to thrive and that  
29080 they deserve.

29081 Rosanna, also from St. Clair Shores, said, "I am a  
29082 pediatric nurse practitioner, and I already hear daily how  
29083 much my patients' families struggle to meet the needs across  
29084 the board.'" I am fighting for Rosanna's patients.

29085 Here is the truth. Republicans are not cutting

29086 Medicaid. We are simply prioritizing the people Medicaid was  
29087 originally designed for: low-income children, pregnant  
29088 women, the disabled, the elderly, and the list goes on and  
29089 on.

29090         And so I am going to tell you something that you don't  
29091 hear of too much. Don't believe Republicans and don't  
29092 believe Democrats. Use the brain that the good Lord gave  
29093 you, and read it for yourself and come to your own  
29094 conclusions. Read the words yourself, not what a politician  
29095 tells you, and you will read for yourself in this bill who is  
29096 fighting for you.

29097         Democrats are doing what they always do: fearmongering,  
29098 distracting, and defending failing systems. They are  
29099 inflating Medicaid with illegals, ineligible recipients, and  
29100 able-bodied adults who refuse to work. These aren't reforms.  
29101 They are reckless giveaways that take resources away from the  
29102 truly vulnerable, the people who they say they are serving.  
29103 They are leaving behind the kids, the moms, the seniors who  
29104 need Medicaid the most.

29105         And my colleagues across the aisle say you haven't found  
29106 any fraud, waste, and abuse. Well, how about this? In a  
29107 2023 report from the Michigan Inspector general -- remember  
29108 we talked about taking the cops off the beat? Well, the  
29109 Michigan instructor inspector general noted that Michigan's  
29110 Medicaid program had improperly paid over \$10 million in

29111 benefits to non-citizens, \$10 million. Is there anybody who  
29112 could use \$10 million in the room to help with their family?  
29113 Ten million could have gone to Kirsten's son, to Barbara's  
29114 students, or Rosanna's patients. Instead, it was sent to  
29115 illegal aliens.

29116 But what do you call that, if it is not fraud, if it is  
29117 not abuse, if it is not waste? They are not going to call it  
29118 that. You know why? Because it is by design. That is why  
29119 the left is fighting so hard to protect it. It is like they  
29120 are deathly allergic to accountability.

29121 If you want to believe that every reform is a cut, every  
29122 accountability measure is cruelty, and standing up to a  
29123 failing status quo -- the status quo is not working in this  
29124 country. We have to do something to fix it. But they are  
29125 not fighting for patients, they are fighting to protect the  
29126 status quo. And that is not good enough for people or the  
29127 folks in my district who desperately rely on us to do the  
29128 right thing here. We are not buying it. We are not buying  
29129 the crocodile tears. We are here to fix the problem.

29130 So with or without my Democrat colleagues and their  
29131 inflated numbers, Republicans are going to defend and  
29132 strengthen Medicaid. We will ensure that Medicaid remains a  
29133 lifeline for millions of vulnerable Americans, not a loophole  
29134 for exploitation.

29135 With that, Mr. Chairman, I yield.

29136           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields.

29137           [Disturbance in hearing room.]

29138           \*The Chair. Could the room come to order? The room  
29139 come to order.

29140           All right, the room will come to order. All right, the  
29141 room will come to order.

29142           The gentleman from New York is recognized for five  
29143 minutes to speak on the amendment.

29144           \*Mr. Tonko. Can we get order here?

29145           \*The Chair. The gentleman from New York has the time to  
29146 speak on the amendment for five minutes.

29147           \*Mr. Tonko. Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank  
29148 you, Mr. Ranking Member. Thank you to my colleagues on both  
29149 sides of the aisle and staff and, in a very special way,  
29150 thank you to those who have brought your stories. They are  
29151 so powerfully inspirational, those gathered here and the so  
29152 many that have reached out through the course of weeks and  
29153 months to be involved in this decision-making.

29154           As we wind down this debate, I have a confession to  
29155 make. I am tired. And I know we are all tired. We have  
29156 been at this for more than 25 hours now. And while I am  
29157 tired, I am also energized because I know our cause is just  
29158 and because I know that these past 25 hours have helped to  
29159 illuminate the stakes of this debate for the American people.  
29160 And the stakes, my friends, could not be higher. The choices



29161 that are made in this room today and in our House of  
29162 Representatives will impact the lives of millions of people  
29163 that we will never meet.

29164 In this moment I am thinking of how this might impact  
29165 one family that I have met, Sarah and her son Cameron from  
29166 Niskayuna, New York. Cameron is a 16-month-old pediatric  
29167 stroke survivor. Cam was previously normally developing and  
29168 healthy, but at seven months old he had a rare pediatric  
29169 stroke that changed everything. Sarah shared how they  
29170 quickly found themselves in a community of parents with  
29171 disabled kids that rely on Medicaid. Her son receives five  
29172 to six therapies a week and goes to two to three doctors  
29173 appointments every month. Medicaid is the safety net that  
29174 supports them to provide things like copays and medical  
29175 braces, which add up and make a huge difference.

29176 Sarah's story could be any of our stories. She shares  
29177 with me, and I quote, "It really hits home for me that  
29178 Cameron became disabled after his stroke pretty much  
29179 overnight. Our lives changed. So I think what people may be  
29180 missing here is anyone can become disabled at any moment, and  
29181 therefore you may not have the coverage you once thought you  
29182 had.'`

29183 Republicans falsely claim that children like Cameron  
29184 won't be impacted by their package, but I have read the text  
29185 and that is simply not true. New York State stands to lose

29186 billions of dollars in cuts to Medicaid from the reduced  
29187 Federal match, the provider tax provisions, and more  
29188 senseless provision in this cruel package.

29189         Again, let me reiterate when states have to make these  
29190 massive cuts to their Medicaid programs, where do you think  
29191 they are going to look first? To the most expensive  
29192 patients, the elderly, the sick and the disabled, to the very  
29193 people that my Republican colleagues claim they are trying to  
29194 protect.

29195         Republicans have been offered so many opportunities  
29196 today to put pen to paper on their claims that this bill  
29197 won't hurt people like Cameron. They have refused to do so.  
29198 When someone shows you who they are, believe them.

29199         Here is your last chance. Support this amendment.  
29200 Let's make an ironclad guarantee to folks like Sarah and  
29201 Cameron that we are going to take care of them. Let's make  
29202 that ironclad guarantee that lets this family sleep a little  
29203 easier tonight. I am ready to make that promise, and I urge  
29204 my colleagues to do the same.

29205         And with that I yield back.

29206         \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
29207 discussion on the Republican side?

29208         Seeing none -- the gentleman from California, Dr. Ruiz,  
29209 is recognized for five minutes on the amendment.

29210         \*Mr. Ruiz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I want to thank

29211 you, as well as Ranking Member Pallone and all the members  
29212 that lasted this 25 hours. I want to thank the people  
29213 attendance who are here, especially those that were with us  
29214 overnight. And I really want to give a shout out to all of  
29215 our staff, the Energy and Commerce staff, including all the  
29216 staff in our individual office.

29217 [Applause.]

29218 \*Mr. Ruiz. They stayed up with us. They worked with  
29219 us. It is not easy. Thank you.

29220 So where did we start? We started with a budget  
29221 resolution that asked this committee to cut \$880 billion in  
29222 order to pay for the tax cuts that are primarily going to go  
29223 to billionaires in the tune of billions of dollars. And  
29224 initially they said, no, there is no such thing as Medicaid  
29225 cuts. No, we are not going to touch Medicaid. All this  
29226 other nonsense. But in fact, today it was revealed that they  
29227 are actually going to cut \$715 billion in Medicaid.

29228 And how are they going to do that? Well, the only way  
29229 they are going to do that is to try to get people off the  
29230 rolls, to try to get less individuals who utilize Medicaid  
29231 decrease access to Medicaid and health care. And yes, they  
29232 are looking at individuals who are undocumented, but they are  
29233 also looking at primarily U.S. citizens. These are people in  
29234 the Medicaid expansion and, yes, children, disabled, seniors,  
29235 and pregnant women. So let me break it down in how they too

29236 are going to be losing access to health care.

29237         Primarily, the biggest factor is the red tape  
29238 requirement, or the work requirements. Eligible U.S.  
29239 citizens will get off the rolls because we have already seen  
29240 and heard in examples through Georgia and others that it is  
29241 cumbersome, that people give up, and that is the intent. In  
29242 fact, currently right now, as we speak, Georgia has only  
29243 enrolled three percent of U.S. eligible citizens in their  
29244 state. Only three percent of the people who could use  
29245 Medicaid have been enrolled because it is so cumbersome.

29246         How else will they manage this? Well, they will shift  
29247 the burden to the states. How, you ask? Well, it is  
29248 unfunded work requirement, red tape requirement,  
29249 administrations. Unfunded mandates for reportings and  
29250 verifications, and uncompensated care, and, for some states  
29251 reduced the Federal share.

29252         Now, what will states do when this is happens? One,  
29253 they will increase taxes or they will shift monies from other  
29254 programs. Two, they will decrease benefits. Three, they  
29255 will decrease eligibility for individuals. And four, they  
29256 will decrease physician reimbursements, which means that less  
29257 physicians will take patients on Medicaid.

29258         And the uncompensated care that we are going to see rise  
29259 because 3.7 million Americans will lose their health  
29260 insurance? Well, that is going to increase costs for

29261 hospitals. And what else will hospitals do? They will cut  
29262 programs like pediatrics and labor and delivery. There you  
29263 go. That is where the children will lose care, because those  
29264 hospitals won't provide pediatrics. And the disabled? Same  
29265 thing. Oh, and labor and delivery? Bingo. Pregnant women  
29266 are going to lose their access to care with these hospitals  
29267 that are going to cut services. And seniors and the rest of  
29268 us? Hospitals will close. And that is how seniors and  
29269 everybody else, whether you have Medicaid or private  
29270 insurance, are going to have access to the care that you have  
29271 now.

29272         Don't take my word for it. I read you many quotes from  
29273 different hospital associations throughout different states  
29274 and throughout our country: 13.7 million people will lose  
29275 health insurance and, according to your estimate, 12.3  
29276 million U.S. citizens. Of those 13.7 million people, 12.3  
29277 million U.S. citizens will lose health care. Costs will go  
29278 up for everybody. Medical debt and bankruptcy will rise.  
29279 And this bill is just God-awful.

29280         Don't take my word for it. Here is a quote today from  
29281 Josh Hawley, Senator Josh Hawley. It says this, the cuts in  
29282 the House GOP's big, beautiful bill -- and says it must  
29283 change to become law. This is real Medicaid benefit cuts, he  
29284 says, "And I can't support that. No Republican should  
29285 support that. We are the party of the working class. We

29286 need to act like it.'`

29287 \*The Chair. The gentleman's time has expired. Thank  
29288 you.

29289 \*Mr. Ruiz. So I encourage you to act like it.

29290 \*The Chair. So the gentleman's time has expired. The  
29291 gentleman from Alabama is recognized to speak on the minute -  
29292 - on the amendment for five minutes.

29293 \*Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the  
29294 amendment and I move to strike the last word.

29295 \*The Chair. The gentleman is recognized.

29296 \*Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, I just wonder what my  
29297 colleagues on the other side of the aisle think about Gavin  
29298 Newsom's proposal to freeze enrollment in Medi-Cal for  
29299 enrollees 19 and up with unsatisfactory immigration status,  
29300 and to charge those who do enroll \$100 per month premium. I  
29301 mean, they had a conniption about \$35, so I know they must  
29302 really be in a panic about the Golden State freezing  
29303 enrollment for 19-year-olds with questionable immigration  
29304 status and charging them \$100 a month.

29305 I yield back.

29306 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is anyone on  
29307 the Democrat side seeking recognition?

29308 The gentlelady from New York, Ms. Clarke, the gentlelady  
29309 is recognized for five minutes to speak on --

29310 \*Ms. Clarke. Yes, let me thank you, Mr. Chairman. Let

29311 me also thank the ranking member and all of my colleagues for  
29312 a very important and sobering debate. Let me thank our  
29313 advocates who traveled miles to be here to demonstrate to the  
29314 American people that, when we show up, we win.

29315 [Applause.]

29316 \*Ms. Clarke. Mr. Chairman, I have just been overwhelmed  
29317 by the gaslighting that has been taking place in this room.  
29318 I want to express my opposition to the provision in this bill  
29319 that penalizes states like my home state of New York for  
29320 providing health coverage to undocumented immigrants,  
29321 particularly our children.

29322 New York is home to one of the most diverse populations  
29323 in the world. We are a state built on the backs and of labor  
29324 -- and labor of immigrants from Africa, Caribbean, Latin  
29325 America, Asia, and Europe, all working hard to build better  
29326 lives, contribute to their communities, and raise their  
29327 children.

29328 This bill proposes a penalty for states like New York  
29329 that use state-only funds to provide health coverage to these  
29330 individuals. The reduction in the FMAP from 90 percent to 80  
29331 percent would result in devastating consequences for our  
29332 health care systems and for New York. It amounts to a loss  
29333 of over \$1.6 billion dollars annually.

29334 Furthermore, the provision limiting the reasonable  
29335 opportunity window for citizenship verification is another

29336 misguided attempt to deny people access to health care they  
29337 desperately need.

29338         Federal Medicaid funding does not cover undocumented  
29339 immigrants, and even lawfully present immigrants face years'  
29340 long waits for access under current law. But Republicans  
29341 want to end protections like the reasonable opportunity  
29342 period which gives U.S. citizens and legally present  
29343 immigrants the ability to receive care while their status is  
29344 verified through the Social Security Administration or the  
29345 Department of Homeland Security. Past policies show this  
29346 approach is harmful.

29347         Remember the pandemic? Yes, you should, because Donald  
29348 Trump knew that the virus was airborne and sat on his hands,  
29349 as it would cause delays or the denial of coverage due to  
29350 paperwork issues.

29351         Let me be clear. The real goal here is to use  
29352 immigrants as scapegoats to justify policies that strip  
29353 health care coverage from millions of Americans in order to  
29354 put more money in their billionaire donors' pockets. This is  
29355 not just a policy issue.

29356         Our commitment to health care is a fundamental human  
29357 right. No one should be left without health care simply  
29358 because they are unable to navigate a complex and flawed  
29359 verification system. However, we always find the money for  
29360 tax breaks for the wealthy. But when it comes to health care



29361 for working people, suddenly we are out of money. This is a  
29362 bold-face and brazen cruelty. Their goal is to shift Federal  
29363 support to their donors' pockets through privatization,  
29364 contracts, and tax cuts. They are punitive, they are short-  
29365 sighted, and they will devastate our nation.

29366 So no, I will not quietly sit here so that my colleagues  
29367 can pontificate, gaslight, and everything else on the other  
29368 side of the aisle as they chip away at the American dream and  
29369 the need for health care in our nation for the most  
29370 vulnerable. In one of the wealthiest, most advanced nations  
29371 in the world, everyone, no matter their political beliefs,  
29372 deserves access to quality, affordable health care.

29373 This is not a fiscal policy. This is a moral failure,  
29374 and I reject this bill. Yes, indeed, cruelty is the point.

29375 And with that, I yield back the balance of my time.

29376 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady from New York  
29377 yields back.

29378 And before -- I am going to recognize -- I just want to  
29379 explain where we are. So we are speaking on an amendment.  
29380 So we will have to have a roll call vote on the amendment, so  
29381 that is one. And then we are marking up an amendment in the  
29382 nature of a substitute, and so we can adopt that, hopefully  
29383 by voice, because we will have to vote on it by roll call.  
29384 So hopefully, we will be able to do that by voice.

29385 So we have a roll call on this amendment, voice the

29386 AINS, and then roll call the bill, the AINS. That is where  
29387 you get your roll call on the AINS. And that is on the  
29388 committee print for health care. And then we will have one  
29389 more votes to bring all the four prints together and report  
29390 out. So there will be -- unless you call a roll call on  
29391 AINS, which is your right to do, but hopefully we won't --

29392 \*Mr. Pallone. There will be no roll call --

29393 \*The Chair. There will be three roll call votes when we  
29394 get going, so just be -- so you know what is coming.

29395 All right. The gentleman from North Carolina is  
29396 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment before  
29397 us.

29398 \*Mr. Hudson. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

29399 Well, there you have it, folks. We just heard the  
29400 explanation. One side is fighting to give Medicaid benefits  
29401 to illegal immigrants and our side is fighting for people.

29402 I introduced you at the beginning of this hearing about  
29403 20 hours ago to Melissa from Burlington, who said Medicaid is  
29404 a godsend; to Christine from Robbins, North Carolina, who has  
29405 a special needs son and depends on Medicaid; to Jennifer from  
29406 Greensboro, North Carolina, who has a disabled daughter and  
29407 said, "Medicaid has helped our family tremendously by giving  
29408 us the opportunity to give her the care she deserves.'" I  
29409 introduced you to Cara from Moore County, who says that she  
29410 knows a lot of families in Moore County that depend on

29411 Medicaid, and her family is one of them. She has a six-year-  
29412 old son with a rare disease. These are the people I am  
29413 fighting for.

29414 I would also introduce you to Vicky from Fayetteville,  
29415 North Carolina, who wrote me and said, "Medicaid is the only  
29416 reason that my mother can afford her health care. She is 87  
29417 and deals with multiple health issues.'" I am fighting for  
29418 Vicky. That is who I care about.

29419 And I am sorry that the other side for months has been  
29420 -- I think the term I heard a minute ago was gaslighting. I  
29421 have got some terms here.

29422 They have misled you to believe that Republicans are  
29423 going to cut Medicaid. We didn't. Our chairman went through  
29424 the bill, explained exactly what our bill does. But you have  
29425 been misled by the fibs, the equivocations, the palter, the  
29426 untruths, and the falsehoods.

29427 Let me give you some truth. Medicaid is going broke.  
29428 It is going broke. Our states are going broke, the Federal  
29429 Government is going broke. And there is a lot of reasons  
29430 why, and there is some issues that I believe my colleagues on  
29431 the other side of the aisle in good faith want to work on:  
29432 the cost of drugs, access issues. There is a lot of things  
29433 that we are working on together that we need to do more work  
29434 together.

29435 But another contributor is that President Joe Biden in

29436 four years allowed illegal immigrants to receive benefits.  
29437 They stopped verifying eligibility. So there are, according  
29438 to the Congressional Budget Office, millions of people on  
29439 Medicare -- Medicaid that don't qualify. That is why it is  
29440 going bankrupt. And those of us on this side of the aisle  
29441 want to make sure that doesn't happen because of Deborah, and  
29442 Vicky, and Melissa, and all the people in my district who  
29443 depend on Medicaid.

29444         And I am sorry that you have been victims of deception  
29445 and fiction and falsifications. They have scared you into  
29446 thinking that somehow something is going to be taken away  
29447 from you, but that is just not true. And I am really  
29448 disappointed that some of my colleagues made personal  
29449 attacks. I mean, we have sat for 20 hours and been told we  
29450 don't like children, we don't like disabled children, we  
29451 don't like old people. I mean, we have been told that we  
29452 want to hurt people intentionally. I mean, it is  
29453 unbelievable, the fiction and the falsity and the half-truths  
29454 and exaggerations that we have had to sit through.

29455         And really, we are better than that, because this  
29456 committee has a long history of working together and solving  
29457 problems, and we can solve this problem, too. And you have  
29458 got my commitment. You have got everybody on this side of  
29459 the aisle's commitment. We are going to continue to fight  
29460 for you. We are going to continue to make sure that Medicaid

29461 is there, that it works for you. We are going to make it  
29462 better. We are going to try to add resources to it. We are  
29463 committed. We are in, and this piece of legislation is a  
29464 good first step. There is a lot of more work to do.

29465 And I just say to my colleagues, Mr. Chairman, on the  
29466 other side of the aisle, I would extend my hand to them.  
29467 Let's work together. Let's stop calling names. Let's stop  
29468 pointing fingers because the folks who are here in this room  
29469 who have been here for 20 hours, the folks watching us at  
29470 home that are scared to death because of the pretense and the  
29471 myths and the fables and the yarns and the stories they have  
29472 been told, they are not true. The only threat to you and  
29473 your Medicaid are illegal immigrants and people that don't  
29474 qualify that are taking the benefits, that are getting in  
29475 line ahead of you, that are booking the appointments.

29476 And so that is the difference, Mr. Chairman, and I am  
29477 proud of this legislation. It is a great first step. It is  
29478 not perfect, but I urge my colleagues to support the  
29479 legislation.

29480 And with that I yield back.

29481 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The chair will  
29482 recognize the gentlelady from Colorado --

29483 \*Ms. DeGette. Well --

29484 \*The Chair. -- for five minutes to speak on the  
29485 amendment.

29486           \*Ms. DeGette. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I really hadn't  
29487 intended to say anything, but this is kind of crazy because  
29488 my friends on the other side of the aisle are -- say -- are  
29489 talking about all these people who are on Medicaid. And  
29490 let's be clear, everyone in this room wants those people to  
29491 be on Medicaid. If they are eligible for Medicaid, of  
29492 course, they deserve to be on Medicaid.

29493           And as we have said numerous times, there are no  
29494 undocumented people that are covered by Federal funds for  
29495 Medicaid. So all those people my friends on the other side  
29496 of the aisle are talking about, they are not going to lose  
29497 their Medicaid to people who are undocumented. It is not an  
29498 either-or proposition. That is number one.

29499           But number two, it is hard for me to explain how the  
29500 non-partisan Congressional Budget Office says 13.7 million  
29501 people are going to lose their health insurance because of  
29502 the various nibbling cuts that the majority makes in the  
29503 bill, and also because they stopped the ACA expansion. So  
29504 those 13.5 million people are people who are on Medicaid  
29505 right now who then will be thrown off so they are not going  
29506 to be kept on Medicaid at the expense of those other people  
29507 that my colleagues mentioned. All of them --

29508           \*Mr. Hudson. Will the gentlelady yield?

29509           \*Ms. DeGette. No, I won't.

29510           All of them can have the health care that they need.

29511 And in fact, several of my colleagues mentioned uninsured  
29512 people fell dramatically when we did the ACA expansion, which  
29513 is good for the health care of those people. And also it is  
29514 cost effective.

29515         So why are we here? Why are we doing this? And I am  
29516 going to be honest. We are not doing this because Medicaid  
29517 is about to become insolvent. We are doing this in order to  
29518 give a tax cut to billionaires and corporations. And this  
29519 bill, which takes 13.7 million people off of Medicaid, is  
29520 going to allow the Republicans to get over \$700 billion in  
29521 credits. That is how they are going to be able to pay for  
29522 the tax cuts. So it is not like some big crisis and we are  
29523 going to throw elderly people and disabled people off. It is  
29524 that we are going to throw people who are eligible for  
29525 Medicaid off in order to give the tax cuts.

29526         And let's be real clear about this, because this is  
29527 millions of people. These are my constituents' lives. These  
29528 are your constituents' lives.

29529         And P.S., I just have to point out, if you actually  
29530 manage to zero out Planned Parenthood, that is one million  
29531 Americans, women, who are getting their health care, their  
29532 women health care, through Planned Parenthood. They are  
29533 going to go off, too.

29534         I yield back.

29535         \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back, and the chair

29536 recognizes the gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Allen.

29537           \*Mr. Allen. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield Mr.  
29538 Hudson my time.

29539           \*Mr. Hudson. I thank the gentleman. I was just going  
29540 to ask the gentlelady. She was citing a CBO number, and I  
29541 just wanted to ask if she was aware that one of the sub-sets,  
29542 one of the groups that she was citing, is 1.6 million of  
29543 those are -- according to the Congressional Budget Office,  
29544 the source that the gentlelady was citing, are illegal  
29545 immigrants. I mean, in fact, I could enter for the record,  
29546 Mr. Chairman, without objection.

29547           \*The Chair. Without objection, so ordered.

29548           [The information follows:]

29549

29550           \*\*\*\*\*COMMITTEE INSERT\*\*\*\*\*

29551



29552           \*Ms. DeGette. I don't have any -- I yielded my time  
29553 back.

29554           \*Mr. Hudson. So I think we agree with the source.

29555           \*Ms. DeGette. You know what? If I can reclaim my  
29556 time --

29557           \*Mr. Hudson. We all need to agree with facts, but --

29558           \*Ms. DeGette. Well, if I can reclaim my --

29559           \*Mr. Hudson. It is actually --

29560           \*The Chair. It is Mr. Allen's time.

29561           \*Mr. Hudson. It is Mr. Allen's time.

29562           \*The Chair. We are on Mr. Allen's time. You have  
29563 yielded back.

29564           \*Mr. Hudson. These facts are tough.

29565           \*Ms. DeGette. No --

29566           \*Mr. Hudson. I just think that is a good example of why  
29567 this is so confusing. She was citing the Congressional  
29568 Budget Office number, and a sub-set of that number is -- that  
29569 she cites -- will lose their coverage -- that is right, 1.4  
29570 million illegal immigrants are right now on Medicaid,  
29571 according to Congressional Budget Office, non-partisan. Not  
29572 my source, her source.

29573           So Mr. Chairman, with that I will yield back to --

29574           \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield to me, then?

29575           \*Mr. Hudson. -- Mr. Allen.

29576           \*Ms. DeGette. Will the gentleman yield to me, then?

29577           \*The Chair. It is the gentleman from Georgia's time.

29578           \*Ms. DeGette. Yes, I know. Will the gentleman yield to  
29579 me?

29580           \*Mr. Allen. I yield back.

29581           \*The Chair. He yields back. So now, will anyone on the  
29582 Democrat side seek recognition?

29583           The gentlelady from Washington is recognized for five  
29584 minutes to speak on the amendment.

29585           \*Ms. Schrier. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

29586           I would like to summarize my concerns with this bill by  
29587 telling the story of a constituent of mine. Miguel is a 76-  
29588 year-old widower who lives in Wenatchee, a small city in my  
29589 district in central Washington. And it is also the apple  
29590 capital of the world. So if you eat Washington apples, there  
29591 is a good chance they come from my district.

29592           Now, after Miguel's wife passed away, he relied solely  
29593 on his Social Security check to cover his living expenses. A  
29594 retired orchard worker, Miguel spent decades doing physically  
29595 demanding labor without access to a pension, and private  
29596 insurance was never affordable. He depends on Medicaid to  
29597 stay in his modest home, receiving regular in-home nursing  
29598 visits and help with daily tasks like bathing and cooking and  
29599 managing his medications. And without Medicaid's coverage  
29600 for home-based care and transportation and care coordination,  
29601 he would have no way to attend his checkups or manage his

29602 diabetes and the limitations caused by a stroke.

29603 Miguel fears losing access to the services that allow  
29604 him to live with dignity and independence in his own home.  
29605 For seniors like Miguel, Medicaid is not optional. It is  
29606 their lifeline. And unfortunately, Miguel's fears are not  
29607 unfounded. The rural hospital he depends on treats patients  
29608 that are more likely to be on Medicaid just like he is. If  
29609 those patients lose their health insurance because of this  
29610 bill, the cost of their care gets absorbed by the hospital.  
29611 And for already struggling rural hospitals that face  
29612 additional barriers when providing care, this will force them  
29613 to cut services or close altogether, leaving patients like  
29614 Miguel without access to care.

29615 I am not trying to fearmonger or deceive Americans. I  
29616 am simply telling you what our rural hospitals and our  
29617 community health centers are telling me: the bill will take  
29618 away health care from 13.7 million Americans, all while  
29619 increasing costs for everyone and decreasing access to care.  
29620 I want you to think about that.

29621 Finally, I would like to thank all of the advocates who  
29622 came to Washington, D.C. to attend this hearing because their  
29623 futures also depend on Medicaid. I will tell you that I have  
29624 been paying attention to the people packing this committee  
29625 room, including all night long while we were here, those  
29626 filling the halls of this building, those who were lined up

29627 outside waiting to get in. I looked at those tee shirts, I  
29628 looked at those signs. And let me tell you, not a single one  
29629 said, gut Medicaid, tax cuts for billionaires.

29630 The public has spoken. My colleagues' constituents have  
29631 spoken. And now my Republican colleagues have a very  
29632 important decision to make. And I sure hope that they decide  
29633 to answer to their constituents and not to the President, and  
29634 that they choose to protect Medicaid.

29635 Thank you, and I yield back.

29636 \*The Chair. The gentlelady yields back. Are there are  
29637 any on the Republican side.

29638 Seeing none, the gentlelady from Texas, Mrs. Fletcher,  
29639 is recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

29640 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Well, thank you so much, Mr. Chairman.  
29641 And as we wrap up here, I join others in thanking you for how  
29642 you have conducted this markup and for answering or trying to  
29643 answer my many questions, as well as thank Ranking Member  
29644 Pallone and, of course, the fantastic staff here and all the  
29645 advocates who have joined us over the last 25 -- almost 26  
29646 hours now, and long before to help inform and help us make  
29647 smart policy.

29648 And I support this amendment, and I think it is  
29649 important that this bill cannot take effect if its provisions  
29650 result in reduced access to health care coverage, and that is  
29651 what we have been talking about for the last 25 hours.

29652 Throughout this markup, we have talked about big issues and  
29653 all the ways we know it is true that the things we have  
29654 talked about over the last day are the likely outcomes of the  
29655 legislation that we are marking up.

29656         We have been here a long time. I know we have said a  
29657 lot of things over and over. But I hope that repetition has  
29658 registered, because we have been here before. So many of the  
29659 things that Republicans are proposing to do in this bill,  
29660 states have tried them and they have failed. We heard  
29661 cautionary tales from Arkansas and Georgia, as Dr. Ruiz  
29662 recapped, and we have heard cautionary tales from Texas. As  
29663 I discussed earlier, defunding Planned Parenthood has failed  
29664 by every metric, and it continues to fail Texas women.

29665         And in Texas we saw recently the redeterminations after  
29666 the moratorium on Medicaid disenrollments at the end of the  
29667 COVID pandemic is also a cautionary tale. Texas didn't allow  
29668 for automatic renewals, forced almost all the beneficiaries  
29669 to resubmit their documents to prove that they were eligible,  
29670 the kinds of things we are talking about in this bill. And  
29671 almost 1.4 million people lost coverage for procedural  
29672 reasons like what we are talking about here, failing to  
29673 submit a form or making an error. It was not because they  
29674 were not eligible for coverage. Nearly a million, just shy  
29675 of a million of those people, were children.

29676         And we have another cautionary tale from Texas, and I

29677 think it is important to know. In 2003, in order to reduce  
29678 the enrollment and cost of CHIP, the Republican Texas  
29679 legislature passed a bill requiring twice-a-year enrollment,  
29680 much like the one proposed in this bill. And while proposed  
29681 as ensuring eligibility, it was an absolute disaster of the  
29682 state losing paperwork, and it became a tragedy for families.

29683       A friend was just telling me about a Houston child,  
29684 Devonte Johnson, who had a treatable form of cancer back in  
29685 2007. Devonte's mom was a paralegal, and she was so diligent  
29686 about getting all of his forms in on time. She knew his  
29687 cancer treatment required CHIP coverage, and she did  
29688 everything right. The State of Texas lost his paperwork, and  
29689 when she couldn't get help she finally turned to our former  
29690 colleague here, Congressman Sylvester Turner, and he was able  
29691 to help Texas Children's Hospital resume Devonte's treatment  
29692 immediately. But because of the pause in his treatment when  
29693 he lost his coverage because the state lost his paperwork,  
29694 his tumors returned and they grew.

29695       Representative Turner passed H.B. 107 in the Texas  
29696 legislature in 2007, and that eliminated this twice-a-year  
29697 requirement. And I just want to point out this policy was so  
29698 bad that the State of Texas repealed it. It made an  
29699 immediate difference in enrollment, but it was too late for  
29700 Devonte. He died before the bill became law.

29701       Let this lesson be a story now before it is too late,

29702 before you vote to increase the frequency of eligibility  
29703 verifications. Let's not make the law that was so bad in  
29704 Texas become the law of the land across the country.

29705 Let's listen to each other. And even if we aren't  
29706 persuading each other right now, let's listen to the doctors  
29707 and the people who are telling us what this means in real  
29708 life. Let's be smarter. Let's learn from these failed  
29709 experiments in the states, failures that the CBO considered  
29710 when it reached its conclusions about this bill, failures  
29711 that we should consider here before it is too late, before  
29712 nearly 14 million Americans lose their health care. It is  
29713 not too late. It is not too late to do the right thing by  
29714 and for the American people.

29715 Thank you, Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

29716 \*The Chair. Thank you. The gentlelady yields back. Is  
29717 there anyone on the Republican side?

29718 Seeing none, next on the Democrat side will be Ms. Kelly  
29719 from Illinois. The gentlelady is recognized for five  
29720 minutes.

29721 \*Ms. Kelly. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I would like to  
29722 yield my minutes to Representative DeGette.

29723 \*Ms. DeGette. I thank the gentlelady for yielding, and  
29724 I think this is an important issue to discuss, because it is  
29725 the main thing in the talking points of the Republicans.

29726 My colleague from North Carolina says facts are tough,

29727 and he is correct. Facts are tough if you actually see what  
29728 this bill does for undocumented individuals.

29729 If you look at the CBO score, which I have in my hand  
29730 right here -- you might want to follow along -- the Federal  
29731 Government, as I have said repeatedly, and as I put the  
29732 statute into the record last night, does not cover  
29733 undocumented people under Medicaid. Some states do choose to  
29734 do it. And the reason some states do it is because the  
29735 undocumented people will flood their emergency rooms and  
29736 cause their state costs to go up so dramatically.

29737 So what the Republican bill does, if you read along, it  
29738 says reducing expansion FMAP for certain states providing  
29739 payments for health care furnished to certain individuals.  
29740 So it is not cutting Medicaid benefits to undocumented  
29741 people. It is cutting FMAP benefits to states, which could  
29742 go to those very same people my Republican colleagues are  
29743 talking about, people who are elderly, people who are  
29744 disabled, other people who are eligible for Medicaid because  
29745 the states' FMAP is going to be reduced for Medicaid.

29746 But even more crazy about this argument that they are  
29747 making, even if you accept, oh, Medicaid is going to go for  
29748 undocumented people, do you know how much this saves? Do you  
29749 know how much this saves? Eleven billion dollars. And it is  
29750 \$11 billion taken out of the money that goes to the state.

29751 So I guess the question I have -- actually, I am going



29752 to ask it as a rhetorical question -- is because this bill  
29753 says it saves over \$700 billion. So if only 11 billion of  
29754 that is for people who are undocumented, where else are you  
29755 going to cut that other \$700 billion? You are going to cut  
29756 it from the 13.7 million Americans who are eligible for  
29757 Medicaid who you are going to push right off.

29758 I yield back, and I thank the gentlelady for yielding.

29759 \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time from Illinois. Do  
29760 you yield back?

29761 The gentlelady from Illinois yields back. The gentleman  
29762 from New Jersey is recognized for five minutes to speak on  
29763 the amendment.

29764 \*Mr. Menendez. Thank you, Chairman. I just want to  
29765 thank you. I had an immense amount of respect for you before  
29766 this hearing -- this markup, I should say -- and I think you  
29767 did an incredible job navigating the committee through it on  
29768 a really difficult bill, a lot of different opinions about  
29769 it. But I thought you treated both sides extremely fairly,  
29770 and so I want to thank you for that. The ranking member  
29771 knows how I feel about him, but thank you, Frank, as always.  
29772 And to the staff who did an incredible job sticking with us,  
29773 I know for everyone's personal office there was a lot of time  
29774 spent here.

29775 And, listen, we have been here for 25 hours. I know  
29776 people are still making points that we have made over the

29777 last 25 hours. I am not going to. You know there is things  
29778 I disagree with and feel differently about.

29779         The point I would make, though, is that there are so  
29780 many things in this bill that I think, under different  
29781 circumstances, the committee would have really enjoyed  
29782 working together on a bipartisan basis on. I really believe  
29783 that. From artificial intelligence, cybersecurity, I think  
29784 energy and health care, there is things that we actually want  
29785 to do. I think the environment that we had to do it through  
29786 reconciliation, through a tight timeframe creates a difficult  
29787 set of circumstances to do so.

29788         But I think we just have to get out of the habit of  
29789 trying -- and I think both sides are responsible for this --  
29790 but we have big challenges as a country. People that I talk  
29791 to back home in my very Democratic district know what I say  
29792 is that to solve the challenges of our day, they won't be  
29793 solved by Democrats alone or Republicans alone. They will be  
29794 solved when we realize these are American challenges. And I  
29795 think the things that we discussed in this bill are things  
29796 that we need to work on on a bipartisan basis.

29797         Frankly, I don't know how we get there in the near term,  
29798 but I just want people to know that I think a lot of us are  
29799 committed to working on things in a bipartisan way. We have  
29800 to figure out how we can do that because, like I said, this  
29801 is a challenging environment to do.

29802           We need to figure out ways to build back trust. This is  
29803 a bipartisan committee that deals with the broadest  
29804 jurisdiction of any committee. That is why so many of us  
29805 wanted to be on it. And I just hope that we can figure out a  
29806 way to get back there because there is a lot of work we have  
29807 to do for the American people. Our challenges aren't getting  
29808 any easier. They are only getting increasingly more  
29809 challenging, more difficult. Our foreign adversaries are  
29810 getting more sophisticated, so that really requires that we  
29811 come together. And I just hope that we can do that and start  
29812 showing some good faith on both sides so we can take these  
29813 challenges on together.

29814           With that I yield back.

29815           \*The Chair. Thank you. I thank my friend from New  
29816 Jersey for his kind words, and we will find opportunities to  
29817 work together.

29818           I know people are kind of moving around a little bit.  
29819 Just remember we have three roll call votes and we are  
29820 getting close to them, so stay close.

29821           Mr. Obernolte from California is recognized for five  
29822 minutes to speak on the amendment.

29823           \*Mr. Obernolte. Well, thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I  
29824 would like to join my colleagues in thanking you and all of  
29825 the committee staff for your hard work over the last 26  
29826 hours, almost, of this hearing. It has been a unique

29827 experience to sit through.

29828         And to be honest with you, I am kind of vacillating  
29829 between, on the one hand, being encouraged because this is  
29830 really an exercise in democracy, you have heard passionate  
29831 debate on a topic that is important to everyone in this room  
29832 for the last 26 hours, but on the other hand, I have to be  
29833 honest, I found it to be also a deeply cynical, performative,  
29834 partisan experience. So I have to reflect on that some more  
29835 after I have gotten some sleep.

29836         I will tell you one thing, though, that has really  
29837 struck me, and that is the things that everyone on this dais  
29838 agrees with. Medicaid is something we all care very deeply  
29839 about, and I think we all recognize the purpose for which  
29840 Medicaid was created, to serve the core population of the  
29841 least fortunate people that need that social safety net in  
29842 society: the disabled, pregnant women, children, the poor.  
29843 And we are all passionately committed to making sure that  
29844 that core program is around for future generations of  
29845 Americans.

29846         But there is something else that should also be  
29847 abundantly clear to everyone in this room, which is that  
29848 Medicaid is on a fiscally unsustainable trajectory. It is  
29849 the single largest, fastest-growing expenditure in Federal  
29850 Government. And this is a Federal Government that this year  
29851 will run a deficit of over \$2 trillion. That is 30 percent

29852 of all Federal spending. And that is what has driven our  
29853 Federal debt to over \$37 trillion.

29854 And folks, if you think that that is sustainable, you  
29855 need to read some of the literature that our bipartisan  
29856 Congressional Budget Office is putting out, or you need to  
29857 come attend some of our Congressional Budget Committee  
29858 hearings, because we are running out of our capacity to  
29859 continue to borrow. Ultimately, our ability to borrow is  
29860 governed by the willingness of people to lend us that money.  
29861 And those rates are going up, and we will not be able to  
29862 continue to do this.

29863 So continuing down this path of providing Medicaid to  
29864 the people who need it will require some changes to the  
29865 program. And this bill, the one we have been debating for  
29866 the last 26 hours, proposes some relatively modest changes.  
29867 What do I mean by modest? Overall, the whole reconciliation  
29868 package, when it is put together, will encompass about two  
29869 percent of overall Federal spending, two percent. The  
29870 Medicaid portion that we have been debating, depending on how  
29871 you figure it, is in the single digits of percentage of  
29872 overall Medicaid spending. And in fact, even if the bill is  
29873 put into law exactly as it was in print today, overall  
29874 Federal spending on Medicaid will continue to increase, not  
29875 decrease. So it is not a cut. It is just bending the curve  
29876 a little bit.

29877           But I am also a little bit disturbed by the things we  
29878 haven't been able to agree on. For example, what is wrong  
29879 with asking the states to check the death rolls to make sure  
29880 that we are not spending taxpayer money on someone who is  
29881 deceased? We should all be able to agree on that.

29882           What is wrong with asking the states to compare notes  
29883 with each other so when we have a beneficiary who moves from  
29884 one state to another, which, according to the inspector  
29885 general, happens quite often, that we aren't continuing to  
29886 pay health insurance premiums for -- in two different states  
29887 for the same person? We should all be able to agree on that.

29888           And then this debate about community engagement -- and I  
29889 know the folks on the other side of this issue are calling on  
29890 work requirements. Just to remind everyone, read the bill.  
29891 We are talking about half-time, 20 hours a week is the  
29892 requirement, not just work. Work can satisfy it. You can go  
29893 to school, you can volunteer in your community. It is only  
29894 for the expansion population, which means people who are not  
29895 poor, not disabled, the able-bodied people, who don't have  
29896 dependents, who don't have a substance abuse disorder, who  
29897 aren't enrolled in a substance abuse program.

29898           And I will -- I have to say I have heard a couple of my  
29899 colleagues on the other side of the aisle say that we are  
29900 doing this because we are cruel and we don't care, and I find  
29901 that offensive. We are all here because we deeply care.

29902           But the expansion population was supposed to be part of  
29903   our social safety net. It is not something that was intended  
29904   for people to be on their whole lives. And the reason why we  
29905   do this is because we want to help people get off of Medicaid  
29906   and back on their feet. We want them on the exchanges in  
29907   traditional health insurance. We are not doing this because  
29908   we don't care. I want that for my constituents because I  
29909   care about them. And this is necessary to preserve the  
29910   future of this program for the people that are depending on  
29911   it, the core population. And if we don't make these changes,  
29912   this program won't be around for future generations of  
29913   Americans.

29914           So I urge a rejection of the amendment, and I urge  
29915   adoption of the underlying AINS.

29916           I yield back.

29917           \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. The gentleman  
29918   from Texas, Mr. Veasey, is recognized for five minutes to  
29919   speak on the amendment.

29920           \*Mr. Veasey. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I will be brief,  
29921   because I know that this has been a very, very long day.

29922           I was thinking about the different constituencies that  
29923   would be hurt by these cuts to Medicaid. And, of course, the  
29924   constituency that I represent is a largely Latino and African  
29925   American community in Fort Worth and Dallas and some of the  
29926   surrounding cities. But that is not all who is going to be

29927 hurt.

29928           And there was a really good article that I encourage  
29929 everyone to go and read that was in the Washington Post, and  
29930 it was direct quotes, so you can't -- no one can say liberal  
29931 media or anything like that. These are quotes that come  
29932 directly from these people that were affected. And it was in  
29933 a place called New Castle, Pennsylvania, and these were  
29934 mainly Italian Americans that had been Democrats a generation  
29935 before, but they were proud Trump voters, and they were all  
29936 on SNAP and Medicaid, and they were convinced that they would  
29937 -- that Trump would never take their Medicaid away from them.

29938           And so I was thinking about them, and it reminded me  
29939 there was a notable death that happened in Republican  
29940 politics back in 2023. Kevin Phillips -- some of you  
29941 probably know that name that have studied political history  
29942 -- but he wrote a book called, "The Emerging Republican  
29943 Majority," and he was Nixon's 1968 guy on race. And he had  
29944 a quote, and it was, "The whole secret of politics is knowing  
29945 who hates who."

29946           And what I am asking my Republican colleagues and  
29947 friends is, when the people in New Castle, Pennsylvania are  
29948 upset that they lose their Medicaid, please don't pit them  
29949 against the undocumented population. And I am just calling  
29950 it now because I don't want you to do that. Because if you -  
29951 - if I don't call it now, people will pretend like it is new,



29952 and they will try to say, well, see, people in New Castle,  
29953 Pennsylvania, you lost your Medicaid because of these people  
29954 that are undocumented. So we know the game. It goes back to  
29955 -- all the way back when Kevin Phillips wrote this book. So  
29956 we know the game. We know how the game is played. But I  
29957 think that we need to figure out a way how to get beyond that  
29958 in this country. So please don't use that card when people  
29959 in places like New Castle, Pennsylvania lose their Medicaid.

29960 Mr. Chairman, I yield back.

29961 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there any  
29962 member on the Republican side?

29963 Seeing none, the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Landsman, is  
29964 recognized for five minutes to speak on the amendment.

29965 \*Mr. Landsman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I support the  
29966 amendment.

29967 I don't believe that anyone should lose their health  
29968 care, and that is what the amendment says. No one should  
29969 lose their health care. It is a core belief of mine. I  
29970 think people should get more health care. We should expand  
29971 health care. We shouldn't cut health care.

29972 I don't believe that there is people who deserve health  
29973 care, deserve to be on Medicaid, and people who don't. I  
29974 think everyone deserves health care. And I genuinely believe  
29975 that is something that we share, despite the outcome today.  
29976 I think the only reason we are here and the majority is

29977 cutting \$715 billion from Medicaid is because that was the  
29978 assignment. It was a math assignment. The assignment was to  
29979 find \$880 billion to cut in order to pay for tax cuts that  
29980 overwhelmingly benefit the wealthy and big corporations.

29981 And here is the math. At the end of the day, right,  
29982 multiple hearings, \$715 billion in Medicaid cuts, health care  
29983 cuts, that is 8.6 million people who will lose health care;  
29984 \$358 billion in ACA cuts, that is 5.1 million people who will  
29985 lose health care; \$230 billion in food assistance cuts, that  
29986 is millions of people that are going to lose food assistance.  
29987 If you add it up, 715, 358, 230, that is \$1.3 trillion. Now  
29988 hold that number, \$1.3 trillion, because, again, this is a  
29989 math assignment.

29990 If we decided that we were going to work together, put  
29991 workers over wealth, we would take up the corporate tax rate.  
29992 We would say, look, a few years ago it was 35 percent, and  
29993 then it got cut to 21 percent. If you take it to 28 percent,  
29994 not even anywhere near 35 percent where it was several years  
29995 ago, that would generate \$1.3 trillion. So you just changed  
29996 the corporate tax rate a little bit, and everybody keeps  
29997 their health care, everybody keeps their food assistance, and  
29998 everybody gets their tax cut. Everyone wins. No one should  
29999 lose their health care or food assistance. And everyone that  
30000 needs tax relief should get it.

30001 Let's go a little further. Just play this out. There

30002 are two major changes to the tax code that, if we were all  
30003 working together, I think we could make some headway on. One  
30004 is the top wage earners. Before this tax cut, the top  
30005 earners in this country were taxed at a rate of 39.6 percent.  
30006 It got cut to 37 percent. If you let that expire, that is  
30007 \$246 billion. If you add the billionaire minimum income tax  
30008 called the Elon tax, they have to pay a minimum tax that is  
30009 \$503 billion. You add that together, that is \$749 billion.  
30010 That would allow us to spend \$325 billion, which pays for  
30011 comprehensive paid family and medical leave; \$200 billion for  
30012 free universal preschool; \$135 billion to restore the Earned  
30013 Income Tax Credit that helped people pay all their bills; and  
30014 free community college, which is \$90 billion. You add all of  
30015 those things up, it equals exactly \$749 billion.

30016 And so I think, if we had a different assignment, we  
30017 would come to a better budget. And my hope is, in the end,  
30018 you all won't have the votes. I genuinely hope that. And  
30019 then you will need us, and then we will work together in a  
30020 bipartisan way. We will get a budget that provides tax  
30021 relief for workers, tax relief for the middle class, tax  
30022 relief for farmers, tax relief for small businesses, and it  
30023 invests in our workers, fixes the tax code so everyone at the  
30024 top pays all their taxes. That is what I believe will happen  
30025 if you all don't have the votes: We will work together, and  
30026 hopefully we will be back here, and no one will lose their

30027 health care, no one will lose their food assistance, and  
30028 everyone will get the tax relief they need.

30029 With that I yield back.

30030 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. Is there anyone  
30031 else seeking discussion?

30032 The gentleman from Idaho, Mr. Fulcher.

30033 \*Mr. Fulcher. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

30034 I don't pretend to have the verbiage to say anything  
30035 better than it has been already said, or clear, or convince  
30036 anyone of anything differently, but I just -- at the end of  
30037 this whole proposition I just felt like it was important to  
30038 say something. And what has dawned upon me these last 20-  
30039 plus hours is that if you say something often enough, you  
30040 have a tendency to believe it. It doesn't have to be true.  
30041 But if you say it often enough, you have a tendency to  
30042 believe it.

30043 And we have heard over and over and over again that this  
30044 is tax cuts to billionaires, and I truly believe that my  
30045 colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that. We  
30046 hear over and over and over again that we are cutting  
30047 benefits, when the reality is this is a work requirement, and  
30048 that is fair for working-aged, able-bodied people. That is  
30049 fair. That saves it for the people it is intended for. It  
30050 is validation of eligibility, that is what it is. It is not  
30051 cutting the benefits. It is making the program solvent.

30052           Red tape concerns was one of the biggest ones for me,  
30053   because it is coming from my friends on the other side of the  
30054   aisle who have never seen a reg or a rule they don't like.  
30055   It is really about accountability and transparency.

30056           If you say things often enough, you have a tendency to  
30057   believe it. This is not hurting the targeted Medicaid  
30058   population. This is saving the system so they can get it.

30059           Mr. Chairman, add my name to the list of the people who  
30060   said you did a pretty darn good job, given the whole  
30061   circumstances on this whole thing. We are going to wrap this  
30062   up. We are going to make this happen. I encourage support  
30063   of the AINS.

30064           I yield back.

30065           \*The Chair. Thank you, and we hope to do it before the  
30066   next round of votes. We don't want to come back tonight,  
30067   that is for sure.

30068           So the gentlelady from Virginia is recognized for five  
30069   minutes to speak on the amendment.

30070           \*Ms. McClellan. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

30071           I believe that many of us in this room, if not all, do  
30072   want to protect the most vulnerable and deserving of health  
30073   care coverage, but there doesn't seem to be a lot of  
30074   agreement on exactly who that is, and that is especially true  
30075   for the larger Republican caucus, because there are people  
30076   outside of this room who don't even like this because they

30077 think it doesn't cut enough people.

30078           Based on everything that I have heard in the past 25  
30079 hours, there seems to me to be a disdain among some of you  
30080 for the expansion population. I have heard some, like the  
30081 chairman, say they are deserving and need to be included. I  
30082 have heard others that say we need to get back to the  
30083 original population, which I assume means 1965. But I am  
30084 going to give you the benefit of the doubt, as a preacher's  
30085 kid, and say you mean the expansion population.

30086           I hear a clear disdain for undocumented immigrants and  
30087 transgender individuals who have become the boogeyman for the  
30088 vast majority of Republicans for everything that they think  
30089 ails this country. But whether we like it or not, they are  
30090 not the ones that are causing the increases in the Medicaid  
30091 costs. And they do get sick and they get injured. And if  
30092 they get sick enough or injured enough, they are going to  
30093 show up in the emergency room, and they are going to get  
30094 treated under Federal law. And if they are not insured, the  
30095 cost of their care is going to be passed on to everybody  
30096 else, and our health costs will go up.

30097           Now, as I have mentioned several times today, the real  
30098 underlying reason for the vast majority of the increase in  
30099 costs of Medicaid and health care in general are the fact  
30100 that people are living longer, with more complex underlying  
30101 conditions, and that individuals with chronic conditions and

30102 disabilities that have that complex care, those costs are  
30103 ballooning. And this bill does very little, if anything, to  
30104 address that. It does very little to address the health care  
30105 workforce shortages that we have talked about, the increase  
30106 in prescription drug prices and technology costs, and the  
30107 other things that make it difficult to provide care. It does  
30108 nothing to address the underlying causes of the maternal and  
30109 infant mortality crisis, the substance abuse crisis that  
30110 making [sic] serving those populations challenging, even as  
30111 the actions of the Trump Administration gut the very  
30112 workforce and programs designed to help address those crises  
30113 and those problems.

30114         This bill does nothing to address the gutting of our  
30115 public health care workforce and infrastructure, or tariffs  
30116 that would increase costs including health care costs. This  
30117 bill ignores the environmental and social determinants of  
30118 health, and actively works to roll back problems addressed to  
30119 -- designed to address them as woke or whatever. It makes  
30120 assumptions that somebody who earns \$300 a week will pay up  
30121 to \$35 because they need to get skin in the game, and ignores  
30122 the reality that that person also has to pay rent, groceries,  
30123 transportation costs to get to and from the job that they  
30124 need to have, and they are going to end up not paying \$35 to  
30125 get primary or preventative care, but they will eventually  
30126 show up in the emergency room.

30127            Democrats have been cut out of this process from day  
30128 one, and then asked to trust that this big, beautiful bill  
30129 that we had nothing to do with, that we got a framework on  
30130 Sunday for, and the text on Monday, and that we are supposed  
30131 to trust that it doesn't make mistakes by adopting work  
30132 requirements that have been shown to not actually work in the  
30133 states that have done them -- oh, trust us, trust the same  
30134 people who sit back as Elon Musk fires people by accident and  
30135 says, oops, mistakes were made, and laughs about it.

30136            Everybody in this room, our view on this bill and health  
30137 care policy is based on our life experiences and what we  
30138 know. And it is very different, and very different from the  
30139 vast majority of the people that we represent.

30140            So I believe health care is a right because in the  
30141 Declaration of Independence, the first word of the rights  
30142 that we are endowed by our creator with is life. And you  
30143 need health care to live.

30144            I also believe that lowering the number of insured --  
30145 uninsured lowers the cost for everybody. I think that is  
30146 what the American people want. I think that is why they have  
30147 consistently said don't repeal the Affordable Care Act or gut  
30148 Medicaid or Social Security. I think this bill is going to  
30149 do all of that, and it is not finished. And that is why you  
30150 hear us reflecting --

30151            \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time has expired --



30152           \*Ms. McClellan. -- the fears of our constituents.

30153           \*The Chair. The gentlelady's time has expired.

30154           \*Ms. McClellan. Listen to them.

30155           And I yield back.

30156           \*The Chair. Thank you. Are there any others seeking  
30157 recognition?

30158           The gentleman from Georgia seeks recognition to speak on  
30159 the amendment.

30160           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And  
30161 again, as everyone has indicated, you did a great job.

30162           Folks, this may come as a surprise to some of my  
30163 colleagues, but I am a pharmacist.

30164           [Laughter.]

30165           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Anybody know that? No,  
30166 seriously, I am. I was a pharmacist --

30167           \*The Chair. Mr. Weber just asked what drug are you  
30168 taking, that is --

30169           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Yes, yes. I may not be taking  
30170 drugs, and I don't, but I will tell you I sold a bunch of  
30171 them.

30172           [Laughter.]

30173           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. See, I had three pharmacies  
30174 that I owned, and those pharmacies served Medicaid patients.  
30175 And I had another business that I owned, and that business  
30176 serviced nursing homes and personal care homes and assisted

30177 living and hospices. In fact, when I sold that business, it  
30178 was the second-largest provider of institutional pharmacy in  
30179 the State of Georgia. I was very proud of that.

30180 But I tell you that because I have seen it firsthand. I  
30181 know how important this program is. I know how people depend  
30182 on it. I was the one at the front of the counter when the  
30183 senior citizens were up there with their Medicaid card,  
30184 trying to get their medication. I was the one doing that. I  
30185 was the one in the nursing home, sitting behind the nurse's  
30186 station, going through patient's charts, trying to decide  
30187 what to recommend for those patients and their drug therapy,  
30188 what was covered and what wasn't covered, and how could we do  
30189 the best we could for them.

30190 And I knew there were a lot of problems. I knew there  
30191 were some people on there that shouldn't be on there. And if  
30192 you look at what we have done -- and this is why I am so  
30193 proud of this, because what we have done -- we are going to  
30194 stop paying for people that aren't actually eligible. This  
30195 is for the most vulnerable in our society. We don't need  
30196 those who are not supposed to be on it on this program. We  
30197 need the people -- we have got a waiting list for some  
30198 people. They need to be on this program. Yet there are  
30199 people who shouldn't be on the program who are on it, and  
30200 they don't need to be on it.

30201 That is what we are doing. We are cleaning that up. We

30202 are making sure that we are not going to pay for 1.6 million  
30203 people who are getting it in more than one state. They get  
30204 it in two states. Some of them get it in three states. That  
30205 is waste. That is not what we need to be doing. We  
30206 shouldn't be giving it to illegals. They should not -- this  
30207 is for the American people. We shouldn't be giving it --  
30208 now, we need to -- I agree, yes, we need to address that.  
30209 But this program was intended for the most vulnerable in our  
30210 society: the aged, the blind, the disabled, mothers,  
30211 children.

30212 Listen, I am the one who collected that Medicaid card  
30213 every month from those people. I have seen it. I know what  
30214 we are doing here. We need to stop. We -- hey, look, there  
30215 are some bad actors out there. Every profession has bad  
30216 actors. There is some bad pharmacists out there who are  
30217 billing that shouldn't be billing, some bad physicians who  
30218 are billing that shouldn't be billing. That is the kind of  
30219 thing we are going after here. That is what we are cleaning  
30220 up.

30221 And then we talk about the community involvement. Yes,  
30222 if you are able-bodied, you ought to be working, you ought to  
30223 be volunteering. Now, if you are taking care of a child, if  
30224 you are taking care of a parent, no, that is not what it  
30225 says. What it says is, if you are an adult, able-bodied, if  
30226 you are above 19 years of age, or older than that or are

30227 under 64, yes, you ought to be volunteering, you ought to be  
30228 doing something. And what is wrong with that?

30229 I saw people on that program when I was practicing that  
30230 shouldn't be on it, but I saw those people who needed it so  
30231 bad.

30232 Folks, I grew up in south Georgia. We got a lot of  
30233 paper mills in south Georgia. I worked in a paper mill. My  
30234 daddy worked thirty-three-and-a-half years' shift work in a  
30235 paper mill. I don't know if any of you have ever worked in a  
30236 paper mill, but I worked on a broke beater. And it is not  
30237 hell, but you can see hell from there, I will tell you that.  
30238 It is hard. And those people work hard, and we need to be  
30239 taking care of them.

30240 And what we are doing with this is we are cleaning up  
30241 this program. We are not kicking anybody off. What we are  
30242 doing is making it better. I am very proud of this, of this  
30243 entire committee, very proud to be a part of this, and very  
30244 proud of this product. This is going to make Medicaid  
30245 better.

30246 And I yield.

30247 \*The Chair. The gentleman yields back. If there is no  
30248 further discussion, the vote occurs on the amendment.

30249 The gentleman requests a recorded vote, and there will  
30250 be three successive recorded votes, so if everybody could  
30251 stay close by, we will appreciate expediting that. So the

30252 gentleman requests a recorded vote, and the clerk will call  
30253 the roll.

30254 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

30255 \*The Chair. This is on the amendment.

30256 \*Mr. Latta. No.

30257 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes no.

30258 Mr. Griffith?

30259 \*Mr. Griffith. No.

30260 \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes no.

30261 Mr. Bilirakis?

30262 \*Mr. Bilirakis. No.

30263 \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes no.

30264 Mr. Hudson?

30265 \*Mr. Hudson. No.

30266 \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes no.

30267 Mr. Carter of Georgia?

30268 \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. No.

30269 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes no.

30270 Mr. Palmer?

30271 \*Mr. Palmer. No.

30272 \*The Clerk. Mr. Palmer votes no.

30273 Mr. Dunn?

30274 \*Mr. Dunn. No.

30275 \*The Clerk. Mr. Dunn votes no.

30276 Mr. Crenshaw?

30277 [No response.]

30278 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce?

30279 \*Mr. Joyce. No.

30280 \*The Clerk. Mr. Joyce votes no.

30281 Mr. Weber?

30282 \*Mr. Weber. No.

30283 \*The Clerk. Mr. Weber votes no.

30284 Mr. Allen?

30285 \*Mr. Allen. No.

30286 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes no.

30287 Mr. Balderson?

30288 \*Mr. Balderson. No.

30289 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes no.

30290 Mr. Fulcher?

30291 [No response.]

30292 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger?

30293 [No response.]

30294 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger?

30295 [No response.]

30296 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks?

30297 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. No.

30298 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes no.

30299 Mrs. Cammack?

30300 [No response.]

30301 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte?

30302           \*Mr. Oubernolte.   No.  
30303           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Oubernolte votes no.  
30304           Mr. James?  
30305           [No response.]  
30306           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz?  
30307           \*Mr. Bentz.   No.  
30308           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes no.  
30309           Mrs. Houchin?  
30310           \*Mrs. Houchin.   No.  
30311           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes no.  
30312           Mr. Fry?  
30313           \*Mr. Fry.   No.  
30314           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes no.  
30315           Ms. Lee?  
30316           \*Ms. Lee.   No.  
30317           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes no.  
30318           Mr. Langworthy?  
30319           \*Mr. Langworthy.   No.  
30320           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes no.  
30321           Mr. Kean?  
30322           \*Mr. Kean.   No.  
30323           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes no.  
30324           Mr. Rulli?  
30325           \*Mr. Rulli.   No.  
30326           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes no.

30327 Mr. Evans?

30328 \*Mr. Evans. No.

30329 \*The Clerk. Mr. Evans votes no.

30330 Mr. Goldman?

30331 [No response.]

30332 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman?

30333 [No response.]

30334 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman?

30335 \*Mr. Goldman. No.

30336 \*The Clerk. Mr. Goldman votes no.

30337 Mrs. Fedorchak?

30338 \*Mrs. Fedorchak. No.

30339 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fedorchak votes no.

30340 Mr. Pallone?

30341 \*Mr. Pallone. Aye.

30342 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pallone votes aye.

30343 Ms. DeGette?

30344 \*Ms. DeGette. Aye.

30345 \*The Clerk. Ms. DeGette votes aye.

30346 Ms. Schakowsky?

30347 \*Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

30348 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky votes aye.

30349 Ms. Matsui?

30350 \*Ms. Matsui. Aye.

30351 \*The Clerk. Ms. Matsui votes aye.



30352 Ms. Castor?

30353 \*Ms. Castor. Aye.

30354 \*The Clerk. Ms. Castor votes aye.

30355 Mr. Tonko?

30356 \*Mr. Tonko. Aye.

30357 \*The Clerk. Mr. Tonko votes aye.

30358 Ms. Clarke?

30359 \*Ms. Clarke. Aye.

30360 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes aye.

30361 Mr. Ruiz?

30362 \*Mr. Ruiz. Aye.

30363 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes aye.

30364 Mr. Peters?

30365 \*Mr. Peters. Aye.

30366 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes aye.

30367 Mrs. Dingell?

30368 \*Mrs. Dingell. Aye.

30369 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes aye.

30370 Mr. Veasey?

30371 \*Mr. Veasey. Aye.

30372 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes aye.

30373 Ms. Kelly?

30374 \*Ms. Kelly. Aye.

30375 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes aye.

30376 Ms. Barragan?

30377 \*Ms. Barragan. Aye.  
30378 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes aye.  
30379 Mr. Soto?  
30380 \*Mr. Soto. Aye.  
30381 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes aye.  
30382 Ms. Schrier?  
30383 \*Ms. Schrier. Aye.  
30384 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes aye.  
30385 Mrs. Trahan?  
30386 \*Mrs. Trahan. Aye.  
30387 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes aye.  
30388 Mrs. Fletcher?  
30389 \*Mrs. Fletcher. Aye.  
30390 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes aye.  
30391 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?  
30392 [No response.]  
30393 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss?  
30394 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. Aye.  
30395 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.  
30396 Mr. Auchincloss.  
30397 \*Mr. Auchincloss. Aye.  
30398 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes aye.  
30399 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?  
30400 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. Carter votes aye.  
30401 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes aye.

30402 Mr. Menendez?

30403 \*Mr. Menendez. Aye.

30404 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes aye.

30405 Mr. Mullin?

30406 [No response.]

30407 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin?

30408 \*Mr. Mullin. Aye.

30409 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes aye.

30410 Mr. Landsman?

30411 \*Mr. Landsman. Aye.

30412 \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes aye.

30413 Ms. McClellan?

30414 \*Ms. McClellan. Aye.

30415 \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes aye.

30416 Chairman Guthrie?

30417 \*The Chair. So I am no, no on the amendment.

30418 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes no.

30419 \*The Chair. So we have Mrs. Harshbarger.

30420 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger is not recorded.

30421 \*The Chair. Mr. Fulcher --

30422 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. No.

30423 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes no.

30424 \*The Chair. Mr. Fulcher?

30425 \*Mr. Fulcher. Fulcher is no.

30426 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes no.

30427           \*The Chair.   Mr. James?

30428           \*Mr. James.   No.

30429           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James is not recorded.

30430           \*The Chair.   He said --

30431           \*Mr. James.   James, no.

30432           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James --

30433           \*The Chair.   Cammack?

30434           \*The Clerk.   -- votes no.

30435           Mrs. Cammack is not recorded.

30436           \*Mrs. Cammack.   No.

30437           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes no.

30438           \*The Chair.   Mr. Crenshaw?

30439           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   Crenshaw is no.

30440           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes no.

30441           \*The Chair.   All right, if everybody can stay put, we

30442   will get through the -- we have Ms. Alexandria --

30443           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman --

30444           \*The Chair.   -- Ocasio-Cortez, I am sorry.

30445           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger --

30446           \*The Chair.   I am sorry, Ms. Ocasio-Cortez, you --

30447           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez.   Aye.

30448           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Ocasio-Cortez is recorded as aye.

30449           \*The Chair.   Okay.

30450           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Chairman, Mr. Pfluger is not recorded.

30451           \*The Chair.   Who is not recorded?

30452           \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger.

30453           \*The Chair. Oh, okay, Pfluger.

30454           \*Mr. Pfluger. No.

30455           \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes no.

30456           \*The Chair. Is everybody recorded that wants to be  
30457 recorded?

30458           So again, everybody stay put. We will get through this  
30459 pretty quick. So the clerk will report.

30460           \*The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote there were 24  
30461 ayes and 30 noes.

30462           \*The Chair. So the amendment is not agreed to.

30463           So now we are going to do the amendment in the nature of  
30464 a substitute, okay, which we are going to do by voice.

30465           So everybody -- so if there is no further discussion,  
30466 the vote occurs on the amendment in the nature of a  
30467 substitute.

30468           All those in favor shall signify by saying aye.

30469           All those opposed, no.

30470           In the opinion of the chair the ayes have it. The  
30471 amendment in the nature of substitute is agreed to.

30472           Are there further amendments?

30473           Seeing none, so this will be a roll call vote.

30474           I move that the committee do now approve and agree to  
30475 transmit to the House Committee on the Budget --

30476           \*Voice. No, no, no.

30477           \*The Chair. No, Subtitle -- okay, I am sorry. Let me  
30478 start over.

30479           I move that the committee do now approve and agree to  
30480 transmit to the House Committee on Budget Subtitle D Budget  
30481 Reconciliation Legislation Recommendation, as amended, to  
30482 Health.

30483           Okay, so we have got to roll call this one and one more  
30484 roll call on this. So a roll call has been requested, and  
30485 the clerk will call the roll.

30486           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

30487           \*Mr. Latta. Aye.

30488           \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.

30489           Mr. Griffith?

30490           \*Mr. Griffith. Aye.

30491           \*The Clerk. Mr. Griffith votes aye.

30492           Mr. Bilirakis?

30493           \*Mr. Bilirakis. Aye.

30494           \*The Clerk. Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.

30495           Mr. Hudson?

30496           \*Mr. Hudson. Aye.

30497           \*The Clerk. Mr. Hudson votes aye.

30498           Mr. Carter of Georgia?

30499           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia. Aye.

30500           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Georgia votes aye.

30501           Mr. Palmer?

30502           \*Mr. Palmer.   Aye.  
30503           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
30504           Mr. Dunn?  
30505           \*Mr. Dunn.   Aye.  
30506           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes aye.  
30507           Mr. Crenshaw?  
30508           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   Aye.  
30509           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes aye.  
30510           Mr. Joyce?  
30511           \*Mr. Joyce.   Aye.  
30512           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes aye.  
30513           Mr. Weber?  
30514           \*Mr. Weber.   Aye.  
30515           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes aye.  
30516           Mr. Allen?  
30517           \*Mr. Allen.   Aye.  
30518           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Allen votes aye.  
30519           Mr. Balderson?  
30520           \*Mr. Balderson.   Aye.  
30521           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Balderson votes aye.  
30522           Mr. Fulcher?  
30523           \*Mr. Fulcher.   Aye.  
30524           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fulcher votes aye.  
30525           Mr. Pfluger?  
30526           \*Mr. Pfluger.   Aye.

30527           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pfluger votes aye.  
30528           Mrs. Harshbarger?  
30529           [No response.]  
30530           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger?  
30531           \*Mrs. Harshbarger.   Aye.  
30532           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Harshbarger votes aye.  
30533           Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
30534           \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks.   Aye.  
30535           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes aye.  
30536           Mrs. Cammack?  
30537           \*Mrs. Cammack.   Aye.  
30538           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Cammack votes aye.  
30539           Mr. Obernolte?  
30540           \*Mr. Obernolte.   Aye.  
30541           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Obernolte votes aye.  
30542           Mr. James?  
30543           \*Mr. James.   Aye.  
30544           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes aye.  
30545           Mr. Bentz?  
30546           \*Mr. Bentz.   Aye.  
30547           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes aye.  
30548           Mrs. Houchin?  
30549           \*Mrs. Houchin.   Aye.  
30550           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes aye.  
30551           Mr. Fry?



30552           \*Mr. Fry.   Aye.  
30553           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes aye.  
30554           Ms. Lee?  
30555           \*Ms. Lee.   Aye.  
30556           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes aye.  
30557           Mr. Langworthy?  
30558           \*Mr. Langworthy.   Aye.  
30559           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
30560           Mr. Kean?  
30561           \*Mr. Kean.   Aye.  
30562           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes aye.  
30563           Mr. Rulli?  
30564           \*Mr. Rulli.   Aye.  
30565           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes aye.  
30566           Mr. Evans?  
30567           \*Mr. Evans.   Aye.  
30568           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes aye.  
30569           Mr. Goldman?  
30570           \*Mr. Goldman.   Aye.  
30571           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
30572           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
30573           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   Aye.  
30574           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes aye.  
30575           Mr. Pallone?  
30576           \*Mr. Pallone.   No.

30577           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes no.  
30578           Ms. DeGette?  
30579           \*Ms. DeGette.   No.  
30580           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes no.  
30581           Ms. Schakowsky?  
30582           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   No.  
30583           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes no.  
30584           Ms. Matsui?  
30585           \*Ms. Matsui.   No.  
30586           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes no.  
30587           Ms. Castor?  
30588           \*Ms. Castor.   No.  
30589           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes no.  
30590           Mr. Tonko?  
30591           \*Mr. Tonko.   No.  
30592           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes no.  
30593           Ms. Clarke?  
30594           \*Ms. Clarke.   No.  
30595           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Clarke votes no  
30596           Mr. Ruiz?  
30597           \*Mr. Ruiz.   No.  
30598           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Ruiz votes no.  
30599           Mr. Peters?  
30600           \*Mr. Peters.   No.  
30601           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Peters votes no.

30602 Mrs. Dingell?  
30603 \*Mrs. Dingell. No.  
30604 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no.  
30605 Mr. Veasey?  
30606 \*Mr. Veasey. No.  
30607 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes no.  
30608 Ms. Kelly?  
30609 \*Ms. Kelly. No.  
30610 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes no.  
30611 Ms. Barragan?  
30612 \*Ms. Barragan. No.  
30613 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes no.  
30614 Mr. Soto?  
30615 \*Mr. Soto. No.  
30616 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes no.  
30617 Ms. Schrier?  
30618 \*Ms. Schrier. No.  
30619 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes no.  
30620 Mrs. Trahan?  
30621 \*Mrs. Trahan. No.  
30622 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes no.  
30623 Mrs. Fletcher?  
30624 \*Mrs. Fletcher. No.  
30625 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes no.  
30626 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

30627           \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. No.

30628           \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.

30629           Mr. Auchincloss?

30630           \*Mr. Auchincloss. No.

30631           \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes no.

30632           Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

30633           \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. No.

30634           \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes no.

30635           Mr. Menendez?

30636           \*Mr. Menendez. No.

30637           \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes no.

30638           Mr. Mullin?

30639           \*Mr. Mullin. No.

30640           \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes no.

30641           Mr. Landsman?

30642           [No response.]

30643           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman?

30644           [Laughter.]

30645           \*The Chair. He is no.

30646           \*Mr. Landsman. No.

30647           \*The Chair. He is a no.

30648           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes no.

30649           Ms. McClellan?

30650           \*Ms. McClellan. No.

30651           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes no.

30652 Chairman Guthrie?

30653 \*The Chair. Aye.

30654 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes aye.

30655 \*The Chair. Has anyone not responded to the roll call?

30656 Has anybody not responded to the roll call?

30657 Seeing none, the clerk will report.

30658 \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were

30659 30 ayes and 24 noes.

30660 \*The Chair. The ayes have it, and the motion is agreed  
30661 to.

30662 So we have one final roll call vote. Before we close I  
30663 just would like to take a moment to say thank you to Phill  
30664 Swagel, the director of the CBO, along with his team and  
30665 analysts that we went through quite often.

30666 And I would like to offer a special thanks to Warren  
30667 Burke, the legislative counsel of the House of  
30668 Representatives, and his staff attorneys who provided  
30669 extensive support. The exceptional staff for CBO and the  
30670 Office of Legislative Counsel plays a fundamental role in the  
30671 legislative process, and we could not have done it without  
30672 them.

30673 I want to have a special thanks to both the majority and  
30674 the minority staff who make Energy and Commerce --

30675 [Applause.]

30676 \*The Chair. Energy and Commerce has the best members on

30677 both sides of the aisle, but we absolutely have the best  
30678 staff on both sides of the aisle. And we didn't get sleep  
30679 last night. I know some of these haven't gotten sleep for  
30680 the last several nights, so I really, really appreciate them.

30681 We have had a lot of discussions. I appreciate some of  
30682 the kind comments that I have received over the last two days  
30683 on how we can unleash American energy, support American  
30684 technology, and strengthen Medicaid for the American people.

30685 And as we get ready to close, I want to thank all of our  
30686 members for -- both Republican and Democrat. We are all very  
30687 passionate about these issues. We want to make these  
30688 programs as strong as we can be in the way that we see them.  
30689 And I want to thank most -- members of both sides of the  
30690 aisle, and we will -- we heard some really good rhetoric -- I  
30691 mean, talk, not rhetoric -- talk amongst ourselves. And so  
30692 we will just put this together, and let's find ways to work  
30693 together. And I commit that under this chairmanship we will  
30694 find ways to work together and get big things done.

30695 I will go to the ranking member, and then we will vote  
30696 and everybody can go about their business.

30697 \*Mr. Pallone. Well, I certainly agree with everything  
30698 you said, Mr. Chairman.

30699 It obviously is not always easy to be in the opposition,  
30700 particularly on this bill, where we pretty much opposed  
30701 everything that you were proposing here tonight. But I do

30702 think we made a good fight, and we certainly fought in a way  
30703 I think that the opposition should.

30704 And I want to thank everyone, all the members and the  
30705 staff, for a job well done. Thank you again.

30706 \*The Chair. Okay.

30707 [Applause.]

30708 \*The Chair. So the moment we have all been waiting for  
30709 for the last 26 hours and 24 minutes, I move that the  
30710 committee do now transmit the recommendations of this  
30711 subcommittee approved as Subtitles A, Energy; B, Environment;  
30712 C, Communications; and D, Health, as amended, and all  
30713 appropriate accompanying materials including supplemental,  
30714 minority, additional, or dissenting views to the House  
30715 Committee on Budget in order to comply with the  
30716 reconciliation directive included in section 2001 of the  
30717 Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2025,  
30718 H.Con. Res. 14, and consistent with the section 310 of the  
30719 Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974.

30720 A roll call has been requested, and the clerk will call  
30721 the roll.

30722 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta?

30723 \*Mr. Latta. Aye.

30724 \*The Clerk. Mr. Latta votes aye.

30725 Mr. Griffith?

30726 \*Mr. Griffith. Aye.

30727           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Griffith votes aye.  
30728           Mr. Bilirakis?  
30729           \*Mr. Bilirakis.   Aye.  
30730           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bilirakis votes aye.  
30731           Mr. Hudson?  
30732           \*Mr. Hudson.   Aye.  
30733           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Hudson votes aye.  
30734           Mr. Carter of Georgia?  
30735           \*Mr. Carter of Georgia.   Aye.  
30736           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Carter of Georgia votes aye.  
30737           Mr. Palmer?  
30738           \*Mr. Palmer.   Aye.  
30739           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Palmer votes aye.  
30740           Mr. Dunn?  
30741           \*Mr. Dunn.   Aye.  
30742           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Dunn votes aye.  
30743           Mr. Crenshaw?  
30744           \*Mr. Crenshaw.   Aye.  
30745           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Crenshaw votes aye.  
30746           Mr. Joyce?  
30747           \*Mr. Joyce.   Aye.  
30748           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Joyce votes aye.  
30749           Mr. Weber?  
30750           \*Mr. Weber.   Aye.  
30751           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Weber votes aye.



30752 Mr. Allen?  
30753 \*Mr. Allen. Aye.  
30754 \*The Clerk. Mr. Allen votes aye.  
30755 Mr. Balderson?  
30756 \*Mr. Balderson. Aye.  
30757 \*The Clerk. Mr. Balderson votes aye.  
30758 Mr. Fulcher?  
30759 \*Mr. Fulcher. Aye.  
30760 \*The Clerk. Mr. Fulcher votes aye.  
30761 Mr. Pfluger?  
30762 \*Mr. Pfluger. Aye.  
30763 \*The Clerk. Mr. Pfluger votes aye.  
30764 Mrs. Harshbarger?  
30765 \*Mrs. Harshbarger. Aye.  
30766 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Harshbarger votes aye.  
30767 Mrs. Miller-Meeks?  
30768 \*Mrs. Miller-Meeks. Aye.  
30769 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Miller-Meeks votes aye.  
30770 Mrs. Cammack?  
30771 \*Mrs. Cammack. Aye.  
30772 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Cammack votes aye.  
30773 Mr. Obernolte?  
30774 \*Mr. Obernolte. Aye.  
30775 \*The Clerk. Mr. Obernolte votes aye.  
30776 Mr. James?

30777           \*Mr. James.   Aye.  
30778           \*The Clerk.   Mr. James votes aye.  
30779           Mr. Bentz?  
30780           \*Mr. Bentz.   Aye.  
30781           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Bentz votes aye.  
30782           Mrs. Houchin?  
30783           \*Mrs. Houchin.   Aye.  
30784           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Houchin votes aye.  
30785           Mr. Fry?  
30786           \*Mr. Fry.    Aye.  
30787           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Fry votes aye.  
30788           Ms. Lee?  
30789           \*Ms. Lee.    Aye.  
30790           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Lee votes aye.  
30791           Mr. Langworthy?  
30792           \*Mr. Langworthy.   Aye.  
30793           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Langworthy votes aye.  
30794           Mr. Kean?  
30795           \*Mr. Kean.    Aye.  
30796           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Kean votes aye.  
30797           Mr. Rulli?  
30798           \*Mr. Rulli.    Aye.  
30799           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Rulli votes aye.  
30800           Mr. Evans?  
30801           \*Mr. Evans.   Aye.

30802           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Evans votes aye.  
30803           Mr. Goldman?  
30804           \*Mr. Goldman.   Aye.  
30805           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Goldman votes aye.  
30806           Mrs. Fedorchak?  
30807           \*Mrs. Fedorchak.   Aye.  
30808           \*The Clerk.   Mrs. Fedorchak votes aye.  
30809           Mr. Pallone?  
30810           \*Mr. Pallone.   No.  
30811           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Pallone votes no  
30812           Ms. DeGette?  
30813           \*Ms. DeGette.   No.  
30814           \*The Clerk.   Ms. DeGette votes no.  
30815           Ms. Schakowsky?  
30816           \*Ms. Schakowsky.   No.  
30817           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Schakowsky votes no.  
30818           Ms. Matsui?  
30819           \*Ms. Matsui.   No.  
30820           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Matsui votes no.  
30821           Ms. Castor?  
30822           \*Ms. Castor.   No.  
30823           \*The Clerk.   Ms. Castor votes no.  
30824           Mr. Tonko?  
30825           \*Mr. Tonko.   No.  
30826           \*The Clerk.   Mr. Tonko votes no.

30827 Ms. Clarke?  
30828 \*Ms. Clarke. No.  
30829 \*The Clerk. Ms. Clarke votes no.  
30830 Mr. Ruiz?  
30831 \*Mr. Ruiz. No.  
30832 \*The Clerk. Mr. Ruiz votes no.  
30833 Mr. Peters?  
30834 \*Mr. Peters. No.  
30835 \*The Clerk. Mr. Peters votes no.  
30836 Mrs. Dingell?  
30837 \*Mrs. Dingell. No.  
30838 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Dingell votes no.  
30839 Mr. Veasey?  
30840 \*Mr. Veasey. No.  
30841 \*The Clerk. Mr. Veasey votes no.  
30842 Ms. Kelly?  
30843 \*Ms. Kelly. No.  
30844 \*The Clerk. Ms. Kelly votes no.  
30845 Ms. Barragan?  
30846 \*Ms. Barragan. No.  
30847 \*The Clerk. Ms. Barragan votes no.  
30848 Mr. Soto?  
30849 \*Mr. Soto. No.  
30850 \*The Clerk. Mr. Soto votes no.  
30851 Ms. Schrier?

30852 \*Ms. Schrier. No.

30853 \*The Clerk. Ms. Schrier votes no.

30854 Mrs. Trahan?

30855 \*Mrs. Trahan. No.

30856 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Trahan votes no.

30857 Mrs. Fletcher?

30858 \*Mrs. Fletcher. No.

30859 \*The Clerk. Mrs. Fletcher votes no.

30860 Ms. Ocasio-Cortez?

30861 \*Ms. Ocasio-Cortez. No.

30862 \*The Clerk. Ms. Ocasio-Cortez votes no.

30863 Mr. Auchincloss?

30864 \*Mr. Auchincloss. No.

30865 \*The Clerk. Mr. Auchincloss votes no.

30866 Mr. Carter of Louisiana?

30867 \*Mr. Carter of Louisiana. No.

30868 \*The Clerk. Mr. Carter of Louisiana votes no.

30869 Mr. Menendez?

30870 \*Mr. Menendez. No.

30871 \*The Clerk. Mr. Menendez votes no.

30872 Mr. Mullin?

30873 \*Mr. Mullin. No.

30874 \*The Clerk. Mr. Mullin votes no.

30875 Mr. Landsman?

30876 \*Mr. Landsman. No.

30877           \*The Clerk. Mr. Landsman votes no.  
30878           Ms. McClellan?  
30879           \*Ms. McClellan. No.  
30880           \*The Clerk. Ms. McClellan votes no.  
30881           Chairman Guthrie?  
30882           \*The Chair. Aye.  
30883           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie votes aye.  
30884           \*The Chair. Is anyone here seeking to answer the roll  
30885   call?  
30886           Seeing none on the Republican, any on the Democrat side?  
30887           Seeing none, the clerk will report.  
30888           \*The Clerk. Chairman Guthrie, on that vote there were  
30889   30 ayes and 24 noes.  
30890           \*The Chair. The ayes have it, and the motion to  
30891   transmit is agreed to.  
30892           [Whereupon, at 4:28 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]