



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2017

No. 159

## House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL).

### DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
October 4, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROB WOODALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives.*

### MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2017, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

### HARVARD RAPE VICTIM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, graduating from high school and going to college is an important goal for many, many American teenagers. College offers the promise of an education, new friends, and new experiences.

When parents drop their children off at their new dorms, they are entrusting those universities with the well-being of their kids. The dark reality is that, in many cases, this trust is woefully misplaced.

Mr. Speaker, approximately one in five women are sexually assaulted in college. That is one out of every five of our daughters, sisters, and friends. This shocking statistic would lead most people to assume that colleges have extensive protections to support those people on campus who may be sexually assaulted. This is just not the case.

Last year one of these victims published an anonymous op-ed at Harvard about her attack. The title of her article was, "It's Me, One of Your Statistics." She described the night of her attack.

A friend invited her to his dorm room to study for an upcoming science midterm test. She thought nothing of it, but when she started to become uncomfortable, she decided it was important for her to leave. But he did not let her leave. He sexually assaulted her.

After the attack, she ran to a friend's room for help. She refused to shower, knowing that she had to immediately get a rape kit done. Assuming the university would be able to help her, she called their health services department, but the news she received from them shocked her. Harvard University Health Services didn't provide rape kits. They didn't provide any post-rape care whatsoever. There was nothing they would or could do for her. The university essentially threw up their hands and just turned her away.

She was forced to call an Uber and paid someone to drive her to the hospital across town. But once she arrived, there was no staff at the hospital trained to deal with sexual assault victims or trained to collect forensic evidence.

Sexual assault forensic examiners, or SAFEs as they are called, are specifically trained to properly collect forensic evidence from victims and provide the victim with care and support that is sensitive to the trauma that they have experienced. She had to wait over

3 hours for somebody to arrive. This is unacceptable, and it is sad.

It is estimated that less than 25 percent of victims of rape report their crimes. They fear this exact scenario, that they will be turned away, dismissed, ignored, or not believed.

To address this problem I have introduced legislation that would require a hospital to provide access to a sexual assault forensic examiner or have a plan in place to quickly get a victim to a nearby hospital that can provide forensic services.

This bill is named for Megan Rondini. It is called the Megan Rondini Act, in honor of a 21-year-old sexual assault victim who was denied proper post-rape treatment at a hospital in Alabama. This bill will ensure victims can access the care that they need.

Megan's hospital didn't have a sexual assault nurse examiner on staff either, so when she reported the rape to the authorities, the authorities did not believe her. Anguished, Megan returned to Texas, despondent, and tragically took her own life. The only thing she knew for certain in her case was that she was failed by the university, the hospital, and the law enforcement agencies.

Universities should have a sexual assault victim advocate on staff—all universities. A SAFE should be available for victims at a nearby hospital, and law enforcement must quickly analyze sexual assault kits because there are hundreds sitting on the shelves all over the country that have never been tested.

Mr. Speaker, sexual assault victims are people. They are mainly young people at universities. As the Harvard student said, they are not just statistics on a hospital spreadsheet. Society can no longer ignore the silent, painful cries for help of victims of rape on our college campuses anymore. These days need to end.

And that is just the way it is.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7753

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DR. VIRGINIA  
KIMBROUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BARTON). The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. BUTTERFIELD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BUTTERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a great American, Dr. Virginia Kimbrough Newell, who will celebrate her 100th birthday on Saturday, October 7. Dr. Newell has spent her entire lifetime in service to others as a civil rights activist, elected official, mentor, and friend.

Dr. Newell was born in Advance, North Carolina, to William and Dinah Kimbrough. She graduated from historic Atkins High School in Winston-Salem and received a degree in mathematics from Talladega College in Talladega, Alabama. She received her master's degree from New York University and a doctorate in education from the University of Sarasota in Sarasota, Florida.

After receiving her doctorate, Dr. Newell returned to her beloved North Carolina and taught mathematics at Washington High School and J.W. Ligon High School in Raleigh. Dr. Newell later joined the faculty at Shaw University in Raleigh as an associate professor of mathematics.

In 1965, Mr. Speaker, Dr. Newell joined Winston-Salem State University as a mathematics professor. She taught at that institution for 20 long years and served as chair of the mathematics department. Acknowledging her tremendous contributions to the university, the computer science center bears her name.

A dedicated public servant, Dr. Newell served as Winston-Salem city alderman for 16 years, where she focused on the needs of her constituents and advocated for those who were often without a voice. In recognition of her selfless advocacy, the city of Winston-Salem has named a street and walking trail in her honor.

Virginia Kimbrough married George Fisher Newell, a distinguished science professor, a marriage that lasted 46 long years. Two daughters were born to the marriage, my friend, Dr. Glenda Newell-Harris, and Dr. Virginia D. Banks. She is blessed with six grandchildren: Brittany, Phillip, Mary, Matthew, Mark, and Todd.

Dr. Newell is a member of Alpha Kappa Alpha Sorority, Incorporated, and is a platinum member of The Links, Incorporated. She is an Alpha Bette, which is a wife of an Alpha Phi Alpha Fraternity man, and an Archousa, which is a wife of Sigma Pi Phi Fraternity. She has been a faithful member of First Baptist Church in Winston-Salem for more than 50 years.

Dr. Newell is, without a doubt, a visionary trailblazer who has positively impacted the lives of so many. On behalf of the United States House of Representatives and the people of my congressional district, I wish Dr. Virginia Kimbrough Newell a very happy 100th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. ADAMS), who is from the 12th District of North Carolina.

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the phenomenal Dr. Virginia K. Newell, a mathematician, author, civil rights activist, teacher, elected official, mentor, and my Alpha Kappa Alpha soror.

Dr. Newell is an asset to North Carolina. We celebrate her 100th birthday today and honor her legacy as a voice for the voiceless.

A native of the triad, Dr. Newell graduated from Atkins High School in Winston-Salem before attending Talladega College in Alabama. She earned her master's degree from NYU and her doctorate of education from the University of Sarasota.

As an educator, she touched the lives of countless students at Washington and Ligon High Schools in Raleigh, Yale Summer High School, Shaw University, and Winston-Salem State University. As chairwoman of the mathematics department at WSSU for 20 years and later as professor emeritus, Dr. Newell is credited with bringing computers to that campus.

In Winston-Salem, Dr. Newell sought to make the greatest difference she could. She was elected as city alderwoman, serving for 16 years and always placing her constituents' needs first. She led numerous voter registration drives and co-chaired the Shirley Chisholm for President campaign in North Carolina. Even after retirement, Dr. Newell served as mentor and tutor to hundreds of students who continue to thank her for her firm approach and for expecting nothing but the best from them.

Dr. Newell's hard work and dedication to her students, constituents, and North Carolina is admirable and noteworthy. Indeed, she is a phenomenal woman, and I wish her a very happy 100th birthday.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR.  
GEORGE HAMILTON

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. George Hamilton, who passed away on August 4, 2017, at 88 years old.

Mr. Hamilton graduated from the University of Georgia School of Pharmacy and owned and operated his own private pharmacy. He was the owner of Hamilton's Apothecary in the heart of downtown Savannah, where he was the primary pharmacist for many citizens of Savannah.

It wasn't just his products that brought in his customers, but the genuine care that he showed for people. He opened his business mainly because of his genuine love for neighbors and community. If someone could not afford to purchase their desperately needed medicine, he would give it to them for free.

He also stocked his store with basic groceries to keep the elderly people who lived near his store from having to make a long walk to the grocery store.

Aside from being passionate about his profession, Mr. Hamilton watched, with his children, his beloved Georgia Bulldogs play almost every Saturday.

I thank Mr. Hamilton for his dedication to the Savannah community and the profession of pharmacy. He will truly be missed.

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. HERMON  
BUTLER

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the life of Mr. Hermon Butler, Sr., who passed away on August 21, 2017, at 81 years.

Mr. Butler was a man who wore many hats in the Pembroke, Georgia, community. He worked at a barber shop for many years before serving as a Bryan County probate judge.

During his judgeship, he hosted three or four city-famous roadside feasts a year, where he cooked quail, venison, chicken, barbecued pork, and low country boil on the courthouse grounds. His events became extremely popular and eventually garnered the title of Cafe, more specifically, the Road Kill Cafe, because of the large amount of choices he served. He served not only courthouse staff and law enforcement, but people from across Pembroke and the State of Georgia, including some of the State's highest officials.

He retired in 2000, and his roadside feasts were special for anyone who was lucky enough to attend.

Mr. Butler certainly will be missed.

RECOGNIZING REAR ADMIRAL UPPER HALF  
RANDY CRITES

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Rear Admiral Lower Half Randy Crites for his promotion to Rear Admiral Upper Half. Rear Admiral Crites currently serves as commander of Submarine Group 10 at Kings Bay Naval Base in the extreme southern portion of the First Congressional District of Georgia.

Since he signed up to serve in 1985, Rear Admiral Crites has proven himself as an outstanding leader. Among his many accomplishments, he completed four patrols while commanding the submarine USS *West Virginia* that dissuaded enemies from potentially threatening our country.

It would be impossible for me to overstate the work that Rear Admiral Crites is doing at Kings Bay Naval Base, and I trust that he will succeed in his new assignment and make an even greater contribution to the safety of our Nation in his position. The First Congressional District of Georgia appreciates Rear Admiral Crites' patriotism and dedication to the United States.

GUN VIOLENCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, last week we honored and welcomed back STEVE

SCALISE to this Chamber, victim of a horrible shooting aimed at him because he was a Congressman. It could have been any one of us.

Today the Democrats spoke on the steps of the Capitol about the need for reasonable gun law reform, and with us was Gabby Giffords, who was shot in 2011 because she was a Congressperson doing her job.

Congressman JOHN LEWIS had said that you can't go to a movie theater, you can't go to a concert, and you can't go to school and feel safe. You can't be a public official and feel safe.

What happened in Las Vegas where 58 people were murdered and over 500 injured calls on the United States Congress to take action to protect the American people.

□ 1015

This is the time to act for reasonable, commonsense gun reform laws. Former Deputy Prime Minister of Australia Fischer, who, in 1996, after the greatest mass shooting in Australian history, led an effort to reform the Australian laws, sent a missive to President Trump suggesting this is the time for him to act and to do something very important for American society. He said: It can be done.

After those killings in Australia, they passed laws that made automatic and semiautomatic weapons illegal. They had a buyback program that bought back over 600,000.

After the 1996 effort, which was difficult but successful, Australia has not had a killing of over five people. Prior to 1996, they had 15 or 16 shootings of that nature.

Everyone recognizes Australia's success. We need to do something besides just having continued moments of silence.

Yesterday, on a bill on this floor about the unborn taking precedence over the rights of women, quite a few Republicans came to the floor and talked about pain to the unborn and loss of their potential for life. But none have talked about the pain of the 500 who were injured and the 58 lives that were lost.

We could pass laws to eliminate bump stocks that, apparently, this murderer used to make his weapon into, effectively, an automatic weapon, where you can shoot hundreds of bullets at a time, which he did. Bump stocks should be illegal. Senator DIANNE FEINSTEIN had a bill to make them illegal in 2013, and she has one again.

We need better background checks and to make sure the mentally ill don't get guns. Unfortunately, in this Congress, in February, we passed a law that President Trump signed with passion and a flare that eliminated a rule that said that the Social Security Administration would send the names of people who couldn't manage their own financial affairs to a bureau to see to it that they were on a list so they couldn't buy guns.

If you can't successfully manage your own financial affairs, should you have a gun?

I would submit not. But that bill was passed on a partisan vote and signed by the President, making it easier for people to get guns when the Social Security Administration has found they cannot manage their own affairs.

The same for the no-fly, no-buy list. If you are considered too much of a security threat to fly on an airplane, you shouldn't be able to buy a gun. The arguments we heard against that were about due process.

Has anybody brought a bill to give the people on the no-fly list due process? Has it come to the floor?

No. It won't. It makes sense to have a no-fly list. They also should be the people that can't buy guns.

We shouldn't have semiautomatic weapons. Automatic weapons are illegal. The bump stocks make regular weapons automatic weapons.

The CDC is prohibited by law from doing a study to see if there is a connection between gun violence and mental health or our country's health. That law should be repealed. We shouldn't fear the CDC study.

High-capacity magazines also shouldn't be permitted, and law enforcement should be protected from armor-piercing bullets.

I hope that we can act to save American lives.

#### REFORMING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the 21st Century AIRR Act, a comprehensive act to reauthorize the FAA and reform air traffic control.

Our aviation system was once the best in the world, but, unfortunately, America is no longer first in flight. Ask anyone who flies. They know our aviation system is plagued with inefficiencies. These range from indirect routes that send us all over, trying to get from one point to another; seemingly endless delays; and time wasted on the tarmac, hoping to take off to head to your destination.

These delays and congestion cost travelers and our economy an estimated \$25 billion a year.

You may have heard that argument that there is nothing we can do; 50 percent of our air traffic delays are caused by bad weather.

Well, underlying that is 50 percent of our delays are caused by bad weather because you have to space out aircraft further and differently when the weather is inclement.

Why is that?

Well, in many cases, we are using World War II radar technology to keep track of modern aviation. In fact, over 400 air traffic control facilities were built before the invention of the inter-

net and 9 of them are old enough to collect Medicare if they were a live human being. Think about that. They are that old.

Questions have been asked: Why haven't we simply fixed the problem?

After all, taxpayers and passengers have poured billions of dollars into the FAA to modernize that system over the last 30 years, yet we have little to show for it.

As President Clinton pointed out nearly 20 years ago, "part of the problem is our outdated technology . . . but a more fundamental problem is also how the FAA operates."

I couldn't agree more.

We recently had a hearing regarding air traffic control, and the FAA was asked: What does it take to get to a modern air traffic control system like is used in other parts of the developed world?

I was told: If we had 10 more years and \$30 billion more, we would hope to have the project done.

I come from private business. Hope is not a plan.

The 21st Century AIRR Act would replace a Federal entity that has proven itself to be ineffective with an independent, not-for-profit board tasked with modernizing our air traffic control system. They would have one duty: providing the safest, most efficient air traffic control service to all users.

Contrary to critics, our board would be balanced. It would be comprised of users of the system. All are represented equally.

Quickly, let me bust a few myths here.

Critics argue that transferring air traffic control services from the FAA to a new entity would be a free giveaway of Federal assets.

Well, first, let me state they are not Federal assets. They are our assets. We paid for them. Everyone in this Chamber has paid for them. Every taxpayer has paid for them. They are owned by the people.

Most of these assets are so old and outdated that, in many cases, they are actually a liability. There are many facilities that are actually environmental brownfields.

A number of FAA facilities no longer meet OSHA standards, yet, somehow, some of the critics claim that these are valuable Federal assets. In fact, users are going to pay to update this air traffic control system. They will pay for the equipment, staff, and technology to finally update a system that we have been trying to do for over 30 years.

Many in this Chamber talk about refocusing the Federal Government, reducing it back to its core missions, reducing government back to what it does best. This bill does just that.

Mr. Speaker, after billions of dollars and decades of Federal bureaucrats' fruitless efforts to modernize our air traffic system, it is time for change. It is time for real reform.

Mr. Speaker, this bill does exactly that. Let's bring the bill to the floor.

Let's achieve real reform, rather than just talking about it.

#### ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have received a lot of calls in my office in the last few days. Some are offering help to the people of Puerto Rico, but many are from moms and dads hoping to hear from their children, from children hoping to hear from their moms and dads, from grandchildren worried about an elderly grandparent who is still in Puerto Rico.

Two weeks after the hurricane hit Puerto Rico, there are people who have not been heard from and people who are calling for help, but have not received it yet.

I have had Members of Congress, State and local officials, and people from all over the country call me to tell me about someone who needs help getting out of Puerto Rico. Their mom is still in Puerto Rico, or a cousin is on dialysis and has not been heard from, and can I help them get to a hospital on the mainland.

These calls are heartbreaking because they are all about U.S. citizens who should be treated better 2 weeks after a calamity, even a devastating calamity like Hurricane Maria.

Most of the calls have been from my constituents in Chicago. Here is one example that was summarized to me by one of my staff members in Chicago.

She said:

Congressman, I received a call from—I won't give her name—she lives here in Illinois, but has an aunt who is in a hospital in Guaynabo, Puerto Rico, who is very ill with cancer. She is requesting assistance from our office to get her aunt out of Puerto Rico so she can receive treatment in Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, if you take a look at my Facebook page, you will see the same sort of thing.

Manny writes:

The municipality of Arecibo, a coastal town in the northern part of Puerto Rico, has not received help. I spoke to my family there via text and she said the situation there is dire.

Yanny writes:

Please don't forget Aibonito. The people there are hungry, thirsty, and there are many sick who need medicine. Thank you.

I just spoke 10 minutes ago to Maria in Chicago. She said:

Congressman, I haven't heard from my parents in Cayey.

Mr. Speaker, it is tragic. These messages break my heart. I don't know what to tell people, except to say that help may be on the way soon. Of course, that is not good enough.

I have no explanation for why it is not already there. It certainly is not the fault of the brave men and women who work for FEMA and the Armed Forces. I spent a lot of time with them in Puerto Rico while I was there, and they are working hard. They are tired.

They are facing the difficult task of finding and feeding people.

From what I saw in Puerto Rico this last weekend, what I am hearing from my constituents, and what I am hearing from my family and friends, we need to seriously ramp up the use of full capacity and capabilities of the U.S. Government, including the U.S. military, to rescue people.

They don't need paper towels tossed at them like T-shirts at a sports arena. They need helicopters, bridges, cell towers, and generators. This is why I was, frankly, horrified by our President's performance yesterday on the island.

He said that Puerto Rico was making his budget out of whack, as if the monetary cost of saving lives is what we should be focusing on, or that an agenda that cuts taxes is really as important as saving people's lives in danger.

From the beginning, he has focused on the cost of saving Puerto Ricans, not the moral duty to save them. He has essentially said that Puerto Ricans are sitting around looking for handouts and not helping themselves, which is not at all what I saw in Puerto Rico this past weekend, Mr. Speaker.

Yesterday, the President said we should all feel proud because only 16 people have been listed as officially killed by Hurricane Maria in Puerto Rico.

Really? We should feel proud?

He said that a real tragedy like Hurricane Katrina killed many more people. Thousands, he said.

So I guess he is saying: Hey, only 16. Why the big fuss?

That number doubled overnight, by the way. Everyone understands that it will go up further still when contact is made with all parts of the island.

I look at it a little differently. To me, it is almost like Hurricane Maria posed a test to the United States of America and to our President. The hurricane said: I am going to take 34 souls. That is 34 too many, but that is what I am going to take. Now I am leaving it up to you, America, Mr. President, and you the people in Congress to tell me what you will do to prevent that number from going any higher. Are you getting medicine to the sick? Are you evacuating the aunt with cancer or the cousin on dialysis? Are you providing safe drinking water and flights to safety?

Mr. Speaker, I don't think today's body count is the right metric to look at, but, rather, we should be challenging ourselves to make sure it doesn't go higher.

The most serious event in Puerto Rico's modern history may not qualify as a significant disaster to our President, but let us not sit back and allow the body count to change the President's mind. We just can't wait that long.

#### 21ST CENTURY AVIATION REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I have the honor of serving on the House Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, and I rise today in support of the 21st Century Aviation Innovation, Reform, and Reauthorization Act. We call it the AIRR Act in the committee.

H.R. 2997 is a unique opportunity in a bipartisan way to do something big together for the American people.

I know we hear that a lot in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker, but so often it seems like it is just out of our reach. That is not the case today.

Under Chairman SHUSTER's leadership on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Mr. Speaker, my colleagues and I have worked to craft the kind of bold, forward-thinking reform that America's 21st century aviation system needs. It is in reach today to make that the law of the land.

When we sit together to reauthorize the FAA, Mr. Speaker, it isn't just about attending to the Nation's business of ensuring safety of air travelers across the country. Of course, that is a priority, but it is an opportunity to implement the kind of innovative reforms that we have seen across the globe and that America needs to reestablish itself as the world's aviation leader.

□ 1030

We have an opportunity together to deal with a bloated bureaucracy, to reduce taxpayer costs, to improve efficiency all in an industry that is designed to prioritize customer's experience and customer service.

Mr. Speaker, Americans pioneered air travel, and we remain the safest aviation system on the planet. But our own outdated bureaucracy, our own outdated rules are standing in the way of American innovators and making air travel more time consuming, more costly, and safety innovations more difficult.

Mr. Speaker, with this legislation, we have a chance to empower our innovators, to better serve our travelers, and to preserve the world's finest commitment to safety, as we always have.

As is the case, Mr. Speaker, with any heavy lift, with any big task, there are always concerns in keeping America's system safe and the American people safe a highest among those concerns.

Mr. Speaker, what you need to know today is that with the support of General Mattis, with the support of the Department of Defense, the AIRR Act has focused on preserving the primacy of preserving national security in our aviation infrastructure.

Mr. Speaker, the bill has the support of those dedicated public servants at the Pentagon because it has been sensitive to these issues. It maintains the DOD's access and management of airspace. It doesn't allow user fees that are charged to passengers to be passed onto taxpayers through the DOD. It leaves intact the President's and the DOD's proper authorities to manage this space.

In addition, it provides unequivocal definitions about the importance of defense to the American people and balances the needs of general aviation with the needs of the Department of Defense. The oversight will always remain with the FAA, with the DOT, and with the United States Congress.

Mr. Speaker, after we preserve national security, we turn our attentions to the general aviation community. And if you have talked about this bill at all with any of your constituents back home, Mr. Speaker, you heard the concerns of the general aviation community about what it will mean to them to completely reform America's air traffic control system.

Mr. Speaker, we have to balance the role of government oversight and accountability with private innovation. Our bill is designed to empower those innovators but to preserve the protections that GA has today.

Mr. Speaker, I want to refer you to a graphic. You will find it at the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure's website. It is [transport.house.gov](http://transport.house.gov). You can't see it from where you sit, but I have line by line by line the law that we are talking about, the bill that we are talking about, the reforms that we are talking about, and how it protects our friends at the general aviation community.

No fees. No new fees for our friends in general aviation, Mr. Speaker. If you have a doubt about that, look at section 9313, you will see "charges and fees may not be imposed for air traffic services provided."

Continuing airspace and airport access, Mr. Speaker, so important to American citizens involved in general aviation, again, I refer you to chapter 907: "General rights of access to airspace, airports. . . . The Secretary shall take such actions as are necessary to ensure that an air traffic services user is not denied access to airspace or air traffic services. . . ."

The stakeholder board, Mr. Speaker, the cooperatizing of air traffic services that we have seen done so successfully in Canada where they say they are getting twice the safety and modernization input for half the cost, getting it done in a third of the time, having done away with their bloated bureaucracy, the stakeholder board, Mr. Speaker, is defined by general aviation nomination. [Transport.house.gov](http://Transport.house.gov), Mr. Speaker.

#### PASSING COMMONSENSE LAWS REGARDING FIREARMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, a few minutes ago, I stood on the east steps of this ornate building, and I now rise in the hall of this august body to call for action on an issue that has languished for far too long. Specifically, Congress needs to pass commonsense reform of our laws regarding firearms.

I applaud our concerns for broader background checks, but broader background checks must be as effective as they are efficient. It is true that our current technology allows us to be efficient enough for background checks to be completed within 3 days, and over 90 percent of them are.

But what happens to that less than 10 percent? And why aren't they completed within that timeframe? Well, Mr. Speaker, we do not have a perfect world. Our public servants are not perfect and the consuming public is not either. Public servants occasionally make mistakes, and some consumers intentionally make misrepresentations.

No matter how good our technology is, sometimes the process requires more than 3 days to ferret out dishonest and ill-intended purchases. We need to close the gaping loopholes in our gun laws. We need to close the internet sale/gun show loophole that allows gun purchases to evade restrictions in place when purchasing a weapon through a licensed dealer.

We need to close the loophole that allows individuals on the terrorist watch list to purchase firearms. We need to close the loophole that allows domestic abusers to purchase guns. We need to close loopholes that allow semiautomatic weapons to be effectively turned into illegal automatic weapons.

The so-called bump stocks that allow the retrofitting of semiautomatic firearms to make them fully automatic should not be legal.

The Las Vegas shooter had several of these devices that enabled the firing of hundreds of rounds per minute. The purchasing of fully automatic weapons has been significantly restricted in this country since the 1930s, because weapons of war should have no place in our civil society. Give us a vote to close this loophole.

We need to close the Charleston loophole that allows purchases of firearms without the completion of a background check. My Background Check Completion Act will do just that and prevent another tragedy like the Emanuel AME Church shooting that took the lives of nine worshippers more than 2 years ago. Give us a vote to close this loophole.

Mr. Speaker, Congress needs to pass commonsense reforms of our laws regarding firearms. Give us a vote.

#### GRATITUDE FOR PASSAGE OF MICAH'S LAW

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I am so grateful that yesterday this Chamber passed the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act, or Micah's Law. I am especially grateful to everyone who actually voted for it and had the courage and the humanity to do so.

In the years to come, no matter what else they do in this Chamber, I believe

they will look back on that day as a day they stood for those who cannot protect themselves, for the least of their little brothers and sisters.

Mr. Speaker, it was just over 4 years ago that one Kermit Gosnell was convicted of killing a mother and murdering innocent late-term, pain-capable babies in his grisly torture chamber clinic even after they were born.

When authorities entered the clinic of Dr. Gosnell, they found a torture chamber for little babies that defies description within the constraints of the English language.

According to the grand jury report: "Dr. Kermit Gosnell had a simple solution for unwanted babies: he killed them. He didn't call it that. He called it 'ensuring fetal demise.' The way he ensured fetal demise was by sticking scissors in the back of the baby's neck and cutting the spinal cord. He called it 'snipping.' Over the years, there were hundreds of 'snippings.'"

Ashley Baldwin, one of Dr. Gosnell's employees, said she saw babies breathing, and she described one as 2-feet long that no longer had eyes or a mouth, but, in her words, was making like this screeching noise, and it "sounded like a little alien."

For God's sake, Mr. Speaker, this can't be America.

Kermit Gosnell now rightfully sits in prison for killing a mother and murdering innocent children just like the one I just described. And yet there was and still is no Federal protection for any of them, and if he had killed these pain-capable babies only 5 minutes earlier and before they had passed through the birth canal, it would have all been perfectly legal in many of these United States of America.

Now, supporters of abortion on demand have tried for decades to deny that unborn babies ever feel pain, even those, they say, at the beginning of the sixth month of pregnancy, as if somehow the ability to feel pain magically develops the very second the child is born.

Now that we have passed Micah's Law, Mr. Speaker, voices who have long hailed the merciless killing of these little ones as freedom of choice, freedom will now grow louder than ever, especially the ones who profit from it most.

I pray when Senators hear those voices, they will search their own souls and remember the words of President Abraham Lincoln when he said: "Those who deny freedom to others deserve it not for themselves; and under a just God, cannot long retain it."

Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln called upon us to remember that magnificent declaration of America's Founding Fathers, and said: ". . . their enlightened belief that nothing stamped with the Divine image and likeness was sent into the world to be trodden on, and degraded, and imbruted by its fellows."

He reminded those he called posterity, that when in the distant future some men, some factions, some interests should set up a doctrine that some

were not entitled to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, that "their posterity"—that is us, Mr. Speaker—"might look up again to the Declaration of Independence and take courage to renew the battle which their Fathers began." Wow.

Mr. Speaker, what we are doing to these little babies is real, and all of us here know that in our own hearts. So let me close with a final wise counsel from Abraham Lincoln, who stood so strongly for human dignity, and it desperately applies to all of us in this moment.

He said: "Fellow citizens, we cannot escape history. We of this Congress and this administration will be remembered, in spite of ourselves. No personal significance, or insignificance, can spare one or another of us. The fiery trial through which we pass will light us down in honor or dishonor to the last generation."

Mr. Speaker, what if the words of the American Declaration of Independence really are true? What if there really is a creator? And what if these little pain-capable human beings really are his children?

#### HONORING BERTHA McMORRIS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUSH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay a privileged tribute to a longtime resident of my district and a true friend of mine, Bertha McMorris, in honor of her 80th birthday.

Though a Chicagoan by birth, Miss Bertha is also so very much more. She is a proud graduate of the DuSable High School and the Chicago Teachers College.

Miss Bertha is a dedicated public servant who spent more than 20 years at the U.S. Department of Education. In addition to her work as a public servant, Miss Bertha spent nearly a decade working at the Rainbow PUSH Coalition and is currently the proprietor of the newly founded Rainbow PUSH store.

She also spent time as a past leader of Happy Companion, Incorporated, a community service organization founded by her late sister, Ms. Winifred Jackson.

□ 1045

For over 60 years, Miss Bertha has been a resident of the West Woodlawn community, which is located in my district. She has been a lifelong and faithful member of the Berean Baptist Church of Chicago, where she is currently a trustee of the church's credit union.

Miss Bertha is also the proud mother of Mr. Lamell McMorris, a very successful entrepreneur and founder and chief executive officer of the Perennial Strategy Group and Perennial Sports and Entertainment Group. Lamell manages an in-house team of experienced government and public relations

professionals, lawyers, and sports agents, offering a multitude of services to clients in a wide range of disciplines and specialty areas.

Even today, Mr. Speaker, Miss Bertha stays very active, has a very big heart, and is so very kind to everyone whom she meets. She is aptly described as someone who brings cheer, who brings joy wherever she goes. She is indeed our own merry matriarch of Chicago.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that by my coming to the floor today, that this very small gesture can bring a big smile to her face and help Miss Bertha enjoy her birthday a little bit more.

To you, Miss Bertha, we all say happy 80th birthday, and may you have many more, and God speed.

#### RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF TOM MCNAMARA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. BOST) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BOST. Mr. Speaker, this last week on Sunday, southern Illinois, the State of Illinois, and I believe this Nation mourned with the family and friends of a friend of mine by the name of Tom McNamara.

About 2 weeks ago, we lost this local hero who spent decades on the front line of law enforcement combating the drug trade.

Tom began his career in Carbondale as just a local police officer with the department while he was in college. Over the years, he became an author, instructor, investigator, an expert witness, and an undercover agent. Even after retirement, he continued to serve the public as an adviser to local police departments that are still fighting the drug trade.

I came to know Tom, the good friend that he is, on November 23, 1988.

Mr. Speaker, you might ask, how in the world would you remember the day that you first met someone?

Well, I can remember that day because it was the day after my youngest daughter was born. Tom then was the head of what was known as the MEG unit—Metropolitan Enforcement Group—a drug task force that had been assigned, and he had been an undercover agent for quite some time.

And my sister actually was the secretary for that unit. So she had brought Tom over to see the new baby. While my wife was out of the room and I was in the room by myself, Tom came in. When he came in, he was introduced to me, and I told him how glad I was to finally meet him. Tom is a very big man, and at the time, he was an undercover agent, so his hair was grown out, his beard was grown out, and he was actually undercover in a motorcycle gang. He was all dressed in black, which he commonly did—actually, always did.

When my wife returned to the room, he is leaning over the top of the bassinet there where our daughter lay, look-

ing at the baby. My wife came in and had this startled look on her face because she didn't see me and my sister in the room, and instantly she kind of had that mother reaction to try to protect a child. All of a sudden my sister jumped up and said: It is okay. This is Tom McNamara. Tom McNamara is a police officer.

Her first words to Tom, who, as I said, became a very good friend with me and very good friends with her: Well, I want to let you know that I would not run to you in an alley if I am in trouble at night. You would not be the one I would run to.

He said: Then that is good. I am doing my job.

Tom McNamara taught other police officers the dangers and concerns. He served proudly as a police officer and as an undercover agent, but he also studied in great detail the harmfulness of certain drugs.

When I was a State legislator, he came to me in 1997 and said: Mike, I need to talk to you and then-Senator Luechtefeld. I need to explain to you about a drug that is so awful, that if a mother and a father would use it, it would make them not have any concerns for the safety of their children, because they are so focused on trying to get more of this drug. And they can actually make it in their kitchen. They can make it in their cars.

That was methamphetamines. That was when we first started drafting laws in the State of Illinois, under Tom's guidance, to try to deal with the meth problem that still exists.

Tom was also one of the first leaders that realized that there were these drugs like bath salts and all of these that are being used.

I don't even know how many people Tom McNamara has saved over the years. We will never know, I am sure, let me tell you, because of his ability and his willingness to work and always to stand in the back, not to be recognized, sometimes for his own safety. But, Mr. Speaker, he did it for the betterment of this Nation, and that is why I stand to recognize him today.

I thank his wife, Judy; his daughter, Rachel; his son-in-law, and their children for giving up this man to serve us, and serve us so well, for all the lives that he saved.

#### ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, just a few floors from here, I am in the Homeland Security Committee, and we are addressing issues dealing with the security of this Nation. And in my remarks on the legislation that we are dealing with, I expressed the pain of having this Congress come together in a bipartisan manner. I know a couple of sessions ago, we worked on a bipartisan border security bill. Sometimes America says enough is enough. They want us to work together.

This morning I rise to mourn and stand with those families—58 of them—who are feeling now an unspeakable pain. They are questioning how their loved one could be at a joyous country music festival and be massacred.

My hometown newspaper says it right: that the massacre in Vegas was an act of pure evil.

Those of us who believe in this flag, whether we kneel, whether we stand as we pledge, we know that America is the greatest country in the world; but when she is hurting, it is important for this Congress to act.

The comment that this is no time to discuss how we solve this unfettered violence, this massacre, this evil perpetrator, then that sentiment is a sentiment I hope will only be a small percentage of this body.

We have tried over and over again in any manner that we could to discuss fairly the idea of gun safety legislation, not the diminishing of the Second Amendment, as some made the argument, that the kneeling, take a knee, or “I kneel” was a diminishment of the First Amendment. It absolutely was not, because the First Amendment allows one to petition one’s grievances.

In terms of the Second Amendment, the procedure of overturning a constitutional amendment would be a long journey, which would include the two Houses of Congress and the people of the United States.

Stop fueling fear that any manner of regulating the right to hold guns is in any way diminishing the Second Amendment, the right to bear arms.

It is “enough is enough.” There were hundreds of mothers and fathers outside of the Capitol this morning when Democrats stood up and called on this Congress and the Speaker to appoint a select committee, of which I join them in. Make it as large as it can be. Have people who will disagree. Take members of the jurisdictional committees and others who have experienced this violence. Let us solve this dirty problem.

It is dirty, for you cannot give any support to the idea of civilians having military-style weapons and taking them and preying on the innocent.

Beautiful young women, young men, mothers and fathers, grandparents now dead, and nothing but their faith will give to their family the hope that they may see them again, for we are God-fearing people in whatever faith we may have.

Our hope is vested in seeing our loved ones again, in particular in the Christian faith, and others have their ways of seeing their loved ones again.

There must be a ban on assault weapons. There must be a recognition that there exists domestic terrorism.

What was the Pulse nightclub?

Domestic terrorism comes in different ways. It doesn’t have to be ISIS. It can be Charleston, South Carolina. That was an act of intimidation.

There were those interviewed who said: I may rethink my life. Why

should I be going to large venues? Maybe I can’t do that.

That is not America. That is not what we want for our children. Why can’t this Congress look at the polling numbers of the members of the National Rifle Association. They understand the importance of training, of putting locks on guns, of not having military weapons in the hands of individuals who would kill us dead.

So, Mr. Speaker, I rise today to say that enough is enough. We cannot do nothing. This flag demands that we do something.

I close by saying that a veteran was killed. He was not killed in Iraq or Afghanistan, where he fought; but he was killed in the streets of America, where he had overcome post-traumatic stress disorder. We know that Texans were wounded.

So, Mr. Speaker, I leave this podium in respect simply to say: As America, we cannot do this any longer, and we must stand up as a Congress and do our jobs and find a way to end this gun violence now.

#### COMMEMORATING THE DEDICATION OF THE SOUTH TEXAS AVIATORS MEMORIAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FARENTHOLD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, as home to almost half of all naval air training in our country, south Texas is a hub of military aviation. That is why I am here today to commemorate the dedication of the South Texas Aviators Memorial, which will be dedicated on October 12 at Corpus Christi’s Ropes Park.

After almost 3 years of planning, fundraising, and awareness by Associate Directors Caleb and Anne Booher, former Naval Air Station Corpus Christi flight instructor Chris Keech, and many other volunteers, the memorial will soon be permanently placed to grace the bay front of Corpus Christi.

This memorial, a tribute to fallen military aviators of all branches, features a 7-foot-tall bronze aviator surrounded by benches and a walkway made of bricks bearing the name of local individuals and businesses that supported the building of the memorial.

□ 1100

Thank you to each person who sponsored the building of this new memorial. I am proud to represent so many south Texans that are proud of our military and are honoring military aviators who have paid the ultimate price in service to our country.

SERVICE ACADEMY NIGHTS IN THE 27TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, each year I have the honor of nominating young men and women from the 27th District of Texas to our United States service academies.

My office will soon be holding two service academy nights to help stu-

dents interested in earning appointments to a service academy learn about the application process and eligibility requirements. Representatives from West Point, Annapolis, the Air Force Academy, the Coast Guard Academy, and the Merchant Marine Academy will be on hand to answer questions. There will be a presentation about the Reserve Officer Training Corps, or ROTC.

These events are recommended for young men and women between the ages of 17 and 21 and their parents who are residents of the 27th Congressional District of Texas, but are open to any high school student considering applying to our service academies.

The first one will be in Victoria, on Tuesday, October 10, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at the University of Houston–Victoria, University North Building Multi-Purpose Room, that is Room 114, at 3007 North Ben Wilson Street in Victoria.

The second will be in Corpus Christi, on Thursday, October 12, from 6 p.m. to 8 p.m. at Veterans Memorial High School’s cafeteria, 3750 Cimarron Boulevard.

For more information, you can contact my office or visit my website, [farenthold.house.gov](http://farenthold.house.gov).

DOUBLE TEN DAY IS THE NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, on October 10, or Double Ten Day, it is the National Day of Taiwan, and I would like to take the opportunity to wish the people of Taiwan a very happy Double Ten Day.

Over the years, Taiwan has proven its leadership on the global stage, despite its unique political status, through its commitment to democracy and its contribution to global health initiatives, international development, and humanitarian missions.

Taiwan was there following the 2010 earthquake in Haiti, the 2013 typhoon in the Philippines, and was delivering critical aid and food in times of need. Taiwan was also there for the United States when Hurricane Harvey hit. They have donated a total of \$800,000 to the American Red Cross and Texas to assist with relief efforts.

I would like to thank the Taiwanese Government and its people for this generous support and their continued friendship. I would also like to recognize all the great Taiwanese companies doing business in the 27th District of Texas. Thank you for creating American jobs and being a part of our communities.

Thank you again, Taiwan, and I offer my best Double Ten Day wishes to the people of Taiwan.

BIRTHDAY WISHES TO BOB HAUETER AND LUIS BUENTELLO

Mr. FARENTHOLD. Mr. Speaker, this week is the birthday of two of my staff: Luis Buentello in my district office, and Bob Haueter, my chief of staff here in Washington, D.C., and Corpus Christi. Both are dedicated public servants committed to helping the people of the 27th District and all of America.



Happy birthday, guys, and thanks for the help.

#### THE RELIEF EFFORT IN PUERTO RICO

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGRO) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GALLEGRO. Mr. Speaker, this weekend, as millions in Puerto Rico trudged through squalor and sewage in search of food, as hospitals ran low on power and medicine, as homes lay in ruins and businesses remained swamped under feet of water, our Commander in Chief went golfing. As our brothers and sisters on the island suffered, our President sank putts and hit drives.

As the gross inadequacy of his administration's response was revealed to a worldwide audience, the leader of the free world patted himself on the back. "We have done a great job with an almost impossible situation," Trump tweeted.

Mr. Speaker, Donald Trump has it backwards. He is not doing a great job despite an impossible situation; the Puerto Rican people are.

Yesterday, on a belated visit to the island, Trump could have apologized. He could have promised a vast expansion of the Federal relief effort to match the vast and growing needs of the Puerto Rican people. Instead, he offered only blame and condescension. "I hate to tell you, Puerto Rico," he says, "but you are throwing our budget out of whack," said Trump.

I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, but our President is dead wrong. He is the one who is throwing our budget out of whack with his tax cuts for the rich. He is the one who is throwing our government out of whack with his early-morning tweets and his childish temper tantrums. He is the one who is throwing our country out of whack with attacks on immigrants and people of color and the disabled and veterans and Gold Star parents, and on and on, and now, most recently, on the courageous leaders of Puerto Rico and the people of Puerto Rico. Such poor leadership, he says, of the ability of the mayor of San Juan and others in Puerto Rico.

Mr. Speaker, I am not sure Donald Trump understands the meaning of the word "leadership," especially in the wake of a natural disaster. Real leadership is about having the courage to do what is right and the compassion to do what is necessary to help others. It is about self-sacrifice, not self-promotion. It is about putting our country first and your own ego second.

Instead, yesterday we were treated to the bizarre spectacle of the President of the United States throwing rolls of paper towels into a crowd.

Despite the millions in Puerto Rico wanting for electricity or basic necessities, he called his administration's response "unbelievable" and "incredible."

Donald Trump even had the gall to congratulate Puerto Rico on not losing

hundreds of lives like in a real catastrophe like Hurricane Katrina. Frankly, it is hard to recall a more callous statement from an American leader in my lifetime.

Mr. Speaker, the outrageously poor response to the devastation in Puerto Rico is the best illustration yet that President Trump only cares about people who look like him or vote for him or make the kind of money that he makes.

The American people, especially the 3.5 million U.S. citizens in Puerto Rico, deserve a President who is capable of common human decency, a President more concerned about his conduct in office than his coverage in the media, a President who understands that his base is every single one of us.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to close with a few words in Spanish for the brave people of Puerto Rico.

(English translation of the statement made in Spanish is as follows:)

The Puerto Rican people are stronger than Donald Trump thinks.

And they will come out of this crisis and prosper again.

We can't wait any longer.

We are with you.

Los puertorriqueños son más fuertes de lo que Donald Trump cree.

Y ellos saldrán de esta crisis y prosperarán de nuevo. No podemos esperar más.

Le debemos a la gente de la isla nuestro apoyo completo. Estamos con ustedes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

The gentleman from Arizona will provide a translation of his remarks to the Clerk.

#### RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 7 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

#### AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

#### PRAYER

Imam Abdullah Antepli, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina, offered the following prayer:

The holy One, as Your creation, we call You by different names, experience You through multiple paths. Our human diversity is from You. As the creator of all, You made us different. Enable us to understand, appreciate, and celebrate our differences. Teach and guide us to turn these differences into opportunities, richness, and

strength. Prevent us from turning them into sources of division, polarization, hate, and bigotry.

The most merciful One, this incredibly diverse Nation of ours is one of the most successful attempts to understand Your wisdom in creating us different. We are far from being perfect, but came a long way in creating a multicultural, multireligious, and pluralistic society by making in America "you will be judged by what you do, not by who you are" as one of our foundational promises.

The most compassionate One, help us to preserve our achievements in this regard. Do not let the destructive forces of division and exclusion erode our ideals, our firm commitment to diversity and pluralism. Empower us and these legislators to further improve the culture of inclusion and welcome to all in our Nation and beyond.

The most forgiving One, if and when we forget You, do not forget us.

In Your most holy and beautiful name, we pray.

Amen.

#### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

#### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from New York (Mr. KATKO) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. KATKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

#### WELCOMING IMAM ABDULLAH ANTEPLI

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. PRICE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Mr. PRICE of North Carolina. Mr. Speaker, I rise to introduce today's guest chaplain, my friend, Imam Abdullah Antepli.

Imam Antepli has been a pioneer in Muslim Campus Ministry, serving since 2003, in chaplaincy roles at Wesleyan University, Hartford Seminary, and Duke University. He was also a founding member of the Muslim Chaplains' Association.

During his time in the chaplaincy, Imam Antepli counseled students and adults of all faiths and provided an Islamic perspective to discussions of faith, spirituality, social justice, peace, and cultural exchange. He effectively built bridges and promoted an understanding across religious and cultural divides. That was his mission, and it continues to be his mission to this day.



Imam Anteppli's leadership roles at Duke University currently include chief representative of Muslim affairs at the Colleges of Arts and Sciences and senior fellow in the Office of Civic Engagement. He has also served as associate director of the Duke Islamic Studies Center. Imam Anteppli also serves as senior fellow of the Jewish-Muslim Relations at the Shalom Hartman Institute in Jerusalem.

He joined Secretary John Kerry's Office of Faith-Based Community Initiatives and Secretary Hillary Clinton's religion and foreign policy team to bring a religious perspective to major foreign policy issues. He traveled around the world as an informal ambassador to engage on issues of religious diplomacy.

I am honored to welcome Imam Anteppli back to the House of Representatives. He is a prophetic voice for peace and justice, an engaging teacher and counselor, a gifted interpreter of his faith, and an effective promoter not merely of interfaith tolerance, but of positive engagement.

I am happy to count him as a friend and, along with my colleagues, wish to express appreciation for his words of inspiration today.

---

#### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WESTERMAN). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

---

#### AIR TRAFFIC REFORM

(Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I often hear at home from folks who are frustrated with their experiences with air travel and airport security.

We have an opportunity to address part of the problem to reduce flight times, prevent involuntary bumping, save fuel, reduce emissions, reduce the number of government employees, and save money both in the public sector and out of our constituents' pockets.

The FAA is spending billions of dollars attempting to implement new technologies and next generation air traffic control management systems. They are failing.

Right now, we have the 21st Century AIRR Act, which is a step in the right direction. It is going to unleash American innovation and allow us not just to catch up with other countries but to surpass them.

It is about American jobs. It is about providing the American public with the service they deserve.

I urge Members to support and advance the 21st Century AIRR Act.

#### TAX CUTS DON'T PAY FOR THEMSELVES

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, Treasury Secretary Mnuchin and the President said that their plan would not benefit the rich and would grow the economy. They called it the Mnuchin rule.

If you make \$730,000 a year in America, your income would rise by 8.5 percent, which is \$129,000 a year, or \$10,750 a month. That is your tax cut under the Trump plan, a direct violation of what we were told.

We are also told that this plan was a middle class miracle. If you make \$67,000, your income will rise by 1.2 percent, which is \$670 a year, or a whopping \$56 a month.

This is not a miracle. This is an illusion. This plan will increase the deficit by \$2.4 trillion over the next 10 years. I am wondering where the deficit hawks are.

We were told that these tax cuts would pay for themselves. News flash: tax cuts don't pay for themselves. In fact, economists from Goldman say these tax cuts will have virtually no good impact on the economy. The Treasury Secretary and the National Economic Adviser are both immediately from Goldman.

This tax cut is a fraud being perpetrated against the American people and against the American middle class.

---

#### CRITICAL BILL FOR AMERICAN AVIATION

(Mr. KATKO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KATKO. Mr. Speaker, today, most actions in Congress are viewed through a partisan lens, but the 21st Century AIRR Act is a bill with significant support from both Republicans and Democrats, as well as a number of groups representing a wide array of political ideologies.

Modernizing air traffic control has historically been a bipartisan issue. In fact, 20 years ago, then-President Clinton said: "The FAA's 20-year effort to modernize its air traffic control technology simply has not been able to keep pace with either the emergence of new technology or the growth and demand for air travel. . . . We can continue on the current course and continue to experience crowded airports, flight delays, and even higher passenger frustration. But if we act now to improve our infrastructure, we can ensure that air travel in the 21st century is the safest, most cost-effective, most efficient in the world."

These words are still true today.

Because we have failed to act decisively, the FAA is struggling to give Americans the 21st century air traffic control system they deserve. We have the opportunity to change that with the AIRR Act.

Many former top administration officials from both parties support reform as well as a broad coalition of stakeholders.

Air traffic control reform hasn't been a partisan issue, and it shouldn't become one now. I urge all my colleagues to pass this critical bill for American aviation.

---

#### HONORING EASTWOOD ACADEMY AND LYONS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL AS 2017 NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON SCHOOLS

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Eastwood Academy and Lyons Elementary School in Houston, Texas, as National Blue Ribbon Schools for 2017.

The U.S. Department of Education selects blue ribbon schools each year from across the country based on their overall academic excellence and progress in closing the achievement gap. Lyons Elementary and Eastwood Academy are 2 of just 342 schools selected nationwide this year.

Lyons Elementary and Eastwood Academy were selected as exemplary high-performing schools based on State and national assessments while serving the historically disadvantaged communities of Northline and Eastwood.

I thank the parents, teachers, and administrators of Eastwood Academy and Lyons Elementary for their hard work and commitment to building a brighter future for our children and our community.

Finally, I wish to recognize the students at Lyons Elementary and Eastwood Academy for their diligence and academic excellence and wish them best in their future endeavors.

---

#### HONORING THE LIFE OF NOLAN WATSON

(Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Nolan Watson, a Georgia resident and veteran of the United States Air Force, who joined our Heavenly Father earlier this year after battling kidney cancer for over a decade.

In 1966, Mr. Watson was one of the heroic men during the Cold War who was involved in the cleanup efforts after a B-52 bomber collided with a KC-135 tanker over Palomares, Spain, releasing four hydrogen bombs. After his service, Mr. Watson suffered from severe medical problems and was ultimately diagnosed with kidney cancer in 2002.

Nolan is survived by his lovely wife, Nona, who has been a fierce and devoted advocate for her husband, working tirelessly throughout the years to

garner the recognition these young men deserved for the sacrifices they made responding to this unfortunate disaster.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to stand with me and join me for a moment of silence to honor the life and legacy of Nolan Watson, a hero who deserves our respect and who will be sorely missed.

#### HOW TO BECOME A BETTER AND STRONGER NATION

(Mr. COSTA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to spotlight the statement of Lieutenant General Jay Silveria, the superintendent of the United States Air Force Academy, made after an incident involving racial slurs.

His speech made three clear points:

First, the appropriate response for horrible language and horrible ideas is a better idea.

Second, we currently have the opportunity to think about our defining values as Americans and to stand firm on our values.

Lastly, if you cannot treat someone with dignity and respect, then you need to get out.

Lieutenant General Silveria is a role model. I stand here to share these words because we in Washington need to hear and heed them. We must think about who we are as a nation and we must stand firm in our values. After all, we are Americans. Our values have always defined us.

So we simply cannot accept the words and actions of those who do not treat others with dignity and respect. We must respond to horrible language and hateful ideas with better ideas and a strong resolve to rise above hate. This is how we become a better and a stronger nation.

#### DESIGNATING MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. MARSHALL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. MARSHALL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support designating the first Friday in October as Manufacturing Day.

Across our country, manufacturing provides over 12 million jobs and contributes over \$2 trillion to our economy. In Kansas, manufacturing accounts for nearly one-fifth of the State's economy and directly employs over 160,000 people.

The industry has a long and successful history in Kansas, and this Friday, I plan to help a small manufacturing company, Superior Boiler Works in Hutchinson, Kansas, celebrate 100 years of being in business, as part of our Manufacturing Day tour.

These small businesses have a substantial impact on local communities

by providing good-paying jobs in places like Atwood, Sharon Springs, and Hutchinson, Kansas.

I look forward to celebrating National Manufacturing Day in Kansas this Friday and ask my colleagues to support designating the first Friday in October as National Manufacturing Day.

□ 1215

#### COURAGE TO ACT ON GUN LEGISLATION

(Mr. QUIGLEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. QUIGLEY. Mr. Speaker, 4 years ago, 26 small children and teachers were massacred at Sandy Hook Elementary, and Congress lacked the courage to act. Two years ago, the Emanuel 9 were murdered by a White supremacist, and Congress did nothing. Last year, in a hate crime against the LGBT community, 49 people were killed in the Pulse nightclub terrorist attack, and Congress did nothing.

This week, at least 59 people have been killed and over 500 injured in the worst mass shooting in modern American history. Will Congress yet again lack the courage to act?

Will we prioritize thoughts and prayers at the expense of substantive action that saves lives? Will we hide behind the "it's too early to talk about gun violence" excuse? If so, when is the right time? A week from now? a month? a year? or perhaps after the next mass shooting?

For the over 1,500 mass shooting victims since Sandy Hook, the right time to talk about gun violence has tragically come and gone, but we can and must turn the page today. Let us not continue dishonoring their memories because of political pressure and fear to do what is right.

#### CELEBRATE NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

(Mr. BILIRAKIS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BILIRAKIS. Mr. Speaker, this Friday we celebrate National Manufacturing Day. The economist, Peter Navarro, recently said that manufacturing is the seed for all other jobs in the United States. I couldn't agree more. Manufacturers are the pioneers, the innovators, and the people who bring ideas to life.

With over 20 percent of Florida's manufacturers located in the Tampa Bay area, I am proud of the fact that there are more than 2,500 manufacturers in and around my district. Their work couldn't be more essential to our community and our country.

It is our job to support manufacturing and to create a business environment in which they can thrive. This

means passing meaningful tax reform, eliminating regulations that stifle the industry, and encouraging STEM education, which is needed for workforce development.

I look forward to continuing to work on these important issues as we embrace the full potential of what it means to make it in America: Made in America.

#### RYAN-McCONNELL REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

(Mr. KILDEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, middle class families should be the focus of tax relief, not billionaires, not the wealthiest Americans. Unfortunately, the Ryan-McConnell tax plan fails that basic test.

Independent analysis shows that the Republican plan would actually raise taxes on many middle class families, giving billionaires, the top 1 percent, the biggest breaks. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center says that middle class families could actually pay an increase of \$1,290 a year. Even worse, the families I represent would be asked to foot the bill for a big, massive giveaway to the rich.

Under the Republican plan, the wealthiest families, 5,400 families that are the superwealthy in this country, would get a \$270 billion break through the repeal of the estate tax—100 families in my home State of Michigan, the DeVos family, certainly the Trump family. This is not representative of the values of the American people.

Just saying that the people at the top won't benefit doesn't make it true. Read the bill. Look at these analyses. This is a giveaway to the wealthiest Americans, and it is wrong.

#### ENCOURAGE SENATE TO VOTE ON PAIN-CAPABLE UNBORN CHILD PROTECTION ACT SOON

(Mr. LABRADOR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LABRADOR. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 36, the Pain-Capable Unborn Child Protection Act. This legislation passed the House yesterday, and I encourage the Senate to vote on it soon.

I am strongly pro-life. The Federal Government's most important responsibility is protecting human life, including the lives of the unborn. Additionally, we have a moral obligation to minimize pain and suffering, especially for the most innocent among us.

The United States is one of only seven countries that allow abortions after 20 weeks. At the 20-week mark, anesthesia is used in fetal surgeries for patients still in utero. For premature babies born at this stage, special care is given to reduce their pain.

H.R. 36 will prohibit abortions after the 20-week mark precisely because of

the substantial evidence that unborn babies at this stage can and do feel pain.

I am proud to support H.R. 36, and I am glad it passed the House. I will continue to do all I can to advance a culture of life in Idaho and in America.

#### HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, right now, 3.5 million Americans, our fellow citizens, are facing a humanitarian crisis. In Puerto Rico, the majority of people still lack basic electricity, clean drinking water, and medicine, the bare basic necessities just to stay alive—not to speak of the basic resources they need to begin the great task of rebuilding their lives and their communities.

It has been days since the hurricane passed over Puerto Rico leaving death and destruction in its wake. The people of Puerto Rico are literally crying out for help. There are far too many, especially those in rural communities, who still have not been reached by those bringing aid. As a Representative from an island State in Hawaii, I can only imagine their frustration and desperation.

I urge the administration to dedicate all available resources to helping the people of Puerto Rico. Work with Congress to pass an emergency aid package to ensure that those delivering aid have what they need to help the people of Puerto Rico and save lives.

#### ALLOWING VA-CREDENTIALLED HEALTHCARE PROVIDERS TO PRACTICE TELEMEDICINE ACROSS STATE LINES

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the Department of Veterans Affairs for proposing a rule that will allow VA-credentialed healthcare providers to practice telemedicine across State lines. This is excellent news because our veterans should receive the best care possible no matter where they live or are located.

With advances in technology, we see new opportunities for veterans to obtain coverage through telemedicine, especially in some of our most rural areas.

The VA rule is similar to a bill that I introduced together with Representative JULIA BROWNLEY, called the VETS Act. The existing licensure requirements for VA service providers are not in line with the technology and care available today.

Outdated regulations prevent individuals who receive care within the VA system from accessing qualified providers who utilize telemedicine simply

because of the geography and a State border. That is wrong, and we must change it.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the VETS Act and work to give our veterans access to the best care possible. Our servicemen and -women answered their country's call. Let's be there for them when they return home.

#### INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO BAN BUMP STOCKS TO CONVERT SEMIAUTOMATIC WEAPONS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, 58 innocent people were murdered in Las Vegas. Their killer used 12 bump stocks to convert his semiautomatic weapons into the equivalent of a machine gun.

No one should possess one of these devices, let alone 12 of them, and that is why I am introducing legislation to ban them.

But I am mindful, Mr. Speaker, that we have been here before after Newtown, Aurora, San Bernardino, Orlando, and other mass shootings. Each time, my Republican friends have refused to act.

Now, in the wake of the worst mass shooting in modern history, our Republican colleagues are not only refusing to act, but they are going to make the problem even worse by pressing proposals that will make the problem worse, making it easy to carry a concealed weapon, making it easier to buy a silencer. I mean, this is insane.

I get it. Elections have consequences. You won last November so you get to do what you want, but this is wrong. Let's come together and do something. And I promise you, if Congress fails to respond to the demand for common-sense gun safety legislation, we will be held to account by those we serve, and rightly so. So let's work together and do something.

#### PASS TAX CUTS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

(Mr. MESSER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MESSER. Mr. Speaker, we have an incredible opportunity to pass tax cuts for the American people. I appreciate President Trump's leadership on this issue as well as the leadership of Chairman BRADY in working to pass the President's tax plan.

While we are working on tax cuts, I rise today to urge the chairman and the Ways and Means Committee to also eliminate tax credits for illegal immigrants. Most Hoosiers get it: we can't continue to reward people who come to our country illegally while those who work hard and play by the rules struggle to get ahead.

I have authored legislation to close the loophole that allows \$7 billion in refundable child tax credits to be paid

out to illegal immigrants every year. This money should be used to increase the child tax credit for law-abiding American families. President Trump included this proposal in his budget request to Congress, and I believe it should be included in the President's broader tax plan.

#### RISING IN SUPPORT OF FULLY FUNDING THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to fully support the funding of CHIP, the Children's Health Insurance Program. CHIP plays a very important role in providing low-income children across the country with health insurance.

Without CHIP, over 9 million children nationwide, including 90,000 in my great home in Michigan, will lose access to doctor checkups, immunizations, and basic healthcare.

For the last 2 days, we heard numerous concerns for the unborn children. We must show that same compassion toward the low-income children who are alive and living in our communities, whose access to critical healthcare, including CHIP, is a matter of life or death.

CHIP's impact is felt in communities of color, 52 percent of Hispanic and 54 percent of all Black children nationwide.

As Members of Congress, we have a duty to protect our Nation's children. We need to extend funding for CHIP and support the millions of families who rely on this program. Let's take care of our children in America.

#### REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 367

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to remove my name from H.R. 367.

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

There was no objection.

#### FOCUS ON BIPARTISAN EFFORTS TO INVESTIGATE THE CAUSES OF GUN VIOLENCE IN AMERICA

(Mr. DEFAZIO asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Speaker, in light of the tragic and horrific events this Sunday, I believe our focus should be on bipartisan efforts to investigate the causes and lessen the potential for gun violence in America. That is why I am calling on Speaker RYAN to name a select committee to address these issues.

Additionally, I believe the Republican leadership should formally withdraw their so-called sportsman's package, which has many objectionable provisions.

Furthermore, we need to bring to the floor a vote on comprehensive background check legislation that includes closing the gun show loophole and individual internet sale loophole. There is overwhelming support in the public and this Congress for those actions.

I would like to see what the investigation reveals and whether a suppressor would have allowed this monster to create more carnage. However, we do know he used something called a bump stock, which I never heard of before.

Anything that converts a semiautomatic weapon into something that is virtually a fully automatic weapon, which is outlawed, should not be sold. The bump stocks and any other devices like that should be banned.

#### CRITICAL NEED TO FUND CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Mr. CARBAJAL asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, today I rise in disbelief that this Congress has shamefully allowed the Children's Health Insurance Program, CHIP, to expire earlier this week. CHIP provides healthcare to 8.9 million low-income children in our country and to over 2 million children in my home State of California.

My Republican colleagues have spent all their time and energy this year fighting to repeal healthcare for millions of Americans covered by the Affordable Care Act, and now they have failed to protect healthcare for our country's children.

If we do not act quickly, it could soon lead to States not enrolling children and potentially even denying them coverage altogether due to the lack of funding.

It is critical that we fund the CHIP program without delay and provide certainty to these families that they will not lose their health coverage because of this irresponsible and derelict congressional inaction.

□ 1230

#### PROTECT WOMEN'S HEALTH AND SUPPORT THE CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHT TO CHOOSE

(Mr. BROWN of Maryland asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, 3 days after Congress allowed the Children's Health Insurance Program to expire, this House once again passed a bill that restricts women's health and reproductive rights.

This should not be the time to prioritize politics. Women should be able to make their own choices about their bodies and their healthcare.

Over the past 40 years, the Supreme Court has affirmed a woman's constitu-

tional right to privacy, including the right to choose.

Not only is the 20-week ban imposed by this Congress not based on accepted science, but this ban disregards the role doctors play in making health decisions.

In States that have already passed this ban, young people, women of color, low-income women, and immigrant women are the ones who are most impacted by the ban.

If we care about women's health, we should work to reduce unintended pregnancies, expand access to contraception, and support maternal and children's health. Instead, the majority is slashing Medicaid, attacking Planned Parenthood, and passing bans.

Not me. I will remain committed to protecting women's health and supporting the constitutional right to choose.

#### PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H. CON. RES. 71, CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 553 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 553

*Resolved*, That at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027. The first reading of the concurrent resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the concurrent resolution are waived. General debate shall not exceed four hours, with three hours of general debate confined to the congressional budget equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget and one hour of general debate on the subject of economic goals and policies equally divided and controlled by Representative Tiberi of Ohio and Representative Carolyn Maloney of New York or their respective designees. After general debate the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The concurrent resolution shall be considered as read. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent. All points of order against such amendments are waived except that the adoption of an amendment in the nature of a substitute shall constitute the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment. After the conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment and a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and con-

trolled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, the Committee shall rise and report the concurrent resolution to the House with such amendment as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the concurrent resolution and amendments thereto to adoption without intervening motion except amendments offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget pursuant to section 305(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to achieve mathematical consistency. The concurrent resolution shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question of its adoption.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MCGOVERN), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all of my colleagues may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is going to be a great day. I don't know how your Wednesday has gotten started, but we are now in the throes of budget day.

Budget day only happens on the floor of this House once a year, and it is one of those times where I would tell you the House operates as every man, woman, and child across this country believes the House should operate every day.

I have the great honor as a member of the Rules Committee and as a member of the Budget Committee of bringing this structured rule to the floor today.

Mr. Speaker, H. Con. Res. 71, the rule that we will be debating for the next hour, makes in order every single budget substitute that was offered in the Rules Committee. Now, let me tell you what that means in practical terms.

Over the next 2 days, we are going to hear visions laid out for what the American government should spend, what American policies should look like, what the Federal budget should include.

Over the next 2 days, we are going to hear visions laid out from every single Member or group in this institution that cared enough about this process to craft a budget of their own.

Mr. Speaker, I serve in the Republican Study Committee. I was once chairman of the Budget and Spending Task Force on the Republican Study Committee. I had the honor of crafting a substitute budget to bring to the floor to offer for my colleagues' consideration.

Over the next 2 days, any Member who has a voice that needs to be heard

has had the opportunity. We put out the call last week. My friend from Massachusetts and I, we sit on the Rules Committee, Mr. Speaker. We send out the call to the membership in advance to say this is what we expect to happen in the Rules Committee, this is what we are going to be considering in the Rules Committee. We sent out the call for any Member of this House to craft their substitute amendment, and we received four.

We received one from the Congressional Black Caucus, we received one from the Progressive Caucus, we received one from the Republican Study Committee, and we received one from the Democrats on the Budget Committee. Every single one of those has been made in order by the rule that I will ask my colleagues to support today.

We are going to debate those. We are going to vote on those each individually, allowing everybody to have their say. That budget that this House ultimately agrees on collectively, collaboratively after these days of debate, we will then send to the United States Senate for its consideration.

Mr. Speaker, they say that budgets are a reflection of values. I believe that to be true. We are going to have budgets on the floor of the House to consider that cut taxes, budgets that believe that the economy has not grown to its full potential, budgets that believe that the American workforce participation rate is still at historically low levels. We have to get men and women back into the workforce. We have to reward that dignity of work. We have budgets that are going to cut taxes in an effort to stimulate that job growth across this land.

We have other budgets that are concerned that we are not bringing enough revenue into the government coffers. It is true, Mr. Speaker. I know you are thinking it. We are bringing in more tax revenue today than we have ever brought in in the history of the United States of America. That is true, but we are still running budget deficits. So we will consider those budgets today that don't necessarily believe that spending is the problem; they think it is tax collection that is the problem.

We will consider budgets that raise taxes by about \$2 trillion. We will consider other budgets that raise taxes by about \$4 trillion. Mr. Speaker, I think we will even consider budgets that raise taxes by \$9 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, there are only two things that can happen in this institution. We either have to raise more revenue, or we have to cut spending, or we have to mortgage our children's future. Three things: raise taxes, cut spending, mortgage our children's future.

Over the next 2 days, we are going to have that debate and we are going to have that discussion.

I know where my constituency lands, Mr. Speaker. There are tough decisions that have to be made, and they believe they sent men and women to Congress

to help make those tough decisions. We sit on the Budget Committee. That is what we do.

If you have not gotten a chance to work with her this season, Mr. Speaker, Chairwoman DIANE BLACK on the House Budget Committee, if there is a more patient and more persistent Member of this body, I don't know who that would be. She has worked tirelessly to move this process along, to get us to this point where we are today, trying to bring people together around a unified vision of what we can do and what we should do not just as an institution, but as a nation.

I expect we will have some disagreements over the next 2 days, Mr. Speaker. It won't surprise me at all. In fact, I think this institution is characterized by the things that we disagree about. Certainly that is what the media would like to focus on. But at the end of this process, what will have to be said is that we have considered every idea, that we have considered every point of view, that we have made room for every voice, and that we have now come together on a common pathway forward. That is what is ahead of us, Mr. Speaker, if we support this rule that we are debating now.

Again, I urge my colleagues to support this rule. I hope you will find that budget that meets your constituency's needs, support that underlying budget, and then let's move a budget to the United States Senate and speak with one voice for the American people.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

(Mr. MCGOVERN asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I obviously rise in strong opposition to this rule. This can be a frustrating place. So frustrating, that sometimes I want to tear the remaining two strands of hair I have on my head out, because what we do here, in my opinion, is not to advance anything that is good for the American people. This is a frustrating place, because what happens on this House floor is either nothing or you guys make things worse.

On Sunday, we once again witnessed a massacre, the worst mass shooting in American history. People across this country are demanding action, but the response of the Republican leadership in this Congress is nothing. We had a moment of silence, but it means nothing because that is all we do. There are no hearings, no debate, no votes, just absolutely nothing.

It is obvious that too many Republicans have been intimidated and have been frightened or have been bought off by the National Rifle Association. It is shameful and, quite frankly, it is disgusting.

If the Republican leadership of this House is not willing to lead, then move

aside. Allow us to bring measures to the floor so we can have a vote, so we can have a debate, so we can enact measures that might save some lives.

Mr. Speaker, what we are considering today, this Republican budget, is an example of the majority making things worse for the American people.

Budgets are moral documents. They show what we value and what we care about. And if this budget reflects Republican values, then shame on Republicans. When you look at the specific programs House Republicans target, it becomes clear just how cruel this budget really is.

Last night, in the Rules Committee, I complained loudly to the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee about the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program known as SNAP, basically a program that provides poor people food. It helps prevent hunger in this country. In this budget, they call for \$164 billion in cuts to this program.

The chairwoman said: Well, I believe that people who get this benefit ought to work.

I pointed out to her last night, and I am going to point out to my colleagues here today, that the majority of people on this program—67 percent of the people who are on this program are not expected to work. Why? Because they are children, because they are senior citizens, because they are disabled.

Of those who can work, the majority work. But you have individuals who are working, who are on SNAP because they earn so little that they still qualify for this program.

So why aren't we demanding that work pay more in this country? Why aren't we coming together to demand an increase in the minimum wage so it is a livable wage, so that people who work don't have to be on public assistance?

Instead, we have yet another attack on poor people in the form of these cuts.

The gentlewoman said: Well, I want to narrow it down to just able-bodied adults without dependents. They all ought to work.

□ 1245

Well, many of these people do work, Mr. Speaker, but many of them don't work, for a number of reasons. Many have limited educational experience, with 80 percent having no more than a high school education or a GED. Some are aging out of foster care. Some have underlying mental health issues, difficult histories of substance abuse, or are ex-offenders with nowhere else to turn.

As many as 60,000 of these able-bodied adults without dependents who have qualified for SNAP initially are veterans. These are brave, courageous men and women who have served our country, who have returned home and are having difficulty reintegrating into the community, getting on their feet. Our gratitude for their service is, we

are going to throw you off the food benefit? I don't know what people are thinking who drafted this in the budget.

The chairwoman of the Budget Committee said: Well, it is important that we constantly review programs to see if they are working, if they are living up to our expectations. I agree. I am a liberal Democrat. I want to make sure that whatever programs are in existence are working, are effective. Nobody is for ineffective government.

I happen to sit on the Agriculture Committee, Mr. Speaker. We have already held 23 oversight hearings on this program—23 on SNAP alone. We have had Republican witnesses, and we have had Democratic witnesses. As my friend from Georgia knows, his party is in control, so Republicans get to have more witnesses than Democrats do. We have had 23 hearings, and not one witness, not one, recommended a \$164 billion cut in this program.

In fact, what they recommended, Democrats and Republicans, was that we ought to strengthen wraparound services. That means like you ought to fund fully job training programs so that States can guarantee people a slot in a job training program.

Many argue, Democratic and Republican witnesses, that the benefit is too inadequate, that we need to expand the benefit, because contrary to what you hear oftentimes on this floor about SNAP and about how generous the benefit is and that it is like a gravy train, if you will, the average SNAP benefit is \$1.40 per person per meal. That is it. That is the benefit.

That is why when you talk to the heads of food banks all across the country, in every State in this country, they tell you the same thing, that they experience an uptick in people who need to utilize their services in the middle and toward the end of the month because, basically, the benefit is not enough to carry them through the month so they can put enough food on the table for them and their families.

We have 42 million people in the United States of America, the richest country in the history of the world, who are hungry. I am ashamed of that, and I am ashamed because hunger is a political condition.

What I mean by that is we can solve it, but we don't, because for some reason, this population, these people struggling in poverty, never quite rise to the level as the very wealthy in this country.

We have a budget here that not only cuts SNAP but basically cuts a whole bunch of other programs aimed at helping people get out of poverty and helping struggling middle class families.

Basically, this budget, just so everybody is clear, is kind of a blueprint to help pave the way for the Republican tax cut bill that they are going to produce on this floor in the not-too-distant future.

It was interesting last night in the Rules Committee, we heard people talk

about, well, we have to make tough choices because we don't want to saddle our children and our grandchildren and great-grandchildren with debt. Well, if, in fact, my Republican friends get their wish and pass this tax cut, we are told that it will add about \$2.4 trillion to our debt.

The deal is this, Mr. Speaker. One of the faults in their budget is they have these assumptions that we all know are not true. Like, for example, the Affordable Care Act is going to kind of mysteriously just disappear, and they are going to be able to cut Medicaid by close to \$1 trillion to help offset the cost of their tax cut. But the last time I checked, their repeal barely passed this House, and it can't seem to get anywhere in the United States Senate. Their assumptions are fantasy. They are not based on reality.

Mr. Speaker, it is not just food assistance that this budget dismantles. It cuts half a trillion dollars in Medicare and ends the Medicare guarantee. It rips apart the Affordable Care Act, drastically raising healthcare costs for older and low-income adults, and kicks another 20 million people off their health insurance if they get their wish here. It makes higher education more expensive. It cuts veterans' benefits. It reduces our commitment to ensuring that our neighbors have access to affordable housing. It even sticks the American taxpayer with a \$1.6 billion bill to begin constructing a costly and stupid and ineffective wall along the U.S. southern border with Mexico.

In case people are scratching their heads, during the campaign, Donald Trump said that Mexico was going to pay for the wall. I guess he didn't mean it because a downpayment was put into their budget.

I could go on and on and on, but you might ask yourself, Mr. Speaker: Who wins? The answer is simple. If this budget goes through, and they pave the way for their tax cut, it is clear who the winners are: Donald Trump, the Trump family, and all of his wealthy friends. While all these cuts in the budget come from our safety net programs, infrastructure investments, and programs that help middle and working class families, none of the savings in this budget—that is right, not one penny—come from closing tax loopholes that benefit big corporations or the wealthy.

As I said before, the drastic cuts are all being used to try to finance this massive tax cut that disproportionately benefits the wealthiest in this country. Give me a break.

Mr. Speaker, it is galling how indifferent that so many in this House seem to be to those who are struggling in poverty. America's most vulnerable, granted they don't have super PACs, they don't have big lobbyists, their voice in Washington is supposed to be us. The whole purpose of government, in my view, is to make sure that everybody gets a fair shake, and the people who need government the most are the people who are struggling in poverty.

But to listen to my colleagues and to look at this budget that they put together, it is clear that the poorest Americans in this country are being treated as if they don't exist, as if they are invisible, as if they don't matter. I just find that deeply offensive.

President Kennedy said it this way. He said: "If a free society cannot help the many who are poor, it cannot save the few who are rich." It is frustrating. It is just frustrating that here we are with this budget which devastates so much of what I think is important.

If we implemented what this budget asks us to do, this country would become a tale of two cities, and it is already getting to that point. It would truly become a tale of two cities. It would create a government without a conscience, and I think we need to push back and we need to reject that.

Mr. Speaker, this isn't some Ayn Rand fantasy where we can just mess with the numbers and see what happens. We are talking about real people here—people who are counting on us; people who need help. This budget fails by any measure, in my opinion, to be a budget even for Republicans to support.

I think America's hardworking middle class families and all those working to struggle to get in the middle class deserve a heck of a lot better than this.

Mr. Speaker, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this rule and certainly vote against this cruel Republican budget, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, you heard the passion of my friend from Massachusetts, and I have had an opportunity to work with him on the Rules Committee for 7 years now. I can tell you that every bit of that passion is sincere.

So often I think folks turn on C-SPAN, they look at a group of politicians talking, and they think it is all for the cameras and it is all for show. I will tell you that while I sometimes have that same suspicion when I turn on a program of folks I don't know, with folks I do know, I can tell you that that passion is sincere.

What I can also tell you is that many of those concerns are misguided, and I think that is important. What happens here in this institution matters. Our ability to have that debate with one another matters. The truth is, as you know, Mr. Speaker, most of that debate doesn't happen here on the House floor.

My friend from Massachusetts and I are here today because it is time to vote. We are here to bring the rule, we are here to bring the substitutes, we are here over the next 2 days to vote. The conversation has gone on not for a day, not for a week, not for a month, but for the better part of this year on what the budget is going to look like.

I happen to have a copy of the budget report right here, Mr. Speaker. It captures all the votes we have taken. It



captures all the debates we have had. It captures what the intent of the institution is.

Now again, we are going to have a choice of which budget we want to support. If you think taxes are too low, you can vote to raise taxes. If you think taxes are much too low, you can vote to raise taxes a whole lot. If you think the tax code as it exists today is a ridiculous compilation of confusing provisions stitched together by a patchwork of Congresses over the last 40 years, you can vote for fundamental reform.

If you are tired of the fact that America used to be number one in the world in terms of tax competitiveness and now we are at the bottom of the list and you want to take America back to being number one, you can vote for that, too. I happen to put myself in that category.

I want to read, if I may, Mr. Speaker, from the budget report. The fact is, I can't. I imagined myself a younger man when I grabbed that report.

If I can now read from the budget report, "The resolution's reconciliation instructions," that is what is in the budget, Mr. Speaker. That is what allows us to take a tax package from the House to the Senate. You have heard about how the Senate is having a tough time getting anything done because it requires a supermajority. It requires 60 votes. Through reconciliation, you can get things done with less than 60 votes. That is how the Affordable Care Act was passed, with less than 60 votes. You can get the tax bill passed with less than 60 votes.

It says this, "The resolution's reconciliation instructions that the Committee on Ways and Means will develop will be a deficit-neutral tax reform legislation and report such legislative language to the Committee on the Budget." Deficit neutral. Nobody wants to blow a hole in the budget, Mr. Speaker.

What the discussion is, is can we do better than today's tax code? Candidly, Mr. Speaker, if any Member of this body wants to take the position that we can't do any better, the IRS is as good as it can be in implementing the American Tax Code today, the Tax Code that is twice as long as the Bible is absolutely as concise and succinct as it can possibly be, those Americans who spend dozens of hours, even dozens of days, even dozens of weeks trying to put together their taxes, that is just the best we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I have seen it happen. Sometimes folks throw their hands up and think: We can't do any better. Not me. Not today.

We can all agree that we can do better than what we are doing today. Passage of this budget gives us that opportunity.

You heard my friend from Massachusetts speak from the heart, Mr. Speaker, about the ability we have as a government to care for one another. I would tell you that responsibility isn't uniquely a government responsibility. I

would say it is a faith responsibility, it is a family responsibility, it is a community responsibility. It is a responsibility that begins at home. It doesn't begin here, it begins at home, but it is a sincere responsibility, and it is one that we want to do better at every day.

I am sure you are aware, Mr. Speaker, the labor force participation rate in America is the lowest it has been since the President from my great State of Georgia, Jimmy Carter, was in office. The labor force participation rate. There is not one of us in this body who can drive down the street without seeing a "help wanted" sign. There is not one of us in this body who can go out to a business without seeing someone asking folks to come in and help, yet fewer Americans are working today than ever before. Why? It is a hard question.

Fewer Americans are working today than since the 1970s. Why? It is important that we ask that question.

The budget is not designed to answer it. The budget can't answer it. I sit on the Budget Committee. I don't have the jurisdiction to answer it, but I know this: you will find in this budget a discussion of whether it is better to support people in poverty or lift folks out of poverty.

□ 1300

It doesn't have to be mutually exclusive. I would tell you that we can support people until we can lift them up, but that lifting them up must be our goal. Supporting them is not enough.

You will find it here, Mr. Speaker, in these pages. This is a vision document. This is what we are gathered together to do today, and we will have legitimate disagreements about when we are doing enough in a particular area and when we are doing too much.

There are those in this body, Mr. Speaker, who believe passionately in education. I am one of those people. I come from a district with amazing school systems.

You can go to any public school in my district, Mr. Speaker, if you work hard and apply yourself. I don't care what your background is, I don't care where your family is from, I don't care what you have stacked against you; if you work hard and apply yourself in our public schools, you can be anything you want to be.

I know everybody wants that for their constituency back home; and I have colleagues who believe that only Washington, D.C., is successful enough, has a track record of success strong enough to implement that vision back home.

I don't come from that camp. I see a lot of failure come out of Washington, D.C. I see a lot of bureaucracy come out of Washington, D.C. I see success come out of parents and teachers and principals back home raising taxes, supporting those institutions, making sure every child has a chance. We do that together as a community.

The discussion that we might have in this institution, Mr. Speaker, is not: Do you believe in education?

It is: Do you believe educators in Washington, D.C., have the best answers, or educators back home in your district have the answers?

The truth is that we don't have many educators in Washington, D.C. We have bureaucrats in Washington, D.C., who oversee educators. I side with my educators back home. It is a legitimate disagreement that we are welcome to have.

What can't be said, though, Mr. Speaker, is that there are any disagreements over these next few days that we are not going to be allowed to have. I have said it before, and I will say it again because it makes me so proud. We don't always have time or make room for all the voices in this institution, Mr. Speaker. You know, sometimes we pick and choose winners and losers, whose voice is going to be heard. Not today. Any Member of Congress could submit their budget to the United States House of Representatives Committee on Rules.

It is a hard thing to produce a budget. I told you I have done it before, Mr. Speaker. It takes a lot of time, a lot of effort, a lot of commitment. But if you believe that you have a better idea, you can do it. And if you did it, we made it in order in the Rules Committee last night and we are going to debate it on the floor and we are going to vote on it on the floor.

We can't always say that every single idea, every single substitute is going to make it to the floor for a vote. We can say that today. I am proud that we can.

It is not going to stop the disagreements, Mr. Speaker, but what it is going to do is air those disagreements; what it is going to do is allow us to talk about our differing visions; and what it is going to do is allow us to come together on a common vision at the end of the day.

I hope my colleagues will support this rule so we can begin that process, and I hope my colleagues will support the underlying budget of their choice.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops in opposition to the Republican budget.

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF  
CATHOLIC BISHOPS,

Washington, DC, August 31, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As Congress proceeds with the 2018 budget process, the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops (USCCB) reaffirms that the federal budget is a moral document with profound implications for the common good of our nation and world. The budget requires difficult decisions that ought to be guided by moral criteria that protect human life and dignity, give central importance to "the least of these" (Matthew 25), and promote the welfare of workers and families who struggle to live in dignity.

The Catholic Church teaches that it is the role of the state to promote the three pillars



of the common good. In May 2017, we outlined these three pillars: respect for the fundamental and inalienable rights of the human person, promotion of human development, and defense of peace. Our Conference has long supported the goal of reducing future unsustainable deficits that would harm all citizens, especially those who are poor. However, a just framework for sound fiscal policy cannot rely almost exclusively on disproportionate cuts in essential services to poor and vulnerable persons.

Sharp increases in defense and immigration enforcement spending, coupled with simultaneous and severe reductions to non-defense discretionary spending, particularly to many domestic and international programs that assist the most vulnerable, are profoundly troubling. The House Budget Committee's H. Con. Res. 71 proposes increasing defense spending by \$929 billion over the next decade, which is \$72 billion above sequester levels. This is coupled with a proposal to cut \$4.4 trillion over the same period from domestic and international programs that assist the most vulnerable, potentially impacting health care safety net programs like Medicaid, Medicare, and CHIP, as well as food security programs like SNAP. The proposal would also reduce current funding levels for environmental stewardship by \$824 million.

Such deep cuts would harm people facing dire circumstances, and would place the environment and natural resources at risk. When the impact of other potential legislative proposals, including the proposed reduction of spending on health care by hundreds of billions of dollars over the next decade and implementation of tax policies that would offer trillions of dollars in tax cuts to the wealthy over the same period are considered, the prospects for vulnerable people become even bleaker.

Our nation should elevate diplomacy, along with humanitarian and international development assistance, as primary tools for promoting lasting peace, regional stability and human rights. The USCCB urges Congress to reject H. Con. Res. 71's proposed fiscal year 2018 budget authority level of \$41.521 billion for the International Affairs functions of government. This would represent a \$10 billion cut from this year's appropriations for those functions. Although the USCCB does not support every individual International Affairs account, it has repeatedly called for robust diplomatic efforts to end longstanding conflicts in a range of countries, including Syria and Iraq, as well as for robust funding for refugee and humanitarian assistance. It is hard to reconcile the need for diplomacy, political solutions, and life-saving humanitarian and development assistance with cuts to the State Department budget of the magnitude proposed by H. Con. Res. 71.

At the same time, H. Con. Res. 71 anticipates dramatic increases in immigration enforcement spending. We fear that such increases could pave the way for enactment of many of the destructive proposals contained in recently released budget plans, including increases in immigrant detention beds, the construction of a wall along the entire border between the United States and Mexico, and the expansion of agreements with state and local governments that threaten local law enforcement's ability to foster trusting relationships with immigrants in their jurisdictions. Any changes to the tax code called for through reconciliation should include a provision to empower the educational choices of families. The reconciliation process should not be used to achieve savings through cutting health care, nutrition, income security, or other anti-poverty programs. This budget attempts to use the rec-

onciliation process to fast-track over \$200 billion in cuts to anti-poverty programs over the next ten years, including Medicaid and Medicare. The bishops have devoted their efforts to addressing the morally problematic features of health care reform while insuring that all people have access to health care coverage.

The human consequences of budget choices are clear to us as pastors. Our Catholic community defends the unborn and the undocumented, feeds the hungry, shelters the homeless, educates the young, and cares for the sick, both at home and abroad. We help mothers facing challenging situations of pregnancy, poor families rising above crushing poverty, refugees fleeing conflict and persecution, and communities devastated by wars, natural disasters and famines. In much of this work, we are partners with government. Our combined resources allow us to reach further and help more. Our institutions are present in every state and throughout the world, serving some of the most marginalized communities and enjoying the trust of local populations.

The moral measure of the federal budget is how well it promotes the common good of all, especially the most vulnerable whose voices are too often missing in these debates. The Catholic Bishops of the United States stand ready to work with leaders of both parties for a federal budget that reduces future deficits, protects poor and vulnerable people, and advances peace and the common good.

Sincerely yours,

HIS EMINENCE TIMOTHY  
CARDINAL DOLAN,  
*Archbishop of New  
York, Chairman,  
Committee on Pro-  
Life Activities.*

MOST REV. OSCAR CANTÚ,  
*Bishop of Las Cruces,  
Chairman, Com-  
mittee on Inter-  
national Justice and  
Peace.*

MOST REV. CHRISTOPHER J.  
COYNE,  
*Bishop of Burlington,  
Chairman, Com-  
mittee on Commu-  
nications.*

MOST REV. FRANK J.  
DEWANE,  
*Bishop of Venice,  
Chairman, Com-  
mittee on Domestic  
Justice and Human  
Development.*

MOST REV. GEORGE V.  
MURRY, SJ.,  
*Bishop of Youngs-  
town, Chairman,  
Committee on Catho-  
lic Education.*

MOST REV. JOE S.  
VÁSQUEZ,  
*Bishop of Austin,  
Chairman, Com-  
mittee on Migration.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Coalition on Human Needs against the Republican budget.

COALITION ON HUMAN NEEDS,

*Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote no on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 Budget Resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution.

The Coalition on Human Needs is an alliance made up of human service providers,

faith organizations, policy experts, labor, civil rights, and other advocates for meeting the needs of low-income and vulnerable people. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we've made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well-prepared for productive lives. But the majority's proposed budget does not build—it breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our nation weaker for decades to come.

The most recent survey data on poverty in the U.S. shows the biggest two-year decline since the late 1960's. Refundable tax credits for working families, SNAP/food stamps and housing subsidies have lifted multi-millions of people out of poverty. The decline in the proportion of our population without health insurance continued its decline in 2016, down to 8.8 percent. More people are working, and in general, low- and moderate-income households have finally started to make income gains.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity. Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education and housing assistance: these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut. The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

The primary goal of H. Con. Res. 71 is to allow huge tax cuts to be enacted with only a simple majority in the Senate. These tax cuts are claimed to be a critical element in increasing economic growth enough to make the tax cuts deficit neutral. Reputable economists are skeptical that the proposed tax cuts would boost the economy to the 2.6 percent average growth projected in the budget and acknowledge that tax cuts to corporations and the rich deepen the deficit. History supports this: the economy grew and unemployment declined more during the Clinton tax increase years than during the Bush era tax cuts. And the Kansas experience with tax cuts is cautionary: revenues plummeted, with the tax take in 2016 \$570 million lower than in 2013, even after counting increases enacted in sales and cigarette taxes. The economic growth that did occur from cutting taxes was estimated to bring in about \$30 million, leaving the state very deeply in the hole. The state legislature has recently reversed course, unwilling to slash education budgets as much as the revenue hole would have forced. They saw that they were weakening their state. Congress should not inflict the same dangerous lesson on the entire nation.

We urge you to reject H. Con. Res. 71 because of its central choice: paying for tax cuts that overwhelmingly favor the rich and corporations with cuts to essential services. Our nation faces major challenges: reducing disproportionate poverty among children and helping children and young adults to advance in education so they can meet the challenges in our economic future, protecting seniors in their retirement, and rebuilding communities. Both the emergency needs of communities devastated by natural disasters and the similarly urgent threats from opioids and other epidemics, decaying infrastructure and inadequate public health and consumer protections demand a vigorous federal response. Instead of making these investments, the House budget would cripple the federal capacity to respond by slashing domestic appropriations by 44 percent compared with FY 2010 levels over the next decade and making similarly extreme cuts in

health care, nutrition, income assistance for seniors, people with disabilities, and working families. In addition to trillions of dollars in cuts and structural constraints to basic mandatory programs, the budget would fast-track \$203 billion in cuts to domestic programs over the next ten years through reconciliation rules. Cuts like these would recklessly weaken us; they are self-inflicted wounds.

The proposed tax cuts will worsen inequality and reward businesses that park their income offshore. Instead, Congress should insist that corporations and the rich pay their fair share. Please vote against weakening America, and instead protect and expand investments as called for in the budgets proposed by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the House Budget Committee Democrats' substitute. These three constructive alternatives deserve your yes vote.

Sincerely yours,

DEBORAH WEINSTEIN,  
*Executive Director.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter to all Members of Congress from the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda against this Republican budget.

NATIONAL HISPANIC  
LEADERSHIP AGENDA,  
July 26, 2017.

Re NHLA opposition to House Budget Resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Hispanic Leadership Agenda (NHLA), the coalition of the nation's 45 pre-eminent Latino advocacy organizations, we are writing to express our deep concerns with the budget resolution that recently passed out of the House Budget Committee and urge you to vote against passage of the resolution if it comes to the House floor. The resolution threatens the basic living standards of tens of millions of Americans in order to subsidize tax cuts for the wealthy. From education and scientific research to basic assistance and health programs, the House budget would cut \$4.4 trillion from entitlement programs and \$1.3 trillion from non-defense discretionary programs over the next decade, crippling the most important drivers of our nation's economic engine—working families. For these reasons, and those detailed further below, NHLA will consider any votes on the budget resolution for inclusion in future NHLA scorecards evaluating the support of Members of Congress for the Latino community.

Budget resolutions serve as fiscal blueprints that signal the priorities of government spending to support all Americans in their attainment of the American Dream. However, rather than seek to bolster opportunities for American working families, the House budget places the burden of reducing our deficit squarely on the backs of families struggling to make ends meet in order to give tax breaks to wealthy corporations and individuals. Rather than investing in America's future homebuyers, workers, and students, both the House budget and President Trump's budget undermine the progress our country has made and prioritize corporate interests over those of hardworking American families.

The trillions of dollars of cuts in the House budget would have a catastrophic impact on the millions of Latinos who struggle to put food on their tables and a roof over their heads. Recent research by UnidosUS (formerly NCLR) provides evidence of the strong impact of federal assistance programs on lifting millions of Latinos, especially children, out of poverty. In 2015, for example:

Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) lifted about 2.7 million Latinos out of poverty, including 1.4 million children.

Child Tax Credit (CTC) lifted an estimated 981,000 Latinos out of poverty, including 560,000 children.

Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) lifted an estimated 1.3 million Latinos out of poverty, including 640,000 children.

Rental assistance lifted about 720,000 Latinos out of poverty, including 270,000 children.

Supplemental Security Income (SSI) lifted an estimated 630,000 Latinos out of poverty, including 140,000 children.

The House budget resolution would threaten the effectiveness of many of these programs. The budget plan also calls for cuts to Medicaid and other health programs more severe than the House-passed bill to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Further, the House budget resolution dismantles consumer and worker protections, jeopardizing the ability of Latino and all working families to build and maintain wealth. The budget plan not only guts the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau—the only agency whose sole mission is to protect Americans from predatory practices in the financial marketplace—but also undermines our nation's workforce, cutting funding for the Wage and Hour Division in the Department of Labor more deeply than proposed in the Trump budget. Additionally, Latino workers cannot afford cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency, which protects our human health and environment from toxic chemicals. Working families need more and better enforcement of consumer financial and labor protection laws to protect Americans from abuse, and also ensure law-abiding financial service providers, as well as employers, are not harmed by unfair competition by unscrupulous actors.

Simply put, the House budget resolution would harm American families and workers, especially Latinos, making our nation more inequitable and less prepared for economic challenges. We strongly urge Members of Congress to oppose the House budget plan and instead support a budget that defends the interests of the American public and prudently spends taxpayer dollars.

Sincerely,

HECTOR SANCHEZ BARBA,  
*Chair, NHLA, Executive Director, Labor Council for Latin American Advancement (LCLAA).*

BRUCE GOLDSTEIN,  
*Co-Chair, NHLA Economic Empowerment and Labor Committee, President, Farmworker Justice.*

ERIC RODRIGUEZ,  
*Co-Chair, NHLA Economic Empowerment and Labor Committee, Vice President, UnidosUS.*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD letters from the AARP, the Main Street Alliance, and the League of Conservation Voters, all in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

AARP,

Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR MEMBER OF CONGRESS: On behalf of over 38 million members and other Americans who are age 50 and older, AARP is writing to communicate our views as you consider H. Con. Res. 71, the House Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for Fiscal Year 2018. As the process moves forward, AARP urges you to support Social Security, Medi-

care, and other key programs that millions of Americans depend upon for their health and financial security and oppose proposals that would hurt older Americans.

#### MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

Our members count on Social Security and Medicare and believe they should be protected and strengthened for today's seniors and future generations. Proposals creating a defined contribution premium-support program; restricting access by raising the age of eligibility; or allowing hospitals and providers to arbitrarily charge consumers higher prices than Medicare can make health care unaffordable for older Americans. These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of health care, but simply shift costs from Medicare onto individuals—many of whom cannot afford to pay more for their care. We urge you not to include attempts to cut Medicare benefits or increase beneficiary costs in the upcoming budget proposal.

The typical senior, with an annual income of around \$25,000 and already spending one out of every six dollars on health care, counts on Social Security for the majority of their income, and on Medicare for access to affordable health coverage. We will continue to oppose changes to current law that cut benefits, increase costs, or reduce the ability of these critical programs to deliver on their benefit promises. We urge you to continue to do so as well.

#### MEDICAID, LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS AND SNAP

Medicaid serves as a critical safety net for millions of people in every state, including over 17 million poor elderly and children and adults with disabilities, who rely on vital Medicaid health and long-term care services. Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through this program. Furthermore, caps could result in significant cost-shifts to state governments unable to shoulder the costs of care without sufficient federal support. Instead of arbitrary caps, proposals should focus on efforts to improve Medicaid, such as encouraging more individuals to receive services in their homes and communities rather than costly institutional care.

SNAP plays a vital role in feeding millions of hungry Americans, including over four million older Americans. Proposals to block grant the program, or impose work requirements will make SNAP less responsive and accessible in times of need; and without clear work requirement exemptions for the elderly and disabled, would bar these individuals from receiving SNAP benefits.

We ask you to reject the cuts proposed in H. Con. Res. 71. We stand ready to work with you to develop proposals that protect and improve Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and SNAP.

Sincerely,

JO ANN C. JENKINS,  
*Chief Executive Officer.*

JOYCE A. ROGERS,  
*SVP Government Affairs, AARP.*

—  
MAIN STREET ALLIANCE,  
Washington, DC, October 2, 2017.

Re H. Con. Res. 71, Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Resolution.

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVES: Main Street Alliance, a network of small business owners

throughout the country, strongly urges you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the Fiscal Year 2018 Budget Resolution. This budget, if enacted into law, would cut \$3.4 trillion from Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending over the next 10 years. This will significantly harm small business owners and their employees, damage local economies, and decimate state budgets.

Millions of small business owners, their employees, and their families rely on Medicaid and Medicare for access to healthcare critical to their survival. The House Budget Resolution would strip them of their health coverage. The proposed budget would slash \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and other health programs, and gut Medicare by \$500 billion, transforming both from systems in which beneficiaries are guaranteed certain levels of coverage, to a capped amount per enrollee. Work requirements would also be imposed on Medicaid. This puts 69 million Medicaid recipients and 57 million Medicare beneficiaries at risk for a loss in services, including millions of small business owners and their employees.

Healthcare, education, food, and housing costs would skyrocket under the House Budget, devastating local economies and small businesses that depend on consumer demand from customers in their communities. In addition to the deep cuts to healthcare, the budget would cut \$150 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, which enables nearly 22 million families to put food on the table, and eliminate \$90 billion from education, training, employment, and social services programs, significantly scaling back Pell Grants, which help nearly 8 million students afford college. These draconian spending cuts would force vulnerable and working families to pay more for vital programs, resulting in a reduction in their disposal income and the amount of money they can spend on goods and services. Small business owners would see a decline in customers.

The House budget cuts would siphon trillions of dollars out of state economies from 2018 to 2027. Because the block grant funding scheme provides a fixed amount of Medicaid and Medicare funding for states each year, the proposal would also leave states on the hook for any and all unexpected healthcare costs from recessions, natural disasters, public health emergencies, or prescription drug price spikes, and unaccounted costs like the aging of the population. The deep reductions in federal healthcare, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending would force states to make up the difference, drastically cutting the quality of services offered. As state budgets contract, employment would decrease and small businesses would decline.

The impact of the House Budget Resolution on small businesses will be felt in the loss of vital services, reduced business, and contracted state budgets. We urge you to protect Main Street small businesses owners, working families, communities, and economies, and oppose the House Budget Resolution. Reject any budget that enables tax cuts for the very wealthy and large profitable corporations to lose revenue, since it will force deep cuts in vital programs that harm small business.

Signed,

AMANDA BALLANTYNE,  
National Director, Main Street Alliance.

LEAGUE OF CONSERVATION VOTERS,  
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.  
Re Oppose FY18 House Budget Resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: The League of Conservation Voters (LCV) works to turn environmental values into national priorities. Each year, LCV publishes the National Environmental Scorecard, which details the voting records of members of Congress on environmental legislation. The Scorecard is distributed to LCV members, concerned voters nationwide, and the media.

LCV urges you to vote NO on H. Con. Res. 71. This budget resolution includes a huge giveaway to oil and gas companies by paving the way for drilling in the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, one of America's most iconic landscapes. It threatens environmental and public health safeguards, provides tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires, and slashes programs and protections that benefit communities across the country, among other harmful provisions.

The House budget resolution puts some of our most iconic landscapes at risk. It contains reconciliation instructions that aim to open up the pristine Arctic National Wildlife Refuge and possibly other public lands and waters to drilling. The Arctic Refuge is one of the largest remaining intact ecosystems in the world. It has sustained the Gwich'in people for centuries and is home to an incredible array of wildlife, including caribou, wolves, polar bears, and nearly 200 species of migratory birds. We have a moral obligation to protect this natural treasure and to transition to a clean energy future.

Following in the footsteps of the Trump administration's unconscionable budget proposal, the House Republican leadership's budget resolution would make dangerous cuts to programs that benefit the most vulnerable in our society while benefitting polluters. Included in the resolution are provisions that will lead to trillions of dollars of cuts to health care and programs that provide basic living standards for struggling families, as well as other substantial cuts. Meanwhile, it would account for \$1.6 billion of federal funds to pay for a xenophobic and environmentally harmful border wall. Rather than investing in safeguards for clean air and water, protections for our national parks and other public lands that drive our outdoor recreation economy, and growing clean energy industries, this budget sells out those priorities to pay for tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires and for gifts to corporate special interests.

We urge you to REJECT H. Con. Res. 71 and will strongly consider including the vote on this bill in the 2017 Scorecard.

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,

President.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I just want to make sure that it is clear that, certainly on the Democratic side, we are very much dedicated to trying to lift people out of poverty. That is one of the reasons why we oppose this Republican budget that cuts \$211 million from financial aid programs to help people be able to get additional higher education. That is one of the reasons why we have complained loudly about the inadequate funding for job training. You want people to train for employment, you need to make sure that those slots are available so that people can get the training and the assistance they need.

The gentleman says: Don't worry about the debt because the reconcili-

ation instructions will instruct the Ways and Means Committee to do a deficit neutral tax plan.

Well, I mean, there is lots of stuff in here that are assumptions that aren't true, like, you repealed the Affordable Care Act. That didn't happen and it is not going to happen.

And what we are told from the Tax Policy Center and the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, according to their analysis, is that what the Republicans are proposing in terms of their tax plan will basically cost well over \$2 trillion, and that will be added to our debt.

So I don't—we can debate fantasyland if we want, but the reality is the reality, and this budget is a bad deal for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, this week, our Nation witnessed the deadliest mass shooting in history. We have endured horrific mass killings in Newtown, San Bernardino, Orlando, and now Las Vegas, among many others, all without any congressional action. The killings happen every single day on our streets, at public events, and even in our homes.

Mr. Speaker, my heart broke when the children of Sandy Hook were killed, and I remain absolutely stunned that this Congress has done nothing about it, nothing.

Now 59 people lost their lives in Las Vegas during what was supposed to be a celebratory event, a concert, and this is only 16 months after the last deadly mass shooting in Orlando. Gun violence in this country is out of control, and all we have done is cater to the gun lobby.

The United States Congress is a legislative body, Mr. Speaker. We are not a think tank or a church or a synagogue. Thoughts and prayers are not what this country expects from us, and it is not what it needs from us. The people of this country need us to act, to pass laws that protect their lives and their children's lives.

As my colleague in the Senate, Senator CHRIS MURPHY, has said: "This must stop. It is positively infuriating that my colleagues in Congress are so afraid of the gun industry that they pretend that there aren't any public policy responses to this epidemic. There are. And the thoughts and prayers of politicians are cruelly hollow if they are paired with legislative indifference."

For this reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Mr. THOMPSON's bill, H. Res. 367, which I am a cosponsor of, which would establish the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention.

Mr. Speaker, let me explain what I mean when I say "defeat the previous question." We are here debating which bills will come to the House floor this week, the agenda for the House of Representatives. The majority chose to consider their misguided budget. Fine. We can do that.

But what I am saying is that we should also take the first step in at least setting up a committee to look at gun violence in America. So if we say no to ending debate on this rule, by defeating the previous question, we can then debate whether or not to create this committee. This is the least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON) to discuss our proposal.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, it was almost 5 years ago that this Nation witnessed the terrible tragedy at Sandy Hook Elementary School, where 20 first graders were murdered in their classrooms, along with six of their teachers. Congress did nothing.

A church in Charleston, a White supremacist walked in and murdered nine worshippers. Congress did nothing. And worse than that, Congress didn't even address what is called the "Charleston loophole" that allowed this deranged White supremacist to be able to buy a gun or obtain a gun that he was buying without completing the background check.

Orlando, Florida, the nightclub: 49 people murdered. Congress did nothing.

The congressional baseball game, one of our own was shot by some deranged murderer. Congress did nothing.

Las Vegas, just these past days, a country music festival: 59 people murdered. The biggest mass shooting in the history of the United States of America. Even as sad, it is the 273rd mass shooting in the United States of America this year.

So what is Congress going to do? More of nothing? That is not appropriate.

In the almost 5 years since Sandy Hook, we have been working on our side of the aisle diligently to try and come up with some ideas, some solutions to help prevent gun violence, and we have come up with some. As a matter of fact, one of them is a bipartisan measure with a bipartisan coauthor on my bill, Mr. PETER KING from New York, and we have four or five Republican coauthors on that bill.

Have we had a hearing?

No.

Have we had a vote?

No.

All we are trying to do with that bill is expand background checks to make sure that criminals and the dangerously mentally ill can't buy firearms easily; make it more difficult for these people, who we know commit crimes with these guns, to get their hands on a gun. It is within the confines of the Second Amendment. It just

expands the already existing background checks to include commercial sale of firearms across the country. No hearings, no votes.

Instead, our friends on the other side of the aisle have their own gun agenda. They want to legalize silencers. They want to remove the restrictions on silencers. Police entities, officers, chiefs, and sheriffs across the country have told us that this is dangerous. It puts the people that we represent at risk, but that is their gun agenda.

If you don't like the ideas that we have brought forward, please bring something forward, other than deregulating silencers, that will help with this epidemic that we are facing in our country.

Thirty people a day are killed by someone using a gun.

What are your ideas?

Nothing. Silence.

The only thing we have heard now is we hear from your leadership that we are not going to discuss policy in regard to gun violence prevention.

Well, that is why we came to Congress. That is why every one of us ran for Congress, to work on policy. That is why our constituents sent us to Congress, to vote on policy.

But on the heels of 59 people being murdered the day before yesterday, what are we told?

That we are not going to do policy on gun violence prevention.

That is not responsible.

The bill that my friend, Mr. MCGOVERN, talked about, my bill that he is a coauthor on, would establish a Select Committee, Democrats and Republicans, to sit down at the same table and try and find some solutions to help prevent gun violence, and then move that to the House for consideration. That is all we want.

We want these issues to be heard. We want to be able to do our job. Our constituents want a vote on these issues that are important to the safety of every single person in the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that we defeat the previous question.

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

If you have not tuned in to this debate until just these past few minutes, you might not know that this is the budget debate today. We have been prepping for the budget debate today for about 10 months now, and we are ready today not just with one budget, but with a variety of budget choices. And what is wonderful about this process is it has been such an open process.

You can come down to the House floor and air absolutely any idea that is on your mind. That has not just been true today, Mr. Speaker, but that has been true throughout this entire budget process. In fact, I have a letter signed by literally hundreds of groups that support not just voting on the rule to bring the budget to the floor, but groups that support passing the budget as we passed it out of the House Budget Committee.

Now, if my colleagues have any concerns about that, I hope they will come and knock on my door, Mr. Speaker, because I promise you that one of these groups is going to be from their part of the country.

Certainly, in Georgia, the Georgia Chamber of Commerce is on that list. So our folks back home are supportive. If you are from Alabama, I have got Alabamans on here. If you are from Baton Rouge, I have got Baton Rouge. If you are from Battle Creek, I have Battle Creek, because what we are working on here isn't a Republican budget, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1315

What we are working on isn't a regional budget. What we are working on here is the national budget for the United States of America that can be transformational for absolutely every citizen in absolutely every corner of this country.

We have that opportunity. I think we are going to seize that opportunity, but we can't do it until we move this rule to get to the underlying bills. I encourage my colleagues to do that.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume, and I include in the RECORD letters from the UAW, the SEIU, The National Treasury Employees Union, AFSCME, the American Federation of Government Employees, and NARFE.

INTERNATIONAL UNION, UNITED  
AUTOMOBILE, AEROSPACE & AGRICULTURAL  
IMPLEMENT WORKERS  
OF AMERICA—UAW,

Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the International Union, United Automobile, Aerospace and Agricultural Implement Workers of America (UAW), I am writing to strongly urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House Fiscal Year (FY) 2018 budget resolution. The federal budget is a moral document as well as a fiscal blueprint, and H. Con. Res. 71 fails spectacularly on both fronts. This draconian budget would be a disaster for our economy, the middle class and our most vulnerable citizens.

The proposed budget forces working people and retirees to pay for enormous tax cuts to the wealthy. Despite claims to the contrary, by 2027, roughly 30 percent of households earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000 would see an increase in their taxes. H. Con. Res. 71 cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid and ends the programs as we know them. Medicaid and Medicare are literal lifelines for many of our most vulnerable citizens—especially children and the elderly. Medicaid is the largest provider of nursing home and long-term care.

This radical piece of legislation creates fast-track procedures to implement the tax cuts that will overwhelmingly benefit the wealthy and multinational corporations. The average tax cut for millionaires would be \$230,000 a year by 2027. It eliminates the estate tax, which currently only applies to the top two tenths of one percent of estates, giving the ultra-wealthy \$239 billion in tax cuts. By 2027, 80% of tax cuts will go to the top one percent.

It also uses these procedures to make at least \$203 billion in cuts to mandatory programs that are important for working families and our most vulnerable citizens. In

total, this budget assumes \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts. Cuts of this magnitude would almost certainly lead to slashing funding for Legal Services Corporation, federal employee pensions, nutritional assistance infrastructure, and unemployment compensation, to name a few. It also repeals the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and the Affordable Care Act.

This budget resolution takes America in the wrong direction. We have tried “trickle down” economics several times in the past; it did not work then and it will not work now. These tax cuts will not pay for themselves. Instead, they will come at the expense of hardworking every day Americans—many of whom have trouble affording basic necessities today.

We strongly urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71 and instead work on a federal budget that invests in our country and works for ALL Americans.

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,  
*Legislative Director.*

SEIU STRONGER TOGETHER,

*Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 2 million members of the Service Employees International Union (“SEIU”), I write to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the FY18 House budget resolution. This budget would further rig the system against working Americans by slashing resources that help families afford basic needs like healthcare, food, and education—all to pave the way for tax cuts for corporations and the wealthy. SEIU believes The People’s Budget is a better way forward for working families. While the House Republican budget would continue to leave working families behind, The People’s Budget makes American workers its first priority through critical investments in health care, education, and infrastructure.

The first goal of any elected representative should be to improve the lives of their constituents. H. Con. Res. 71 fails to meet this standard. To pay for tax giveaways for the wealthy and corporations, the budget resolution includes reconciliation instructions that would significantly undermine basic living standards for families. For example, under the reconciliation instructions, committees are directed to make cuts of \$203 billion dollars over ten years to programs that could include Medicaid, Medicare, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and programs for people with disabilities, which provide critical support for millions of Americans.

By threatening Medicaid, this budget ignores the tens of thousands of people who mobilized month after month to soundly reject efforts to dismantle healthcare and cut Medicaid. Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding put at risk healthcare for 74 million Americans—including children, people with disabilities, and seniors. Hospitals could be forced to close or cut services, further reducing access to care, especially in underserved areas. States—which must balance budgets and already face fiscal pressures—would not be able to make up the lost federal Medicaid dollars and would likely be forced to deny coverage. Furthermore, the cuts would lead to significant job loss in the healthcare industry, one of the fastest growing sectors in our economy.

In contrast, The People’s Budget would focus on reforms to increase access, affordability, and quality of health care by building on the foundation of the Affordable Care Act (“ACA”). In its entirety, it would move the nation’s health care system closer to achieving universal coverage, while ensuring that working families would have affordable care. At the same time, it would invest in de-

veloping innovative care delivery models that control costs and increase quality. The People’s Budget would put America’s health care system on the right path forward.

The House Republican budget, however, would compound the proposed Medicaid cuts with potential cuts to Medicare, Social Security Disability Insurance, and nutrition assistance. The budget doubles down on its harm to seniors and people with disabilities and further shift costs to states. The cumulative impact of the deep cuts proposed in this budget would force states to make drastic spending and job cuts, raise taxes, or both. This budget pressure would likely also trickle down to local governments in the form of decreased funding to cities and counties, creating a fiscal crisis in communities across the nation.

While H. Con. Res. 71 would force Americans to make a false choice between programs that are essential to their communities and tax giveaways for the wealthy, The People’s Budget invests in American communities through a robust infrastructure program and makes debt free college a reality for all students—without sacrificing health care for millions of Americans. The House Republican budget makes no such commitment to education, and its steep cuts create the potential for state budget crises that put education programs and working families’ futures in jeopardy. Trickle-down economics have left America’s middle class behind for decades. It is time we turn the page towards an economy that is designed for working families and aimed at improving their lives.

The proposed FY18 House Budget Resolution is a disaster for America’s working families. By decimating programs that provide healthcare, food, housing, and education to set the stage for massive tax cuts for the wealthy and corporations, this budget is an attack on our communities’ quality of life. We respectfully urge you to reject the proposed budget resolution, and instead support The People’s Budget which would prioritize working families in building an economy that works for everyone. We will add votes on H. Con. Res. 71 to our legislative scorecard.

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,  
*International President.*

THE NATIONAL TREASURY  
EMPLOYEES UNION,

*Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: As National President of the National Treasury Employees Union, I represent over 150,000 dedicated federal employees at 31 agencies. I am writing to ask you to VOTE NO on the House Budget Resolution, H. Con Res 71.

The House Budget Resolution instructs the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform to produce at least \$32 billion in cuts to programs under its jurisdiction, which are federal employee benefit programs. While the Budget Committee recommended sizable cuts to federal employee retirement, it is important to highlight that this program has been utilized in recent years to help pay for both infrastructure and unemployment insurance. This was twice accomplished by increasing the amount federal employees contribute toward their retirement benefits, and occurred against a backdrop of a multi-year pay freeze, further squeezing employee paychecks. In recent years, federal employees have endured compensation losses of close to \$200 billion for deficit reduction, from the above retirement changes and from reduced pay increases in 2014, 2015, 2016, and in 2017. At a time when private sector raises are averaging 3%, federal wage increases continue to trail behind.

Federal employees play a vital role for taxpayers—ensuring air, water and food safety, border and national security, consumer protections, and preserving our national parks, to name just a few of their functions and missions. Like all Americans, federal employees face ever-increasing food, utility, health care, and college bills, and have rent and mortgage obligations. Families will fall further behind if their take-home pay is slashed or if cost-of-living adjustments, similar to those made to Social Security, military retirement and to veterans’ benefits to keep these payments whole, are removed in retirement. These further cuts will also degrade morale, make it difficult for agencies to recruit and retain quality employees, and will erode income security for retirees.

Additionally, I ask you to strongly oppose Representatives McClintock and Walker’s Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute that places a severe financial burden on federal employees by vicescrating federal employee compensation, and further unfairly attacks worker protections and labor organizations.

On behalf of our nation’s federal employees—who live and work in every state and congressional district across the country—serving as scientists, accountants, statisticians, park rangers, and law enforcement officers, I ask you to reject the cuts contemplated in the Budget Resolution, and VOTE NO.

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,  
*National President.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE,  
COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

*Washington, DC, October 2, 2017.*

MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the 1.6 million members of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees (AFSCME), I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year (FY) 2018 budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee and scheduled to be considered by the full House. This budget plan would impose considerable hardship on many Americans in order to slash taxes for the wealthy and corporations and to boost defense spending.

The budget decisions made by Congress each year are vital to ensuring that the economy is strong and that our communities are safe and prosperous. Yet, this budget completely undercuts responsibility for shared prosperity by applying the same misguided priorities proposed by President Trump. It sets woefully inadequate spending levels for critical public services and cuts over a trillion dollars from non-defense discretionary spending (NDD), in order to significantly boost defense spending and provide massive tax giveaways to wealthy individuals and large corporations.

The budget slashes \$5.7 trillion over 10 years including \$1.3 trillion from NDD programs that have already been compromised by austere budget caps. FY 2018 statutory caps lower funding for NDD programs by 17 percent adjusted for inflation below FY 2010, and the House budget cuts this by an additional \$5 billion. The additional cuts proposed in the House budget would weaken public services that all Americans rely on, create massive budget problems for states, and lead to enormous job losses. It would force dramatic cuts in, education, job training, federal employee pensions, and nutritional assistance. Over 10 years, the budget cuts \$4.4 trillion from entitlement programs, such as, Medicare and Medicaid, including at least \$203 billion in entitlement cuts to be

made through the “fast track” reconciliation process. As a result, safety-net programs that millions rely upon are once again a target, further shifting enormous and unsustainable costs to the elderly, disabled, students and states.

Rather than increasing revenues for investment that creates jobs and spurs economic growth, the proposed budget creates a fast-track process for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit corporations and the wealthy. In fact, according to the non-partisan Tax Policy Center, the Trump/GOP tax cut would largely benefit the richest 1 percent. The budget also relies on the gimmicks of dynamic scoring and sham accounting, hiding the true cost of unnecessary and harmful tax cuts.

The budget approved by the House Budget Committee would hurt families, kill job growth and send the economy into a downward tailspin. I strongly urge you to oppose. H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed 2018 concurrent budget resolution.

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

*Director of Federal Government Affairs.*

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF  
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,

*Washington, DC, September 29, 2017.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the American Federation of Government Employees, AFL-CIO, which represents over 700,000 federal employees across the country, I strongly urge you to oppose any FY 2018 budget resolution proposal that includes reconciliation instructions to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee (OGR) requiring cuts within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by \$32 billion for the FY 2018-2027 period, when the House considers various FY 2018 budget proposals during the week of October 2, 2017. These cuts would target federal employee retirement benefits, as that is the only substantial mandatory spending within OGR's jurisdiction.

Such an approach would be consistent with the Senate Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution proposal that excludes reconciliation instructions that would result in cutting federal employee retirement benefits. Indeed, the Senate version only includes reconciliation instructions to two committees: the \$1.5 trillion allowance for net tax cuts under the Finance Committee's jurisdiction and a \$1 billion, 10-year deficit cut instruction to the Energy and Natural Resources Committee which could open up a portion of Alaska's Arctic National Wildlife Refuge to oil and gas exploration.

AFGE opposes the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution's reconciliation instructions to the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to cut federal employee retirement benefits by \$32 billion for the FY 2018-2027 period. We believe this budget reconciliation instruction would help rip away any sense of financial security that federal employees currently have.

As you know, the House Budget Committee budget report included recommendations that would:

Require federal employees, including Members of Congress and their staffs, to make greater contributions to their own defined benefit retirement plans.

Eliminate the Federal Employees Retirement System (FERS) supplemental annuity payments to federal employees who retire before age 62, such as law enforcement officers and federal firefighters.

Transition new federal employees to a defined contribution retirement system. (The existing Thrift Savings Plan under FERS is a defined contribution retirement plan.)

These proposed federal retirement cuts of \$32 billion over ten years would be on top of the \$182 billion in cuts to pay and benefits that federal employees have experienced since 2011. Those pay and benefit cuts included: a three-year pay freeze (2011, 2012, 2013), three years of reduced pay increases (2014, 2015, 2016), unpaid furlough days because of the 2013 sequestration, and two increases in retirement contributions for new hires (2012 and 2013).

It is important to view the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget proposal to cut federal employee retirement benefits in the proper context. The federal employee retirement systems (FERS and CSRS) have played no role whatsoever in the creation of the federal budget deficit. In addition, increasing federal employees' contributions to their defined benefit retirement plans would decrease consumer demand and thereby adversely impact the American economy.

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. KAHN,

*Director, Legislative Affairs.*

NATIONAL ACTIVE AND RETIRED  
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION,

*Alexandria, VA, October 3, 2017.*

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
*Washington, DC.*

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Active and Retired Federal Employees Association (NARFE), I write to ask you to oppose the inclusion of reconciliation instructions in any budget resolution that target federal retirement and/or health benefits considered by the full House of Representatives.

The House Budget Committee passed, and the House is expected to consider, a budget resolution containing reconciliation instructions calling for at least \$32 billion in cuts to mandatory spending under the jurisdiction of the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform (OGR). Such instructions directly target the hard-earned retirement and health benefits of federal and postal workers and retirees, as these benefits constitute the only substantial mandatory spending under OGR's jurisdiction.

Proposals to meet the \$32 billion in savings range from bad to worse—from imposing a “retirement tax” on current federal and postal employees by raising payroll contributions towards retirement without any benefit increase to various proposals that would dramatically reduce the value of federal pensions for those nearing—or even in—retirement. These are neither fair nor prudent policies, yet any budget resolution containing reconciliation instructions for OGR endorses them prior to any significant evaluation.

The upcoming budget resolution is being used to set the stage for advancing tax reform that proponents argue provides a break to hard-working, middle-class Americans. Reconciliation instructions that target hard-working, middle class federal and postal workers are diametrically opposed to that goal and undermine a key argument as the basis of comprehensive tax reform.

For these reasons, I ask you to oppose any budget resolution that contains substantial reconciliation instructions to the House Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

Sincerely,

RICHARD THISEN,

*National President*

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, let me just say to my colleague from Georgia, thanks for reminding us that the Republicans have been working on the

budget for 10 months; but according to your own Republican Budget Committee website, the budget was supposed to be presented and finished by April 15, so you are a little late.

In any event, I also want to remind the gentleman, because I know he is on the Rules Committee, so I know he knows this, that the rule sets the agenda for the House. Yes, if one of the things that the Republicans want to bring up is their terrible budget, that is fine. You can do that. But the rule can also be an opportunity for us to bring up the bill that Mr. THOMPSON has offered, to set up this commission to deal with gun violence. We can do both.

You can walk and you can chew gum at the same time. This is not a radical idea. But this is our only way to be able to bring something to the floor, because the leadership of this House has said no to everything. They have said no to everything. We can't get hearings. We can't get votes. We can't get debates. We get nothing.

Don't be startled by us trying to defeat the previous question. It is a perfectly legitimate way to try to expand the agenda, and I hope that some of our Republican friends will vote with us to defeat the previous question. We can still do the budget, but we can also do the Thompson bill as well.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Delaware (Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER).

Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend and fellow member of the Agriculture Committee, Mr. MCGOVERN, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to H. Con. Res. 71, the Republicans' proposed budget. This plan would make extreme and irresponsible cuts to domestic spending programs and weaken our Nation's social safety net.

We should be proposing a budget that provides for real economic growth. We should be strengthening programs that help young Americans access higher education, increasing infrastructure funding, and investing in our Nation's roads and bridges. We should be focused on vision, aspiration, a budget reflective of our great Nation and the great things we can do.

This budget instructs my friend from Massachusetts and my committee to find \$10 billion in cuts to agriculture programs over the next 10 years. This decrease will affect our ability to fund essential USDA programs across our country in every congressional district. These are programs that farmers, schoolchildren, families, communities, and Americans rely on.

Where will we be forced to take the money from? Rural development? conservation programs? our already insufficient nutrition programs? resources for schools?

At a time when spending on fighting wildfires has surpassed previous records, will we cut that budget?

This budget and accompanying tax plan does not put us on strong fiscal



ground either. Many people don't realize the significance of the agricultural industry in Delaware. Our State is filled with family farmers that produce specialty crops, commodities. Delaware has the highest number of chickens per capita—300—of any State in the Nation. Many of these farmers rely on the very programs that we will be forced to undermine if these cuts are realized, and that hurts all Americans.

Access to food is not just a farmer's issue; it will affect rural communities, urban communities, and all of us. This is not a responsible way to govern.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would say to my friend from Massachusetts that I have no further speakers remaining. I would be happy to close when the gentleman is prepared.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the remainder of my time.

I just want to tell my colleague from Georgia, if he hasn't read what we are trying to propose here, we are suggesting that they bring up the Thompson bill to the floor under an open rule, and even get a motion to recommit, but under an open rule. Take us up on this offer because we have had no open rules in this Congress. Try it; you might like it. It might be contagious. We might see more open rules where Democrats, Republicans, liberals, and conservatives can offer their ideas. We suggest they bring it up under an open rule.

I would urge all of my colleagues to think about that before they cast their vote on defeating the previous question.

Mr. Speaker, I began by saying the frustration I have with this place is that we either do nothing or we make things worse for people. Going back to this issue on creating a commission to deal with gun violence, there are a lot of things I would like to do, but maybe this is a way to get some bipartisan buy-in to actually try and figure out how to respond to this epidemic of gun violence.

There have been 26 bills on gun safety introduced in this Congress sponsored by Democrats and Republicans. I include that list in the RECORD.

#### GUN SAFETY BILLS IN THE 115TH CONGRESS

1. H. Res. 367 Establishing the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention.

2. H.R. 2841 Title: Disarm Hate Act

3. H. Res. 361 Supporting the goals and ideals of "National Gun Violence Awareness Day" and "National Gun Violence Awareness Month".

4. H.R. 57 Accidental Firearms Transfers Reporting Act of 2017

5. H.R. 62 Gun Violence Reduction Resources Act of 2017 (200 additional ATF Agents)

6. H.R. 1982 To authorize funding to increase access to mental health care treatment to reduce gun violence

7. H.R. 370 Amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to require that a standing committee (or subcommittee thereof) hearing be held whenever there is a moment of silence in the House for a tragedy involving gun violence

8. H.R. 630 National Statistics on Deadly Force Transparency Act of 2017

9. H.R. 445 Buyback Our Safety Act (gun buyback program)

10. H.R. 1079 Campus Gun Policy Transparency Act

11. H.R. 163 Gun Manufacturers Accountability Act

12. H.R. 2033 Undetectable Firearms Modernization Act

13. H.R. 3013 Help Communities Fight Violent Crime Act

14. H.R. 1111 Department of Peacebuilding Act of 2017

15. H. Res. 90 Expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that gun violence is a public health issue and Congress should enact by the end of the 115th Congress comprehensive Federal legislation that protects the Second Amendment and keeps communities safe and healthy, including expanding enforceable background checks for all commercial gun sales, improving the mental health system in the United States, and making gun trafficking and straw purchasing a Federal crime.

16. H.R. 1475 Title: Gun Trafficking Prevention Act of 2017

17. H.R. 1612 Title: Gun Show Loophole Closing Act of 2017

18. H.R. 1708 Firearm Risk Protection Act of 2017 (insurance for gun owners)

19. H.R. 1832 To authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

20. H.R. 2380 Handgun Trigger Safety Act of 2017

21. H.R. 1832 To authorize the appropriation of funds to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention for conducting or supporting research on firearms safety or gun violence prevention.

22. H.R. 1478 Gun Violence Research Act

23. H.R. 3613 Safer Neighborhoods Gun Buyback Act of 2017

24. H.R. 3361 SECURE Firearm Storage Act

25. King-Thompson Background Check Bill (closes gun show and Charleston loopholes, not yet reintroduced)

26. No Fly No Buy (not yet reintroduced)

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, people have their ideas. Some of them are maybe not so good ideas; some of them may be very good ideas. But let's begin to talk about what our response should be. That is at least doing something. That is better than a moment of silence or offering your thoughts and prayers to people who were victims in this terrible latest massacre.

We have got to do something, and nothing is no longer sufficient. We can't keep on doing that. People are horrified that Congress seems indifferent. We can't even have a hearing on this issue, never mind a debate on the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to defeat the previous question so we can bring up the Thompson bill, and maybe we can start coming together and coming up with some ideas that might save some lives. That is the least we can do.

Mr. Speaker, to my other point that we either do nothing or you guys do things that make life worse for people, it brings us to the budget. This budget basically, in my opinion, is a cruel budget that targets, disproportionately, those who are poor and those who are in the middle class.

It is astounding to me where some of the savings are sought. The idea that

you would cut SNAP by \$164 billion, a program that provides food to people; a program where 67 percent of the people on the benefit are children, are senior citizens, or people who are disabled; a program where those who can work, the majority of them work, but they earn so little in the workforce that they still qualify for that program. You want to take that benefit away, a benefit that is \$1.40 per person per meal.

Come on. What are people thinking when they make those kinds of suggestions?

By the way, we all know what this is. It is basically a pretext to move forward on your tax cut plan, which benefits Donald Trump, Donald Trump's family, and Donald Trump's friends.

This idea that somehow this would be deficit neutral is laughable. The OMB Director, Mick Mulvaney, stated: "If we simply look at this as being deficit neutral, you're never going to get the type of tax reform and tax reductions" that you guys are looking for. That is the former colleague and the OMB Director.

So we all know what is going on here. But people ought to think long and hard before they cast their vote for this Republican budget. Budgets basically indicate what we value, what we think is important.

I have got to tell you, I just don't believe that if people read this budget, that a majority of my friends, we have disagreements on lots of issues, but I just don't believe that deep in your heart you actually believe this stuff. I mean, this is offensive.

We ought to be talking about lifting people up and not putting them down. We ought to be talking about all of the citizens of this country with respect and treating them with dignity. We ought not treat people who are in poverty as if somehow they are invisible, and that is what this budget does.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote down this Republican budget. I urge them to defeat the previous question so we can bring up, under an open rule—under and open rule, which nobody in this Congress has seen—a bill that would allow us to create a commission, a bipartisan commission to examine gun violence.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, what I love most about budget day is the fact that we do get to talk about our competing ideas. I do reject some of the implications that we have heard that what we are talking about is whether we love people or not. That is actually not the debate today.

I want to stipulate that I know the men and women of this Chamber on a personal basis, and each and every one of them that I know personally loves and cares for their constituency back home. The debate that we have is not whether we love people; it is how to love people best.



Do you love people best by giving them a check or giving them a job? That is a legitimate debate.

Do you love people best by leaving their children with them or taking their children away from them? That is a legitimate debate.

I believe in families. I believe in the dignity of work. I want to have those debates.

I think we do ourselves a disservice when we describe what is going on here today on the floor of the House as anything other than our absolute legal and governmental responsibility to pass a budget for the United States of America. Wherever you sit on the continuum, the political continuum, the economic continuum, the regional continuum, there is a budget for you today.

If what you believe, Mr. Speaker, is that the problems we have in this country are because taxes are not high enough, there is going to be a Democratic substitute coming out of the Budget Committee that will raise taxes about \$2.4 trillion. If you think taxes are too low, we can raise them \$2.4 trillion. That budget never balances. That budget never stops borrowing from our children and our grandchildren. That budget never stops mortgaging America's future. But it is a legitimate debate because folks are taking those funds and they are investing them in America. They are prioritizing that investment over balancing.

If you believe \$2.4 trillion is not enough, Mr. Speaker, we will have a budget from the Congressional Black Caucus today that will raise taxes by \$4.2 trillion. We can raise taxes by \$4.2 trillion. Again, that budget never balances. It spends all that money and more, but it is a legitimate debate about where those dollars come from and where those dollars are going. I am glad we are going to be able to have it.

If raising taxes by \$4.2 trillion isn't enough for you, Mr. Speaker, we have the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget on the floor. It raises taxes by just over \$10 trillion. Again, the budget never balances. It spends all of that money and more and continues to borrow from our children and grandchildren, but it is a legitimate debate and it is a conversation worth having. I am proud that the Rules Committee made that debate in order.

To describe what is happening on the floor of the House today, Mr. Speaker, as anything other than what is exactly expected of this institution is to do us all a disservice.

I talked about making taxes higher. Let me talk a second about making taxes lower.

I talked to some friends back home; I talk to constituents; I talk to folks for whom I work, and some of them might say: "Rob, I have enough to feed my family, and if it means paying down the debt and deficit, I am willing to pay a little bit more." Other members in the community, Mr. Speaker, say: "For Pete's sake, I am trying to grow

a business here, Rob. I am trying to employ your friends and neighbors. I am trying to keep the community working. I am plowing everything I have back into the business. If I don't have to pay as much in taxes, I am going to be able to hire more people."

The Republican budget, Mr. Speaker, takes a shot at once-in-a-generation tax reform—once in a generation. This isn't what we talked about last year or the year before that or the year before that. This is a conversation we have not had since Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill had it in 1986. This is a conversation that we have not had since America slipped from number one in the world to almost last in the industrialized world in terms of tax competitiveness. This is a conversation that America has longed for and that we can deliver today.

Mr. Speaker, let's have these debates about what our priorities are. Let's have these debates about whether or not we can do better. At the end of the day, let's agree that we, in fact, can do better, that our bosses back home expect us to do better, and that by supporting this rule and supporting one of the underlying budgets, we, in fact, will do better.

I encourage my colleagues, Mr. Speaker, support this rule, begin this debate. Let's pass this budget. Let's fulfill our promises. Let's make the difference that we all came here to make.

The material previously referred to by Mr. MCGOVERN is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 553 OFFERED BY  
MR. MCGOVERN

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the resolution (H. Res. 367) to establish the Select Committee on Gun Violence Prevention. The first reading of the resolution shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the resolution are waived. General debate shall be confined to the resolution and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Rules. After general debate the resolution shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the resolution are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the resolution for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the resolution to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the resolution, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the resolution.

SEC. 3. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 367.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT  
IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's *Precedents of the House of Representatives* (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the *Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives*, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In *Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives*, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 231, nays 189, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—231

Abraham	Garrett	Mitchell
Aderholt	Gianforte	Moolenaar
Allen	Gibbs	Mooney (WV)
Amash	Gohmert	Mullin
Arrington	Goodlatte	Murphy (PA)
Babin	Gosar	Newhouse
Bacon	Gowdy	Noem
Banks (IN)	Granger	Norman
Barletta	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Barr	Graves (LA)	Olson
Barton	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Bergman	Griffith	Paulsen
Biggs	Grothman	Pearce
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Perry
Bishop (MI)	Handel	Pittenger
Bishop (UT)	Harper	Poliquin
Black	Harris	Posey
Blackburn	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Blum	Hensarling	Reed
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Roby
Brooks (IN)	Holding	Roe (TN)
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Buck	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Bucshon	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Budd	Hultgren	Rokita
Burgess	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Byrne	Hurd	Rooney, Thomas
Calvert	Issa	J.
Carter (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (TX)	Jenkins (WV)	Roskam
Chabot	Johnson (LA)	Ross
Cheney	Johnson (OH)	Rothfus
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rouzer
Cole	Jones	Royce (CA)
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Russell
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Comer	Katko	Sanford
Comstock	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Conaway	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cook	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Costello (PA)	King (NY)	Sessions
Cramer	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Crawford	Knight	Shuster
Culberson	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Labrador	Smith (MO)
Davidson	LaHood	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	LaMalfa	Smith (NJ)
Denham	Lamborn	Smith (TX)
Dent	Lance	Smucker
DeSantis	Latta	Stefanik
DesJarlais	Lewis (MN)	Stewart
Diaz-Balart	LoBiondo	Stivers
Donovan	Love	Taylor
Duffy	Lucas	Tenney
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	MacArthur	Thornberry
Dunn	Marchant	Tiberi
Emmer	Marino	Tipton
Estes (KS)	Marshall	Trott
Farenthold	Massie	Turner
Faso	Mast	Upton
Ferguson	McCaul	Valadao
Fitzpatrick	McClintock	Wagner
Fleischmann	McHenry	Walberg
Flores	McKinley	Walden
Fortenberry	McMorris	Walker
Fox	Rodgers	Walorski
Franks (AZ)	McSally	Walters, Mimi
Frelinghuysen	Meadows	Weber (TX)
Gaetz	Meehan	Webster (FL)
Gallagher	Messer	Wenstrup

Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman

Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho

Young (AK)  
Young (IA)  
Zeldin

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 232, noes 188, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—232

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chu, Judy  
Cicilline  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Cohen  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Courtney  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Cummings  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Demings  
DeSaulnier  
Deutch  
Dingell  
Doggett  
Ellison  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Espallat  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Foster  
Frankel (FL)  
Fudge  
Gabbard

Gallego  
Garamendi  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Gottheimer  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Grijalva  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Hastings  
Heck  
Higgins (NY)  
Himes  
Hoyer  
Huffman  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Kaptur  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kennedy  
Khanna  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
Loeb sack  
Lofgren  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lujan Grisham,  
M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Matsui  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McNerney  
Meeks  
Meng  
Moore  
Moulton  
Murphy (FL)  
Nader  
Napolitano  
Neal

Nolan  
Norcross  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Pallone  
Panetta  
Pascrell  
Payne  
Perlmutter  
Peters  
Peterson  
Pingree  
Pocan  
Polis  
Price (NC)  
Quigley  
Raskin  
Rice (NY)  
Richmond  
Roybal-Allard  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Suozzi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Thompson (CA)  
Thompson (MS)  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Wilson (FL)  
Yarmuth

Abraham  
Aderholt  
Allen  
Amash  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barton  
Bergman  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Bost  
Brady (TX)  
Brat  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Coffman  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)  
Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Cook  
Costello (PA)  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Culberson  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis, Rodney  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DesJarlais  
Diaz-Balart  
Donovan  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Duncan (TN)  
Dunn  
Emmer  
Estes (KS)  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Fox  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert

Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Griffith  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Hill  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hudson  
Huizenga  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Rouzer  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, Sam  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Katko  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
LoBiondo  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
MacArthur  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marino  
Marshall  
Massie  
Mast  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer

Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Sanford  
Schweikert  
Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NE)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Webster (FL)  
Wenstrup

NOES—188

Adams  
Aguilar  
Barragán  
Bass

Beatty  
Bera  
Beyer  
Bishop (GA)

Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici

NAYS—189

NOT VOTING—13

□ 1351

Messrs. GRIJALVA and HOYER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Mr. FITZPATRICK changed his vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

Boyle, Brendan F.	Grijalva	O'Rourke
Brady (PA)	Gutiérrez	Pallone
Brown (MD)	Hanabusa	Panetta
Brownley (CA)	Hastings	Pascarell
Bustos	Heck	Payne
Butterfield	Higgins (NY)	Pelosi
Capuano	Himes	Perlmutter
Carbajal	Hoyer	Peters
Cárdenas	Huffman	Peterson
Carson (IN)	Jackson Lee	Pingree
Cartwright	Jayapal	Pocan
Castor (FL)	Jeffries	Polis
Castro (TX)	Johnson (GA)	Price (NC)
Chu, Judy	Johnson, E. B.	Quigley
Cicilline	Kaptur	Raskin
Clark (MA)	Keating	Rice (NY)
Clarke (NY)	Kelly (IL)	Richmond
Clay	Kennedy	Roybal-Allard
Cleaver	Khanna	Ruiz
Clyburn	Kildee	Ruppersberger
Cohen	Kilmer	Rush
Connolly	Kind	Ryan (OH)
Conyers	Krishnamoorthi	Sánchez
Cooper	Kuster (NH)	Sarbanes
Correa	Langevin	Schakowsky
Costa	Larsen (WA)	Schiff
Courtney	Larson (CT)	Schneider
Crist	Lawrence	Scott (VA)
Crowley	Crist	Serrano
Cuellar	Lee	Sewell (AL)
Cummings	Levin	Shea-Porter
Davis (CA)	Lewis (GA)	Sherman
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Sinema
DeFazio	Lipinski	Sires
DeGette	Loeb	Slaughter
Delaney	Loeb	Smith (WA)
DeLauro	Lofgren	Soto
DelBene	Lowenthal	Speier
Demings	Lowe	Suozi
DeSaulnier	Lujan Grisham,	Swalwell (CA)
Deutch	M.	Takano
Dingell	Lujan, Ben Ray	Thompson (CA)
Doggett	Lynch	Thompson (MS)
Ellison	Maloney,	Tonko
Engel	Carolyn B.	Torres
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Tsongas
Espallat	Matsui	Vargas
Esty (CT)	McCollum	Veasey
Evans	McEachin	Vela
Foster	McGovern	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	McNerney	Visclosky
Fudge	Meeks	Walz
Gabbard	Meng	Wasserman
Galleo	Moore	Schultz
Garamendi	Moulton	Waters, Maxine
Gomez	Murphy (FL)	Watson Coleman
Gonzalez (TX)	Nadler	Welch
Gottheimer	Napolitano	Wilson (FL)
Green, Al	Neal	Yarmuth
Green, Gene	Nolan	
	Norcross	
	O'Halleran	

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei	Kihuen	Scalise
Bridenstine	Long	Schrader
Doyle, Michael F.	Loudermilk	Scott, David
Hultgren	McCarthy	Titus
	Rosen	

□ 1359

So the resolution was agreed to.  
 The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.  
 A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Honorable NANCY PELOSI, Democratic Leader:

OCTOBER 4, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,  
*Speaker of the House of Representatives, U.S. Capitol, Washington, DC.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: Pursuant to section 3 of the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children Act (Pub. L. 114-244), I am pleased to appoint Dr. Dolores Subia BigFoot of Norman, Oklahoma to the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter

Soboleff Commission on Native Children Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,  
*Democratic Leader.*

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H. Con. Res. 71, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

The Chair appoints the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. LAMBORN) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1402

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. LAMBORN in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution is considered read the first time.

General debate shall not exceed 4 hours, with 3 hours confined to the congressional budget, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget, and 1 hour on the subject of economic goals and policies, equally divided and controlled by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) or their designees.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 90 minutes of debate on the congressional budget.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.  
 Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, our budget, Building a Better America. Our budget takes real, tangible steps to balance the budget, build a stronger military,

unlock tax reform, and support an economy that creates opportunity for all Americans.

In past years, our budget resolution was a vision document, but this year it is different. With the election of President Trump, our budget goes from being a vision document to being a governing document that outlines how we build a better America for our children and our grandchildren.

Today, we have the opportunity to fulfill our promises to the American people. Balancing the budget by 2027 is our top priority. Our national debt stands at \$20 trillion, with \$9 trillion added over just the last 8 years. For too long, both parties in Washington have failed to abide by a simple principle that all American families and small businesses do, that we must live within our means.

Balancing the budget requires us to make some tough decisions, but the consequences of inaction far outweigh any political risk we may face.

Unless we take bold steps to bring our excessive spending and debt under control, a sovereign debt crisis is the natural conclusion. Failure to take swift and decisive action is not only inexcusable, it is immoral.

The budget resolution before us takes real steps to put our country on a sound fiscal path that balances in 10 years and will allow us to start paying down our national debt.

Building a Better America also assumes bold reforms to strengthening programs that our seniors and our most vulnerable citizens rely on and ensure that these programs can continue to serve them for generations to come.

While our budget includes reforms to discretionary spending, we also strongly believe that mandatory spending must be addressed in this budget resolution and in budget resolutions to come.

Mandatory spending is already more than two-thirds of all of our Federal spending, and that number will only continue to grow, and that is why our committee felt strongly about addressing mandatory spending programs in this budget through reconciliation.

Our budget requires 11 authorizing committees to find a minimum of \$203 billion in savings and reforms over the 10-year budget window with an expectation that the reforms will result in significantly higher savings.

This package of mandatory reforms is the largest since the 1990s, through reconciliation, and it is the first step to change the culture of Washington in our spending.

Our budget also promotes tax reform and regulatory reform to get the Federal Government out of the way and allow our free market economy to thrive. The larger the government, the less freedom individuals and businesses have to thrive, grow, hire, and innovate. The Obama economy left millions of Americans behind with over 14 million people leaving the labor workforce in just the last 8 years.

Through reconciliation, our budget specifically paves the way for progrowth tax reform that will reduce taxes for the middle class Americans and free up American businesses to grow and to hire. It will also simplify the Tax Code, allowing about 9 out of 10 Americans to file their taxes on a simple postcard.

Many of our friends across the aisle and in the media said that a 1.9 percent economic growth is the new normal and that we are doomed to continue the economic stagnation of the Obama years.

They have a pessimistic view of our Nation's ability to create jobs and to build our foundation of greater opportunity for all.

America has the greatest workers, the greatest innovators, and the entrepreneurial ethos to far surpass the economic growth of the last 8 years, if only the Federal Government would get out of the way.

In this budget, we put our trust in the American people. But a stronger economy is not enough; we must also strengthen our military.

The number one job of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens. Over the last 8 years, the weak foreign policy of President Obama has led to an increase in threats from all corners of the globe while the funding for our men and women in uniform has failed to keep pace. Building a Better America invests \$621.5 billion in our military and \$75 billion specifically for the global war on terrorism for fiscal year 2018. These resources will help our men and women in uniform complete the mission with which they have been tasked.

Building a Better America presents us with an opportunity to change the trajectory of our country forever. The election of President Trump was a signal to all of us that the American people will no longer accept the status quo.

This budget is also a very personal one for me. As I and my committee have gone through the long and arduous process of getting this budget to the floor, I have had to stop and think about not just what we are doing but where we are going.

I have a picture of my six grandchildren taped to the back of my voting card. I was a nurse for more than 40 years and still hold my license today. Government and public service was never an ambition of mine, but when I saw what was happening in my State and in this country, I couldn't sit back and do nothing.

Every time I put my voting card into a slot, I am reminded of why I left the career that I loved to join the political fray. It is for them. It is for my children and grandchildren and for yours as well.

I grew up in an America where a poor girl, whose parents' only ambition was for her to finish high school, could graduate from college, become a nurse, and eventually become a Member of the House of Representatives.

I grew up in an America that was a land of—that is a land of opportunity and was a land of opportunity then of strength and of compassion. But that America is slipping away from us. For too many young people in this country, the opportunity to live the American Dream is out of reach. A government that was supposed to be of, by, and for the people has left them behind.

Building a Better America requires a government that spends within its means, a military with the resources to complete the mission, an economy that creates the opportunity for all, and a Federal bureaucracy that respects the taxpayers.

It also requires an understanding that the greatness of America does not lie in the grand buildings and the stone pillars of Washington, D.C. The greatness of America lies in the spirit and the tenacity of the people.

We designed Building a Better America to put this vision into practice, to empower individuals to live their version of the American Dream. Future generations of Americans are counting on us, and failure is not an option.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of this committee for their hard work that they have done, for the months that we have worked tirelessly to come together and build a budget that reflects our principles.

It hasn't been easy, but producing a budget that puts our vision for fiscal sanity into practice will be worth it, and I thank each and every one of you for your hard work.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget we are debating here today is a shockingly extreme document that gives to the rich and takes from everyone else. It calls for more than \$5 trillion in spending cuts that threaten our economic progress and our national security, and it willfully ignores the needs and priorities of the American people.

This budget isn't about conservative policy or reducing the size of our debt and deficits. It is not even about American families. This budget is about one thing: using budget reconciliation to ram through giant tax giveaways to the wealthy and big corporations and to do it without bipartisan support.

□ 1415

This budget and the tax cuts it exists to support are built on a foundation of lies. They are part of a dangerous and deceptive three-step process Republicans have used before with serious consequences for our Nation and the American people.

This is what they do. First, my Republican colleagues call for massive tax cuts for the rich, claiming they will generate so much economic growth, that they will pay for them-

selves. Last week, congressional Republicans announced a \$2.4 trillion tax cut plan that benefits the wealthy at the expense of everyone else. Yes, I said trillions with a T.

For example, under this tax plan, millions of families making \$50,000 a year would be subject to a tax increase, while millionaires get a \$230,000 average tax cut. That is not tax reform. That is a shakedown.

In total, individuals will see their taxes go up by more than \$450 billion, while corporations, wealthy pass-through entities, and rich estates get a tax cut totaling \$2.9 trillion.

One might justifiably ask why anyone would want to do that. After all, the income disparity in the United States is greater than almost every other country on Earth, and it is getting larger. Just a few decades ago, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans earned about one-fourth of all national income. Today, it is close to 40 percent. Yet, once this plan is fully phased in, 80 percent of the entire tax cut in this plan goes to just the top 1 percent, while 45 percent of all households with children see a tax increase.

You could be someone who gets a \$1 million salary, owns billions in corporate stock, be a partner in a hedge fund, or just the heir to a massive fortune, no matter the type of millionaire you are, Republicans make sure you will get a tax cut. No matter how many times President Trump, Secretary Mnuchin, or my colleagues across the aisle say it and how much they hope the American people will fall for it, these tax cuts won't pay for themselves.

That is not just my argument. That is the conclusion of the Federal Reserve, the Congressional Budget Office, and respected economists of all stripes.

Conservative economist and former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin said: "There is just no evidence that the tax cuts actually pay for themselves."

Even Goldman Sachs, Secretary Mnuchin's former employer, says any growth will be minimal, maybe up to two-tenths of a percent.

Bruce Bartlett, the man who wrote Reaganomics, which codified the trickle-down theory, told Congress last week that he now thinks it is: "bull." Well, that is half of the word he used, but you get the idea.

The historical record is clear. We went through this in the early 1980s, the early 2000s under George W. Bush, and we recently saw it play out to disastrous effect in Kansas. Now congressional Republicans want to try it again.

We all know the truth. The tax cuts in this plan will increase deficits and debt by approximately \$2.4 trillion in the first 10 years alone and trillions more in the years after. These aren't special, supernatural tax cuts. They aren't going to magically defy expert analysis, historical precedence, and empirical evidence. This budget will

blow enormous holes in the Federal budget, which brings me to the second part of the Republican deception.

When the growth fails to happen as promised and these tax cuts keep digging our economy down deeper and deeper, Republicans will again bemoan the horrors of deficits and debt.

These cries will lead us to the third and final part of the plan. They will call for congressional action, not to roll back the tax cuts to the wealthy that caused all the damage, but for drastic cuts to important programs that the American people need and support. Education, healthcare, research, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits are already threatened in this budget. It includes an astonishing \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts; \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid alone. It even assumes \$49 billion in cuts to veterans' benefits.

The enormity of these cuts and the severity of the consequences for American families cannot be overstated, but more cuts will be coming if my Republicans get their way with this budget. We will see more attacks on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, nutrition assistance, on important benefits and services that help American families get ahead, and on key investments that keep our economy and our Nation strong.

To be clear, and with all due respect to my friend and colleague from Tennessee, by voting on this budget, for this budget, they are jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 515,000 hungry children in Tennessee so that the wealthiest person in that State, who has a net worth of \$8.8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Democrats have a different budget and a far different vision for our country. Our priorities reflect the priorities of the American people.

We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families; public investments that lead to a brighter future, such as rebuilding roads, bridges, and other vital infrastructure; retirement security for seniors now and for millions of Americans who fear they will never be able to afford to stop working; affordable education so that young people will be able to compete for the careers of the future; affordable, quality childcare for hardworking parents; and affordable quality healthcare for all Americans.

We believe in a government that helps individuals with nowhere left to turn and a Tax Code that helps families get ahead. Those are American priorities, and they should be the priorities of this Congress.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman and all the members of the Budget Committee who voted for this budget, and now it is on the floor.

I encourage all Members of the House to vote in favor of this budget, and that is because our national debt continues to grow exponentially every day, every hour, every minute, and every second. We cannot afford to have any more time waiting to address the spending crisis that we are in.

This budget begins to put these irresponsible elitist policies behind us, and creates a culture around here that makes sure that our friends and neighbors who really need the help get the help without forcing our Nation's bills on our children and grandchildren, future generations, some of whom don't even exist yet.

Specifically, this budget reforms mandatory spending so it is focused on those, Mr. Chairman, in our communities who really need help. This will ensure that our country will focus limited resources on those who are most vulnerable, while encouraging a culture of self-reliance instead of government dependence.

We should be measuring, Mr. Chairman, success of these programs on how many people we get off of them, not how many people we trap in them.

Mr. Chairman, as the chart I am holding shows, because mandatory spending is over two-thirds of our total annual spending, reforming this part of our spending is the only way to really get our debt and deficits down. This budget, for the first time, starts addressing this part of the pie, \$203 billion worth, and that is because of the leadership here of Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Now, this budget also protects our friends and neighbors by making sure our families are safe, that the military has the tools that they need, and that the administration has the money it needs to secure our border.

This budget also jump-starts tax reform, which will put money back in the pockets of hardworking Hoosiers and all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, as President Ronald Reagan once said: "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much."

That is still true today, Mr. Chairman, except that that \$1 trillion is now \$20 trillion and growing.

Again, I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Indiana that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,150,553 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Indiana to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax break.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today as a member of the Budget Committee to express my strong opposition to this budget resolution, which, if passed, would leave countless working families behind, and not to mention would, in fact, raise the Federal debt by at least \$3 trillion over the first decade and by at least \$6.6 trillion by the end of the second 10 years.

This proposed budget is an atrocious representation of our values. As more Americans find it harder and harder to get by, this budget guts what people need to be most successful. It takes away dollars from education; it takes away dollars from the programs we rely on for retirement, for switching between jobs, for healthcare.

We should be focused on funding the things that will enable the workforce to prepare for the 21st century, not gutting programs that will leave them falling further behind.

Rather than funding luxury travel for the Trump administration, let's invest in quality education, job skills training, and properly fund the State Department and foreign aid programs that Secretary of Defense Mattis and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dunford have said are critical to our national security.

This budget puts working families, our economy, and our national security at risk.

Passage of this budget would also pave the way for Republican tax reform, if you want to call it that, which would favor big businesses that destroy our small towns.

It shouldn't be easier for a company to get a tax break on buying another robot than training their employees to gain skills for the modern economy. We need a tax plan to incentivize companies to invest in their workers instead of engaging in a race to the bottom where workers are viewed as a burden rather than an asset.

We need a budget that will foster economic growth for all of our people, and we need to make taxes more simple and fair for working families, not give handouts to the rich.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this proposed budget so that we can go back to the table—or, actually, to go to the table for the first time as Democrats and Republicans, and have a conversation about funding the resources that will actually move our economy and country forward into the 21st century and beyond.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is also a member of our committee and also of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I must first start by thanking Chairwoman BLACK for her excellent work on this bill.

There are a lot of things that I can talk about that are very positive in

this budget, but today I want to emphasize how it prioritizes our national security.

With the growing threats around the globe, it is imperative that we fund defense of our Nation in an appropriate and a substantial way. We need to invest in our Armed Forces. We have to upgrade our defense systems and weapons systems, and we have to ensure the readiness of our military.

The United States must continue to lead on a global scale. This budget takes us in that direction by investing in our national defense. Obviously, coupled with targeted soft diplomacy funding, we accomplish that.

This budget takes us, as I said, in that direction, and it does so in a very positive way. I believe this budget makes those critical investments.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have to tell you that under the previous administration, cuts to our defense spending left the world a more dangerous place and it left our country in a more vulnerable place. Thankfully, the current administration recognizes the failure of the last 8 years and is, again, willing to lead again. Now it is up to us to do our part to provide the resources to allow the administration and our military to lead again. This budget gets us there. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for her invaluable leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the same and, again, make sure that we stand toe to toe with our adversaries and we stand, most importantly, with the national security interests of the United States.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my friend and colleague from Florida that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 1,448,000 hungry children in Florida so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$13.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this dangerous budget proposal.

With many working families and businesses still struggling to adapt to a rapidly changing economy, our top priority in Congress should be to help expand opportunities and sustain long-term economic growth and security so no American is left behind as we forge new paths ahead.

□ 1430

To spur robust job growth, we must invest in our education system to provide the training and skills workers need to be prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow.

We should invest in infrastructure that will put people to work and make our communities better places to do business, and we should invest in growing a strong middle class, the backbone of our economy.

But instead, we are debating a budget that will go nowhere in the Senate simply so it can be used as a vehicle to give the wealthiest Americans a massive tax cut on the backs of middle class families.

This reckless budget cuts early childhood, K-12, and higher education programs, as well as job training and apprenticeships. It guts nutrition assistance, which provides benefits to more than 43 million Americans a year, almost half of whom are children. It continues the destructive cycle of neglecting our already crumbling infrastructure, even though we know the longer we wait, the more costly repairs will be in the future and the less economically competitive our communities will be.

Slashing programs that help working families in order to line the pockets of the wealthiest Americans has never led to jobs or economic growth, and it never will. Every dollar we spend is a reflection of our values, which is why I am deeply disappointed that this budget demonstrates an utter disregard for middle class Americans, a lack of vision for what our future could look like with smart, targeted investments, and a complete lack of empathy for the most vulnerable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for yielding time to me, and I particularly want to congratulate her on doing something that is going to be pretty remarkable today. She is bringing a budget that actually balances in 10 years.

My good friends on the other side will bring us three budgets, none of which come into balance in 10 years. In that, to be fair, they follow the tradition that President Obama set, who never ever brought us a budget that balanced and left us with a national debt roughly twice the size of the one he had when he came into office. If we don't do what Chairwoman BLACK suggests here, we are going to be in exactly that same position.

I particularly want to congratulate the chairwoman for having the courage to take on the tough issue of entitlement and mandatory spending reform. She has \$200 billion of it. It sounds like a lot of money, but it is out of \$30 trillion over 10 years. This is something we can do—frankly, we should do more of—and that is the way to actually move toward balance.

I also want to congratulate the chairwoman for actually working with other committee chairmen to help them identify the cuts so they are real. They are not just fictional things in an imaginary document.

Finally, I particularly want to commend her for a wise investment in national security. That is a tough decision to make, but we have all seen the

ravages left by sequester and by continuing resolutions that are the number one enemies of the United States military. We have actually, under the last administration, inflicted more damage on the military than any enemy could do on any battlefield anywhere in the world. Our chairwoman and our committee stops that, reverses that, and begins to invest.

Mr. Chair, I just want to end by pointing out the long-term solution here to our problems really is entitlement reform. We have to get serious about mandatory spending. It is two-thirds of the budget now. Without changing the direction we are going, it will be 81 percent a decade from now. It is simply not sustainable.

It is nice to talk about this discretionary program or that discretionary program. The fundamental problem that we face is mandatory spending. The chairwoman addresses it in her budget. We can come back and build on what she does next year and continue to go after the area that really unbalances the budget.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note, for my friend and colleague, that by voting for this budget, he will force 678,763 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Oklahoma all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$10.2 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 2018 Republican budget resolution, a budget that comes nearly 6 months late and days into the new fiscal year. This Republican budget betrays millions of hardworking middle class families, while showering billionaires with irresponsible tax cuts.

By cutting \$211 billion over the next 10 years for student loans and college aid, it makes it harder to send our kids to college. It abandons our Nation's crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$245 billion over 10 years for transportation. It turns its back on families putting food on the table with SNAP by cutting \$150 billion from the program over the next 10 years. It neglects our grandparents and our seniors with a \$487 billion cut to Medicare in the next decade, and it assumes the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, leaving over 20 million Americans uninsured.

I offered two amendments during the markup of this budget—one to fully fund programs for our veterans, and another to reject paying for a border wall—both of which were blocked by my Republican colleagues.

This budget boosts defense spending to \$622 billion, \$72 billion above the budget cap for defense and well over even the President's request, and it underfunds nondefense spending at \$5 billion below the cap.



At the same time, Republicans have included instructions to fast-track a tax proposal that would add trillions to our Nation's deficit—trillions. It would end almost all itemized deductions, and according to the Tax Policy Center, increase taxes for roughly one in four taxpayers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlemen from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, this budget completely ignores a balanced approach to achieving fiscal sustainability and stacks the deck even higher against middle class families, seniors, and students.

Mr. Chair, I reject today's Republican budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I want to remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that, during the time of the previous administration, there was \$9 trillion added to the debt, 1.9 percent economic growth, and that was the high of that period of time, and there were 14 million people who left the labor workforce. If their policies worked, we wouldn't see these kinds of statistics.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in many years, this budget uses reconciliation for the purpose it was intended: to bring mandatory spending under control.

The appropriations that dominate so much of the debate comprise less than one-third of our total spending, and that is called discretionary spending. The budget sets a level; the appropriations process spends to that level. That is everything from general government to defense.

We have actually been able to bring that under control, but the other two-thirds of spending is called mandatory spending. It is beyond the annual control of Congress. It continues automatically until and unless the statutes that call for it are actually changed.

It is the mandatory spending that is eating our country alive. Mandatory spending is supposed to be controlled by reconciliation. Instructions are sent to the various authorizing committees to make whatever changes are necessary in current law to stay within our means. But this powerful fiscal tool has been ignored or squandered in past budgets, and this neglect is undermining the solvency of our country.

For the first time in many years, the House budget finally restrains mandatory spending by instructing our committees to find at least \$200 billion in savings over the next decade. That means this budget will get us back to

balance within the decade, and this is why it is so important.

If the Democrats had their way and we maintain our current path, the Congressional Budget Office warns that in just 4 years, in 2022, our deficits will surpass \$1 trillion a year. That is where economists warn we run the risk of damage or even loss of our access to credit, a sovereign debt crisis.

If you want to know what that looks like, Venezuela is going through it right now, and within our own territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—pension systems implode, basic services falter, the economy collapses.

Two years after that, in 2024, 6 years from now, the CBO warns that the annual interest cost on our debt will reach \$654 billion. That is more than we currently spend on defense.

I would remind my friends on the left that you cannot provide for the common defense or promote the general welfare if you can't pay for it, and the ability of our country to do so is being undermined by our spending trajectory.

At the same time, we charge the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, sending trillions of dollars of capital and hundreds of thousands of jobs to other countries. In the last 8 years, we have averaged only half of our postwar economic growth.

I remind my friends that corporations do not pay corporate taxes. Corporate taxes can only be paid in one of three ways: by consumers through higher prices, by employees through lower wages, by investors through lower earnings. Cutting corporate taxes means lower prices for consumers, higher wages for employees, and higher earnings for investors.

Tax relief is absolutely vital to reviving the economy, but experience does warn us that revenue growth only partially offsets revenue lost to tax reductions. Indeed, when we are told that the choice is between taxes and debt, those are two sides of the same coin.

Taxes and debt are the only two possible ways to pay for spending. Once we have spent a dollar, we have already decided to tax it. We either tax it now, or we borrow it now and tax it later. Either way, it is entirely driven by spending. By restraining spending, this budget makes possible the tax relief that our economy desperately needs to grow.

Frankly, we could do much more if we summon the political will, and I will be presenting such a budget tomorrow on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

But this budget moves us a long way in the right direction. It sets in motion the policies that Presidents from Calvin Coolidge to John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan have all used to revive and expand our economy. It brings us closer to that day when families will awaken to a new and prosperous morning for America.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I want to note for my colleague that, by voting

for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,319,000 hungry children in California so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$62.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chair, since the gentlewoman, my friend from Tennessee, remarked upon economic growth, let me, as one who was here at the time, perhaps correct the RECORD.

Bill Clinton's economic growth was higher than Ron Reagan's, and that is not in dispute. Barack Obama's economic growth was higher than George W. Bush's. We were losing 800,000 jobs a month at the end of the Bush administration, to bring up one point, which, by the way, is closer to 2.1 percent.

People here know I follow these issues like a hawk, but the truth is that this budget today that is being put forward is a threat to Medicare and Social Security down the road.

The previous speaker said he is concerned about mandatory spending. I gotcha. Put out a plan. Put out a plan on Social Security and Medicare. And don't do it in the backdoor way here as they complain about deficits and they prepare to embrace a tax cut of \$1.5 trillion or, over 10 years, \$2.2 trillion on top of the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 which amounted to \$2.3 trillion. So we are at \$5 trillion worth of tax cuts, and the Clinton administration left us with four balanced budgets and \$5 trillion worth of surplus.

This is not a budget that supports meaningful tax reform. I am ready, and she knows because of our working together in the past, prepared to work with Republicans on fundamental tax reform. The system is begging for it.

Don't call tax reform tax reform when it is really a tax cut. And that is where this is headed, and I think they know that as well.

This is a partisan roadmap that has failed in the past. They are using reconciliation instruction so that the majority can ram through a tax plan here. That is all it is about.

Last night, by the way, the tradeoff is in some States you can keep the mortgage interest deduction if you are willing to give up the State and local tax deduction.

I want to tell you something, I guarantee you right now, based on long history, we will end up keeping both, and they will have to add more to the debt as time goes on.

Is this a cut for the wealthy? Eighty percent of the tax cut goes to the top 1 percent in 2027.

□ 1445

This is from the Tax Policy Center in Washington. Incidentally, how great is it to have a nonpartisan scoring committee offer us a snapshot of the future?

The average tax cut for millionaires, \$230,000 a year in 2027. The average tax



cut for the top one-tenth of 1 percent is \$1 million in the year 2027.

The people in this country who need tax relief are the middle class. We should be investing in human capital, community colleges; we should be investing in vocational education.

So 45 percent of all households with children will see a tax increase in 2027. Among households earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000, you are going to see a one-third tax increase in 2027.

I look at this and say: Why are we not offering some relief to middle class Americans? Why are we not investing in them? Do we not have enough faith in them to help them get through what have been difficult times with children in college and costs mounting all of the time?

Instead, it is back to tax relief for people at the very top. I guess concentrated wealth in America now is not a big issue. I guess the top 1 percent in America who, by the way, aren't even asking for tax relief—that is the irony of this. They are not asking for tax relief. They are arguing for more investment in America rather than concentrating more money in fewer hands.

The American people deserve a Tax Code that is based on fairness. Our code should reward hardworking, middle class families, small business, innovation, and ensure that no one, no matter how wealthy they are, can avoid paying their fair share.

Our focus is going to be on helping the middle class, creating jobs, boosting wages, and giving people the assistance they need in a complicated economy with their grocery bills and childcare as well. Invest in human capital today.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it kind of blows my mind. You look at the sign that was just displayed by our colleague; it says that the Republican budget is a bad deal for working Americans.

Well, I don't know what Americans you folks are talking to, but the middle class Americans that I talk to, they want an economic growing, job creating, tax cutting budget and tax relief effort. That is what they want out of the House. That is what the Republican plan is bringing.

We not only rebuild our military, but we do something that has not been done in years. We begin to get into that mandatory spending and the out-of-control spending that we have here in our Nation's Capitol.

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the biggest threat to our national security is our national debt. How are we ever going to do that if we don't begin to address mandatory spending?

Mr. Chair, we have brought a good budget, a responsible budget, one that balances in 10 years to the floor. We need to get every colleague in this

Chamber to get behind it because it is good for working Americans, it is good for working families, and it is the responsible thing to do.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I want to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,154,337 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Ohio to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$6.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

And just in case my colleagues on the other side are wondering where this information comes from as to the wealthiest person in each State, it is from that notoriously leftwing magazine, *Forbes*, this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, any budget requires an examination of how and who pays for it and how that budget impacts the economy.

We were told by President Trump and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin that there would be no new tax cuts for the wealthy; and that this budget, and its blueprint, is a middle class miracle. That was last Wednesday.

One week later, this Wednesday, the facts are in. If you make \$730,000 in America, next year your income will rise by 8.5 percent, or \$129,000, or \$10,750 a month.

If you make \$67,000, your income will rise by 1.2 percent, or \$670 next year, or a whopping \$56 a month. This is no miracle. This is fraud being perpetrated against the middle class.

We are told that tax cuts pay for themselves through the magic of dynamic scoring. Their budget will increase the deficit by \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. Where are all the deficit hawks? Where are any of the deficit hawks?

Goldman alumnus Mnuchin and Gary Cohn, the National Economic Adviser, said that this bill will grow the economy. Goldman economists said that their budget will have no good impact in terms of growth in the Federal budget over the next several years.

Finally, infrastructure. The infrastructure budget for America, a nation of 300 million people, for the next 10 years is about the same as we spent rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq and Afghanistan over the last 10 years. This is unacceptable. We can do much better.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her work on this incredible budget that we are talking about here today.

I rise today in support of the FY18 budget entitled "Building a Better

America." Never has a budget had a more fitting title. The budget set forth by the House Budget Committee will balance the budget within 10 years, provide our military with the resources they need for national defense, and cut more than \$200 billion in mandatory spending.

Picture this: \$6.5 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years. On that fact alone, I would hope my colleagues would support this legislation.

This budget also paves the way for the recently released Unified Framework for Fixing Our Broken Tax Code.

On a telephone townhall with thousands of constituents on the phone from my district, 53 percent of participants reported that their most important priority for tax reform is a simpler, fairer Tax Code. The framework does just that and more.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the budget, to reduce the deficit, and take a huge step toward progrowth tax reform that will increase paychecks, spur economic growth, and make our Tax Code simple, affordable, and competitive.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 809,000 hungry children in Georgia so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget Act, adopted in 1974, requires that the House complete work on its budget for the next fiscal year by April 15. That is 172 days ago.

Yet we now have a budget resolution on the floor, already into the fiscal year for which the budget supposedly is planned. Some may ask why. The answer is a simple one.

This is, first of all, not a realistic budget which could or should stand as a budget resolution. No, this budget is not about putting our country on a sustainable fiscal path, and—this is indisputable—it is not a budget to inform the appropriators of budget priorities and constraints.

No, the Appropriations Committee will not be informed. Why? Because we have already passed the appropriations bills. This budget doesn't have anything to do with the appropriation bills. They are passed, they are gone. They are in the Senate.

This is merely a vehicle for achieving partisan tax reform of the kind that President Trump and Republican leaders in Congress outlined last week. Despite what this sham of a budget pretends, their plan is to push through tax changes that massively increase deficits—I call it the granddaddy of all debt increases—while shifting even more wealth from middle class and

working families to people like Donald Trump.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the tax cuts in this proposal would go only to those who make over \$900,000 a year. Hear me. The tax cuts mainly go to those making, in this Nation, over \$900,000 per year.

Despite promises from President Trump and Republicans here in the House, their plan actually raises taxes—hear me—while cutting taxes on those over \$900,000, it actually raises taxes on 1 in 3 middle class families who earn between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Even though Republicans continue to assert the discredited supply-side mantra that tax cuts pay for themselves, no responsible economist believes that, not one—responsible is the operative word. The Tax Policy Center's analysis found that their tax cuts would add \$2.4 trillion to deficits over the next 10 years.

The previous speaker said this balances the budget in 9 years. That is Alice in Wonderland balance. It will never happen. I have been here for 36 years; I have heard those comments all the time. It never happened.

But it is even worse, Mr. Chairman. The budget resolution also proposes to disinvest in job creation, pretends Republicans were able to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it hasn't been repealed, yet they pretend it has been repealed—to kick 23 million off their coverage and make those with preexisting conditions uninsurable.

It guts Medicaid and would end the Medicaid guarantee.

Furthermore, it would severely cut programs that reduce poverty and provide the kind of job training proven to get more people back into the workforce.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. This resolution is a grab bag of all the worst Republican policies: partisan tax cuts for the wealthy that leave the middle class behind, the cruelty of TrumpCare, and draconian reductions in domestic investment. The product is just as bad as the sum of its parts; indeed, it is worse.

Instead, we ought to be working together to enact bipartisan tax reform that is fiscally responsible and focused on the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution, and I ask Republicans, who believe that tax reform must be permanent and, therefore, bipartisan, to join us in doing so.

Only one person can stop spending; that is the President of the United States. He can veto spending bills.

The debt under Ronald Reagan increased 189 percent. Under Bush I, 55

percent; he had 4 years. Under Clinton, 37 percent; under Bush II, 86 percent; and under Obama, who was dealing with the deepest recession of our lifetimes, 87 percent.

A budget is supposed to inform the Appropriations Committee of how it ought to proceed. This budget comes after the fact, and it is only for tax cuts for the wealthy.

□ 1500

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues on the other side that we are talking about the budget. We are not talking about tax reform. We are going to have an opportunity to talk about that later.

Our budget does not assume that tax cuts pay for themselves, and our budget does not reflect that claim. Our budget includes a host of pro-growth economic policies, including comprehensive tax reform, as one of those, but regulatory reform; a reform in the improper payments; restoration of incentives for people to work and save and invest.

Most economists believe that this bundle of pro-growth tax policies will lead to a stronger economy than what we have under the current law. But we are talking about the budget here. So I would like for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to speak about the budget, and we will talk about tax reform at another time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK on her leadership and tireless efforts.

Much has been said about our \$20 trillion debt, and I would like to add that we know that that debt can only be paid back with tax dollars that will be extracted from future taxpayers.

We debated and passed 12 appropriations bills in this Chamber. As heated as those debates were, they were on less than one-third of Federal spending. To attack our debt, we have to attack mandatory spending. This budget does that.

As I traveled around my district and talked to people in my district, I have been pleased to hear that business is good. Businesses want to grow, and they want to expand. But I have not been pleased when they told me that they cannot find employees. So I went back and looked at data. Arkansas has our lowest unemployment rate ever right now, but we have also got the lowest labor participation rate.

In the years from 2008 to 2016, we saw a 5.7 percent population growth. We saw a decrease in unemployment from 6 percent down to 4 percent, or 5½ down to 4 percent, but we had fewer people actually working in 2016 than we had in 2008. We had a decrease of 0.8

percent of people working and a decrease of 2.4 percent of people in the labor force during that time period.

We have to put plans and programs in place to get our economy growing. We have to get more people back to work. During that same time, we saw an increase in SNAP benefits. We saw 330,000 people, or over 14 percent of our State's population of able-bodied, working-age adults, getting their health insurance through Medicaid expansion.

We need to focus on addressing our budget woes. We need an economy that is growing and a labor force that is working. We need a military that is strong. We have to address the 70 percent component of spending that is driving our debt. This budget is the first step in achieving those results, and I urge everyone to vote for this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 594,596 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Arkansas to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership as our ranking member on our Budget Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's so-called budget plan. I am a member, yes, of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and I know, because we work on this each and every day, that our national budget is a statement of our national priorities and our values. I know very well that the Republicans have put forward, quite frankly, a sinister budget whose chief purpose is to hand tax breaks to billionaires.

Budgets are moral documents. They should not be rigged in favor of special interests and the wealthy few, but the Republican budget is. Our Nation's budget should prioritize working families and the middle class, too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line.

It should assist those struggling to find a job and investment in workforce training, education, job creation, and job training. Instead, this Republican budget creates tax cuts for billionaire, millionaires, and corporations.

Our budget should expand to protect healthcare for all. Instead, this budget steals nearly \$2 trillion from lifesaving Medicaid and Medicare.

Our budget should also invest in our crumbling infrastructure, which, of course, creates jobs. But the Republican budget cuts funding for our roads, our bridges, and our railways.

Finally, with nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, our Nation's budget should contain a serious and effective strategy to end poverty, especially for communities of color and

rural communities who have higher poverty rates.

The House Republican budget does not do this. In fact, it slashes programs that help create good-paying jobs for struggling families by \$5.4 trillion. No family in America should be forced to go hungry. Yet, because wages are so low across this country, millions of families now rely on nutrition and food assistance. Yet this budget cuts \$150 billion from SNAP, food assistance, and nutrition assistance, which will create more poverty for people who are working. It doesn't make any sense. It is fundamentally immoral.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, once again, Republicans are determined to balance their budget on the backs of the most vulnerable; to hand tax breaks to millionaires, and billionaires, and corporations; and slush funds for Pentagon contractors.

This budget is cruel and unusual punishment for those who are not rich. I urge my colleagues to reject this un-American, heartless budget, and to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would say to my colleague from Kentucky, I think the rhetorical device that he is using at the end of each speaker is very effective and it is persuasive. But I would challenge him with this: I think one of the things that we have got to struggle with as a body, both Republicans and Democrats alike, is not being selective on the issue of the deficits. What we can't say is deficits are okay if it involves more spending for all of us as a body to distribute as we see fit, but deficits are not okay if they involve a tax cut and sending money back to individuals within each of our communities.

It is for that reason, again, I have voiced my concerns with regard to some of the components of this budget. But I think that the big issue for me is, simply, we cannot continue to spend as we are and have the ship of America sail forward.

It was Erskine Bowles who was the Democratic Chief of Staff to former President Clinton who observed: "We are walking our way toward the most predictable financial crisis in the history of man if we don't get our arms around spending."

So, for me, while not perfect—and I certainly cede that point—I think the building blocks of what this budget is trying to get toward is a sustainable economy.

How do you have a sustainable economy?

Many of the things that my Democratic colleagues have talked about in

terms of education, workforce development, those things. But it is also about the foundation of: Is our spending sustainable?

You can't go on spending more than you take in forever without having bad things happen at the individual level, at the corporate level, and certainly at the governmental level.

I think it is about: Is our tax load sustainable?

Spending drives tax loads, which is interesting. I pulled a chart that shows for the first 100 years of our country's existence, we spent about 3 percent of GDP. It bumped up after World War II. We are now roughly around 20 percent, and we are on our way to 30 percent.

The question we have to ask in this budget or any other budget like it is: Can we continue to do this without going to the exact spot that Erskine Bowles was talking about?

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Finally, I would simply make this point: Not only can you only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip—and there are certainly limits that have shown themselves, which is around 18 or 20 percent of GDP, regardless of tax rate, up, down; there is that—but there is also this: You can pay me now, or you can pay me later in life.

A deficit is simply a deferred tax. A debt is simply an accumulation of deferred taxes. One of the things, again, we have to get our arms around is that we are stacking up deferred taxes. We are stacking up an accumulation of taxes with debt and deficits. This budget, I think, begins to nudge us in the right direction in doing something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from South Carolina, and I certainly have a great deal of respect for his thoughtfulness. But I also must note that if he votes for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 366,000 hungry children in South Carolina so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and its intent to fast-track tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations. This resolution, first of all, is not serious. It assumes \$800 billion in savings from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which we know will not happen. We have the Treasury Secretary being quoted as saying that "massive tax cuts will actually reduce the deficit. . . ."

Well, we know how that works. You cut taxes for the wealthy and say they

are going to pay for themselves. When that doesn't work and the deficit explodes, you come back and demand massive tax and massive cuts in Medicare, Social Security, and education.

Anyway, the Republican budget resolution, even if it did add up, makes the wrong choices for America. By calling for trillions of dollars in spending reductions, the Republican budget undermines America's investments in infrastructure, the environment, scientific research, and much more.

I wanted to use my limited time to focus on its harmful impacts on the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee, where I serve as the Democratic ranking member. Under the Republican budget resolution, children in need of a healthy school meal, students in pursuit of an affordable college education, and workers in search of skills and training to get a better job all take the back seat to tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

In education, the budget harms students and families by undermining our Nation's education system, and instructs the House Education and the Workforce Committee to eliminate \$20 billion in investments in higher education by providing less funding for Pell grants and student loans.

In terms of other instructions, it instructs the Department of Labor to reduce funding designed to provide job training, protect workers from wage theft, and ensure that there is a sufficient number of inspectors to make sure that workers can come home safely from their jobs.

The budget also threatens child nutrition programs. In fact, during the Budget Committee's hearings, it was made clear that child nutrition programs are a target for savings to pay for tax cuts.

Today, almost 10 million children and 20,000 schools have access to universal, healthy school meals, where children are served nutritious meals without the stigma or need for paperwork. Cutting investments in programs to ensure that children have healthy school meals to partially fund tax cuts shouldn't be our Nation's goal.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal budget is a statement of our values. Unlike other Democratic substitutes that responsibly strengthen our economy and expand opportunity for all Americans, the Republican budget undermines priorities in which students, workers, and their families take a hit, and lays the groundwork for a return to a regressive framework benefiting a wealthy few.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the Republican budget resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), who is the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman BLACK for yielding.

Imagine what our opinion would be of a movie review where the reviewer simply looked at a movie poster and then

wrote the review and came to a conclusion that they didn't like the movie. They didn't listen to the music. They didn't see the direction. They didn't see the pacing. They didn't see the acting. They didn't see the script. They didn't see the cinematography. They saw nothing other than a movie poster and they came to a conclusion.

We would dismiss that and we would say: How ridiculous. How absurd.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the Tax Policy Center did this past week. They wrote a review of a proposal as it relates to tax reform, and they didn't have the details.

Why didn't they have the details?

Because many of these details don't exist.

□ 1515

Specifically, they wrote a review which was very pejorative, which the Wall Street Journal completely trashed. They made this finding, and they had no notion of what the income brackets are like in our proposed tax reform plan. They had no notion about the anti-abuse rules that the Ways and Means Committee is working through to make sure there is not an abusive situation as it relates to pass-through entities. They had no notion about some of the offshore protections that are being contemplated.

Let's avoid the hyperbole. Let's avoid the hackneyed, old, tired, and faded bumper sticker that says that any kind of pro-growth tax reform is a sop to the rich. It is complete nonsense.

I think the proof will be in a tax reform proposal that this House hopefully will be considering in the coming weeks and months that will bring buoyancy, optimism, and a real opportunity for us to take advantage of a once-in-a-generation opportunity for a Tax Code that nobody can defend and nobody likes. But let's get real and evaluate real numbers and not just look at posters and bumper stickers.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Illinois that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,066,376 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Illinois to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member YARMUTH for the time to speak in opposition to the Republican budget.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I am really perplexed as to why the majority continues their assault on American excellence, following President Trump's lead and divesting from investments in American global leadership, science, and infrastructure.

This budget would cut \$5 billion for domestic and international invest-

ments, while violating the Budget Control Act for defense spending and triggering a \$72 billion sequester of all defense accounts.

My Republican colleagues might argue that slashing nondefense investments is necessary to reduce the debt, but this is a false choice. Why would the Republican majority give tax cuts to the very wealthiest if it means this country has to take a backseat to China in research and development or let our own workforce go without the training to fill 21st century jobs?

We know there is a role for government where the private sector has left voids. Many in the private sector believe we should be investing more in basic research, STEM programs, and public transportation. This budget and the appropriations bills that enact this budget have fallen short in these areas.

Given the budget is 6 months late and the appropriations process has actually moved before the budget, we do not have to guess the implications of the budget. We have seen what the Republicans would do under these draconian levels.

Just look, Mr. Chairman, at the Labor, Health, and Education bill that passed the House last month. That bill eliminated entire job training programs like apprenticeship grants, cut the Pell grant surplus, and eliminated Supporting Effective Instruction State grants, a \$2 billion investment that reduces class sizes and improves classroom instruction. This cut would cost 8,500 teachers their jobs.

The transportation spending bill eliminated the Department of Transportation's major infrastructure grant program, TIGER, a direct contradiction to the President's promise to improve our Nation's infrastructure and which Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao confirms "funds innovative projects that improve the safety of America's passengers and goods."

Mr. Chairman, we can and should—we must—do better than this. I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for too long Congress has been allowed to play by a different set of rules than the American people in regard to how we budget. No one lives in a world where there is seemingly an endless supply of money, that is, until you enter the fantasy world of Washington, D.C.

However, hardworking American families, businessmen, and businesswomen live in the real world. They have to budget. They have to prioritize and make trade-off decisions: wants versus needs, what is good and what is essential. The bottom line, they have to live within their means.

But, apparently, our government has been exempt from such basic principles of fiscal responsibility under which we the people must live. The prevailing budget philosophy over the years

among our representative leaders has been as follows: as long as we can borrow it, you can bet your bottom dollar we can spend it. And spend it they have.

This borrowing-and-spending delusion has left us on the brink of bankruptcy. We are \$20 trillion in debt, which puts our country in the worst debt position in the history of America, and this with the sacred constitutional charge to secure liberty for our posterity. That means give freedom to our children.

Mr. Chairman, there is no freedom with this level of debt. If we don't do something about this looming debt crisis and stay on our current spending trajectory, in less than 10 years, we will be at \$30 trillion in debt. We will have \$1 trillion in annual deficit. We will be spending more—get this—on our interest on the debt we owe than on national defense.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. I rise in support of this budget, a budget that begins to rein in this reckless spending, a budget that funds our national priorities and our core responsibilities and initiates a historic opportunity for tax relief for middle and working class families.

Let's stop spending our children's future and stop pretending that they won't inherit a disaster as a result. Let's live in the same reality as every other American. Let's focus on our main mission as a limited Federal Government by rebuilding our military, by maintaining our infrastructure, and by securing our food supply so we can maintain the ability to feed our own people.

Let's unleash our job creators from the highest tax burden in the free world. Let's allow our families and individuals to keep more of their hard-earned money, and let's hand this country safer, stronger, and freer than we found it.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,060,000 hungry children in Texas so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, my fellow alum, for his leadership. I recognize and thank the chairwomen of the committee.

To my good friend that was on the floor, I think he wants limited government when disaster is not in his district.

So I think it is important as a member of this Budget Committee of which I am so very proud of its service, as the Democrats have worked so hard, and as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, a committee called upon

for domestic tranquility and domestic security, might I just add that we are now marking up a bill just a few floors away from this House that is asking for \$15 billion to pay for a border wall in the midst of the horror of tragedy and in the midst of a lowering number of individuals even coming to the United States across the border, the very border wall that was told to us would be paid for by the people of Mexico.

But I think the important point is that my good friends who are supporting this dastardly budget that tears at the fabric of America are, as well, supporting a tax cut for the wealthy that will provide \$2.9 trillion of debt to the American people and increase the debt as well as the deficit. It will mean that working and middle class families will have taxes raised on them by \$470 billion. We will see the heavy brunt of this budget on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

Just a few hours ago, I said the American people do not need to have the government step on them; and I can assure you, with this budget, which cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare, we will step on the American people.

We will end the Medicare guarantee, and it will narrowly shortchange soft power by cutting and decimating the State Department, the very partner that we need to continue the security of the American people, raising defense, of whom I support all of our military. Texas is a military State. But it is \$72 billion above cap, and that is not giving our military personnel their due. It is going above the needs of the military.

We need to be prepared, but this skinny budget will undermine education and the workforce at \$326 billion, energy and commerce at \$1.56 billion, homeland security by \$25 billion, justice and the needs of civil justice by \$67 billion, and veterans by \$49 billion.

It will cut the Community Development Block Grant, and it will hurt Virgin Islands U.S. citizens, Puerto Rico U.S. citizens, and Texas, that is still struggling.

Before I came to this floor, I was engaging with my State about more disaster food stamp sites because I have people who are unhoused in the 18th Congressional District, who are needing the resources.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have individuals who our wonderful first responders had to drag out of the raging waters in Hurricane Harvey. I have homes that were underwater that need disaster relief. I have individuals who are walking along highways like oceans, and then I have children who are with families who do not have jobs

because of Hurricane Harvey, who need the Children's Health Insurance Program or need the disaster food stamps.

This is a budget that steps on the American people. It steps on our disaster relief, and it does not recognize what the United States Government is. It is a refuge and a relief for the American people.

Vote "no" on the Republican budget. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Budget Committee, a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the proud representative of the 700,000 residents of 18th Congressional District of Texas who are still coping with the devastation caused by Hurricane Harvey, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

Why do I urge every Member of this House to vote against this Republican budget resolution, laughingly called the "Building a Better America Budget," but which more accurately should be named the "Nightmare on Capitol Hill Budget"?

Let us count the ways; here are eight to start.

1. Republican budget mandates \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts to top priorities like disaster relief, education, infrastructure, research, veteran benefits, and programs that expand opportunities for American families.

2. Republican budget provides \$2.9 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while raising taxes on working and middle class families by \$470 billion.

3. The budget includes fast-track reconciliation procedures to push through cuts to programs that tens of millions of Americans count on totaling \$203 billion across 11 House committees.

4. The steep reductions in program investments proposed in this Republican budget fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

5. Republican budget immediately guts investment critical to expanding economic opportunity by lowering the already inadequate austerity-level spending caps by an additional \$5 billion in 2018 and by even more in subsequent years.

6. Republican budget adopts Trumpcare but does even more damage because in addition to depriving more than 20 million Americans of healthcare, denying protection to persons with preexisting conditions, and raising costs for older and low-income adults, cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

7. Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee and calls for replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with fixed payments for the purchase of health insurance, shifting costs and financial risks onto seniors and disabled workers; this represents a \$500 billion cut to Medicare over ten years.

8. The Republican budget focuses too narrowly on the military, shortchanging American soft-power and other essential elements of national security by increasing defense spending by \$72 billion above the cap and hollowing out the State Department and foreign aid agencies with cuts of \$11 billion and environmental and natural resource protection by more than \$6 billion.

Mr. Chair, the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of our values and priorities as a nation.

Sadly, this Republican budget, just like the President's "skinny budget" fails this moral test of government.

America will not be made great by stealing another \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, abandoning seniors and families in need, depriving students of realizing a dream to attend college without drowning in debt, or disinvesting in the working families just to give unwanted tax breaks to wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent.

America will not be positioned to compete and win in the global, interconnected, and digital economy by slashing funding for scientific research, the arts and humanities, job retraining, and clean energy.

Even a cursory review leaves the inescapable conclusion that this budget represents a betrayal—of our values as a nation, and of the promises made by the President during the election campaign.

This Republican budget is not a budget for the real world that real Americans live in but is as much a fantasy budget as the Trump "Skinny Budget" in that it pretends to achieve balance by assuming that painless spending cuts can and will be made by the following standing committees of Congress in the following amounts:

1. Agriculture Committee: cut \$207 billion
2. Armed Services Committee: cut \$33 billion
3. Education and Workforce Committee: \$326 billion
4. Energy and Commerce Committee: \$1.656 trillion
5. Financial Services Committee: cut \$124 billion
6. Homeland Security Committee: cut \$25 billion
7. Judiciary Committee: cut \$67 billion
8. Natural Resources Committee: cut \$59 billion
9. Oversight and Government Reform Committee: cut \$282 billion
10. Transportation and Infrastructure Committee: cut \$3 billion
11. Veterans Affairs Committee: cut \$49 billion
12. Ways and Means Committee: cut \$800 billion
13. Unassigned (i.e., Intelligence; Foreign Affairs; Small Business; Science, Space, and Technology Committees: cut \$747 billion
14. Total Cuts: \$4.38 trillion

To put these reckless, irresponsible, and draconian budget cuts in perspective, it is useful to examine what they mean when applied to the programs depended upon by Americans to rise up the economic ladder, plan for the future, provide for their families, and strive to achieve the American Dream.

The elimination of funding for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) drains resources from communities, even in times of disaster because CDBG provides flexible grants to local communities for a wide range of unique needs, including Meals on Wheels, housing programs, and community infrastructure improvements.

The Republican budget targets disaster grants made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which help families and businesses when their disaster-related property losses are not covered by insurance.

The Republican budget makes higher education more expensive by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs, like Pell Grants, over ten years.

The Republican budget also eliminates subsidized loans, making it difficult for students, particularly low-income students, to afford college and compounds the damage by making it more difficult to repay student loans by eliminating the Public Sector Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs.

The Republican budget's solution to the affordable housing crisis currently facing cities large and small all across the country is to convert all discretionary spending on affordable housing into a block grant, which means there will be even less assistance to help the 71 percent of extremely low income renter households who spend more than half their income on housing.

The Republican budget cuts \$154 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) over the next ten years by essentially converting it to a block grant, cutting off funding for eligible individuals and requiring cash-strapped states to either fill in the gap or take away food assistance from millions of working families, children, and seniors.

Mr. Chair, as economists and policy experts have documented time and again, immigration reform would expand the size of the U.S. workforce, and in turn would increase the size of the economy and reduce deficits.

The Republican budget, however, again rejects comprehensive immigration reform that would bring clear and just rules for those seeking citizenship and help secure the nation's borders.

In doing so, the Republican budget squanders an opportunity to reduce deficits by an estimated \$900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and extend the solvency of Social Security.

Mr. Chair, none of us can forget the President's favorite boast and central campaign promise that he would build a wall on our southern border and guarantee that Mexico would be made to pay for it.

The Republican budget deprives the President of the opportunity to make good on his foolish boast by forcing American taxpayers to foot the bill for President Trump's \$1.6 billion border wall that will do nothing to stop unauthorized entry into the country and will not fix our broken immigration system.

The Republican budget continues to target federal employees by cutting their compensation and benefits by at least another \$163 billion over ten years, which comes on top of the \$182 billion in cuts federal employees have already absorbed in the form of higher retirement contributions, pay freezes, and furloughs.

The Republican budget puts U.S. transportation network on the road to ruin by slashing transportation spending, by \$254 billion over ten years, or 25 percent below current estimates.

The Republican budget cuts hurts veterans by cutting veterans benefits by nearly \$50 billion over the next ten years, with newly eligible veterans experiencing cuts in programs that pay for education benefits as well as loan guarantees.

Finally, Mr. Chair, it must be pointed out that the Republican budget's pretension to balance is based on reliance on trillions of dollars in budget games and gimmicks to rig the numbers.

The Republican budget counts a dubious \$1.8 trillion "economic dividend" from cutting taxes and taking away consumer protections that is not backed up by any credible analysis and assumes \$1.5 trillion of this "dividend" will go toward deficit reduction.

The Republican budget assumes, despite all precedent and evidence to the contrary, that tax reform will be revenue neutral, even though Republican tax plans are projected to lose between \$3 trillion and \$7 trillion.

Given these budgetary shenanigans, never could it more truly be said that "figures don't lie, but liars figure."

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards.

Because the American people deserve to know exactly what ills Republicans have in store for them, I strongly oppose H. Con. Res. 71 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this reckless, cruel, and heartless measure that will do nothing to improve the lives or well-being of middle and working class families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been an honor to work with the chairman of the Budget Committee as a new Member of Congress because it is such a learning curve to understand the challenges that we have in our country in so many ways, but especially on the fiscal side of things.

I would like to spend my time talking to my grandchildren right now. I am talking to your grandchildren as well.

In the last 48 hours, I have had an opportunity—it was more of a responsibility—to chat with my grandchildren about the horrific events that occurred in Las Vegas. When you are 8 or 16, you assimilate those things in different ways. I talk to them a lot about responsibility for behavior, responsibility for money, and responsibility for their own lifestyles.

I talked to them today to say that we are not going to put you into the debt hole caused by the spending that has occurred over the last decades in this country. We are not going to pass that along to you, because the hole is only getting deeper and more extensive, and we are passing it along to those next generations. Not only is it not right, it is morally wrong and absolutely irresponsible.

We have to ask ourselves the questions: If not now, then when do we

begin to bend the spending curve? If we don't do it, then who will?

We know that mandatory spending within our grandchildren's lifetime will eclipse almost, if not, 100 percent of the Federal budget. That means no money for research, for medical, for education, and for all of those discretionary dollars that are so wisely spent.

We have to begin to bend the spending curve now, and that means cuts in mandatory spending, while responsibly using the other dollars, the discretionary dollars, to advance good programs.

□ 1530

That takes discipline, that takes effort, that takes making tough decisions that are unpopular but necessary for the future of our country.

Our Budget Committee wrestled long and hard to present what you are going to vote on, and I am proud of the fact that with the discourse and debate that we had over tough issues, in the end, the American people are taking a next first step forward towards fiscal responsibility that reflects the reality that we owe to our grandchildren, just like our parents and grandparents felt that they needed to do for us during the Great Depression and a couple of World Wars to make sure that we have a physically viable country. This budget is a next first step.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and an alumnus of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, ugly is ugly.

This is an ugly budget, and it exists primarily to be a vehicle for tax cuts for the already fortunate, the top 1 or 2 percent in America, at the expense of everybody else. It will hemorrhage red ink for as far as the eye can see.

That is not a theory. That is what happened in the previous massive tax cuts, both under Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush.

Let me give you one example of the ruinous aspects of this budget, and it has to do with Federal employees.

This budget cuts Federal employee compensation and benefits by another \$163 billion over the next 10 years, \$32 billion of which is included in reconciliation and instructions which I sought to strike with an amendment submitted to the Rules Committee that was not allowed.

The Republican cuts include higher retirement contributions; elimination of the FERS supplement, which law enforcement retirees heavily benefit



from; lower annuities by changing the retirement calculation and reduced healthcare benefits; a 10 percent reduction in the Federal workforce at non-security agencies, even though nearly all of the workforce increases, since 2001, occurred in security-related agencies.

The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cybersecurity attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe. Veterans make up 31 percent of those Federal employees.

Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of this country's deficit and debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed nearly \$200 billion toward reducing the country's deficit in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions.

We should honor and revere the service of our Federal workforce, not denigrate it with the attacks included in this ugly budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my dear friend.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, I came to the floor today to weigh in on this budget debate.

I find it incredible that my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be in a state of denial on the fact that this country, the greatest on the planet, is \$20 trillion in debt.

These are the same people in opposition, Mr. Chairman, who will present a budget tomorrow that will add nearly \$3 trillion in more taxes and more than \$6 trillion in more spending. This debt is going to land squarely on the shoulders of our children, our grandchildren, and—let me just say it for the record—is so large that it is going to land on our grandchildren's grandchildren.

When does this insanity stop?

There is not an easy way out of the mess. This budget puts us on a path to fiscal sanity. It targets Federal spending that is outside the purview of the Appropriations Committee.

The budget ensures a strong national defense. It puts us on a path to fiscal sustainability, and it gives us the opportunity to do deficit reduction. The budget has progrowth policies that move us in a more sustainable direction.

I understand the opposition coming from the other side. Their answer, Mr. Chairman, as always, is: let's tax more and let's spend more. That is not a responsible course. It won't lead to a good outcome for this country.

Mr. Chairman, let me finally say that it is time we had a national conversation about the math problem facing this country. This budget starts that conversation. I encourage all my col-

leagues to support it, recognize where we are as a country, and resolve to do something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 200,000 hungry children in Arkansas all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

You have got to get a charge out of what you are hearing and listening to today.

If one were to draw a chart from 2001 and 2003 to the present time, what contributes to the deficit and the debt?

I am glad to hear someone from the other side talk about that debt, because I thought you forgot all about it. This budget seems to think that you have amnesia.

If you look at the chart, what grows the debt? The tax cuts that you put into effect in 2001 and 2003, which helped the rich and brought us to an economic abyss 4 years later. You did it, and you are trying to do it again.

So we will see if Democrats are irrelevant, since you didn't include us, so far, up to this point. So much for our bipartisanship.

You asked for \$203 billion in mandatory spending cuts across 11 committees. It will have to be reconciled with a Senate budget that explodes our deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Good luck.

While this Republican budget claims to balance in 10 years, it does so with unnamed cuts, gimmicks, and magical thinking about the economic growth.

The budget is built on the same premise on which you tried to cut the ACA, the Affordable Care Act. Let's take \$750,000, cut down on Medicaid, and we will give that money in tax cuts to the very wealthy. That was your plan. You saw how the country received it.

This budget cuts Medicare by \$487 billion by eliminating the Medicare guarantee. How can you justify that and look into the eyes of seniors in this country?

It assumes repeal of the Affordable Care Act. You want to use the Affordable Care Act's money, but you want to dissolve it, choke it, and starve it. It assumes an appeal of that act, which would take 23 million Americans off their healthcare insurance.

It assumes a \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid—it is in your budget—and \$2.5 trillion in other mandatory cuts, with no specifics.

The gentleman from Michigan needs to study the facts. You have got to get him the facts.

The greatest contributor, as I said, were the two tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. We know the breakdown of where that went to.

This is not a serious budget. It is a desperate attempt to enact deficit-exploding tax cuts.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PASCRELL. I am making all my remarks through the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, 1 percent would be the recipients of 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts within 10 years.

This budget, like the phony tax plan, is a joke and is insulting to us as Members of Congress. I know you have some problems with your own Conference. I don't know how you are going to figure that out. Don't expect us to bail you out.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for her leadership during this budget process. She has done an amazing job of showing wisdom and patience and negotiating this all through this process. My sincere thanks are given to the gentleman.

This budget is a critical step in getting our economy growing and our national debt under control. Not only does it balance in 10 years and put our country on the path to fiscal stability, it also lays the groundwork for tax reform.

With this budget, we are demonstrating that it is possible to have fiscal discipline and keep our promises to the American people. We can no longer continue to kick the can down the road on our mandatory spending crisis. We are leaving behind more and more debt for our children and grandchildren, and it is morally wrong.

We must put politics aside and have tough conversations to ensure that we can keep the promises that we have made to Americans and to future generations.

This budget does not solve our mandatory spending crisis overnight, but it begins that process by achieving a \$203 billion savings in mandatory spending.

By passing this budget, we will also kick-start tax reform. I have said time and time again that America should be the best place in the world to do business, yet we have a Tax Code that tells our businesses that they should take their jobs and their profits overseas.

Every American benefits from lower taxes and growing the economy. The tax reform framework we released last week will do just that. Americans will get to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks, companies will have the freedom to reinvest in their businesses and workers, and more people can move to the American Dream.



Before we can make these changes, we must pass the budget. The reconciliation instructions in the budget will set us on a path to comprehensive tax reform in both the House and the Senate.

This is not just a conversation about dollars and cents. It is about Americans who are counting on us to keep our commitments. We must do the tough work of reforming our mandatory spending programs and reforming our Tax Code.

I am excited to support this budget to build a better America and pledge to continue working toward comprehensive mandatory spending reform.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,519,461 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Georgia to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) the Democratic Caucus chairman.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Kentucky, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget proposal is just cruel. It isn't just cruel; it will set our country backwards. It is worse than cruel.

It puts more than \$5 trillion in cuts on the backs of working and middle class Americans. At the same time, it doles out billions of dollars in tax breaks to wealthy individuals, while leaving everyday Americans empty-handed.

Are you a senior who relies on Medicare or Medicaid for important healthcare needs?

Too bad, says the Republican budget. Your care will simply be cut.

Are you a student looking to get a good education and launch your career?

Tough luck, says the Republican budget. Pell grants are on the chopping block, if Republicans have their way.

Are you struggling to recover after a natural disaster?

Forget about it, says the Republican budget. Grants from FEMA and other programs that help rebuild our Nation will be eliminated.

The facts are clear: this Republican budget does nothing to invest in America, the American people, or our future. It cuts funds for our crumbling infrastructure, rather than rebuilding our schools and roads and putting millions back to work. It slashes investment in green energy technology, rather than preparing a new generation of Americans to lead us into the economy of tomorrow.

Worst of all, it ramps up funding for endless wars overseas while gutting programs that help the brave veterans who served their country so well.

Eighty years ago, then-President Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke of a

national nightmare when he saw a third of our Nation "ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished."

□ 1545

When you look at this budget, it is not hard to see why FDR's words haunt us to this day, because this budget would take us back to that terrible time when dreams were dashed, futures were uncertain, and hope was all but lost, put back to a time when people were hurting.

That is not the America I want. That is not the America our constituents deserve. They deserve a better deal for all Americans.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Democrats believe that our constituents deserve a better deal, a better deal for all Americans, a plan to bring better jobs, better wages, and a better future to everyone, and a vision to give every American the opportunity to prosper and to succeed.

That is the kind of America we should be working towards. That is the better idea that America should be working towards. That is why I will vote "no" on this terrible plan.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I tell you what is cruel. That is doing the same thing over and over again and getting the same results. That is cruel. Especially when we look in our grandchildren's eyes and say: We are really sorry we didn't take 40-year-old programs and reform them so they could be better, so we could reduce the spending, we could give good services and reduce the spending. That is cruel when you don't do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Building a Better America budget. Last month, our country's national debt exceeded \$20 trillion. Interest payments under that alone are scheduled to go up to \$768 billion per year and will skyrocket to \$1 trillion should these artificially low interest rates return to their normal levels.

The debt not only threatens to bankrupt our country, it threatens our children's future and the American Dream.

Now, we can't change the culture of spending in Washington overnight, but this budget puts us on the right path to fiscal sustainability. Our budget balances in 10 years, works to begin paying down the debt, and promotes job growth policies like tax, regulatory, and entitlement reform.

For the first time in decades, this budget resolution finally directs Congress to address mandatory spending, the main driver of these deficits. As this graph shows, if nothing is done to address entitlement programs and our

interest payments, mandatory spending will fully eclipse the Federal budget in the next few years.

Now, politicians in Washington have promised to address exploding debt and deficits for years, but now we have the opportunity to actually do it. We cannot solve our debt crisis, however, without economic growth. That is why our budget provides reconciliation instructions for tax reform.

Today we have a Tax Code that is overly complicated, punishes work, rewards special interests, and discourages job creation and investments here in America. The result has been an anemic recovery of only 1 or 2 percent. This stagnation has made it harder for families in Minnesota and all over the United States to realize the American Dream.

That is what this is about. Every time tax reform has been tried in the 1920s, in the 1960s, in the 1980s, it has worked to make America globally competitive by encouraging private sector investment that is more productive.

That is why today I urge my colleagues to support this budget, tax reform, economic growth, and fiscal sanity.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my friend and colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 216,000 hungry children in Minnesota so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's 2018 budget, which would dramatically increase our deficit and debt by trillions of dollars to give millionaires and billionaires a massive tax cut.

Don't be fooled. This plan directly benefits President Trump, his family, and his administration, including Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, Education Secretary DeVos, and Commerce Secretary Ross, but offers breadcrumbs for the middle class and nothing for low-income Americans.

The craziest thing about all of this is that Republicans have been crowing for 7 years that the deficit is too large and that it is hurting our job growth, yet here they go abandoning their principles to cash out their rich benefactors.

I also want to talk about some of the ways Republicans partially pay for this tax cut for the rich. During the same week that Equifax and Wells Fargo executives are testifying about the harm they have caused to millions of Americans, Republicans propose gutting the Consumer Bureau, which has successfully helped millions of our constituents receive compensation by effectively eliminating its funding and independence.

What is more, Republicans would eliminate the backup authority to safely unwind failing megabanks without harm to our economy. Rather than eliminate this tool, we should instead be talking about how to break up bad megabanks like Wells Fargo, who repeatedly break the law and harm millions of consumers. Yet, both the Consumer Bureau and the megabank wind-down authority are sacrificed to pay for the richest 1 percent tax cut.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to reject this measure.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Building a Better America budget. That is truly what it does. For too long, our government has spent money on a credit card with our children and grandchildren's name on it. It shocks some here in this Chamber, but the era of overspending is over.

Adopting this budget will allow us to deliver the key promises we have made to Americans: getting our spending under control, balancing the budget, and paving the way to deliver meaningful tax reform.

This resolution balances the budget within 10 years and produces a \$9 billion surplus in fiscal year 2027. It achieves deficit reduction of \$6.5 trillion over 10 years. It also reduces the size of our bloated government by giving instructions to 11 House committees to achieve at least \$203 billion in mandatory savings.

This resolution curbs our unsustainable spending while maintaining a strong defense and protecting critical programs like Medicare.

There is much work to be done to create jobs and get our economy moving beyond the pathetic 2 percent growth. This budget is an important step to doing just that.

This budget allows us to deliver on our promise to the American people to fix our broken Tax Code. Workers living paycheck to paycheck, like my parents did, need relief and they need it now. We cannot delay any longer.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek to raise taxes by \$3 trillion and simply spend more. I suggest they study how that approach worked in Greece.

I urge my colleagues to support the Building a Better America budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, here is the Republican and the President's case. They want you to

believe that if you cut corporate taxes, if you cut taxes on the investor class, that this is going to raise wages. That is the President's argument.

Here is what I don't understand. If you want to raise wages, why not just raise wages? Why not just give the tax credits to working families?

The President's Wall Street bankers have a different theory that only gets credence in the beltway. This is not about economics. This is about common sense. Think about it. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that the better way to raise wages is not to cut taxes for corporations, but to actually give the tax relief to people making under \$75,000.

You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you cut taxes for shareholders and corporate CEOs, they are probably going to invest it overseas. If you cut the taxes or give the tax relief to people making 50 grand in Michigan or Ohio, they are going to spend it and create jobs in the United States.

This is just common sense. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you really want to create jobs, invest in technical training for the million skills gap we have, instead of putting hopes on corporate CEOs who already have record profits, that somehow they are going to create more jobs.

Mr. Chair, it used to be that there were serious thinkers on the Republican side, people like Jack Kemp. I disagreed with him, but at least he had innovative ideas of enterprise zones and how to really create jobs. But for the past 20 years, the Republican party has been devoid of ideas.

It is a mantra: tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Oh, we are changing into a digital economy. How do we solve it? Tax cuts. That is not a constructive solution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to talk about common sense just for a moment. Common sense is if our other OECD countries have an average corporate rate of 18 to 20 percent and ours is between 35 and 39, and we have companies that now decide to go overseas. It seems to me to be common sense to at least be equal to what other countries are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the national debt is a staggering \$20 trillion. We are handcuffing future generations with what—if we don't take action—will become an unsurmountable fiscal crisis. This budget resolution before us today is a step toward putting our Nation back on a sustainable fiscal path. But even more, it will lead to greater prosperity and opportunity for American families and generations to come.

My own experience as a 17-year-old, I had the good fortune to be able to buy a small construction company from my older brother for \$1,000 when I was

fresh out of high school. Through a lot of hard work and a dedicated team of individuals, we were able to grow that company, employing over 150 people with family-sustaining jobs, family-sustaining wages.

That is what we call the American Dream. There are countless stories like that: the idea that we can begin with little or nothing, work hard, play by the rules, and achieve our dreams.

Unfortunately, in today's economic environment, for many, the American Dream seems out of reach.

Mr. Chair, that is why this budget is so important. Not only will it put us on a sustainable fiscal path, but it lays out the path forward for tax reform that will give American families the opportunity to improve their lives.

Consider a constituent that I spoke to this week. This particular constituent is a single father of 5 in Lancaster County. He asked me if our tax plan means more money in his paycheck. Now, he makes it work today, but it is difficult for him, and he could use some help. This is exactly the kind of hardworking American we are trying to help with our reforms.

Americans deserve this budget because it lets us pass tax reform to help families like the one I just described. They deserve it because too many Americans today do everything right but still struggle to make ends meet. Americans deserve it because they should have a more honest Federal Tax Code and a simplified filing process that allows them to spend more time with their family, to save for their children's college fund, or to plan for their retirement.

Passing this budget helps to make these things possible, and I strongly urge my colleagues in this Chamber to support it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 734,000 hungry children in Pennsylvania all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3.8 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, debating this budget resolution is a partisan and pointless exercise, and I will point out to the chairman that it is October, after the fiscal year has expired and after we have already passed every single appropriations bill out of the House of Representatives, and, I might add, a continuing budget resolution.

□ 1600

Just as when we considered it in committee this summer, this resolution stands as a demonstration of the

majority's willful and disgraceful neglect of the needs of the American people.

With so many critical legislative issues for us to discuss, the majority has decided it is a better use of our time to discuss tax breaks for millionaires and wealthy corporations; taking healthcare away from 20 million Americans; blowing up our deficit with an ineffective, immoral border wall; and gutting crucial investments in jobs, education, and medical research.

Instead, this House should be enacting legislation to expand background checks and ban assault weapons to combat senseless firearm violence after this Nation witnessed, once again, the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

This House should be passing the Dream Act to protect DREAMers who call this Nation home and protect them from this administration's heartless deportations.

Finally, instead of wasting taxpayer dollars and our constituents' time with this harmful budget resolution, this House should be reauthorizing CHIP, the bipartisan-backed Children's Health Insurance Program, which expired over the weekend and which potentially is going to leave children who badly need healthcare insurance twisting in the wind without it.

Congressional Republicans have chosen instead to bring this incredibly irresponsible and extreme bill to the floor.

In stunning ignorance of reality, it assumes TrumpCare will still pass. Just how many times must the majority be reminded that TrumpCare is not going to become law and the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land that Americans support?

How many times will the majority try to cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, cut Medicare benefits, and raise insurance costs on elderly and low-income Americans?

Enough is enough. Instead of pandering to the well connected and our worst impulses, this budget should embody America's best values, and it is far from it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sadly, this budget does not reflect our responsibility to care for and invest in the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the proposed budget resolution, which will provide the spending cuts that Washington needs and give a pathway to reconciliation for tax reform.

Our national debt sits at an astronomical \$20 trillion and is projected to

reach close to \$30 trillion within 10 years. Washington's out-of-control spending hinders our economy, Mr. Chair, and by kicking the can down the road, it puts the financial burden on the backs of our children and of our grandchildren.

Not only is our debt unsustainable, but high levels of government debt needs substantial resources, and taxpayers' dollars must go to servicing our debt. Over the next decade, the cost to service our debt will rise 219 percent, meaning we will spend close to \$800 billion by the year 2027 simply to pay the interest on our debt.

This budget reduces spending by \$5.4 trillion over a 10-year window. It does not expand the size of Federal Government. It does not encroach on State or local authority.

This is a conservative path forward and will help us accomplish what we came here to do: meaningful tax reform.

While I would like to see our government make even more wise choices with taxpayers' dollars, this budget resolution puts us on the road to achieving that goal. With this resolution as a vehicle for updating our outdated Tax Code, Mr. Chair, I truly believe we can accomplish something that has not been done in over 30 years.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 941,169 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in South Carolina to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the budget before us today sets up a tax plan that would harm hundreds of thousands of working families in Illinois and millions across the Nation.

It has been widely reported that this tax plan enables a budget that would eliminate the State and local tax deduction, also known as the SALT deduction, S-A-L-T, SALT deduction.

In my home State of Illinois, this SALT deduction represents a sizeable portion of taxpayers' income, accounting for approximately 6 percent of the average itemizers' average gross income.

Within my district, the SALT deduction allows families in Cook County to save an average of \$4,000 a year. In Kane and DuPage Counties, the numbers are even greater, \$5,000 and \$6,600, respectively.

Simply put, Mr. Chair, this SALT deduction prohibits double taxation on

working families. That is why numerous bipartisan and nonpartisan organizations have spoken out in support of the SALT deduction, including the National Governors Association and the United States Conference of Mayors.

If this budget passes, the tax structure it creates will cause a dramatic increase in the tax burden on working families.

There is no doubt that our Tax Code needs to be updated, but we need to do so in a way that upholds the President's promise that working families would not see a tax increase.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this double taxation budget and this increase in taxes on working families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

(Mr. SHIMKUS asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and I thank Chairman BLACK for her hard work developing this blueprint.

Our Nation's national debt now exceeds \$20 trillion. While there are many factors driving our Nation's fiscal health and long-term spending outlook, I am working to address one of those items this year: our Nation's need to dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

In 1982, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and enacted a formal nuclear waste management program for the Federal Government and set a 1998 deadline for the Department of Energy to begin to dispose of used fuel. Nuclear utilities signed a contract with DOE requiring this deadline to be met. Unfortunately, the Federal Government did not meet that deadline and has yet to take title to this material.

Since then, the Federal Government has been held liable for not meeting this deadline, and the courts awarded financial damages to utilities due to the breach of contract. The payments resulting from these lawsuits are paid from a specific Department of the Treasury account, known as the judgment fund, a permanent, unlimited fund not subject to budget caps or annual appropriations.

Since 2009, DOE's total liability has escalated from \$12 billion to nearly \$30 billion, or over \$2 billion in total liability for each year of delay. Last year alone, the nuclear waste costs were about one-third of all Federal Government payments due to litigation. Put another way, American taxpayers are paying over \$2 million every single day in which we neglect our moral and legal obligation to permanently dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

It is time to get our nuclear waste management program back on track. Bipartisan legislation I introduced, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which passed out of the Committee of Energy and Commerce by an overwhelming vote of

49-4, would do just that. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address this budget challenge.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK again for her leadership and support of this important issue.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, first, let me thank Chairman BLACK for her leadership on this remarkable budget.

When I ask my constituents from Texas about their biggest concerns for their family and the Nation's future, the overwhelming response is about the debt our country faces. Washington's spending just continues to grow too fast. Our national debt has topped \$20 trillion, and without action, our great country is poised for a difficult and painful fiscal reckoning.

Today, with this budget, we have the opportunity to do something about it, the opportunity to tackle our Nation's fiscal challenges head-on with a strong, two-part approach.

First, this budget provides real fiscal responsibility. It balances within 10 years. It preserves and improves Medicare for the long term. It returns power to our State and local governments so they can do what is best for their communities, not Washington.

Now, these measures get us moving in the right direction, but fiscal accountability is only one crucial piece of the puzzle. If we want a healthier American economy for the long term, we need a growing American economy for the long term. That is why this budget by Chairwoman BLACK also lays the groundwork—the runway, if you will—for a once-in-a-generation pro-growth, pro-family, pro-middle class tax reform.

The House and the Senate are unified with President Trump in delivering a new Tax Code for a new era of American prosperity. We have released bold ideas to deliver more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for the American people, especially our middle class families.

We are united in getting tax reform legislation to the President's desk this year, but if we do not pass the budget, tax reform doesn't move forward. So I would like to ask all my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle: Where do you stand? Are you content with an unsustainable national debt, a slow-growth economy, and a broken pro-Washington, pro-special interest Tax Code, or do you stand in support of fiscal responsibility and pro-growth tax reform that allows all Americans to keep more of their paychecks?

This is our time to show the American people we don't accept that slow-growth future.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman BLACK of the Budget Committee for her remarkable leadership in bringing this budget forward.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 37½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution.

On behalf of Chairman HENSARLING, I would like to take a moment to speak about the instructions given by the chairwoman of the Budget Committee to the Financial Services Committee to find savings of \$14 billion.

Now, that is what we were sent here to do: to find those places where it makes sense to cut the budget and we don't harm anything. In fact, in this case, the Financial Services Committee is going to help things in rural communities by finding those savings that the chairwoman instructed us to find.

Several years ago, the Democratic majority passed the Dodd-Frank resolution, the Dodd-Frank Act. That enshrined too big to fail. It created unaccountable agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Earlier this year, this body passed H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act. That was trying to prune back the capabilities of CFPB to hurt the rural areas, which it had been doing in my district.

Carlsbad National Bank recently shared with us how it takes them 185 pages to complete a mortgage loan, 185 pages for a small bank for just the simple resolution of buying a home.

Many times our community banks are simply stopping to offer that service. No one else is willing to come in to New Mexico and lend into these rural communities. So we are facing a very serious problem.

Sometimes community banks are having to consolidate. That hurts rural communities even worse, because the consolidation usually moves the bank's headquarters outside the State or outside the community. It weakens the fabric of the community.

So by finding the savings in this budget resolution which we were instructed to do, we not only save the money, but we also stop the encroaching regulations that CFPB is putting out, harming the rural communities, harming rural homeowners.

So for those reasons, I gladly support H. Con. Res. 71, the Budget Resolution Act, and urge its passage.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK and Chairman BISHOP for including ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, in the budget process.

I am looking forward to this. With this legislation, we contribute money to solving some of our national debt.

The small area of 1002 in the National Wildlife Refuge is an area of 2,000 acres, smaller than Dulles Airport.

□ 1615

Potentially, though, we have a little over 20 billion barrels of oil. Think how much money that would bring to the Treasury immediately through the bidding process.

This is an issue I have been working on for the last 45 years. It is time we passed it. Once it went to the Senate, and President Clinton vetoed it because it wouldn't help us with that embargo we had at that time.

Now is the time to make sure this Nation is independent totally. It won't happen overnight, but only Congress can do this. It is not a wilderness area. It is designated to be drilled at the behest of the Congress for the good of the Nation.

It will reduce the debt. Again, I said I expect bids of about \$10 billion to \$20 billion just to have the right to drill. With the new royalties that are coming down from the Secretary of the Interior, we will have not only a large amount going into the Treasury, we will have about 776,000 new jobs created by the discovery of this oil.

We have already seen what we have been able to do in other States by fracking and becoming more energy independent and how that controls the OPEC nations. But this is the area which oil has been developed by God. It is only going to be available to the United States, and it is time that this Congress steps forth and brings this to fruition for the people.

We will hear a lot from the other side of those interest groups that have no knowledge at all about the area I am talking about. We hear that the caribou herd will be affected. It is ironic that Prudhoe Bay has produced 17 billion barrels of oil, and when we started, there were 5,000 caribou. Now we have about 31,000 caribou. Oil didn't disturb them.

Oil is not evil. It is the necessity for this Nation socially to create jobs. It will make a healthier economy. I am asking my colleagues again to consider this legislation. It is necessary for this Nation. It is necessary, very frankly, for the good of this Congress. With \$20 trillion in debt, I have yet to hear anything that will create new wealth. You can cut all you want to cut, I will cut what I want to cut, but you have to create new wealth. You have to bring it into the fold of the general budget process and for the economy of this Nation.

Let's not keep putting our heads in the sand and saying: Oh, we don't need to do this; it is not the time to do it. Now is the time for the good of the Nation and because we are in debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this in this budget. I compliment Mrs. BLACK and her work, her chairmanship, on the budget. It is a very difficult process.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time so we can hear from the Joint Economic Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we are making a choice today about the kind of future that we want. We can choose a future of more deficits and more debt piled onto our children, or we can continue having a weak economy where people in their prime working years can keep leaving the job market.

Or we can choose a future where America's job creators, people who go to work every day, decide that they will be better off starting or moving their business overseas.

Or we can choose the future of more of the same, and it is not the wealthy who will suffer more of the same. It is the most vulnerable, low-income Americans trying to climb out of poverty. It is the middle class families who find it harder and harder to keep up, to get ahead—people like my dad, a machine operator who is now retired as a United Steelworker.

It is our children and our grandchildren who will have to pay tomorrow for the mistakes that we make today.

But we can instead choose a better future, Mr. Chair, where the government learns to live within its means and move forward toward balanced budgets; a future where job-creating small businesses aren't punished by our Tax Code when they succeed; a future where we stop losing jobs and businesses to foreign countries with lower tax rates, when workers can finally get the pay raises they deserve, more money in their pockets, and more prosperity is widespread, not just concentrated on our coasts and a few large urban cities.

We will be voting soon on a budget that restores fiscal responsibility and paves the way for a world class Tax Code built for growth and a better future for our kids and our grandkids.

Yesterday, at the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Chair, we held a hearing on the decline in business startups, the engines of job growth and innovation in America, and the role tax reform could play in reversing this downward spiral.

Among other things, here is what we heard yesterday at the hearing. First, simplify the Tax Code. Entrepreneurs spend way too much time and way too much money complying with the Tax Code instead of focusing on growing their businesses.

Second, lower the tax rates that our companies and employers pay. That is something that foreign governments around the world, both friends and foes, have already done to attract more jobs, more businesses.

Third, let companies of all sizes write off the cost of their growth-producing investment immediately, this is called expensing, instead of deducting them slowly from the taxes over many years under very complicated depreciation rules.

Fourth, stop punishing our businesses for investing overseas profits by bringing them back home to America. Move away from the system that double taxes American companies that do business overseas.

These steps will boost economic growth. Growing markets will give entrepreneurs the confidence to risk starting a business, which many won't even do today, as we have seen more and more startups not making it to the starting line.

More startups create more jobs, an average of six new jobs per startup, and more economic growth means continuing to spread that prosperity.

I am happy to report that these recommendations are a large part of our tax reform framework that has just recently been unveiled: simplicity, lower tax rates, expensing, stop double taxing our American businesses that do business abroad, reward investment in America, and boost economic growth.

We need a Tax Code that makes America the best place in the world to do business and grow your business and keep your business.

Our job creators who are corporate taxpayers now face the highest tax rate in the developed world. While other countries aggressively lower their tax rate, Mr. Chair, to attract new businesses, we left our businesses standing still.

Mr. Chair, the tax reform framework would slash our corporate rate from the highest in the world, at 35 percent, to a competitive 20 percent. Instead of the worst, we get much better. In a global economy, that is just not a luxury, that is a necessity.

Our tax reform framework will not only help American companies compete with foreign ones, but also bring capital back to America to invest and grow jobs here at home.

Let's look at how the Tax Code is punishing our small businesses who pay individual taxes as pass-throughs, not just with complex taxes but also high tax rates.

When Main Street businessowners went to sleep on December 31 of 2012, their highest tax rate was 35 percent. When they woke up the following year in January of 2013, Mr. Chair, their top

rate spiked to 44.6 percent due to Obama administration policies.

Many on the other side of the aisle will say that most small businesses don't pay the top rate, but taxpayers who do pay the top rate, those small businesses, in many cases, are responsible for much of our economic activity and our employment as pass-through businesses.

Every small business owner dreams of being successful, and the high top rate punishes the very success that we want them to achieve in America. Adding to the Federal rate, the tax rate, the local rate, many of these small businesses pay over 50 percent in taxes.

The tax reform framework not only slashes rates for American employers but our small businesses as well. The top rate for pass-throughs will be 25 percent.

Another feature of the tax reform framework, Mr. Chair, would allow businesses of all sizes to deduct their business expenses, their investments, immediately through expensing. This would encourage companies to make the kind of investment like buying state-of-the-art equipment that would lead businesses to grow, create more jobs, pay better wages, higher economic growth, and the best part of all, larger paychecks for workers.

Mr. Chair, we have a choice to make. We can turn our backs on the most vulnerable Americans and doom them to more of the same, subpar growth, stagnant wages, more debt, less opportunity, a complex and outdated Tax Code that punishes job creation and investment in America, or I hope we choose a better path forward, a better future for Americans, bigger paychecks, and it starts today with the passing of this budget.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this budget.

Ultimately, a national budget is like a deal between the American taxpayers and Congress about how this country will spend their money. Anyone who looks at the fine print in this budget plan can tell, with a glance, that the American people want, need, and deserve a better deal.

In the Republican tax plan that goes with this budget, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts.

A better deal would drop plans to slash Medicare and Medicaid to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthiest few—a deal that instead would be a bipartisan effort to bring middle class tax relief, badly needed investments, and greater opportunity.

But what we have instead is a budget that cuts \$5.4 trillion in spending over 10 years, including \$4.4 trillion in cuts to the mandatory programs that help average Americans get and stay ahead.

These aren't just paper cuts. These are huge cuts—cuts that would cause enormous damage in the lives of children, students, veterans, and other Americans. About half of these cuts in nondefense spending are in programs that help people who need the help the most—cuts in programs that provide food to those in need, programs that help students from low-income families afford a college education. They even have cuts in the badly needed disaster relief that is helping so many in our country.

In fact, by 2027, more than one-third of the resources for low- and middle-income people would be gone. Struggling Americans deserve a better deal than that. And who pays under the Republican tax plan? Seniors, single parents, and middle class families, it goes up.

Nondefense discretionary is already at its lowest level since the category has been tracked. Republicans want to cut even more, and so they target senior citizens and healthcare.

This budget cuts half a trillion dollars from Medicare, replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with a voucher-like system and increasing its eligibility age to 67.

□ 1630

The CBO estimates that these cuts would cause part B premiums to increase 25 percent by 2020. And this budget claims that it "saves" \$1.5 trillion by repealing the Affordable Care Act, even though they have already tried to repeal it about 60 times on this floor, without success, thank God, and the American people have made it clear that they don't want it repealed.

They still have no replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act. So that means that they would just be leaving millions without health insurance and threatening the coverage of all those with preexisting conditions and chronic illnesses, and would leave millions facing huge premium increases.

Their plan also cuts \$114 billion from Medicaid, ripping away coverage from low-income families and the disabled. This is just plain wrong. Our seniors deserve a much better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak a little bit here about the tax reform opportunities that we are seeing now.

Some people don't like to admit it, but there is a proven, inescapable correlation among tax treatment, capital investment, and job creation. As this chart right here shows, unequivocally correlating an investment of capital with economic change, when you have more money put in, you get more jobs and more economic growth. And some people don't like to admit that connection, but it is inescapable. It has been that way ever since the first commerce took place in the Roman era.

We have a second chart that shows the post-World War II GDP change, an average of 3.1. The American middle class was built on opportunity, lower taxes, economic stimuli, and growth. It wasn't built on this 2.3 to 1.6 that we are going to get if we don't get back to some serious business-centric, investment-centric tax reform.

There is another equally inescapable fact, and that is that capital is fungible. If tax treatment nurtures it, like watering your yard, it will grow. If not, it will be invested somewhere else. Just look at Texas, just look at my home State of Florida, and look at Ireland, for example.

When the tax climate is nurturing and favorable for investment, you get money put in, you get jobs created, you get economic growth. Investment goes where it is most favorably treated. So going to 20 and 25 percent from 35 to 40 percent will unleash a torrent of capital investment and job formation.

Rapid capital recovery by expensing capital assets purchases will attract massive investments, stimulate our economy, make our manufacturing companies do better, and build up the capital stock of our country again, like we used to do. This is going to create one thing: job-creating economic growth.

That is what we need and that is what the Republican reform program offers.

It also offers one more thing and it changes treatment of foreign income, which is something I have some experience in, and it will incentivize companies to keep their income here. That is a good thing for America.

So I might just mention for just a second about what they say and what we say. They say tax cut for the wealthy. No, it is not a tax cut for the wealthy. It lowers taxes on all businesses and middle class Americans.

They say rising brackets on low income. This is an absolute incorrigible falsehood. No. We are taking the 10 percent rate to zero. We are taking the 15 percent rate to 10. By the way, Ronald Reagan reduced the 11 percent rate to zero.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. They say it will explode the deficit, but we all know that economic growth shrinks deficits. Ronald Reagan proved that in spades, and we are going to see it again. When we eliminate many of these narrowly-crafted, special interest, lobbyist-driven credits and deductions, we are going to save enough money. Especially when we eliminate the State and local tax deduction, we are going to save a couple of trillion dollars that will help balance this.

Then they say loss of itemized deductions is a bad thing. When we double the standard exemption, no one is going to need to itemize. The people that do itemize, fine, they can have

mortgage interest reduction, charitable reduction, whatever. But most Americans are going to be able to pay their taxes on a postcard.

In the polling in this country, the frustration of Americans with the IRS is directly related to the fact that nobody can fill out a tax form anymore. So we have great progress here.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent, and the top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts. And what we see in this budget is a slashing of investments in the future strength of our country.

Instead of slashing infrastructure spending, as this budget does, we should be increasing our spending to fill the giant infrastructure pothole that Republican policies have left us with.

We have airports that feel Third World. We have bridges that are crumbling, tunnels that need replacing, roads that need fixing. Failing to do so costs all of us in time, money, and economic development.

This budget totally fails to recognize the value of infrastructure investment. It cuts \$254 billion from transportation over 10 years. Funding would drop from \$92 billion next year to just \$65 billion in 2022.

It eliminates the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery grant program used for infrastructure development and repair projects for interstate highways, bridge improvements, and ports. This is incredibly shortsighted.

According to a study by the American Society of Civil Engineers, failing to close the infrastructure investment gap brings serious economic consequences: \$3.9 trillion in losses to the U.S. GDP by 2025; \$7 trillion in lost business sales in 2025; and 2.5 million lost American jobs in 2025.

I have seen with my own eyes what infrastructure development can mean to business development and the quality of life in the city that I serve. The Second Avenue Subway, built with the help of Federal funds, opened in January and has already had a huge economic impact. Stores say their business is up 20 to 30 percent along that line and it has cut overcrowding and reduced traveling times.

New York's old Kosciuszko Bridge, which was first opened in 1939, was originally designed for 10,000 vehicles a day. It was carrying 18 times that and had become an accident choke point.

Thanks to Federal funding, it has been replaced, and the biggest city in the country will have a brand-new, 21st century bridge soon because these kinds of investments boost productivity and bolster our economy, with each \$1 in infrastructure investment



generating up to \$1.80 in additional economic activity.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives our national infrastructure an overall grade of D-plus and our transit system a D-minus. It is just plain irresponsible to slash spending on our crumbling highways and bridges now, because if we don't make needed investments today, we will jeopardize our competitiveness tomorrow.

Let's be clear: we are already significantly underinvesting in infrastructure. As you can see from this chart, public investments in infrastructure and other public fixed assets have fallen over the last few years, dropping to a low of \$274 billion in 2014, from more than \$357 billion in 2009.

We have created a giant infrastructure spending pothole that you see right here. All told, it costs our Nation more than half a trillion dollars in lost investment over 5 years.

The people of this country deserve modern infrastructure. They deserve a better deal.

This budget also cuts \$154 billion from nutrition, from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, ignoring the more than 40 million low-income families, including children, the working poor, the elderly, and the disabled, to say nothing of the 8 million people, including 4 million children it lifts out of poverty. The hungry children of America deserve a better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a senior member of the Joint Economic Committee, as well as a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, the budget that is being considered here today sets in motion the process of the first major tax reform that we will have been able to see in 3 decades. We are on the cusp of a really exciting opportunity to give Americans what they deserve: a Tax Code that works for them, not against them.

Now, on the House Ways and Means Committee, we spent many months meeting, holding hearings, discussing, working on almost a daily basis ways to craft a tax plan that is simpler and fairer for all Americans. The framework that was just rolled out last week takes that into account and lays out a plan that will lead to more jobs and, most importantly, bigger paychecks.

You know, the economic "recovery" since the Great Recession hasn't worked for a lot of Americans. It certainly hasn't worked for a lot of Minnesotans that I represent. Economic growth has been anemic, and we remain uncompetitive in far too many areas. Many are living paycheck to paycheck, and either have or now are at risk of having a lower standard of living than their parents.

Young people, like my daughter's generation, will go backwards if this

country is not fundamentally more competitive economically. They feel like they just can't get ahead.

Meanwhile, seniors, and baby boomers who will soon become seniors, are also at great risk. Their savings, as well as the government's ability to fulfill its commitment to Social Security and Medicare, could be undermined if we don't grow our economy at a higher rate.

So both Republicans and Democrats agree that it is time to fix our broken Tax Code. No one is defending the status quo, Mr. Chair. Our current Tax Code punishes American workers and manufacturers. It is a maze of special-interest loopholes that are unfair to hardworking Americans. It burdens families and small businesses with excessive paperwork and compliance costs, creating unnecessary frustration each and every tax season throughout the year. That is why 9 out of 10 Americans either pay someone to do their taxes or have to buy the financial software to do their taxes.

Mr. Chair, our Tax Code is holding our country back. It is holding our economy back. So we have a stark choice. We can either truly grow the economy and put ourselves back on a path to real prosperity, or we can continue with weak economic growth, which only benefits "the few" and will do nothing for the rest of us when the next economic downturn happens.

Tax reform, for me, is about one thing and one thing only. It is about restoring the hope for a prosperous future for ourselves, for our parents, and, most importantly, for our children.

It is about Paula in my district, in Plymouth, Minnesota, who said that the Tax Code is hurting her small business and preventing her from hiring more employees and giving them a raise.

It is about an owner of an extrusion company in Chaska, Minnesota, that I just spoke to. He said he would invest in new equipment and machines if this tax plan passes.

And it is about lowering rates across the board for all Americans, as well as small businesses, so that they can keep more of their first dollars earned.

Tax reform means increasing the personal income for average Americans and reducing the cost of living so that day-to-day expenses are more affordable. This will lead to families being able to save for their future and their retirement. It will allow people to take more control of their lives and their finances so that they can save and spend and invest their hard-earned money as they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, this is a really important opportunity we cannot let slip away to help middle-income families and small businesses. Passing this budget puts us on a path for tax reform that has so much potential to unleash and grow our economy to the benefit of middle-income families in Minnesota and across the country.

□ 1645

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in 2001, some of our colleagues across the aisle said many of the same things we are hearing today about the miracle of tax cuts: that huge tax cuts for the most fortunate would pay for themselves, and that they would help grow our economy by trickling down through the miracle of so-called dynamic scoring.

But as we know from history, that was not the case. One year after the Bush tax cuts in 2002, here is what Brookings Institute said was happening in real life:

Our findings suggest that Bush tax cuts will reduce the size of the future economy, raise interest rates, make taxes more aggressive, increase tax complexity, and prove fiscally unsustainable.

A year after that, in 2003, the Brookings Institute said: "Over the past 2 years our country has experienced a dramatic deterioration in the Federal budget outlook."

In January 2001, when President George Bush took office, the Congressional Budget Office projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion—as in "T," trillion—from 2000 to 2011.

But in 2011, nearly a decade after the GOP promised their budget would unleash the economy through tax cuts for the wealthy and budgets that cut services to the vulnerable, this is what we found, from National Public Radio: "Conservatives often promote tax cuts as a way to stimulate economic growth, but the years after 2001 were marked by the slowest growth since World War II."

All of us remember when President Obama came to office that this country was shedding 800,000 jobs a month and it was a long time to dig ourselves out of that big Republican hole and get us moving in the right direction with job growth.

So let's not go down that road again. I call upon my colleagues to remember history.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I would again like to point out this little chart that shows facts. At the bottom of the chart, if the viewers can see, is the United States with our corporate tax rate. All of these other countries, most of whom are our friends, even France, is lower than the United States, Spain, Canada, Netherlands, Austria, Turkey, Italy, New Zealand, Japan—you can go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we have the highest corporate rate in the industrialized developed world. Facts are a stubborn thing to deal with, Mr. Chairman. This budget, as Congressman PAULSEN said, is the first step into dealing with something that we haven't dealt with in 31 years.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this issue. I hear so much from my friends on the other side that I agree with, and I very much would like to work closely with them.

I point out to the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, my friend from Ohio, that while we have the highest corporate rate in the world, 35 percent, which is clearly not desirable, I served in Switzerland for 4 years, where there were 700 American companies because the tax rate was so much lower. Yet that 35 percent rate, in actuality, turned out to be less than 14 percent across all American corporations, and a quarter of American corporations pay zero.

As we look at refining this, it is not just about dropping that rate. It is about making sure that every American corporation pays a fair share of their taxes to the U.S. citizens.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution. Budget resolutions, by their nature, are political documents. But this one also has an instrumental purpose, because the only reason this budget resolution is on the floor is to pave the way for the partisan process for the tax bill, which will significantly increase the deficit in order to give tax breaks to those who need them least.

I think everyone in this body agrees that the average American taxpayer, those who have had virtually no raise for 30 years, deserve and need tax breaks. If we can give them that tax relief, the economy will grow faster.

But the Senate reconciliation instructions that will ultimately pass are written to allow for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the deficit, and that is assuming that the fuzzy math and the rosy expectations actually work out. I appreciate the charts that my friend and colleague, Mr. ROONEY, showed that pointed out that we would like to get to 3.1 percent economic growth. I heartily agree.

But if we look at the period right now where we now have the worst disparity in wealth and the worst disparity in income that we have had in a long time, that tracks this decline from 3.1 percent to 1.6, 1.8, 2 percent.

When I started off in our family business, the corporate tax rate was 78 percent, and our economic growth was a lot higher. Not that we want to go back to 78 percent, but putting more money in the hands of the top 1 percent is not what is going to make this economy grow more quickly.

Actually, looking at the critical programs that are cut in this Republican budget gives us almost a handy guide of more effective ways to spend money. For example, this budget cuts transportation spending by 25 percent at a time when we have a D in our infrastructure by the American Society of Civil Engineers, when President Trump and candidate Hillary Clinton both

campaign hard on more infrastructure investment, not a cut.

This budget cuts student aid by \$211 billion when we know from our Joint Economic Committee hearings that the student debt our young people carry is one of the reasons they don't start new businesses, one of the things that suppresses the growth of new businesses in America.

We also know that human capital is the key to economic growth all through history and today. It contains massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, making healthcare more expensive for those who can least afford it, and that is not a way to grow the economy.

We have an opportunity to enact fiscally responsible, sustainable, bipartisan tax reform that focuses on the Americans whose wages have been stagnant for 30 years. I believe the Democrats are prepared to engage in real reform. It should be simpler. It should be fairer. We should absolutely do away with the special deals and credits and gimmicks, but we need a lower rate for most Americans, and not make sure that 80 percent of the tax benefits go to the people who need them the least, who have the smallest propensity to spend and to invest.

There are many other things wrong with this budget. Let me just point out two particular problems. Number one, the budget attacks the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It essentially sacrifices wildlife and environmental protections to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest.

ANWR encompasses more than 19 million acres and is one of the last intact landscapes in America. It is essential that we protect this wild and spectacular land. The government briefly opened ANWR to seismic testing in the 1980s, and the damage from that activity is still visible today. Truck tracks still scar the expansive tundra where the permafrost never healed. Since then, the Federal Government has protected ANWR from harmful oil and gas drilling because of concerns about the impact on species like polar bears, muskoxen, and caribou.

Mr. Chairman, there are 37 land mammal species, 8 marine mammal species, 42 fish species, and more than 200 migratory birds that inhabit the ANWR. Seismic testing could do lasting damage to the fragile ecosystem way before drilling. Seismic activity sends shock waves underground, disturbing denning polar bears.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, the caribou are a food source for Alaskan indigenous groups who have lived off the land for thousands of years. All of this devastation will likely do very little in the short run to reduce the deficit. The oil prices are so low that no oil com-

pany is going to attempt to extract fossil fuels at this time.

We believe the ANWR must be protected from the budget for future generations, its wildlife, and the native people who inhabit it.

Part two, Mr. Chairman, is the budget also attacks Federal Government employee retirement benefits. It instructs the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to reduce the deficit by \$32 billion. This clearly targets Federal employee retirement benefits because that is the only substantial mandatory spending within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdiction.

By slashing these promised benefits, the budget will eliminate any sense of financial security that Federal employees currently have. We should be protecting their rights and benefits. This was the original bargain they made. Most gave up much more lucrative careers in the private sector for the opportunity to serve all Americans, and for a small but secure Federal pension.

It is also going to make it a lot more difficult for us to recruit and retain the quality employees who make America great.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this budget, and let's work together to create a Tax Code that really does simulate our economy and that works for all Americans.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who represents the central part of Illinois, and is a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This bill makes necessary and responsible funding determinations by reducing the size and scope of government, cutting Federal spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, and balancing the Federal budget in fiscal year 2027.

Given our Nation's more than \$20 trillion in debt, it is past time to get serious about our Federal spending so that important programs are able to be sustained long term. In addition, this bill sets the stage for much-needed tax reform. Small businesses and farmers are the bedrock of the American economy. For decades, we have allowed our Tax Code to balloon with loopholes and tax breaks for special interests, hurting our local economies and middle class workers.

That is why it is so crucial that we pass this commonsense budget as the first step in reforming our Nation's outdated Tax Code. Our current system continues to fail small business owners, farmers, and middle class families with its overwhelmingly complex system. That is why over 90 percent of Americans have to pay for help with filing their taxes every year.

Not only does this cost people their hard-earned money, but this also costs us our valuable time. Every year we

spend a combined 8.9 billion hours filing our taxes. That is time we could be using to focus on our work and families. For businesses, that is time they could use for expanding and growing our economy.

The solution here is not to defend the status quo, as some on the other side of the aisle continue to do, but to simplify our Tax Code and lower the rates for businesses and the middle class.

Another crucial part of reforming our Tax Code must be the elimination of the death tax, which harms farmers like those in the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. Family-owned businesses and farms that use their hard-earned dollars to invest back in their businesses are often forced to sell off parts or all in order to pay the death tax.

There is nothing fair about penalizing our job creators and the drivers of our economy for investing in and growing their business. In fact, it is estimated that repealing the death tax would grow our economy by 0.9 percent over 10 years.

These small business investments are often necessary for small businesses and farmers who depend upon expensive machinery to earn their living. Our current Tax Code, however, encourages businessowners to put off their investments as they are only able to deduct the cost of equipment over many years. By allowing full expensing, businesses and farmers can fully invest in the tools they need to become more productive, all the while earning more savings.

According to the Tax Foundation, full expensing would save businesses money, leading to nearly a 5 percent increase in income for low- and middle-income workers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chair, tax reform is about getting our economy back to working for the middle class, and for our small businesses, growing it from the inside out. This budget is the necessary first step in that process, and I am proud to support it. It will help bring relief to those who need it most.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, just to remind my colleagues, the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center points out that 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent.

But in this budget resolution that we are discussing, it slashes education funding, putting the drain of a college education for average Americans even further out of reach. It asks the American people who already experience crippling student loan debt to reach even deeper into their pockets for their education by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs.

□ 1700

It freezes the maximum level awarded by a Pell grant at \$5,900, covering just 23 percent of an education by 2026, compared to the 30 percent it covers today or the 77 percent it covered in 1980. In addition, it also cuts \$3.3 billion from the Pell grant surplus, which provides a much-needed reserve to cover the cost of future education.

If that is not enough, after students graduate, this budget makes it increasingly difficult to pay off student loans and steers graduates away from public service and teaching jobs by eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs. Our students and our teachers deserve a better deal than that.

I must say that we are suffering from three hurricanes, devastating hurricanes, yet this budget eliminates three programs that play very key roles in disaster relief. The Community Development Block Grant program, AmeriCorps, and the Legal Services Corporation are all eliminated. This budget abolishes these programs that are literally supporting our relief efforts from Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Our Nation's veterans—our Nation's veterans—our bravest, are not spared the carnage of this heartless proposal. The GOP budget proposes \$50 billion in cuts to mandatory spending on veterans programs over 10 years, including education benefits and loan guarantees. So after we have already asked so much of our men and women in uniform, this budget refuses to give them the tools they need to transition to civilian life. Our veterans deserve a better deal than that from the country that they have served so honorably.

Cuts to research, where research is the future of our country, and this budget would also cut investments that are directly tied to our country's future prosperity by slashing basic research funding.

I want to point out how important research funding is to our country. In 1996, two Stanford graduate students took a \$4.5 million research grant from the National Science Foundation and developed a new algorithm called PageRank. Two years later, these same students took PageRank and launched a new internet search engine we now call Google. Today Google is worth over \$600 billion and employs over 72,000 Americans, and it all began with a Federal basic research grant of \$4.5 million.

Google is just one example on a long list of technological advancement companies and, most importantly, jobs that trace their roots to basic research investment. It is what has kept this country on top.

According to the Brookings Institution, two-thirds of the most influential technologies over the past 50 years were supported by Federal research grants. It has brought us lifesaving vaccines, the laser, touchscreen, GPS, and even the internet, technology that has served as a launching pad for cutting-edge medical treatment.

Sadly, the chart behind me reflects a sharp decline in the Federal share of funding of basic research dropping from 72 percent in 1967 to 44 percent in 2015. This GOP budget proposal follows that same trend with instructions to cut \$41 billion from science, space, and technology precisely at a time when we should be increasing investments in these sectors.

It is important to the future prosperity of America. Cuts now mean fewer jobs and economic growth in the future; they mean less innovation and less prosperity. So if my colleagues across the aisle want to grow the economy, turning this trend around is an important way to do it.

Now, I have heard all day from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle how very, very concerned they are about the deficit, but the GOP tax plan makes it worse. The tax framework released last week by the White House and Republican leaders would add \$2.4 trillion to the deficit in the first 10 years and another \$3.2 trillion in the next 10 years.

So the Republican budget is just totally unacceptable. This budget flat-out ignores the reality. So if Republicans are concerned about the deficit, then they should really rewrite their budget proposal.

In conclusion, look at the fine print of this proposed deal and imagine the harm it would cause to millions of American families, to our children, to our seniors, to our sick and suffering, to our disabled and our destitute, to our economy, to our research, and to our infrastructure. It is clear—clear—beyond any and all doubt that Americans deserve a better deal.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), who is the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget before the House.

As a legislator, but more importantly, as a father and grandfather, I am seriously concerned about the mountain of debt our Nation is passing on to our children and grandchildren. Our Nation's total Federal debt is now bigger than our gross domestic product.

Think about that. As the leader of the free world and the driver of global innovation and entrepreneurship, over the next 10 years, we expect to reach a point where annual interest payments to our creditors will exceed the amount we spend on defending our Nation.

It is imperative that we change this trajectory, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK and her colleagues on the Budget Committee for providing a blueprint for tackling the problem. While Congress has made many decisions ahead of us to rein in mandatory spending, this budget is a critical starting point.

Not only is budgeting a fundamental principle of good governance, it is essential to our efforts to reform our outdated tax system to ensure it is simpler and reduces the tax burden for all Americans.

As a CPA with a current license, I look forward to the very real prospect of fundamental tax reform. This budget is the vehicle that can make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I request the amount of time that is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ZELDIN). The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe that this proposal that is before us is an absolute disaster. We should be charting a fundamentally different course.

When you listen to people around their dinner table in America tonight, they would be talking about their concerns in education, infrastructure, jobs, healthcare, security, environment, and disaster relief. But this plan delivers, instead, deep and sometimes disabling cuts to badly needed programs for millions in order to give away benefits to a fortunate few. This is just plain wrong. Budgets are about values and priorities, and the people of this country deserve better.

We should not be cutting our education spending. Failing to train the world's most highly educated workforce is irresponsible and puts our entire economy at a disadvantage. We should be investing more in education at every level—early education and high schools—motivating students to become engaged in science, technology, math, and engineering. We should be leading the way in developing new and improved technical and trade training programs for those who would prefer it. We should be doing more, not less, to make college and postgrad study affordable once again. To do anything less is to fail in our obligation to the rising generation.

We already trail much of the economically advanced world when it comes to healthcare. We get sicker, die sooner, and pay more for our care than most developed nations. Millions are just one serious illness away from financial ruin. But this budget plan would cut spending for healthcare, and this budget would weaken the pillars of financial security for our seniors. The proposed cuts to Medicare and Medicaid will come at the expense of seniors, the disabled, and the middle class.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford this budget. I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America is at a crossroads, and this budget is about choices.

Mr. Chairman, there are moms and dads, single moms and elderly folks sitting at the kitchen table every night making choices on what to buy and what to pay for. They have to live within their means, Mr. Chairman.

The Federal Government, for too long, hasn't lived within its means, and this budget is about that. This budget is about tax reform. This budget is about growing our economy. We haven't seen the growth in this recovery that we have seen in others.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when I got my first job at McDonald's. My immigrant mother and my immigrant father sat me down and talked to me about the taxes that I would pay coming out of my first paycheck. I clearly remember my dad saying to me: Don't let the taxes that you pay stop you from saving most of this money, because in America, not only do you get taxed when you earn it, you get taxed when you save it, and if you save enough, you will get taxed when you die. That was my immigrant father with a fifth grade education. He was a steelworker.

Mr. Chairman, it is incredibly sad in America today when a successful entrepreneur will pay over 50 percent of what he or she makes in taxes at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 31 years since we reformed our outdated Tax Code, and now is the time—now is the time—at this crossroads to change the direction of America for our kids and our grandkids. I urge a "yes" vote on this responsible budget to live within our means, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 33 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to just begin this next section by making a brief comment about my good friend from Kentucky, who has been using some information off of Forbes as he responds to our speakers. I just want to say, I went out to look at Forbes to see what was on Forbes while we were on this brief intermission, and I found this article that was in Forbes just the day before yesterday that does say that the GOP tax framework is a pay raise for middle class families.

□ 1715

I encourage people to take a look at this. It actually does some scenarios for what we know at this point in time. However, I do want to say that what has been put out is a framework. It doesn't really have enough details to give too much on these scenarios, because there are some very important pieces that are missing.

Guessing on these key points really doesn't allow us to do a proper analysis. Things like the brackets have not

been definitively defined, and neither have the income thresholds or the enhanced child credit.

I think it is a little bit disingenuous to think that is really where we should be using those numbers right at this point in time to give a definitive scenario. I did want to say that that would be a good thing for people to look at if they would like to get a brief idea.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), our ranking member, for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this deeply flawed Republican budget resolution.

When we considered this resolution in July, Democrats offered 28 amendments. The amendments that we offered were meant to help set a course away from the disastrous path that the Republican majority and the Trump administration are steering us down.

We offered amendments on a broad range of issues important to our communities and our families. These included protecting our communities from the effects of climate change; preserving healthcare; investing in public health, research, and diplomacy; and investing in our Nation's workforce and infrastructure. Not surprisingly, not a single one of those made it through.

Instead, we have the resolution: a love letter to millionaires, billionaires, and corporations, and nothing but a manifesto of contempt for America's working families.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution we will be asked to vote on is based on the same faulty assumptions as the bill that came through committee. These include assuming that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act happened, which it did not, and an unrealistic economic growth of 3 percent.

The Republican budget resolution does little but hurt millions of American families in order to fast-track tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and corporations.

In addition, after all the Republican talk of deficit reduction, this cruel budget resolution massively increases the Federal debt by over \$2.4 trillion over the next 10 years and \$3.2 trillion in the 10 years after.

Where does putting the interests of corporations and the wealthiest ahead of working families get us?

Well, we have seen where this ends.

Earlier this summer, the Republican-dominated Kansas Legislature was forced to roll back its 2012 tax cuts. In fact, a recent Brookings Institution analysis found that the tax cuts resulted in an "anemic level of revenues,

which led to ballooning shortfalls, causing significant cutbacks in vital programs such as Medicaid, education, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, court funding, and infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Washington an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JAYAPAL. This Republican budget resolution will lead us into that same hole, yet we know that this will only give Republicans license to call for further cuts to critical programs like Medicare, Social Security, and education.

We know who wins under this budget resolution. It paves the way for a Republican tax proposal that gives a huge tax cut to the wealthiest in our country.

Consider this: 80 percent of the Republican tax cut goes to the top 1 percent by 2027; the average tax cut for the top 1 percent would be \$207,000; for millionaires, the tax cut would provide \$230,000 a year; and 42 million middle class households would face a tax increase, including those people earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is unfair to working families and to our country's future. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's work together on a moral budget blueprint that supports all Americans.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, typically, a budget is a blueprint for how our government plans to meet our obligations to our people; but not this time.

By including reconciliation instructions for their tax plan, the Republicans are using this budget as a blueprint to give tax cuts to the wealthiest few, without requiring bipartisan support.

Under this bill, a family making \$50,000 a year could see their tax burden go up, while millionaires will save \$230,000. And who will pay to make the rich richer? Our working families, children, and seniors.

This budget slashes priorities like education, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits, and even guts Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion.

"You can't make guarantees," is how Treasury Secretary Mnuchin responded when asked if the Republican tax plan would help the middle class. But the thing is, you can make guarantees. If this Republican budget moves forward, it will guarantee that inequality gets worse, while the rest of us pay to help make millionaires into billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution.

A budget is a moral document. It reflects our values. This budget is a stark reminder that the majority and the Trump administration are waging a war on the middle class and eviscerating the social safety net programs that help our most vulnerable citizens.

The social safety net was built on a bipartisan basis. Why is the majority hell-bent on destroying it?

Older Americans will suffer under this budget. It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid. It betrays middle class job seekers by cutting job training, education programs, and other nondefense programs by 34 percent over the next 10 years.

It decimates the Food Stamp program, SNAP benefits and assumes the enactment of the House-passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act, targeting American families who are struggling to get by.

If we were serious about addressing the problems that face middle class families, we would be voting on a budget resolution that invests in their priorities: job training, apprenticeships, paid family and medical leave, fair trade, and equal pay for equal work.

Instead, we are considering a budget that is merely a means for the majority to jam through their tax cuts for the wealthy and for corporations.

The biggest economic challenge of our time is that too many people now are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. We should be growing the middle class and looking for solutions that work for America's families.

We ought to be prioritizing the needs of working families, the ones who have entrusted us to come to Washington to fight for them and to fight for their families. Instead, this budget puts corporate profits first. It caters to those with the most lobbyists.

This budget is a disgrace to the promises that we have made to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal.

As the ranking member on the Transportation Committee, I want to focus in a little bit on what they do to transportation.

We heard great promises from President Trump of a trillion dollars in new investment. Nothing has come from the White House. The first substantive

action on transportation in this Congress is going to be the Republicans in the House of Representatives cutting transportation funding by \$254 billion.

That is right. No trillion dollars of new spending. We are going to spend \$254 billion less.

They are going to eliminate all long-route trains, isolating rural America. They are going to lose essential air service in rural America. And, by the way, the Republicans want to toll your interstate. So if you live in rural America, you can get in your car to go somewhere, but now you are going to have to pay to use the highway you already paid for.

Secondly, it eliminates critical funding for our urban areas, the economic engines of this country. It eliminates TIGER grants for freight and multimodal projects. It eliminates new investment in transit, new start projects. It eliminates all investments in high-speed rail and eliminates specific funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects. The Republicans just hate bicycles.

It also goes on—and this is totally amazing—seriously, you are going to cut funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency? Haven't you been watching television? I think they are already out of money. You are going to cut funding?

We want to do away with those programs that might mitigate the disaster of future floods and hurricanes. You are going to cut grants for firefighters.

Then, that is not enough. We are going to roll back Davis-Bacon protections for people who work on federally funded projects. We are going to roll back Buy American? Really? So it is "Buy Chinese" in the Republican budget. Buy Chinese.

They want to devolve the obligation to fund Federal highways to the States. I have got news for you: we have tried that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is Kansas and Oklahoma. This is Kansas before we had the Eisenhower—by the way, a Republican—National Highway Program. They built their turnpike. Oklahoma said they would build theirs. They didn't. They were out of money. They didn't build it until they got an 80 percent Federal match.

So let's go back to the good, old days. We are going to devolve the obligations of putting together a 21st century transportation system in this country, knitting our country together, getting rid of congestion, moving people and goods more efficiently, but we are going to do it on a State-by-State basis. That is nuts. I just can't believe this.

Then, there is another little trick. The chairman of my committee wants to privatize the airspace in the United States and reduce the ticket tax that

pays for air traffic control. That would be a \$10 billion windfall to the airline industry, because they will raise prices. Then they are going to charge you a head fee to get on the plane.

Even better, it creates \$100 billion of new deficit. So this nifty little thing here contains a reserve fund of \$100 billion to try and make up for the fact and hide the fact that they are cutting \$100 billion of taxes that pay for the current system.

How are you going to pay for the next system?

The airlines will determine that, not Congress.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter that has been signed by 242 agencies and think tanks supporting this budget.

Among those who have signed this letter are the American Bankers Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Tax Reform, Business Roundtable, Financial Services Forum, Manufactured Housing Institute, National Association of Manufacturers, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Grocers Association, National Retail Federation, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, The Kentucky Chamber, and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, among many others.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: We urge Congress to expeditiously pass a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions so that the promise of tax reform can be made a reality.

It has been 31 years since Congress last reformed the tax code. Since then, the code has become an anchor weighing down the economy, job creation, and wage growth for American families.

This Congress has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to fix the problem. Over the past several years, tremendous work has been done to prepare for this moment. In the 113th Congress the Ways and Means Committee conducted a comprehensive look at tax reform. Last year House Republicans released a Blueprint for reform. During the last Congress, the Senate Finance Committee convened bi-partisan working groups that tackled all the major aspects of reform.

President Trump has outlined his goals for reform, and the "Group of Six"—consisting of members from the House, Senate, and Administration—has presented a framework to guide the drafting and markup of legislation in the Ways and Means and Finance Committees.

While much work remains to be done, we believe Congress is well-positioned to move forward with comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

The single-most important next step is for Congress to adopt a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions that will permit tax reform to move forward without the threat of a filibuster.

Just like Members of Congress, each of our organizations will continue to advocate for specific priorities within tax reform as the relevant committees and ultimately the full House and Senate consider tax reform legislation.

But failing to pass a budget resolution now may mean that tax reform never moves forward. That outcome is unacceptable to all of

us and ought to be unacceptable to every Member of Congress who has advocated for reform.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association, African American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA), Alabama Retail Association, Alaska Chamber, Allen Fairview Chamber of Commerce (TX), Alliance for Competitive Taxation (ACT), American Bakers Association, American Bankers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Exploration & Production Council, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Forest & Paper Association, American Foundry Society, American Gas Association, American Hotel & Lodging Association, American International Automobile Dealers Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Made Coalition, American Petroleum Institute (API).

American Supply Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Ames Chamber of Commerce (IA), Argentum, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Asian American Hotel Owners Association, Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Association for Hose and Accessories Distribution (NAHAD), Association of American Railroads, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Washington Business, Auto Care Association, Baton Rouge Area Chamber (LA), Battle Creek Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (FL), Brainerd Lakes Chamber of Commerce (MN).

Bristol County Chamber of Commerce (MA), Buckeye Valley Chamber (AZ), Buffalo Niagara Partnership (NY), Business Council of Alabama, Business Council of New York State, Business Roundtable, Cedar Rapids Metro Economic Alliance (IA), Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association (CTIA), Central Louisiana Regional Chamber of Commerce, Chambers of Commerce Alliance of Ventura & Santa Barbara Counties (CA), Chester County Chamber of Business & Industry (PA), Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce (ID), Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry, Colorado Retail Association, Consumer Bankers Association, Convenience Distribution Association, Coral Gables Chamber of Commerce (FL), Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, Covington County Chamber of Commerce (MS), Crowley Chamber of Commerce (LA).

Davis Chamber of Commerce (UT), Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Eatonton-Putnam Chamber of Commerce (GA), Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Edmond Area Chamber of Commerce (OK), Edwardsville/Glen Carbon Chamber of Commerce (IL), Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Entertainment Software Association, Financial Services Forum, Florida Chamber of Commerce, Florida Retail Federation, Food Marketing Institute, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce (WI), Gas and Welding Distributors Association, Georgia Chamber of Commerce, Georgia Retail Federation, Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association & Film Commission (CO), Granbury Chamber of Commerce (TX).

Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Greater Bakersfield Chamber (CA), Greater Cedar Valley Alliance & Chamber (IA), Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Greater El Paso Chamber of Commerce (TX), Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce (AK), Greater Lehigh Valley Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Louisville Inc. (KY), Greater North Dakota Chamber, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber

(OK), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (VA), Greater Toms River Chamber of Commerce (NJ), Greater Yakima Chamber of Commerce (WA), Grocery Manufacturers Association, Hastings Area Chamber of Commerce (NE), Heating, Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Henderson Chamber of Commerce (NV).

Hilliard Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce (OR), Home Furnishings Association, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, Independent Office Products & Furniture Dealers Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, International Foodservice Distributors Association, International Warehouse Logistics Association, Iowa Chamber Alliance, Irrigation Association, ISSA, The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Jefferson Chamber of Commerce (LA), Jenkins County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Job Creators Network, Johnson City/Jonesborough/Washington County TN Chamber, Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce & Industry (MO), Kalispell Chamber of Commerce (MT), Kansas Chamber of Commerce, Kingsport Chamber (TN), Kyndle (Henderson County KY Chamber of Commerce).

Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Lancaster Chamber (PA), Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce (NV), Lemont Chamber of Commerce (IL), Lima Allen County Chamber of Commerce (OH), Little Rock Regional Chamber (AR), Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Louisiana Association of Business and Industry, Manufactured Housing Institute, McLean County Chamber of Commerce (IL), Metals Service Center Institute, Metro South Chamber of Commerce (MA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (WI), Michigan Retailers Association, Minnesota Retailers Association, Missouri Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Monroe Chamber of Commerce (LA), Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (SC), National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Association of Professional Employer Organizations.

National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association of the Remodeling Industry, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Club Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Office Products Alliance, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Nebraska Retail Federation, NFIB—National Federation of Independent Business.

North Carolina Chamber, North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Dakota Retail Association, North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce (RI), North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce (SC), North Orange County Chamber (CA), North San Antonio Chamber (TX), Office Furniture Dealers Alliance, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio



Council of Retail Merchants, Oklahoma Retail Merchants Association, Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce (WI), Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), PA Chamber of Business and Industry, Pennsylvania Retailers Association, Plano Chamber of Commerce (TX), Portland Cement Association, Prattville Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Precious Metals Association of North America, Professional Beauty Association.

Reforming America's Taxes Equitability (RATE) Coalition, Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce (NV), Retail Association of Nevada, Retail Association of New Mexico, Retail Council of New York State, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Retailers Association of Massachusetts, Richardson Chamber of Commerce (TX), River Heights Chamber of Commerce (MN), S Corporation Association, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce (CA), Salt Lake Chamber (UT), San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce (CA), San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (CA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Service Station Dealers of America and Allied Trades (SSDA-AT), Silver City Grant County Chamber of Commerce (NM), South Summit Chamber of Commerce (OH), Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Southwest Indiana Chamber, St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce (MN), St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, St. Tammany West Chamber of Commerce, State Chamber of Oklahoma, Steel Manufacturers Association, Tampa Bay Beaches Chamber of Commerce (FL), Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Texas Retailers Association, The Chamber of Commerce of the Santa Barbara Region (CA), The Chamber of Medford/Jackson County (OR), The Chamber Grand Forks/East Grand Forks (ND), The Fertilizer Institute, The Financial Services Roundtable, The Kentucky Chamber, The Longview Chamber of Commerce (TX), The Ohio Society of CPAs, The Real Estate Roundtable, Tile Roofing Institute, Tioga County Chamber of Commerce (NY).

Tire Industry Association (TIA), Truck Renting and Leasing Association, Tucson Metro Chamber (AZ), Tulsa Regional Chamber (OK), U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Union County Chamber of Commerce, United Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce (TX), USTelecom—The Broadband Association, Utah Food Industry Association, Utah Retail Merchants Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Small Business Partnership, West Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce (LA), Wholesalers Association of the Northeast (WANE), Window and Door Manufacturers Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, WMDA/CAR Service Station and Automotive Repair Association.

Mrs. BLACK. There are 242 different entities that signed this letter to say that passing a budget is what we should be doing and that would lead us to tax reforms.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee and a fellow rabid Cleveland Indians fan.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

As Vice President Biden stated: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget and I will tell you what you value."

The Republican's so-called Building a Better America budget shows us they do not value education, infrastructure, research and development, veterans' benefits, and other programs which expand opportunities for America's families.

□ 1730

This budget is immoral. It provides trillions of dollars in tax money to millionaires and wealthy corporations while shifting the burden onto the middle class. It cuts \$5.4 trillion from programs that American families rely on; programs like SNAP, Pell grants, Social Security, and healthcare.

The budget ends the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicare alone by almost \$500 billion over 10 years. A vote for this budget destroys American families in favor of a select few. This budget does not build a better America. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have had numerous letters submitted to us taking a position in opposition to this budget resolution, and I think they are pretty compelling, and I would like to read from some of them.

Here is a letter from the Main Street Alliance:

Main Street Alliance, a network of small business owners throughout the country, strongly urges you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This budget, if enacted into law, would cut \$3.4 trillion from Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending over the next 10 years. This will significantly harm small business owners and their employees, damage local economies, and decimate State budgets.

We urge you to protect Main Street small business owners, working families, communities, and economies, and oppose the House budget resolution. Reject any budget that enables tax cuts for the very wealthy and large profitable corporations to lose revenue, since it will force deep cuts in vital programs that harm small business.

This letter from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare:

On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and the Republican Study Committee budget. Instead, I ask you to support the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus budgets.

The committee-passed budget resolution would slash funding to Medicare and Medicaid, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and make it easier for Congress to cut Social Security, all to pay for massive tax cuts for the very wealthy and profitable corporations.

This from the American Public Health Association:

On behalf of the American Public Health Association, a diverse community of public health professionals who champion the

health of all people and communities, I write in strong opposition to the House FY 2018 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 71. This proposal does not eliminate sequestration and would drastically cut nondefense discretionary spending. Such cuts would devastate our Nation's public health and safety net system and would have a disproportionate impact on our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

The proposal also includes the House passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act that would force millions to lose coverage, end the Medicaid expansion, drastically reduce Federal funding for the Medicaid program, and lead to increased cost and fewer benefits for millions of Americans.

This letter from the AFSCME, American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees:

On behalf of the 1.6 million members of AFSCME, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee and scheduled to be considered in the full House.

This budget would impose considerable hardship on many Americans in order to slash taxes for the wealthy and corporations to boost defense spending. Rather than increasing revenues for investment that creates jobs and spurs economic growth, the proposed budget creates a fast-track process for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit corporations and the wealthy.

In fact, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Trump GOP tax cut would largely benefit the richest 1 percent. The budget also relies on the gimmicks of dynamic scoring and sham accounting, hiding the true cost of unnecessary and harmful tax cuts.

And this, from AARP:

Proposals creating a defined contribution premium support program, restricting access by raising the age of eligibility, or allowing hospitals and providers to arbitrarily charge customers higher prices than Medicare can make healthcare unaffordable for older Americans. These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of healthcare but simply shifts cost from Medicare on to individuals, many of whom cannot afford to pay for their care.

Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through this program.

Furthermore, caps could result in significant cost shifts to State governments unable to shoulder the cost of care without sufficient Federal support.

Proposals to block grant the program or impose work requirements will make SNAP less responsive and accessible in times of need, and without clear work requirement exemptions for the elderly and disabled, would bar these individuals from receiving SNAP benefits.

We ask you to reject the cuts proposed in H. Con. Res. 71. We stand ready to work with you to develop proposals that protect and improve Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and SNAP.

This from the Alliance for Retired Americans:

On behalf of the more than 4.3 million members of the Alliance for Retired Americans, I am writing to urge you to vote against H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. This budget blueprint cuts spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, disseminating numerous domestic programs, including those that benefit older Americans.

It is shocking that the same budget that cuts services for many low-income Americans and raises taxes on the middle class will

also carry instructions to provide \$2.4 trillion in tax cuts to corporations and wealthy Americans.

These tax cuts, which will increase the deficit, sets up the perfect scenario for Congress to slash Medicare and Medicaid. We are not fooled by the House leadership's tax giveaway to the wealthy at the expense of ordinary Americans and urge you to oppose this draconian budget. We will be watching how you vote on this important issue.

This is a letter from the Coalition on Human Needs:

On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 budget resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we have made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well prepared for productive lives.

But the majority's proposed budget does not build. It breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our Nation weaker for decades to come.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity.

Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education, and housing assistance, these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut.

The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have chosen to lavish huge tax breaks on large multinationals and the top wealthiest few in our country instead of growing our economy by investing in all Americans. Investing in our workforce, in our physical infrastructure, in entrepreneurship, that is the way to really grow the economy; not these retread Republican tax policies that offer all the benefits to the top and hope something will eventually trickle down to everyone else, that only grow the national debt, as has been shown time and time again.

Our Republicans today call their budget a vision for our country, and what a grim vision it is for anyone who does not count themselves among the top 1 percent. Republicans would only widen income inequality with massive tax breaks for the few, while slashing trillions from initiatives that give more Americans the chance to get ahead, while, at the same time, strengthening our overall economic future.

For seniors, this is a budget that breaks Trump's promise not to cut Medicare to the tune of about half a trillion dollars in cuts, and it would slash an additional \$1 trillion for Medicaid, upon which so many seniors rely.

For students and families that are struggling to get a college education,

the ticket into the middle class, and into economic competitiveness, this budget will make it harder to climb the economic ladder with major cuts to Pell grants and other student assistance programs, and it will limit our investment in education and job training for American workers that are already out there trying to upgrade their skills.

What does the Republican budget do with all the money they save from cutting the middle class and working people, seniors, and those who are trying to get ahead? Well, it stuffs the pockets of those at the top and the large multinationals.

What President Trump and his Republican cohorts say their plan is, it isn't. You know, only last week, Trump said this about his tax plan: "I don't benefit. I don't benefit. In fact, very, very strongly, as you see, I think there is very little benefit for people of wealth."

Well, the analysis of the one tax return that leaked out suggests that President Trump will benefit to the tune of more than \$1 billion. Eighty percent of the tax breaks in this proposal go to the top 1 percent. That is people who are making more than \$730,000 a year while one in four Americans could actually see a tax increase.

That is why you can understand that they say they can't guarantee that taxes won't go up for many people in the middle class. And overall, this is a budget that is dripping in red ink.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we begin to understand why Trump calls himself "the king of debt," because there is plenty of debt that will be added onto this plan.

For Trump and his cohorts, fiscal responsibility is just a political slogan that they use to undermine those education and social service programs they were never for in the first place.

The Republican budget is not just numbers. It has a real human cost. By slashing investments in our economic future, it is a recipe for weakness, not strength. I urge my colleagues to side with the middle class, with working folks all over America, and reject this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Compact for a Balanced Budget Commission, and I will read a portion of this letter. They say: "Dear Chairman Black: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your committee, H. Con. Res. 71, and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

"Our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the Federal budget returns to balance within the 10-year

budget period because runaway Federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational, and civil rights issue. We commend you and your committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest."

And again, this comes from The Compact Commission, Compact for a Balanced Budget.

THE COMPACT COMMISSION, C/O COMPACT FOR AMERICA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.,

Houston, TX, August 8, 2017.

Re 2018 House Budget Resolution and the Compact for a Balanced Budget.

Hon. DIANE BLACK,  
Chairman, House Budget Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLACK: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your Committee (House Concurrent Resolution 71) and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

Our nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the federal budget returns to balance within the ten-year budget period because runaway federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational and civil-rights issue. We commend you and your Committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest.

We also commend the Committee for including Section 501 in the resolution, which endorses adding a balanced budget requirement to the Constitution.

Section 501 identifies the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which we represent on behalf of current and future member states. We believe the most practical, prudent enforcement mechanism is the state-of-the-art balanced budget amendment (BBA) being proposed by the Compact. This state-of-the-art BBA has been specifically designed to overcome concerns expressed in 40 years of congressional hearings that have considered how a BBA should be drafted. Such concerns may have prevented prior BBAs from being proposed.

To advance the policy prescription in Section 501 of the budget resolution in the House, we recommend: updating this section to reflect that the concurrent resolution to effectuate the Compact (House Concurrent Resolution 73) was introduced on July 26, 2017; and incorporating the language of House Concurrent Resolution 73 into Section 501. This could be done as one of several amendments you are probably already planning to bring up during floor consideration as the manager's package, and requires only a majority vote as opposed to the two-thirds required for balanced budget amendment proposals made by members of Congress.

Taking these steps establishes a strong enforcement mechanism, sustaining the budget resolution following its adoption. It would also strengthen the appeal of the budget resolution to fiscal conservatives in the House and taking these steps prior to the consideration of legislation to raise the debt ceiling should expedite approval of that legislation.

Supermajorities of Americans have demanded a balanced budget for decades. Our nation's debt threatens future generations to default or austerity, but we believe there's a chance here for a third option: principled leadership on the matter of debt and spending.

We hope you and your Committee members will agree that there is a path here which acknowledges the need for long-term fiscal

sanity while also meeting shorter-term political and policy needs.

Regards,

CHAIR MEAD TREADWELL,  
*Alaska Commissioner.*  
VICE CHAIR PAULATE  
RAKESTRAW,  
*Georgia Commissioner.*  
GREG SNOWDEN,  
*Mississippi Commissioner.*

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to just bounce off of that and take a look at the chart that we have here. When we take a look at interest—and somehow we don't always talk that much about interest here. We talk about borrowing money and raising our debt ceiling continually. I have been here now for 6½ years, and the conversation is about raising that debt ceiling so that we can pay for our debt, but there comes interest on that.

Just as when we go to a bank and we borrow money, we have to pay interest on that. I remember years ago, when I bought my first house, we were at a period of time when President Carter was the President and the interest rates were outrageous, and our interest rate on our house at that time, when we purchased it as a young married couple, was, I think, somewhere between 14 and 16 percent.

Interest rates now are very much more reasonable for young couples purchasing. And so I want to turn our attention to this chart here to take a look at the outlays in 2027 under the CBO baseline.

If we continue down this path that we are going in, without taking a look at our mandatory spending, the amount of money that we borrow, and the debt that we pile up with an interest to it, just what will that look like?

□ 1745

I think if we look at our own household and we would say that our interest that we are paying on the credit card or whatever, or the car interest or the House mortgage, if it were more than all of the other things like the food and maybe the education for our children and buying books and pencils and things that they need for school, we would be looking at the way in which we were managing our household income and saying, wow, that is not something we want to keep doing. We are going to have to get on some kind of a budget plan and reverse the trajectory of where we would be going.

So here we are. At the end of the period of 2027, if we look at 17 years down the road and we don't do anything about the kind of mandatory spending, which is two-thirds of our budget, currently, and continues to grow, here is what happens:

We see \$768 billion being spent on interest alone.

We see the next one down, the defense, at \$741 billion. We would actually be paying more in interest than we were in the security of our Nation and supporting our men and women who serve in the military, and all of the

supplies and the necessary equipment that it takes to protect them as they protect us.

Look at what happens with Medicaid. We will be spending less on Medicaid that is for people who are the blind, the disabled, the elderly, the children, the pregnant mothers.

We talk about wanting to put our money and our values where we see the values really belong. Is this really where we want our values to be in the money that we spend, \$768 billion in interest compared to what we are spending on our military, what we are spending on our Medicaid?

Look at our veterans, our veterans that we talk about how much we honor them: \$248 billion as opposed to \$768 billion in interest.

Again, we must question where we are going and if this is the right direction. Is this the direction that we can all just raise our hand up and say, yes, we are making good decisions for the future of our country? Because look at where the interest is compared to the other programs that we both, Republicans and Democrats, have said are so important to us.

Over and over again, we have had colleagues on both sides of the aisle go and speak about the importance of what our values are. Our budget is a vision of what our values are.

Transportation, and I have heard more and more times on both sides of the aisle talking about infrastructure, how important that is for our Nation. Look at what our transportation and our infrastructure will be. I don't know that we want to spend only \$110 billion on that and \$768 billion on interest. Think of how many roads we could build, how many bridges we could repair if we reverse this trajectory.

Then, finally, at the bottom here is science-based technology. We all want to be competitive with those around the world to make sure that we are spending the money where we need to spend the money to stay in front of these other nations with our science and our space and our technology.

I want to recommend here that there are only two other programs, Social Security and Medicare, that exceed that net interest. So we will say Social Security, Medicare, and then our net interest; and from there, everything else that we say, both the Republicans and the Democrats, are so important, that we say are our values, are going to be underneath the interest. I don't think that is really where we want to go.

I have to think, my oldest grandchild right now is 19 years old, soon to turn 20, when he is 30 years old, he might say to me: Mimi, what were you doing when you were in Congress? What were you doing to help us, because now we are paying more in interest than we are all of these other programs that we contend to be so important to us?

So these are difficult decisions to make, I will acknowledge that. But I will also say to you, as someone who—

I consider myself to be a policy wonk. As I look at these various programs, I say there is nothing that we are doing in my life that I did 40 years ago that I am doing exactly the same. So if a program has been around for 40 years, should we not want to say maybe we can reform it? Not necessarily cut, but, in the reforming, you may find a way to decrease the spending that you are doing in that program.

Can't we all lock arms, Democrats and Republicans, and acknowledge that there are some decisions that have to be made with programs that have been there for a very long time?

Can we not acknowledge that there are some programs that perhaps have fraud, waste, and abuse that we can take care of, take that money and use it in these places where we really say our values lie?

So I would say that, as we talk about this budget, I am very proud of what we have done in this budget, in the cuts or, as I say, reforms in those programs that would result in \$203 billion worth of savings over a 10-year period, that these are programs that we gave the committees of jurisdiction an opportunity to look within their jurisdiction and to make those decisions and do the homework. It is your jurisdiction; it is not mine. We gave them recommendations and suggestions, but it is their jurisdiction.

Let them evaluate where it is that there are programs that can have new and creative ideas, things that can save us money, not necessarily using the word "cut," but in savings. Yes, you may have some cuts that are done, but these are good cuts. These are things that you have spent a lot of time thinking about.

That is really where we want to go. That is what this budget does is it says: Open up your minds. Think differently. Let's not do things the same old way and keep putting the same old programs out there that maybe aren't working.

And you know what? Maybe they are not even working for the people that we give them to. Maybe they are not working for them, because work is dignity.

When we say that someone who is able-bodied and without any dependents should be at work, that is not cruel. Do you know what that is? That is dignity. When people go to work, it is a dignified activity.

I always say, after I ask you what your name is, and we all do it, we say: What do you do? And when someone cannot tell you what they do, they don't feel dignified.

Look, I don't want to be cruel to people who are disabled, people who are having a really tough time and have other circumstances, but we should acknowledge that there is dignity in work; and when we can give people an opportunity to have that dignity, we should be willing to stand up and do that.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a robust debate. We had a robust debate in the Rules Committee yesterday, and we have had robust debates in the committee markup and during hearings, as well, over the priorities of this country.

As we close this debate tonight, recognizing there will be a few minutes tomorrow for comments, I just want to say that, since this could very well be the last time that I get to appear in Budget Committee business with Chairman BLACK, I have truly cherished the 9 months that we have spent working together.

The chairman is a gracious, fair, thoughtful, and very, very collegial individual, and I wish her the best in her campaign, at least through the primary. I thank her and her very, very competent and professional staff for all of the courtesies they have shown us during this year and this process.

I also want to pay tribute to the Democratic staff, people who work very, very hard every day and are brilliant in their fields and make me sound smarter than I probably am, but I would like to read their names: Jon Antista; Erika Appel; Ellen Balis, the staff director; Hayden Flanery; Jon Goldman; Elliott Grantz; Jocelyn Harris; Najy Kamal; Sam Lau; Sheila McDowell; Diana Meredith; Farouk Ophaso; Kimberly Overbeek; Scott Russell; and Ted Zegers.

They do terrific work, and I want them to know how much I and all the members of the Budget Committee, the minority, appreciate their work.

I would also like to thank my personal staff, led by my chief of staff, Julie Carr, for the work they contribute to this process as well.

In closing, there are a few comments I want to make about this debate.

We heard several times during the day that it is really not fair to talk about the consequences of the tax proposal that will be the end result of this process because the details haven't been ironed out yet. That is, you know, fair enough as it goes, but there were enough details in the outline that we saw last week to make a pretty good guess as to what the impact of these tax cuts would be.

Now, we have read over and over, as Republican speakers spoke, the fact that they were willing to jeopardize the health and safety and nutrition of their citizens to give the wealthiest people in their State tax cuts. Most of these numbers that we read were in the billions of dollars: \$38 billion, \$16 billion. These are individuals with net worths of astounding amounts.

The outline that was publicly released last week said that the Republicans intend, under this tax proposal, to eliminate the estate tax. If they eliminate the estate tax, much of that money is not going to be taxed. They will get to keep it. I don't think that they are going to be out there creating

new companies. Maybe their children will do it if they inherit it. Maybe they have given some of it away so those estates aren't quite as big. I suspect many of them have.

The point is, when you are talking about wealth, collectively, the wealthiest persons in the 50 States, collectively, have \$750 billion in net worth, which means that, if they paid the estate tax, there would be over \$300 billion in money that they would save if you eliminated the estate tax.

So while, yes, we may be off plus or minus 3 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent, the fact is that this is an enormous break for the people who have been the most fortunate in this country. I think it is more than fair to say, if you say you are going to eliminate the estate tax, if you say you are going to eliminate the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, and we can go look at President Trump's 2005 tax return, which said he paid \$31 million in tax because of the alternative minimum tax, it doesn't take any details to know that he would have saved \$31 million in that year if you eliminate the alternative minimum tax.

So, yes, the rates may vary. Ultimately, the tax bill that we have presented to us may not lower the highest rate from 39.6 to 35 percent, but if it does, we know the impact that that will have. We know who will benefit most from that. It is the wealthiest 1 percent of this country.

As I will say tomorrow when we close this debate, I am in the top 1 percent. Half of this body are millionaires. They are all going to benefit. We are all going to benefit. Meanwhile, the people who rely on many of the programs that will be slashed under this Republican budget will suffer. That is not fair.

Now, Republicans will make the argument, as they always do because this is a matter of religious faith to them, that if you give people more money, they will magically create all this growth. Well, has that really happened?

Out of the Fortune 500 companies, I think, in a recent study, 92 of them paid 20 percent or less in corporate tax. Collectively, they eliminated 300,000 jobs over a 5-year period. So they had more money than corporations paying 35 percent. Did they use it to create more jobs, more wealth among middle class and working families? No. They used it to pay dividends, to buy back stock, and to increase the wages of their CEOs.

That is what has happened in modern history every time we lower corporate tax rates or we let them bring taxes in from overseas. They do not create more jobs with the money that they save.

So I think it is very, very fair for us to look at this entire process, the budget proposal, which does anticipate a tax cut—which they claim is revenue neutral, but it is a tax cut—and the outline that we saw last week and say: Who, really, is this going to help?

It is not going to help the people who need the help. It is going to give more

money to the people who already occupy one of the strongest economic positions in a country with the greatest disparity of wealth in the world.

So as we conclude this debate, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the alternatives that will be proposed by the Democratic Caucus, by the Congressional Black Caucus, and by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and compare the values and the priorities of those budgets to those that the Republican budget represents.

I think, on balance, anybody in good faith will say that those budgets, not the Republican budgets, are the budgets that will create a stronger, fairer society in this country, and those are the ones that we should proceed to adopt.

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

□ 1800

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I likewise, would like to just say that the ranking member, Mr. YARMUTH, has just been wonderful to work with, and we may have differences of opinion, but we can do it in a very Southern hospitality way. I just so much appreciate his demeanor, his leadership on the committee, the way he honors the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, and it has just been a joy to work with him. I am going to miss working with him and being able to have lively debate, which is good for this body and it is good for America.

I want to also thank all the members who participated in the debate today, both the Democrats and the Republicans. This is what our democracy is about, being able to voice our opinions and at the end of the day being able to come to a conclusion after that debate. I look forward to continuing discussion and voting on the final passage tomorrow.

As we finish up, I also want to thank our staff for their hard work, and there are many of them, so I am not going to read all of them to you. I do want to mention some of those who are the leaders of the House Budget Committee staff and have just been great to work with.

Rick May, who is the staff director; Jenna Spealman; Andy Morton; Tim Flynn; Mary, who has been here with me at my side the entire time. What would I do without having somebody to pass papers to us? So Mary has been great. Jim Bates, and I am going to leave it at that because I am going to get in trouble if I don't announce all of them.

The staff has just been tremendous to work with, many hours, weekends, and, indeed, even holidays that they have been here helping to gather the information both for the Budget Committee hearings and then, also, for this today.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to a more lively debate tomorrow. I include in the RECORD the names of the staff of the Budget Committee.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Rick May  
 Jenna Spealman  
 Andy Morton  
 Tim Flynn  
 Patrick Louis Knudsen  
 Benjamin Gardenhour  
 Gary Haglund  
 Chris Hartline  
 Sarah Corley  
 Sage Peterson  
 Jim Bates  
 Mary Popadiuk  
 Jonathan Romito  
 Elise Anderson  
 Policy Advisors  
 Jenna Spealman  
 Steve Gonzalez  
 Robert Cogan  
 Eric Davis  
 Robert Yeakel  
 Ellen Johnson  
 Andy Morton  
 Emily Goff  
 Brad Watson  
 Brittany Madni  
 Steve Waskiewicz  
 Alex Stoddard  
 Joe Guillen

PERSONAL STAFF (REPRESENTATIVE DIANE BLACK, TENNESSEE, 6TH DISTRICT)

Teresa Koeberlein  
 Dean Thompson  
 Heather Douglass  
 Jon Toomey  
 Ace Burch  
 Katie Mitchell  
 Hillary Lassiter  
 Zachary Royster  
 Greg Dowel  
 Nicholas Ayers

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I rise to share my concern regarding potential budget reconciliation instructions to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. These instructions could potentially result in significant harm to federal employees and federal retirees, many of whom I represent.

The national debt is a serious challenge that Congress must address, but I urge members of this body to maintain the promises made to federal employees at the time of their hiring. At a minimum, any changes to federal employee retirement or benefits should only be made on prospective employees, not current or former employees.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 71

*Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),*

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.**

(a) **DECLARATION.**—The Congress determines and declares that prior concurrent resolutions on the budget are replaced as of fiscal year 2018 and that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.  
 Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

**TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS**

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

**TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

Sec. 301. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.  
 Sec. 302. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.  
 Sec. 303. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.  
 Sec. 304. Limitation on advance appropriations.  
 Sec. 305. Estimates of debt service costs.  
 Sec. 306. Fair-value credit estimates.  
 Sec. 307. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.  
 Sec. 308. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.  
 Sec. 309. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.  
 Sec. 310. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.  
 Sec. 311. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.  
 Sec. 312. Prohibition on use of guarantee fees as an offset.

**Subtitle B—Other Provisions**

Sec. 321. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.  
 Sec. 322. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.  
 Sec. 323. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.  
 Sec. 324. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.  
 Sec. 325. Application of rule regarding limits on discretionary spending.  
 Sec. 326. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

**TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for commercialization of air traffic control.  
 Sec. 402. Reserve fund for investments in national infrastructure.  
 Sec. 403. Reserve fund for comprehensive tax reform.  
 Sec. 404. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.  
 Sec. 405. Reserve fund for the repeal or replacement of President Obama's health care laws.

**TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

Sec. 501. Policy statement on a balanced budget amendment.  
 Sec. 502. Policy statement on budget process reform.  
 Sec. 503. Policy statement on Federal regulatory budgeting and reform.  
 Sec. 504. Policy statement on unauthorized appropriations.  
 Sec. 505. Policy statement on Federal accounting.  
 Sec. 506. Policy statement on Commission on Budget Concepts.  
 Sec. 507. Policy statement on budget enforcement.  
 Sec. 508. Policy statement on improper payments.  
 Sec. 509. Policy statement on expenditures from agency fees and spending.  
 Sec. 510. Policy statement on promoting real health care reform.  
 Sec. 511. Policy statement on Medicare.  
 Sec. 512. Policy statement on combating the opioid epidemic.

Sec. 513. Policy statement on the State Children's Health Insurance Program.  
 Sec. 514. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery, and innovation.  
 Sec. 515. Policy statement on public health preparedness.  
 Sec. 516. Policy statement on Social Security.  
 Sec. 517. Policy statement on Medicaid work requirements.  
 Sec. 518. Policy statement on welfare reform and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program work requirements.  
 Sec. 519. Policy Statement on State flexibility in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.  
 Sec. 520. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.  
 Sec. 521. Policy statement on supplemental wildfire suppression funding.  
 Sec. 522. Policy statement on the Department of Veterans Affairs.  
 Sec. 523. Policy statement on moving the United States Postal Service on budget.  
 Sec. 524. Policy statement on the Judgment Fund.  
 Sec. 525. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.  
 Sec. 526. Policy statement on tax reform.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,670,356,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,767,357,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,870,414,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,963,953,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,077,586,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,195,139,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,325,690,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,475,784,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,642,629,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,811,687,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$63,213,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$66,151,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$80,162,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$95,958,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$105,330,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$122,777,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$136,738,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$146,394,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$146,749,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$146,700,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,232,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,286,018,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,299,573,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,290,186,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,975,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,483,686,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,528,872,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,655,413,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,746,208,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,824,652,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,164,885,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,265,306,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,283,026,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,323,464,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,603,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,467,047,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,497,308,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,620,210,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,727,971,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,806,792,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$494,529,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$497,949,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$412,612,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$359,511,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$364,017,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$271,908,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$171,618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$144,426,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$85,342,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$4,895,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,059,756,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,720,619,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,263,387,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,717,657,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,120,068,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,414,924,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$23,577,205,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$23,665,687,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$23,701,446,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$23,484,672,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,399,966,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,971,804,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,477,150,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,920,847,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,371,706,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,720,326,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$17,949,306,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$18,156,356,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$18,299,466,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$18,345,826,000,000.

#### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

##### (1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,595,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$607,810,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$660,832,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$636,795,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$693,646,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$666,519,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$728,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$698,761,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$731,818,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$717,568,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$735,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$720,401,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$739,157,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$720,755,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$742,886,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$729,581,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,414,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$734,037,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$751,098,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$737,798,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,521,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,643,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,210,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,207,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,428,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,965,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,654,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,585,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,623,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,021,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,445,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,795,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,285,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,102,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,174,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,643,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,121,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,365,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,025,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,175,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,524,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,072,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,107,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,365,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,702,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,360,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,346,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$29,718,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,018,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,259,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,694,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,797,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,378,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,325,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,112,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,928,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,854,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,550,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,602,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,162,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,088,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,559,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,704,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,714,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,179,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,813,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,871,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$786,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,705,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$445,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$754,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$491,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$437,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$727,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,052,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,233,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,207,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,324,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,370,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,720,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,641,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,856,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,751,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,255,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,581,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,704,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,652,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,295,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,909,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,684,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,186,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,598,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,081,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,520,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,921,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,186,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,526,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,742,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,078,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,223,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,913,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,786,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,293,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,217,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,660,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,835,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,339,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,153,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,713,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,880,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,331,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,863,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,225,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,214,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,593,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,422,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,817,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,287,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,601,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,517,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$15,753,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,358,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$18,126,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$13,446,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,106,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,880,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,470,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,330,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,598,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:



(A) New budget authority, -\$10,989,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,362,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,255,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,849,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,141,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,569,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,933,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,521,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,095,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$91,796,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,892,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,602,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,748,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,508,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,190,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$77,995,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,950,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$65,076,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,895,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,694,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,483,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,617,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,481,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,074,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,714,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,044,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,948,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,741,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,365,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,626,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,170,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,983,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,240,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,842,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,353,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$9,558,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,487,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,386,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,556,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,090,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,673,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,745,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,857,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,767,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,077,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,805,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,953,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,809,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,920,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$89,295,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,090,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,404,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,305,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,129,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,922,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$82,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,350,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$83,539,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,279,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$85,843,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,641,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,897,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,977,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$88,522,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,459,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$89,186,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,216,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$90,080,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$579,328,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$551,277,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$564,387,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$570,419,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$552,405,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$541,949,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$512,289,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$518,445,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$528,560,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$533,688,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$547,998,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$549,687,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$571,335,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$569,207,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,923,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$591,171,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$618,119,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$613,682,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,810,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$626,774,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$593,830,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$593,567,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$652,984,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$652,740,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$692,126,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$691,917,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$739,367,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$739,161,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$826,276,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$826,057,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$845,800,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$845,593,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$850,393,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$850,177,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$916,244,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$916,009,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$988,183,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$987,942,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,053,671,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,053,435,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$491,789,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$477,428,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$464,425,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$454,786,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$475,015,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$464,925,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,414,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$475,140,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$492,453,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$489,299,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$475,767,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$468,217,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,425,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$471,370,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$493,048,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$480,920,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,057,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$496,505,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$511,675,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$505,382,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.  
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,704,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$178,038,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,507,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$190,235,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,930,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$193,931,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,751,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$197,856,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$215,442,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$213,337,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$212,567,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$210,444,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,943,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$207,908,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,991,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$225,820,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$234,947,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$232,660,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,718,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$241,501,000,000.  
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,367,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,079,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$58,245,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$58,867,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,720,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,036,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,054,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$60,946,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,092,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,925,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,671,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,462,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,285,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$65,043,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,947,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,498,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,907,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,200,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,270,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,722,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,564,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,091,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,948,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,314,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,557,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,303,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,386,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,190,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$23,127,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$23,013,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,420,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,057,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,351,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,168,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,246,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,060,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,083,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,917,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,855,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,722,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$376,842,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$376,842,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$409,185,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$409,185,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$450,859,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$450,859,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$493,778,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$493,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$531,929,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$531,929,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$565,282,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$565,282,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$589,292,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$589,292,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$607,012,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$607,012,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$620,536,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$620,536,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$623,786,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$623,911,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$44,505,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$23,272,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,219,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$34,499,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$45,246,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$40,640,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$48,056,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$44,164,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,544,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$47,877,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,326,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$49,819,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$53,659,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$51,411,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,439,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$53,060,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$51,908,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$52,127,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,254,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$53,919,000,000.  
(20) Government-wide savings and adjustments (930):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$34,145,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$2,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,555,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$2,528,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$67,381,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$47,665,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$120,155,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$97,069,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$153,376,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$137,459,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$174,438,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$159,489,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$194,373,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$179,541,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$193,336,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$187,355,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$246,573,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$223,016,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$258,801,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$240,977,000,000.  
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,212,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$83,212,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,409,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$86,409,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,316,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$86,316,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,347,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$90,347,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,573,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$93,573,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,001,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$100,001,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$105,371,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$105,371,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$115,139,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$115,139,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$117,033,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$117,033,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$127,808,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$127,808,000,000.  
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Glob-  
al War on Terrorism (970):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$86,591,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,781,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,748,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,076,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$26,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$18,768,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$13,799,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$11,957,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$4,171,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,160,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$0.  
(B) Outlays, \$165,000,000.  
(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$909,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$740,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$931,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$837,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$956,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$895,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$979,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$944,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,004,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$968,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,030,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$993,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,056,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,018,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,083,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,045,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,112,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,070,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,140,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,099,000,000.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

##### SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR RECONCILIATION.—Not later than October 6, 2017, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations on changes in laws within their jurisdictions to the Committee on the Budget that would achieve the specified reduction in the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to

reduce the deficit by \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$14,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$45,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$32,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$52,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

### TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

#### Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

#### SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 con-

secutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) LIMITATION.—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

#### SEC. 302. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

#### SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in

mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading—

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) VETERANS.—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

#### SEC. 305. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

#### SEC. 306. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office

provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

**SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.**

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives or the Senate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means—

(A) in the Senate, a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(I) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(II) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(B) in the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

**SEC. 308. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.**

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 309. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President’s annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

**SEC. 310. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.**

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

**SEC. 311. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.**

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 312. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.**

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

**Subtitle B—Other Provisions****SEC. 321. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 322. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

- (1) apply while that measure is under consideration;
- (2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and
- (3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 301 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

**SEC. 323. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 325. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.**

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

- (1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;
- (2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or
- (3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

**SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title and title II—

- (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and
- (2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

**TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES****SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels established in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a Federally-chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

(1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;

(2) sets user fees to finance its operations;

(3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;

(4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and

(5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

**SEC. 402. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 403. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.**

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 405. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

**TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES****SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) In fiscal year 2017, the Federal Government will collect approximately \$3.3 trillion in taxes, but spend more than \$4.0 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 15 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of fiscal year 2016, the national debt of the United States was more than \$19.5 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a constitutional convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

(4) As of the spring of 2016, 46 States have requirements to annually balance their respective budgets.

(5) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Currently in the 115th Congress, 8 joint resolutions proposing a balanced budget amendment have been introduced.

(6) In the 111th Congress, the House considered H. J. Res. 2, sponsored by Representative Robert W. Goodlatte of Virginia. Although it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(7) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed to pass by one vote in the United States Senate.

(8) Five States, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Arizona, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which seeks to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget through an Article V convention by April 12, 2021.

(b) **POLICY ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

**SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.**

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should enact legislation that reforms the congressional budget process to—

(1) reassert congressional control over the budget process by reorienting the Views and Estimates that committees submit to the Committee on the Budget, as required under 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to emphasize congressional rather than executive branch priorities;

(2) strengthen enforcement of budgetary rules and requirements by—

(A) enabling Members of the House of Representatives to enforce budget requirements in a manner that does not jeopardize the ability of the majority to work its will on legislation; and

(B) permitting members of Congress to determine whether emergency-designated appropriations are for unanticipated situations that pose a threat to life, property, or national security;

(3) increase control over the costs of Federal activities by—

(A) incorporating debt service costs into cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office;

(B) establishing a process for setting limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President;

(C) transitioning to fair-value accounting;

(D) budgeting for Federal insurance programs on an accrual basis; and

(E) developing and implementing a regulatory budget as provided in section 503;

(4) achieve greater control over mandatory spending by reforming reconciliation procedures and requirements to ensure they are transparent, objectively applied, and maximize opportunities for deficit reduction;

(5) increase the efficiency of the congressional budget process by—

(A) realigning the budget cycle with the calendar year and the congressional calendar;

(B) simplifying the procedures by which the Committee on Appropriations adjusts its section 302(b) suballocations to ensure they are consistent with the Committee's overall section 302(a) allocation; and

(C) increasing congressional accountability for budget decisions;

(6) improve the transparency of the Federal Government's obligations by—

(A) modifying the content of the budget resolution to reflect the budgetary decisions that Congress actually makes and enforces;

(B) requiring the Comptroller General to periodically report to Congress on the consolidated financial report of the Federal Government; and

(C) restructuring the baseline, as set forth in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to treat mandatory spending and revenue on a comparable basis; and

(7) achieve control over long-term budget obligations by—

(A) establishing declining limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President; and

(B) codifying limits on the amount legislation can increase the deficit beyond the ten fiscal-year period of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

**SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Federal regulations are estimated to cost \$1.9 trillion per year or approximately \$15,000 per household. Such costs exceed 10 percent of the Gross Domestic Product of the United States.

(2) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) retards job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from economic recession and harming American households;

(B) operates as a regressive tax on poor and lower-income households;

(C) displaces workers into long-term unemployment or lower-paying jobs;

(D) adversely affects small businesses, the primary source of new jobs; and

(E) impedes the economic growth necessary to provide sufficient funds to meet vital commitments and reduce the Federal debt.

(3) Federal agencies do not systematically analyze both the costs and benefits of new regulations or identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

(4) Agencies too often impose costly regulations without relying on sound science, through the use of agency guidance, judicial consent decrees, and settlement agreements, and through the abuse of high interim compliance costs imposed on regulated entities that bring legal challenges against newly promulgated regulations.

(5) Congress lacks an effective mechanism to manage the level of new Federal regulatory costs imposed each year. Other nations, meanwhile, have successfully implemented the use of regulatory budgeting to control excess regulation and regulatory costs.

(6) Significant steps have been taken already by President Trump and the 115th Congress, including the imposition of a regulatory pay-as-you-go regimen for new and revised regulations by the Trump Administration and the enactment of 14 measures under the Congressional Review Act that repealed regulations promulgated in the final 60 legislative days of the 114th Congress.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with the public, consider legislation that—

(1) requires the President's budget submission to include an analysis of the costs of complying with current and proposed regulations;

(2) builds the institutional capacity of the Congressional Budget Office to develop a regulatory baseline and estimate regulatory costs;

(3) codifies the Trump Administration's regulatory pay-as-you-go requirements, which require agencies to offset the costs of new or revised regulations with the repeal or modification of existing regulations; and

(4) requires Federal agencies to give notice and allow for comments on proposed guidance documents.

**SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Article I of the Constitution vests all legislative power in Congress.

(2) Central to the legislative powers of Congress is the authorization of appropriations necessary to execute the laws that establish agencies and programs and impose obligations.

(3) Clause 2 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures that provide appropriations for unauthorized programs.

(4) In fiscal year 2016, more than \$310 billion was appropriated for unauthorized programs, spanning 256 separate laws.

(5) Agencies such as the Department of State have not been authorized for 15 years.

(6) The House adopted a requirement for the 115th Congress, as part of H. Res. 5, that requires each standing committee of the House to adopt an authorization and oversight plan that enumerates all unauthorized programs and agencies within its jurisdiction that received funding in the prior year, among other oversight requirements.

(b) **POLICY ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**—In the House, it is the policy of this concurrent resolution that legislation should be enacted that—

(1) establishes a schedule for reauthorizing all Federal programs on a staggered five-year basis together with declining spending targets for each year a program is not reauthorized according to such schedule;

(2) prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures in the House that provide appropriations in excess of spending targets specified for such measures and ensures that such rule should be strictly enforced; and

(3) limits funding for non-defense or non-security-related Federal programs that are not reauthorized according to the schedule described in paragraph (1).

**SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Current accounting methods fail to capture and present in a compelling manner the full scope of the Federal Government and its fiscal condition.

(2) Most fiscal analyses produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are conducted over a 10-fiscal year period. The use of generational accounting or a longer time horizon would provide a more complete picture of the Federal Government's fiscal condition.

(3) The Federal budget currently accounts for most programs on a cash accounting basis, which records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received. However, it accounts for loan and loan guarantee programs on an accrual basis, which records revenue when earned and expenses when incurred.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has advised that accrual accounting may be



more accurate than cash accounting in estimating the Federal Government's liabilities for insurance and other programs.

(5) Accrual accounting under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) understates the risk and thus the true cost of some Federal programs, including loans and loan guarantees.

(6) Fair-value accounting better reflects the risk associated with Federal loan and loan guarantee programs by using a market based discount rate. CBO, for example, uses fair-value accounting to measure the cost of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(7) In comparing fair-value accounting to FCRA, CBO has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance".

(8) The Department of the Treasury, when reporting the principal financial statements of the United States entitled *Balance Sheet and Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position*, may omit some of the largest projected Federal Government expenses, including social insurance programs. The projected expenses of these programs are reported by the Department in its *Statements of Social Insurance and Changes in Social Insurance Amounts*.

(9) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of Federal credit programs on a fair-value basis to fully capture the risk associated with these programs.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with CBO and other appropriate stakeholders, reform government-wide budget and accounting practices so Members and the public can better understand the fiscal condition of the United States and the best options to improve it. Such reforms may include the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance analysis by considering the Nation's fiscal condition comprehensively, over an extended time period, and how it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair-value accounting to better capture market risk.

**SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1965, the President's Commission on Budget Concepts made a series of recommendations that were adopted and continue to provide the foundation for the Federal budget process.

(2) Over the ensuing 52 years, the Federal budget process has undergone major transformations, including the following:

(A) Congress asserted its Article I "power of the purse" through the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the form of a congressional budget process predicated on the adoption of an annual budget resolution setting forth its priorities independent of the executive branch.

(B) Congress and the President have periodically augmented the President's budget submission and the budget resolution by establishing statutory budget rules and limits enforced through sequestration.

(C) The share of Federal spending that is not controlled through the annual appropriations process has ballooned from 32 percent of total Federal spending in 1967 to 69 percent in 2016.

(D) Activities previously considered the exclusive domain of the Federal Government have been fully commercialized, contracted out to the private sector, financed through third party arrangements, or devolved to State and local governments.

(E) Key functions of the Federal Government are now funded through user fees rather than general revenue, often shielding them from congressional control and oversight.

(F) The Credit Reform Act of 1990 placed Federal loans and loan guarantees on an accrual basis.

(G) Increasing shares of the economy are directed towards compliance with Federal regulations, which are not subject to the limitations applicable to Federal spending.

(b) **POLICY ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that legislation should be enacted that establishes a Commission on Budget Concepts to review and revise budget concepts and make recommendations to create a more transparent Federal budget process.

**SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.**

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should—

(1) adopt an annual budget resolution before spending and tax legislation is considered in either House of Congress;

(2) assess measures for timely compliance with budget rules in the House;

(3) pass legislation to strengthen enforcement of the budget resolution;

(4) comply with the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(5) prevent the use of accounting gimmicks to offset higher spending;

(6) modify scoring conventions to encourage the commercialization of Federal Government activities that can best be provided by the private sector; and

(7) discourage the use of savings identified in the budget resolution as offsets for spending or tax legislation.

**SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office defines improper payments as any reported payment that should not have been made or was made in an incorrect amount.

(2) Improper payments totaled \$1.2 trillion between fiscal years 2003 and 2016 with a reported Federal Government-wide error rate of 5.1 percent in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Improper payments increased from \$107 billion in 2012 to \$144 billion in 2016.

(4) The Earned Income Tax Credit, Medicare, and Medicaid account for 78 percent of total improper payments, with error rates of 24 percent, 11 percent, and 10.5 percent, respectively.

(5) Eight agencies did not report payment estimates for 18 programs that the Comptroller General deems susceptible to significant improper payments.

(b) **POLICY ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that an independent commission should be established with the goal of finding tangible solutions to reduce total improper payments by 50 percent within the next 5 years. The commission should also develop a more-stringent system of agency oversight to achieve this goal.

**SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Many Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect

and spend fees and other offsetting collections.

(2) The Office of Management and Budget estimates the total amount of offsetting fees and collections to be \$513 billion in fiscal year 2017.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable Government.

(b) **POLICY ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should reassert its constitutional prerogative to control Federal spending and exercise rigorous oversight over Federal agencies. Congress should subject all fees paid by the public to Federal agencies to annual appropriations or authorizing legislation and a share of these proceeds should be reserved for taxpayers in the form of deficit reduction.

**SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Patient-centered health care increases access to quality care for all Americans, regardless of age, income, or health status.

(2) States are best equipped to respond to the needs of their unique communities.

(3) The current legal framework encourages frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits that increase health care costs.

(b) **POLICY ON HEALTH CARE REGULATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the American health care system should encourage research, development, and innovation in the medical sector, rather than stymie growth through over-regulation;

(2) States should determine the parameters of acceptable private insurance plans based on the needs of their populations and retain control over other health care coverage standards;

(3) reforms should protect patients with pre-existing conditions, reward those who maintain continuous health coverage, and create greater parity between benefits offered through employers and those offered independently;

(4) States should have greater flexibility in designing their Medicaid program and State Children's Health Insurance Program;

(5) medical malpractice reform should emphasize compliance with best practice guidelines, while continuing to protect patients' interests; and

(6) States should have the flexibility to implement medical liability policies to best suit their needs.

**SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 57 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Congress address Medicare's long-term financial challenges. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement more pronounced. The current challenges that Congress will need to address include—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2029 and unable to pay the scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase more than 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) due to extended life spans, enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program five decades ago;

(D) notwithstanding the program's trust fund arrangement, current workers' payroll tax contributions pay for current Medicare beneficiaries instead of being set aside for their own future use;

(E) the number of workers supporting each beneficiary continues to fall; in 1965, the ratio was 4.5 workers per beneficiary, and by 2030, the ratio will be only 2.4 workers per beneficiary;

(F) the average Medicare beneficiary receives about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every dollar paid into the program;

(G) Medicare is growing faster than the economy, with a projected growth rate of 7.2 percent per year on average through 2026, peaking in 2026 at 9.2 percent; and

(H) by 2027, Medicare spending will reach more than \$1.4 trillion, more than double the 2016 spending level of \$692 billion.

(3) Failing to address the impending insolvency of Medicare will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with having to pay for these unsustainable spending levels.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to save Medicare for those in or near retirement and to strengthen the program's solvency for future beneficiaries.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This concurrent resolution assumes transition to an improved Medicare program that ensures—

(1) Medicare is preserved for current and future beneficiaries;

(2) future Medicare beneficiaries may select from competing guaranteed health coverage options a plan that best suits their needs;

(3) traditional fee-for-service Medicare remains a plan option;

(4) Medicare provides additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and becomes solvent over the long term.

**SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMBATING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 91 Americans die each day from an opioid overdose.

(2) Nearly half of all opioid overdose deaths involve a prescription opioid.

(3) Since 1999, the number of prescription opioids sold in the U.S. has nearly quadrupled.

(4) Since 1999, the number of deaths from prescription opioids has more than quadrupled.

(5) The CDC asserts that improving opioid prescribing practices will reduce exposure to opioids, prevent abuse, and stop addiction.

(6) The CDC has found that individuals in rural counties are almost twice as likely to overdose on prescription painkillers as those in urban areas.

(7) According to the CDC, nearly 7,000 people are treated in emergency rooms every day for using opioids in a non-approved manner.

(8) The 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act were signed into law in the 114th Congress in an overwhelming display of congressional and executive branch support in the fight against the opioid epidemic.

(9) Bipartisan efforts to eliminate opioid abuse and provide relief from addiction for all Americans should continue.

(b) **POLICY ON OPIOID ABUSE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) combating opioid abuse using available budgetary resources remains a high priority;

(2) the House, in a bipartisan manner, should continue to examine the Federal response to the opioid abuse epidemic and support essential activities to reduce and prevent substance abuse;

(3) the House should continue to support initiatives included in the 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act;

(4) the House should continue its oversight efforts, particularly ongoing investigations conducted by the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, to ensure that taxpayer dollars intended to combat opioid abuse are spent appropriately and efficiently; and

(5) the House should collaborate with State, local, and tribal entities to develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the opioid addiction crisis.

**SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) is a means-tested program that provides health insurance coverage to low-income children and pregnant women who do not qualify for Medicaid based on income.

(2) SCHIP eligibility varies by State, as States decide the income upper limit for beneficiaries; the current upper limit varies from 175 percent of the Federal poverty level to 405 percent of the Federal poverty level.

(3) SCHIP covered on average 6.3 million people monthly in fiscal year 2017.

(4) The average cost of a child enrolled in SCHIP to the Federal Government was approximately \$2,300 in fiscal year 2017, compared to approximately \$1,910 for a child enrolled in Medicaid.

(5) The Federal spending allotment for SCHIP will expire at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(6) The Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission recommends an extension of Federal SCHIP funding, and warns that all States are projected to exhaust their Federal SCHIP funds during fiscal year 2018.

(7) SCHIP should be preserved to assist the Nation's vulnerable children.

(b) **POLICY ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should work in a bipartisan manner to reauthorize SCHIP funding;

(2) the authorizing committees should consider establishing a Federal upper limit for SCHIP eligibility, rather than providing open-ended access to the program for those at higher income levels;

(3) the House should target resources designated for SCHIP toward those most in need of Federal assistance; and

(4) the House should require greater reporting by States of SCHIP data in order to better structure the program to meet beneficiaries' needs.

**SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY, AND INNOVATION.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world for decades.

(2) The history of scientific discovery and medical breakthroughs in the United States is extensive, including the creation of the polio vaccine, the first genetic mapping, and the invention of the implantable cardiac pacemaker.

(3) Reuters ranks the United States Health and Human Services Laboratories as first in

the world for innovation on its 2017 list of the Top 25 Global Innovators.

(4) The United States leads the world in the production of medical devices, and the United States medical device market accounts for approximately 45 percent of the global market.

(5) The United States remains a global leader in pharmaceutical research and development investment, has produced more than half of the world's new molecules in the past decade, and represents the world's largest pharmaceutical market, which is triple the size of the nearest rival, China.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the Federal Government should foster investment in health care innovation and maintain the Nation's world leadership status in medical science by encouraging competition;

(2) the House should continue to support the critical work of medical innovators throughout the country through continued funding for agencies, including the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to conduct life-saving research and development; and

(3) the Federal Government should unleash the power of private-sector medical innovation by removing regulatory obstacles that impede the adoption of new medical technology and pharmaceuticals.

**SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Constitution requires the Federal Government to provide for the common defense. As such, the Nation must prioritize its ability to respond rapidly and effectively to a public health crisis or bioterrorism threat.

(2) There is a persistent threat of bioterrorism against American lives.

(3) Naturally-occurring public health threats can spread through the transmission of communicable diseases during international trade and travel.

(4) As of April 3, 2016, the World Health Organization reported nearly 29,000 cases of the Ebola virus worldwide, including 4 instances in the U.S.

(5) As of July 12, 2017, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that the current Zika epidemic resulted in over 5,000 cases of the Zika virus within the United States, with nearly 37,000 more cases reported in U.S. territories.

(6) Preventing the spread of disease to Americans requires halting threats before they breach the U.S. border.

(7) The United States is a leader in global public health assistance and orchestrates international responses to health crises.

(b) **POLICY ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should continue to fund activities of the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority to develop and stockpile medical countermeasures to infectious diseases and chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents;

(2) the House should, within available budgetary resources, provide continued support for research, prevention, and public health preparedness programs;

(3) the Federal Government should encourage private-sector development of critical vaccines and other medical countermeasures to emerging public health threats; and

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State should collaborate on

global health preparedness initiatives to prevent overlap and promote responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources.

**SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 60 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg of the “three-legged stool” of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans’ retirement security.

(3) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. The financial condition of Social Security and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced each year without reform. For example—

(A) in 2028, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) with the exhaustion of both the Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Fund in 2035, benefits will be cut by as much as 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(4) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$1.3 trillion over the next 10 years.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to CBO, between 1970 and 2015 the number of disabled workers and their dependent family members receiving disability benefits has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. CBO also attributes program growth to changes in demographics and the composition of the labor force as well as Federal policies.

(6) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission”, which helped address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(7) Americans deserve action by the President and Congress to preserve and strengthen Social Security to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should work in a bipartisan manner to make Social Security solvent on a sustainable basis. This concurrent resolution assumes, under a reform trigger, that—

(1) if in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance

and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and any recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit its recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House should introduce the President’s legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction should report a bill, which the House or Senate should consider under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on and provide certainty for future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2028 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This concurrent resolution assumes reform that—

(1) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work;

(2) ensures benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(3) prevents a 7 percent across-the-board benefit cut; and

(4) improves the Disability Insurance program.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that any legislation the House considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance Trust Fund must also improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

**SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Medicaid is a Federal-State program that provides health care coverage for impoverished Americans.

(2) Medicaid serves four major population categories: the elderly, the blind and disabled, children, and adults.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office projects the average monthly enrollment in Medicaid for fiscal year 2018 to be 78 million people.

(4) Of this 78 million people, 27 million – more than one third of the enrollees – are non-elderly, non-disabled adults.

(5) Medicaid continues to grow at an unsustainable rate, and will cost approximately one trillion dollars per year within the decade, between Federal and State spending.

(6) Congress has a responsibility to preserve limited Medicaid resources for America’s most vulnerable – those who cannot provide for themselves.

(7) Forbes reported last year on a first-of-its-kind study conducted by the Foundation for Government Accountability. It analyzed data from the State of Kansas, which dem-

onstrates that work requirements have led to greater employment, higher incomes, and less poverty.

(8) The State of Maine implemented work requirements in 2014, and saw incomes rise for able-bodied welfare recipients by an average of 114 percent within a year.

(9) Work is a valuable source of human dignity, and work requirements help lift Americans out of poverty by incentivizing self-reliance.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that encourages able-bodied, non-elderly, non-pregnant adults without dependents to work, actively seek work, participate in a job-training program, or do community service, in order to receive Medicaid;

(2) Medicaid work requirements legislation could include 30 hours per week of work, of which 20 of those hours should be spent in the core activities of: public or private sector employment, work experience, on-the-job training, job-search or job-readiness assistance program participation, community service, or vocational training and education;

(3) States should be given flexibility to determine the parameters of qualifying program participation and work-equivalent experience;

(4) States should perform regular case checks to ensure taxpayer dollars are appropriately spent; and

(5) the Government Accountability Office or the Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General should conduct annual audits of State Medicaid programs to ensure proper reporting and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

**SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON WELFARE REFORM AND SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM WORK REQUIREMENTS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has grown from 17 million Americans in 2001 to 44 million in 2016.

(2) The work support role of SNAP has declined, and the program increasingly serves as a replacement to work.

(3) Work requirements were key to the success of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (Public Law 104-193), which led to a two-thirds reduction in welfare case-loads, a reduction in child poverty, and an increase in work participation. The successful 1996 welfare reform law provides a model for improving work requirements in other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON WELFARE REFORM AND SNAP WORK REQUIREMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should reward work, provide tools to escape poverty, and expect work-capable adults to work or prepare for work in exchange for welfare benefits; and

(2) SNAP should be reformed to improve work requirements to help more people escape poverty and move up the economic ladder.

**SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Spending on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has almost quadrupled since 2001.

(2) Various factors are driving this growth, but one major reason is that while States have the responsibility of administering the program, they have little incentive to ensure it is well run.

(3) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic President reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the 5 years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This bipartisan success offers a model for improving other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SNAP.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that SNAP should be reformed to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility for struggling Americans on the road to personal and financial independence. Based on the successful welfare reforms of the 1990s, these proposals would improve work requirements and provide flexible funding for States to help those most in need find gainful employment, escape poverty, and move up the economic ladder.

**SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.**

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated, high-skilled workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Average published tuition and fees have increased consistently above the rate of inflation across all types of colleges and universities.

(3) With an outstanding student loan portfolio of \$1.3 trillion, the Federal Government is the largest education lender to undergraduate and graduate students, parents, and other guarantors.

(4) Students who do not complete their college degree are at a greater risk of defaulting on their loans than those who complete their degree.

(5) Participation in Federal income-driven repayment plans is rising, in terms of the percent of both borrowers and loan dollars, according to the Government Accountability Office. Because these plans offer loan balance forgiveness after a repayment period, this increased use portends higher projected costs to taxpayers.

(b) **POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to promote college affordability, access, and success by—

(1) reserving Federal financial aid for those most in need and streamlining grant and loan aid programs to help students and families more easily assess their options for financing postsecondary education; and

(2) removing regulatory barriers to reduce costs, increase access, and allow for innovative teaching models.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 7.5 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with skilled personnel.

(3) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce successfully consolidated 15 workforce development programs when Congress enacted the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to build on the success of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal workforce development programs; and

(2) empowering States with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce.

**SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) In 1995, fire activities made up 16 percent of the United States Forest Service's (USFS) annual appropriated budget. Since 2015, more than 50 percent has now been dedicated to wildfire.

(2) Wildland fire suppression activities are currently funded entirely within the USFS budget, based on a 10-year rolling average. Using this model, the agency must average firefighting costs from the past 10 years to predict and request costs for the next year. When the average was stable, the agency was able to use this model to budget consistently for the annual costs associated with wildland fire suppression.

(3) Over the last few decades, wildland fire suppression costs have increased as fire seasons have grown longer and the frequency, size, and severity of wildland fires has increased.

(4) The six worst fire seasons since 1960 have all occurred since 2000. Since 2000, many western states have experienced the largest wildfires in their State's history. In 2016 alone, there were a recorded 67,595 fires and a total of over 5.5 million acres burned. The suppression costs to USFS and other Federal agencies for 2016 totaled over \$1.9 billion dollars.

(5) As wildfire costs continue to increase, funding levels for USFS wildfire suppression activities will also continue to constrict funding levels for other necessary USFS forest management activities focused on land management and wildfire prevention.

(b) **POLICY ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress, in coordination with the Administration, should develop both a long-term funding mechanism that would allow supplemental wildfire suppression funding and reforms on reducing hazardous fuel loads on Federal forests and lands that could decrease wildfires.

**SEC. 522. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For years there have been serious concerns regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care.

(2) Since 2003, VA disability compensation and health care have been added to the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) "high-risk" list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, lack of a "unified vision, strategy, or set of goals to guide their outcomes," and the inability to ensure allocated resources are used in a cost-effective and efficient way to improve veterans' health care access.

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to America's veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the agency has mismanaged these resources, resulting in proven adverse effects on veterans and their families.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should require the VA to conduct an audit of its programs named on GAO's "high-risk" list and report its findings to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives.

**SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON MOVING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE ON BUDGET.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's Commission on Budget Concepts recommends that the budget should, as a general rule, be comprehensive of the full range of Federal activity.

(2) The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-239) moved the United States Postal Service (USPS) off budget and exempted it from sequestration.

(3) The USPS has a direct effect on the fiscal posture of the Federal Government, through—

(A) the receipt of direct appropriations of \$35 million in fiscal year 2017;

(B) congressional mandates such as requirements for mail delivery service schedules;

(C) incurring \$15 billion in debt from the Treasury, the maximum permitted by law;

(D) continued operating deficits since 2007;

(E) defaulting on its statutory obligation to prefund health care benefits for future retirees; and

(F) carrying \$119 billion in total unfunded liabilities with no foreseeable pathway of funding these liabilities under current law.

(b) **POLICY ON MOVING THE USPS ON BUDGET.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that all receipts and disbursements of the USPS should be included in the congressional budget and the budget of the Federal Government.

**SEC. 524. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE JUDGMENT FUND.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Judgment Fund (Fund), established in 1956, was created to pay judgments and settlements of lawsuits against the Federal Government.

(2) As a result of the Fund's design, it is ripe for executive branch exploitation. The Obama Administration used the Fund to make billions of dollars in payments to Federal agencies and foreign entities. For example—

(A) on January 17, 2016, the State Department announced the Federal Government agreed to pay the Iranian government \$1.7 billion to settle a case related to the sale of military equipment prior to the Iranian revolution, of which \$1.3 billion was sourced through the Fund, without prior congressional notification; the Obama Administration's use of the Fund to make this and other payments raises serious concerns by sidestepping Congress; and

(B) in 2016, the Department of Health and Human Services announced its intentions to use the Fund for settlements with health insurers who sued the Federal Government over the loss of funds for risk corridors under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(3) Failing to address the lack of oversight over the Fund annually costs taxpayers billions of dollars, as payments exceeded \$4.6 billion in 2016 and more than \$26 billion in the preceding 10 year period.

(b) **POLICY ON JUDGMENT FUND.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation that reclaims Congress's power of the purse over the Fund. Such legislation should—

(1) prohibit interest payments paid from the Fund for accounts or assets frozen by the Federal Government and listed on—

(A) the Sanctions Programs list of the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of Treasury; or

(B) Sponsors of Terrorism list of the Department of State;

(2) amend sections 2414 and 1304 of titles 28 and 31, United States Code, respectively, to—

(A) provide a clear definition and explanation of a “foreign court or tribunal”; and

(B) require congressional notification whenever the Fund makes a settlement or court ordered lump sum or aggregated payment exceeding \$500 million; and

(3) require legislative action to approve payments from the Fund in excess of a specified threshold, increase transparency, and require Federal agencies to reimburse the Fund over a fixed time period.

**SEC. 525. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that significant savings were achieved by the House by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources, and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources, including printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent;

(2) the House should review policies and procedures for the acquisition of goods and services to eliminate unnecessary spending;

(3) the Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to services provided to Members and committees of the House, and identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room;

(4) no taxpayer funds should be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress; and

(5) retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

**SEC. 526. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.**

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all 3 counts: it is complex, unfair, and inefficient. The tax code’s complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Standard economic theory holds that high marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(3) Roughly half of United States active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a “pass-through” basis, meaning the income is taxed at individual rates rather than corporate rates. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the highest Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(4) The top United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) is slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages, discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(5) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains eco-

nomical growth and job creation. The United States tax rate differential fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate practices intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(6) The “world-wide” structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors that have more competitive international tax systems.

(7) Reforming the tax code would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and significantly reduce tax avoidance.

(8) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, consumers in higher prices, and investors in diminished returns.

(9) Increasing taxes to raise revenue and meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans’ ability to save for their children’s education and retirement.

(10) Closing special preference carve outs in our tax code to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(11) Tax reform should curb or eliminate tax breaks and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board, not to fund more wasteful Federal Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(12) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform, including a broader tax base and lower tax rates, would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which would have a positive impact on total national output.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider comprehensive tax reform legislation that promotes economic growth, creates American jobs, increases wages, and benefits American consumers, investors, and workers by—

(1) simplifying the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reducing the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowering tax rates for individuals and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repealing the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reducing the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitioning the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-339.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

**AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA**

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) to offer the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.**

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this concurrent resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 and 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

**TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING**

Sec. 1. Direct spending.

**TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance Appropriations.

Sec. 302. Point of order against funding for certain immigration enforcement efforts.

**TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**

**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,566,010,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,231,053,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,754,112,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,852,015,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,011,871,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$4,197,338,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,865,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$4,405,818,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$4,617,110,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026: \$4,840,032,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027: \$5,069,484,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2017: \$0.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$497,484,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$920,604,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$901,439,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$951,960,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$1,014,422,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$977,949,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$943,390,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$994,932,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026: \$1,050,654,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027: \$1,111,097,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

- Fiscal year 2017: \$3,558,164,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,809,501,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,889,380,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$4,085,946,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,242,299,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,524,849,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,667,232,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,840,870,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,123,649,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,359,292,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,604,559,000,000.  
 (3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,411,968,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,801,027,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,859,325,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,031,449,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,190,238,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,474,256,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,610,999,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,770,214,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,057,717,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,301,376,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,545,750,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: -\$845,569,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$569,974,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$569,974,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$179,434,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$178,367,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$276,918,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$315,134,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$364,396,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$440,607,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$461,344,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$476,266,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,611,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$21,412,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,584,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,734,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,490,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$22,950,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,489,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,111,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$24,809,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$26,305,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$15,093,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,752,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,985,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,322,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,693,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,794,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$18,483,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,300,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,195,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$21,166,000,000.

#### SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,810,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$597,390,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,786,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$573,048,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$581,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$575,522,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,087,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$582,924,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$609,309,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$594,652,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,521,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$611,949,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$637,690,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$620,850,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$655,897,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$632,247,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$670,145,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$651,864,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$680,394,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$663,759,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$690,786,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$674,679,000,000.  
 (2) International Affairs (150):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,918,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,533,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,508,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,831,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,425,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$55,384,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,369,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$59,870,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, 69,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,106,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,547,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,255,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,986,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$73,094,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,697,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,618,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,476,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$80,127,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,702,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$83,952,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,835,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$87,887,000,000.  
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$30,853,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,239,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,151,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,678,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,747,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,880,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,204,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,117,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,567,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,522,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,123,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,442,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,766,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,120,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,490,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,818,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,349,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,198,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,390,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,003,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,017,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,581,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$54,382,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,900,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$56,610,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$58,813,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,511,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$60,658,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,073,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$62,314,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,918,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$62,631,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,290,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$63,142,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,119,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$64,100,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,437,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$67,375,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,547,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,851,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,010,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,495,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$122,147,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$125,237,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$124,382,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$128,313,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$127,136,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,915,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$68,294,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,613,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$70,715,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,531,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$72,930,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$74,852,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,455,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,818,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,604,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78,839,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,820,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$81,015,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,930,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,001,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,023,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,713,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,735,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,240,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,298,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,479,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,431,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,832,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,437,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,941,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,610,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,178,000,000.



Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,068,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,514,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,832,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,180,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,105,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,475,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,938,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,328,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,759,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,274,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,131,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,689,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,724,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$11,883,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,714,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$13,516,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,953,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$12,786,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,781,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$15,622,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,145,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$16,679,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,608,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,099,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,576,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$17,836,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,416,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,772,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,478,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,628,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,730,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$94,107,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,383,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$199,409,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$201,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$200,565,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$196,098,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$202,143,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,000,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$203,522,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,935,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$205,038,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$171,562,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$179,442,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,521,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$181,132,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$173,548,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$183,231,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,584,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$185,116,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$175,633,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$187,060,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,950,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$100,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,864,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$79,569,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,802,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$53,477,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,662,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,469,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,830,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,390,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,016,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,481,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,242,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,662,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,177,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,888,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,250,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,244,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$41,353,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,235,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,428,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,792,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$264,242,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$298,769,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$295,251,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,530,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$168,879,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,656,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$172,182,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$188,094,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$182,789,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,237,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$192,067,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$204,174,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$200,177,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$210,915,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$207,028,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$216,669,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$212,774,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,127,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$218,112,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$228,312,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$224,320,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$548,466,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$548,998,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,564,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$585,289,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$613,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$612,402,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$659,060,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$646,374,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,535,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$683,765,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$726,450,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$721,843,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$765,397,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$761,755,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$807,017,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$802,573,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$852,005,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$846,941,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$897,043,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$891,673,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$943,870,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$938,235,000,000.  
 (12) Medicare (570):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,691,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$598,289,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$599,471,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$599,092,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$650,772,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$650,464,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$676,942,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$676,705,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$723,379,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$723,163,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$817,925,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$817,695,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$840,589,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$840,371,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$861,276,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$861,049,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$963,021,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$962,774,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,016,987,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,016,734,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,091,254,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,091,006,000,000.  
 (13) Income Security (600):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$522,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$512,949,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$574,926,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$554,174,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$641,400,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$624,323,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$691,701,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$675,708,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$737,828,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$721,824,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$785,273,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$775,704,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$819,551,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$807,162,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$855,396,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$837,727,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$904,334,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$887,787,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$947,417,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$937,276,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$995,029,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$984,004,000,000.  
 (14) Social Security (650):  
 Fiscal year 2017:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,132,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,155,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,621,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$39,621,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,402,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,402,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,861,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,861,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$50,700,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$50,700,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$54,722,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$54,722,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$59,082,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$59,082,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,228,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,228,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,774,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,774,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$75,499,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$75,499,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$81,931,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,931,000,000.  
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$175,596,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$178,660,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$185,736,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$183,609,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$204,230,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$199,677,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$213,730,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$209,577,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$223,712,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$219,141,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$243,263,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$238,540,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$242,677,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$238,676,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$241,394,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$237,627,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$261,285,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$257,403,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$271,033,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$266,912,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$281,497,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$277,377,000,000.  
(16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$64,048,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,167,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,673,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,686,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,260,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,774,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,134,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,886,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$72,276,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$75,047,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$74,994,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$76,549,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$77,448,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$77,463,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$80,013,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,824,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$82,656,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$81,269,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$91,519,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$90,803,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$95,033,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$93,445,000,000.  
(17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$25,587,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,332,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,239,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,023,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,092,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,670,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,024,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,373,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,752,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,095,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,512,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,804,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,231,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,369,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,813,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,195,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,559,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,041,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,384,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,873,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,207,000,000.  
(18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, \$358,153,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$358,153,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$379,086,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$379,086,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$408,318,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$408,318,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$444,136,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$444,136,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$482,207,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$482,207,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$518,277,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$518,277,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$554,698,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$554,698,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$588,258,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$588,258,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$621,248,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$621,248,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$654,736,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$654,736,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$682,812,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$682,937,000,000.  
(19) Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$886,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$515,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,852,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$16,580,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$9,233,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$9,714,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,552,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,804,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$156,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$223,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,215,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$1,084,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$291,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$200,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$168,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,018,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$971,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,690,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,565,000,000.  
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):  
Fiscal year 2017:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,167,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$83,167,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.

## TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

### SEC. 1. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 4.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget adopts former President Obama's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to expand eligibility, including for childless workers. Continues enhanced credits originally implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to target those most in need. This includes extending the Child and Dependent Care Credit and the American Opportunity Tax Credit through 2027.

(B) The People's Budget includes former President Obama's proposal to boost the Child Tax Credit maximum deduction to \$3,000. It makes key expansions permanent to protect 50 million Americans who would otherwise be at jeopardy for losing part or all of their EITC and CTC.

(C) The People's Budget creates a debt free college that provides Federal matching program to support state efforts to expand investment in higher education, bring down

costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt. The program would encourage innovation by states and colleges to improve efficiency and enable speedy and less-costly degree completion. By treating higher education as a public good worth investing in, we can once again make higher education accessible to all.

(D) The People's Budget allows students to refinance their student loans at low rates and allows private borrowers to shift to more affordable government loans. Allowing student borrowers to reduce the value of their debt will free up income for purchases and will create a job-creating ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

(E) The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are households with children, seniors and individuals with disabilities, but recent cuts lowered average benefits by \$216 in 2014. Providing families with basic food security through SNAP is one of the most effective ways the Federal Government can stimulate the economy.

(F) The People's Budget provides an additional \$10.8 billion for child nutrition programs including program expansion and improvements for summer meals; essential improvements and expansion funding for preschool nutrition including increases in meal reimbursements to fulfill the new meal pattern, an additional meal or snack for children in long-term care, and expanded program eligibility; and investments in school meals and school kitchens.

(G) The People's Budget replaces the 40 percent excise tax with a public option to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to offer a public insurance option within the health insurance marketplaces. This ensures choice, competition, and stability in coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the premium costs for Americans under the public option will be 7 to 8 percent lower than costs in private exchange plans. The repeal of the excise tax costs \$132 billion while savings from the public option are \$176 billion.

(H) The People's Budget continues funding for the entire CHIP program until 2020.

(I) The People's Budget protects States programs by fully retaining maintenance of effort requirements and eliminating any States ability to arbitrarily implement enrollment caps. Without action, Federal funding for CHIP will expire jeopardizing the health care coverage of more than 10 million children and pregnant women.

(J) The People's Budget permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Giving HHS the ability to negotiate prices, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, will save Medicare \$429 billion and will reduce costs for seniors.

(b) **NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.**—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 4.8 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 5.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment

benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years.

(B) The People's Budget also adopts former President Obama's reforms to improve solvencies and incentivize job training.

(C) The People's Budget improves the Affordable Care Act by repealing the excise tax on high-priced health plans. Proponents of the provision hoped that this tax would slow the rate of growth of health costs, while raising revenue. However, in an effort to avoid the tax, employers who traditionally offer excellent benefits have started offering less generous plans. This is an ineffective tool to bend the cost curve. Since the tax is attached to premiums instead of coverage it has the potential to hit plans it wasn't intended to impact.

(D) The People's Budget establishes a representative democracy that truly reflects the diversity and values of our nation by providing funding for the public financing of campaigns. This gives a voice to small donors that have been drowned out by dark money. Public financing keeps politicians accountable to the voters that elect them instead of to special interest money. In the era of the devastating Citizens United decision, big money has taken the reins of our election process. It is now more important than ever to provide candidates with effective alternatives to finance their campaigns.

(E) The People's Budget uses the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for Federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement, current underpricing of costs amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

(G) The People's Budget makes a down payment of \$1.9 trillion to help close the nation's infrastructure deficit while protecting against climate change and creating millions of living wage jobs. The budget also helps boost private financing for critical state and local projects by creating a public-private infrastructure bank. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimates that the United States will need to invest upwards of \$2 trillion above current levels over the next decade just to make required repairs to roads, bridges, water, and energy systems.

**TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT**

**SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report making a general appropriations or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Advance appropriations may be provided for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

**SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.**

It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment there- to or conference report thereon, that appro-

priates funds to implement Executive Order 13767, entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2017 and fiscal years 2018-2027".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to replace the reckless Republican budget that is being considered before this House.

Instead of a doomsday budget that presents a future where everything is bleak and opportunity is nonexistent, the Progressive Caucus is offering a budget that can prove that the future can be bright and prosperous.

The Republican budget sacrifices everything from public education to Social Security to Medicare and Medicaid. It does this for one reason and one reason only: to give the wealthiest few and the corporations more tax breaks and increase their standing and concentration of power and wealth in this country more than it is already.

It has been said over and over that the budget that we are presenting we feel does deal with the values of this country. It deals very directly with something that is important to this Nation, and that is the American people, the greatest resource that we have as a nation, and we see it day in and day out.

This budget invests in the American people. It invests in jobs, it invests in solid education, and it invests in the greater good.

This budget is not narrow, tilted to a few: the wealthiest and the corporations in this country. It deals with the totality of who the American people are: those who are struggling and need opportunity, those who are elderly and need the continued support of this Nation through Medicare and Social Security, those who are poor who need Medicaid and a good education system so their opportunity will be better in the future.

Our budget speaks to the values of the American people. Our budget speaks to the needs of the American people. Our budget speaks to a future that returns the values, to the American people, of opportunity, of hope, and of chance.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, even though I disagree heartily with the budgets advanced by

the Progressive Caucus, they do us an invaluable service in the budget debate by bringing into sharp relief the two very different visions of governance advanced by the two parties.

The Progressive budget is a sincere and bold document. Unfortunately, it is also wrong. It would hike taxes by \$10.1 trillion over the next 10 years relative to the Republican budget.

Now, think of every trillion dollars that we throw around here as \$8,000 from an average family, because that is what it comes to. So \$10.1 trillion in new taxes ultimately translates as \$81,000 from an average family over the next decade taken either as direct taxes or as tax-driven price increases or as lower wages or as lower earnings as businesses pass on their burdens to consumers or employers or investors. Remember, investors are largely your 401(k) or your pension plan.

It also runs up \$2.6 trillion more in debt than the Republican budget over the next 10 years. That means another \$21,000 of debt added to that family's obligations that they will have to pay as future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on their credit card statement this month. And they have got to pay that back before they pay back their credit card statement. The IRS can get very insistent that they do.

And don't believe for a moment that only the rich will pay these taxes. It turns out that the so-called rich people aren't rich and they aren't even people. Many are struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S, small businesses that create two-thirds of the jobs in our economy.

We are told: "Don't worry. We are using that money to create wealth and jobs." Well, the problem is government does not create jobs because it cannot create wealth. Government cannot inject a dollar into the economy until it has first taken that dollar out of the same economy.

As Bastiat warned, we see the job that government creates when it puts the dollar back in the economy. What we don't see as clearly is the job that is lost when government first takes that dollar out of the economy. We see those lost jobs as stagnating wages and workers giving up and leaving the job market, or as it is also known, the Obama economy.

Here is what government can do and what the Progressive and Democratic budgets propose. It can transfer jobs from the private sector to the public sector by taxing one and expanding the other. It can transfer jobs from one sector of the private market to another by taxing one and subsidizing the other. That is precisely the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra. It is the difference between FedEx and the post office. It is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery.

Reagan, like Coolidge and Kennedy before him, reduced the tax and regulatory burdens on the economy and produced one of the longest economic

expansions in our country's history. It truly felt like morning again in America. That is the Republican approach, and it works.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I thank Mr. POCAN and his office staff for the fine work and time that they put into working on this budget that we are proposing today.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, also, for his leadership within the caucus.

I am proud to rise in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget alternative. This is a practical, progressive vision for our country by providing solutions to counter the Republican cuts to vital programs and tax breaks for the wealthy.

Let me contrast the House GOP budget with the Progressive Caucus budget.

First, in healthcare, the Republican budget embraces TrumpCare by incorporating the House-passed American Health Care Act, which cuts at least 20 million people from their care. This includes up to \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, threatening care for seniors in nursing homes, children, and struggling families. It makes \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare, ending the Medicare guarantee and shifting cost risk on to seniors.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act. It lowers prescription drug costs and expands access to mental healthcare and addiction treatment.

We invest in workers. The GOP plan slashes investments in workers and programs to help more Americans get back to work, programs like apprenticeships and job training. And yet the people's budget would create 2.4 million jobs over its first 3 years and raise wages for American workers.

The Republican budget, their \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts means less funding for roads and bridges and schools. Our budget puts a \$2 trillion investment into strengthening our Nation's infrastructure.

The Republican budget drastically cuts Federal funding, which could undermine our ability to respond to disasters. The people's budget provides \$200 billion in emergency disaster funds to rebuild communities devastated by hurricanes.

The Republican budget guts our public education system with cuts that could devastate schools and further disinvest in public universities. The Progressive Caucus budget makes debt-free college a reality and provides for the refinancing of student loans. It expands access to pre-K education and provides childcare for all families.

Let's get real. The reason we are debating the budget this week: Repub-

licans can't wait to get started on their tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican tax plan should be called the Trump Family Tax Plan because it enriches the wealthy on the backs of the middle class.

The Progressive Caucus gets it right. Not one more penny in tax breaks for corporations and the wealthiest Americans. The Progressive Caucus budget ensures that the top 1 percent pay their fair share in taxes, we close corporate loopholes, and we expand the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for working families.

We must reject the Trump Family tax cut and invest in our roads and bridges, our schools, our healthcare, and our workers. Progressives are proposing bold policy solutions as clear alternatives to the cruel budget cuts Republicans are proposing.

The people's budget is an investment in the American people, and I urge you to support the Progressive Caucus people's budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my friend reminds me of a story when Ronald Reagan was pushing his tax reductions a generation ago that produced the biggest expansion in our Nation's history. He was approached one day by a working class fellow on a stop that the President was making, and the man looks at him and says: Mr. President, the Democrats say that you Republicans want to cut taxes on the rich. Is that right?

Reagan says: Well, that is what they say.

And the man says: Well, you go ahead and do that, Mr. President, because a poor person never gave me a job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

□ 1815

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding to me. As you know, Mr. Chairman, he is not just down here as the ranking member on the House Budget Committee. He is also the leader of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force. The leadership he has provided in all those areas means a lot to the entire institution. I am grateful to him for it.

I also want to say I am grateful to my friends in the Progressive Caucus. I disagree with their budget, and I plan to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, how often do we come down here and folks want to complain about what is not going right, but they don't want to do anything about it?

To my friends' credit in the Progressive Caucus, they laid out a vision, and that is exactly what I came here to Congress to be a part of. Let's lay out our visions. Let's have some votes. Let's count those votes and see where we go from there.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, absolutely any group could offer a budget today, yet we only have four alternatives being considered. That tells

you something about how hard it is to put your ideas forward. So I want to thank my friends on the Progressive Caucus for doing that.

I want to run through a couple of things that their budget includes, Mr. Chairman. It includes a 4 percent pay increase for Federal workers across the board. It includes \$500 billion in green energy incentives. It imposes a carbon tax to deal with greenhouse gases. It cuts \$70 billion from the Defense Department and, in fact, eliminates altogether the spending on the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, these are all legitimate policy disagreements.

Their budget also increases revenues, taxes, by \$10 trillion, but spends so much more on American priorities that we continue to end up with almost a \$1 trillion annual deficit in year 10.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of debate that we have to have. I want to understand the priorities of my friends. I want to understand where they want to see more investments. And then I want to understand how it is we are going to balance this budget together. Because what is lacking in this plan, Mr. Chairman, what frustrates me the most about the Progressive Caucus plan is not the investment in green energy, it is not the investment in the Federal workforce, it is not the investment in healthcare; it is the fact that they don't believe we can do these things while raising taxes by \$10 trillion on the American people and balance the budget at all.

Mr. Chairman, if folks want to raise taxes in this institution—I think our problem is a spending problem. I don't think it is a taxing problem, but I am willing to have that discussion with them to understand their point of view.

But the reason I will ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this budget is not because it raises taxes \$10 trillion; it is because it raises taxes \$10 trillion, yet continues to borrow from our children and our grandchildren in the form of annual debt and deficits.

I think we can do better. But we cannot do better without an honest discussion of the issues, Mr. Chairman. Say what you want to about the budgets you are going to see on the floor here, these alternatives that we are going to discuss.

There are a lot of talking heads on TV who just want to talk about it and don't want to do anything about it. If you are looking for a ray of hope today, look at the Progressive Caucus, which I disagree with about almost everything as it comes to how to peg the numbers, but they put their vision forward tonight. They said: Let's take a stand tonight.

If we can work together across that aisle, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing that we cannot do on behalf of the American people.

Vote “no” on this budget, but applaud the effort that has gone into it such that we can try to find common ground going forward.

If we have but one thing to agree on in this institution, let it be to agree to pay for those things that we think are important. Whether it is wars or whether it is green energy, whether it is troops or whether it is Federal employees, let us agree that we should pay for those things today with our dollars, and the borrowing from our children and grandchildren should be ended forever.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, what the Progressive Caucus budget does, and does very clearly, is that we end the special treatment for Wall Street buddies of the majority of this Congress.

Meanwhile, their budget has no problem hitting low- and middle-income families with their tax plan. Under their plan, corporations get a \$2 trillion cut, \$2.4 trillion, and the richest 1 percent will get a tax cut worth \$130,000 next year; and many middle class families will have to pay more.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a valued member of the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his tremendous leadership as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus; and our other co-chair, MARK POCAN, for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, the People's Budget. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that there are two different visions being presented here. Let's be very clear about what those two different visions are.

The Republican budget says we should invest millions of dollars into tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and the largest corporations.

Our budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, says we want to invest in people. We believe in working families across this country who are working hard, want to have a decent life, and want to build a better future. I choose investing in the people. That is what this budget does. It invests in education, in jobs, infrastructure, research, and science, and diplomacy.

Let me just focus for a minute on education as the gateway to opportunity. The People's Budget commits \$1 trillion to help families afford childcare, provides universal access to pre-K, and upholds our Nation's commitment to our public schools, which are the bedrocks of our communities nationwide, through adequate funding and supporting educators with resources that they need to reach every student.

It makes debt-free college a reality by investing in college as a public good. It creates apprenticeship opportunities for all of our districts across the country—red and blue, urban and rural.

Our country's success, Mr. Chairman, lies in that of our children and young people, not in the Republican plan to

give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this vision, this budget, and to invest in the people.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), a former director of the State Policy Network.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Progressive Caucus' budget.

In his farewell address, President Eisenhower said: “We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without asking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.”

Instead of trying to put America on a sustainable financial path, the progressive budget seeks to mortgage even more of our grandchildren's and great grandchildren's future, frankly, by spending over \$57 trillion over the next 10 years. With the national debt surpassing \$20 trillion just last month, now is the time to rein in reckless government spending, not explode it.

In addition to these spending increases, the Progressive Caucus is proposing nearly \$9 trillion in tax increases over the next decade. These enormous tax increases do not come close to covering the cost of the irresponsible policies proposed. I want to repeat that. Enormous tax increases that don't come close to covering the cost of what they have proposed.

As a result, the Progressive Caucus' budget raises the debt to over \$27 trillion by 2027. In fact, by fiscal year 2027, our deficits would be near \$1 trillion.

Higher taxes and higher spending would stifle the American economy and put our debt on an expedited upward trajectory. It is time for us to make tough decisions when it comes to this country's budget. The decision to oppose the Progressive Caucus budget is not one of those tough decisions.

This budget also makes no effort to curb waste, fraud, and abuse. Instead, it would expand bureaucratic programs by trillions of dollars without proposing any oversight measures. For example, it would spend \$41 billion on “free college” promises, and \$1 trillion on childcare and universal pre-K.

Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of the shovel-ready programs that were part of the Obama package just a few years ago. We all had this expectation that this money would go to rebuild our infrastructure, and it turns out just a little over 3 percent of that money actually made it to infrastructure projects; somewhere in the range of \$30 billion out of over \$800 billion.

That is what I see in the progressive budget. It continues the failed ObamaCare experiment, and even goes so far as to allow States to experiment with socialized medicine.

It continues to encourage able-bodied adults without children not to seek work by providing them a government paycheck.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. It increases the pressure on Americans' pocketbooks by increasing the price at the pump and, really, at every level.

It proposes Washington-centric solutions to problems that the States are better equipped to determine, such as the whole college issue. And it spends \$500 billion on green energy and imposes a carbon tax.

Mr. Chairman, we have a moral responsibility to spend taxpayer dollars wisely, and the Progressive Caucus fails to do this in its budget. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus budget invests in the American people, invests in America, and still reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), my friend and a member of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative GRIJALVA for his leadership.

Our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates we have a \$4.6 trillion infrastructure deficit. That is why the People's Budget wisely invests \$2 trillion to fix our infrastructure.

Not only will this budget help repair roads, highways, and bridges, but it will also put broadband all over America, including rural areas, and create millions of good-paying jobs, over 2.5 million in its first year.

We are presenting this plan. We are asking for support. Donald Trump talks a big game on infrastructure, but he has yet to put out a plan. So we urge the President to support our plan. If he doesn't want to, then put out his plan so we can have a discussion on how to move forward on fixing our infrastructure and creating high-paying jobs for Americans.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for giving me an opportunity to address the Progressive Caucus, their budget. I think the budget is unacceptable. It is something the American people ought to pay attention to because the day may come in which a budget similar to the Progressive Budget passes this floor.

The first thing to look at is we are increasing maybe by an average of about a little under—well, around \$1 trillion increase in taxes over the next 10 years. So you are taking a lot more money away from Americans. And despite this huge increase in taxes, you are looking at about a \$70 billion cut in defense.

I suggest that the public and the people who are supporting the Progressive

Caucus take some time talking to their people in the current military, talk about the planes that can't fly, talk about the shortage of parts, and ask: How is it possible you could take this much more money from the American people and still feel we have to have significant cuts in our military budget?

But then you look at what we have to spend more on: a 4 percent raise for Federal workers. Look, we wish everybody had a raise, but, really, at a time when we are approaching \$20 trillion in debt, is it a priority to give Federal workers a raise?

We put more and more people dependent on government; a large expansion of the program providing free college to people. At a time when, quite frankly, many people who already have college degrees can't get jobs, we are expanding that program. And, of course, by making it free, people will respect it less. And not only will they respect it less, but by making it free, many people will go to college who perhaps otherwise don't feel it is for them.

They won't make adjustments to the food stamp program, which is a problem.

We greatly extend the time that you are on unemployment, and this is kind of bizarre because it is a time when our employment is near historic lows. But despite the fact that until now we haven't had such unemployment for a long period of time, we want to extend unemployment, thereby encouraging more people to stay on unemployment.

□ 1830

I would like to thank my friends from the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing students to refinance their student loans, which shows something or another that there is a heart there, a little bit anyway. I wish I could get my own Conference to put that in. But in any event, I urge rejection of the Progressive budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, Americans in this Congress do have a choice. Our budget is a contrast to what the Republicans are proposing. We can either cut Medicare to pay for more tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires as our Republican budget does, or we can close tax loopholes to protect essential programs that invest in jobs. We chose investment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a moral contract between elected officials—the government—and the people we were elected to represent. That is why I am proud to rise in support of the people's budget, presented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This budget serves as a Progressive alternative to the GPO's cruel budget plan, a plan that prioritizes tax breaks for billionaires over the need to fund care for seniors in nursing homes and children and struggling families in places like Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I was proud to help draft the people's budget, which invests \$200 billion to ensure that families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida, and the U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need right now.

The people's budget would also reduce the deficit by \$700 billion over the next 20 years by investing in human capital. We would do this while enacting comprehensive immigration reform, protecting DREAMers, and ending funding for family detention centers.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the people's budget and reject H. Con. Res. 71. Let's stand with the working class, the middle class, and the immigrants in our country. This is the right thing to do for our people and for our economy.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Arizona is finished, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time each side has.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 4¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader in our caucus and a leader here in Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to thank the gentleman and Congressman POCAN for their really great leadership of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and for crafting a budget which creates economic growth, a decent standard of living for everyone, and a strong yet rational national security budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget. Today, millions of Americans are struggling to make ends meet and millions more are working hard trying to find a job. Paychecks for everyday Americans are shrinking, while corporations are reaping record profits. Yet, instead of developing a budget to create jobs and to help American families, the House Republicans "balance" their budget once again on the backs of struggling families. And for what? To protect tax cuts for billionaires and millionaires and corporations. Again, this is totally disgraceful.

The CPC's people's budget stands in stark contrast to the House Republican budget. It creates 2 million good-paying jobs and invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure. It includes a plan to lift more Americans out of poverty, and it invests in communities of color, like expanding computer science education.

It ends the Pentagon's slush fund, known as the overseas contingency account, that for far too long has padded the pockets and the wallets of defense



contractors at the taxpayers' expense. It also tackles waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon by demanding audit readiness. It is hard to believe that the Republican budget goes \$10 billion over what the Pentagon even requested.

Make no mistake, the people's budget does what the House Republican budget does not. It works for the American people, not special interests, nor defense contractors, or the 1 percent.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for all American families, and that is support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for his leadership. It has been more than a pleasure to serve as the vice chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the number of years that we have had to put forward the people's budget.

I simply want to say what a budget is, Mr. Chairman. A budget is a roadmap for the American people. It is a question of whether America cares about the most vulnerable and whether or not, in our caring, we are prepared to do deeds to insist upon their success.

The Republican budget takes \$2 trillion and provides a big, wealthy tax cut for the rich, and it creates, in essence, a deep hole in affordable care for healthcare. It does not provide justice and fair elections. It takes away educational opportunity from students, and, of course, it does not bring the most vulnerable out of poverty and enhance the lives of the middle class.

The people's budget provides for supporting the Affordable Care Act. It provides for giving fair working tax cuts for others, and it provides fairness and justice.

I rise to support the people's budget. It invests in the American people. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the top ten reasons to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

**TOP TEN REASONS TO SUPPORT THE PEOPLE'S BUDGET**

(Supported by over 60 organizations including: AFT, NEA, Planned Parenthood, Communications Workers of America, Sierra Club, AFSCME, AFGE, Vote Vets, Social Security Works, NARAL)

(1) The People's Budget invests \$2 trillion in America's crumbling infrastructure while promoting job growth and strengthening our commitment to sustainability. This is an investment in America which will transform our fossil-fuel energy system, overburdened mass transit, deteriorating schools, lead-contaminated water systems, and crumbling roads and bridges through local hiring and livable wages.

(2) The People's Budget enacts comprehensive immigration reform which permanently protects Dreamers and their families and opposes immigration bans on Muslims and refugees. Our country needs an immigration system that honors our values of inclusion, diversity, and equality. Our Budget prohibits funding to Customs and Border Protection to implement President Trump's discriminatory Muslim and refugee bans.

(3) Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change and rebuild our local communities recently devastated by hurricanes. The People's Budget requires polluters to pay for their reckless behavior while eliminating tax breaks that incentivize fossil fuel energy over cleaner energy. It invests \$200 billion to ensure families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida and U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need to begin the stable road to recovery. It also provides funding for climate change research, mitigation and adaptation to protect those most at risk from future environmental disasters.

(4) The CPC budget delivers on the promise of child care for all and Pre-K for all. It ensures that families will not have to pay more than 10 percent of their income for child care, whether that care is at home or at a child care center. Our budget also expands pre-k for children across the country.

(5) We make debt free college a reality for all students by overhauling the student loan system which currently leaves college students saddled with unmanageable levels of debt. The People's Budget creates a federal matching program that supports state efforts to expand investments in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt.

(6) The People's Budget strengthens the Affordable Care Act, while pushing towards a single payer system. It prioritizes reforms to increase access, equity, and affordability. Maintaining the positive reforms from the ACA are critical as Republicans attempt to gut the health care system and leave millions of Americans stranded without access to critical insurance coverage. The People's Budget protects Medicare's integrity and improves its long-term solvency. It protects children and low-income Americans and gives states the freedom to transition to a single payer system. It also makes two significant policy changes to reduce the costs of prescription drugs: allows Medicare Part D to negotiate drug prices and ends "Pay for Delay" practice which keeps generics out of the market.

(7) The CPC Budget creates a fair tax system for working Americans. In order to make these bold, necessary investments in working families, we must rewrite the rules of a rigged economy that favors billionaires and big corporations. The People's Budget closes tax loopholes that corporations use to ship jobs overseas, and stops CEOs from receiving millions in tax-free bonuses. Our budget tackles inequality through fair tax rates for all Americans, leveling the playing field for working people.

(8) Our budget protects the right to vote and supports criminal justice reforms which strengthen public safety and avoid over-criminalization. Our budget calls for rebuilding trust in the justice system by funding community oriented policing reforms. It also strengthens Department of Justice voter protection programs, protects voting rights by increasing funding to voter protection agencies, and funds public financing of campaigns to curb the influence of special interests in politics. Additionally, the budget makes key investments in America's electoral integrity by upgrading our voting systems.

(9) The People's Budget creates pathways out of poverty by expanding proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives and restoring vital programs to our nation to provide prosperity for all. These include a national strategy to reduce poverty in half in ten years and \$12.8 billion investment to end family homelessness. The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition As-

sistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It also provides an additional \$10 billion for child nutrition programs and allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits for up to two years.

(10) We make veterans a priority by increasing funding for veterans supportive housing to eliminate veterans homelessness and expanding access to mental health care for all veteran and service members. Our budget also invests in job training opportunities for transitioning service members and veterans.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In the debate on the Republican budget and how it contrasts with the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, we heard a lot about needing to control mandatory spending, that that was the real issue here, runaway mandatory spending.

Make no mistake, when my Republican colleagues talk about cutting mandatory spending, they mean they want to cut Medicare and Social Security to pay for the trillion-dollar tax scam and creative numbers that are part of their budget for the wealthy and for the corporations in America.

The other issue that we heard a lot about is that, by making these major cuts for the wealthiest and the rich, that somehow their net gain and their profit and their break on taxes is going to trickle down to the rest of us. Well, we have seen that movie before in this country. That trickle-down theory doesn't work. The money doesn't trickle down, and the American people won't be fooled about that again.

Our budget invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure and jobs immediately. Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change, and our budget delivers on the promise for our children, their inheritance of this country, the inheritance of the children that everybody is worried about a deficit. We are worried about their future as well.

Our budget delivers on the promise of childcare for all, pre-K for all, and a robust public education system to provide all kids with an opportunity to succeed in this Nation.

Our budget is about the future, our budget is about emphasizing the values that make this country special and great, and our budget is a contrast. It offers a contrast about what this country can be if it invests in its people.

The road that we have been on for far too long in which we have disinvested in people, shifted wealth and burden onto the middle class and the working class in this country, that time has ended. Our budget represents that end.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on the people's budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, have my friends on the left learned absolutely nothing over these past 8 years? If massive government spending, higher and higher

taxes, and deeper and deeper debt produced economic growth, the Obama years should have been the golden age of our economy. Instead, we suffered prolonged stagnation. We averaged 1.5 percent annual growth, only half the average economic growth that our Nation has enjoyed in the postwar era. The Progressive and Democratic budgets promise more of the same.

We choose a different path, the Reagan path that produced an average of 3.5 percent growth year after year, higher wages, better jobs. Not just a Republican policy, John F. Kennedy did the same thing. He reminded us that a rising tide lifts all boats. These are the policies that create prosperity.

The government cannot create jobs because it cannot create wealth, but what it can do is create the conditions where jobs multiply and prosper or where they stagnate and disappear. That it can do very well. We have very consistent experience with the policies that create these conditions.

If you increase the burdens on the economy as the Democrats again propose, the economy contracts. If you lighten the burdens on the economy, it grows and prospers. No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

We know what works and we know what doesn't work because we have tried both paths many times before. The House Budget Committee's budget follows principles that have, time and again, consistently and rapidly produced economic expansion and prosperity.

The House Democrats' budget and the Progressive budget before us now double down on policies that have impoverished and bankrupted nations wherever they have been employed down through history.

That is the choice before us today. Let us choose wisely. Our future depends on it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

**SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.**

The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,569,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,089,508,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,274,576,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,420,911,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,596,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,749,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,965,428,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,166,178,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,361,378,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,619,387,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$211,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$256,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$324,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$361,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$414,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$432,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$503,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$544,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$572,000,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$661,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,875,166,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,829,543,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,845,871,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,920,549,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,149,670,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,282,139,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,411,746,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,653,359,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,865,876,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,058,527,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,538,175,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,808,907,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,890,015,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,963,843,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,167,060,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,267,110,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,373,622,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,615,778,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,833,878,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,032,183,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$593,606,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: -\$719,399,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: -\$615,439,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: -\$542,932,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: -\$570,144,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: -\$517,194,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: -\$408,194,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: -\$449,600,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: -\$472,500,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: -\$412,796,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,175,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$22,085,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,866,575,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,578,811,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$24,291,408,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,985,937,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$25,599,925,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$26,248,973,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$26,981,444,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$27,552,527,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,515,893,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019: \$16,336,714,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020: \$17,080,338,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,782,001,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,543,046,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023: \$19,291,339,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,972,026,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025: \$20,739,642,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026: \$21,579,464,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027: \$22,413,681,000,000.

**SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.**

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$611,786,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$583,502,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$624,900,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$605,816,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$638,087,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$620,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$651,309,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$634,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$664,521,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$652,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$678,690,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$661,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$692,897,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$670,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$707,145,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$689,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$722,394,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$703,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$737,634,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$718,554,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,264,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,815,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,630,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$42,812,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,970,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$45,705,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$44,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,744,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$45,271,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$47,817,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,175,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$48,897,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,539,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$47,725,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,634,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,596,000,000.  
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,234,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,128,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,889,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,653,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,557,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,013,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,281,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,539,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,036,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,337,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,793,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,033,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,059,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,498,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,885,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,138,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,717,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,900,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,555,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,703,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,864,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,614,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,876,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,684,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,507,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,334,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,459,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$5,169,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,504,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$4,195,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,997,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,712,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,926,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,746,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,216,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,054,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,341,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,248,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,791,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,939,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,710,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,911,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,980,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,966,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,986,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,068,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,107,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,647,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,257,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,620,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,280,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$49,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,469,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$50,643,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,625,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$51,731,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,866,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$52,965,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,223,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,691,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,035,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,664,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,998,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,211,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,231,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,614,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,737,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,490,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,910,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,549,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,468,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,933,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,232,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,586,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,505,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,867,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,373,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,755,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,050,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,075,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,792,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,377,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,445,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$8,435,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,949,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,120,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,167,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,317,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,731,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$7,204,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,315,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,672,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,499,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,195,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,468,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,244,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$6,346,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$412,246,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$260,375,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,646,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$302,342,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,199,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$246,432,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,422,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$162,071,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,379,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$129,557,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,348,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$115,488,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,330,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$111,477,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,381,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$110,947,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,441,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$112,855,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,514,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$114,823,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,581,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,517,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,840,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,726,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,338,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,834,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,297,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$25,883,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,806,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,354,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,296,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,249,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,298,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,080,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,839,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$22,489,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,384,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,071,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,080,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,935,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$142,001,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$165,585,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$165,987,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,570,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$159,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,088,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$160,233,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$163,705,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,826,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$160,066,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,277,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$157,407,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,679,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$156,729,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,996,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$157,914,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,273,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$151,875,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$573,434,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$580,091,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,568,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$604,320,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,496,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$637,447,000,000.

- Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$669,270,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$666,179,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$702,953,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$696,993,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$735,459,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$728,890,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$772,591,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$763,909,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$810,799,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$801,662,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$849,471,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$839,223,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$890,688,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$879,028,000,000.
- (12) Medicare (570):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$601,682,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$601,303,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$672,626,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$672,318,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$720,653,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$720,416,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$775,853,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$775,637,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$871,247,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$871,017,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$896,829,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$896,611,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$920,920,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$920,693,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,028,532,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,028,285,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,093,424,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,093,171,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$1,176,028,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,175,780,000,000.
- (13) Income Security (600):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$528,718,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$508,933,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$541,318,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$538,787,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$554,195,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$554,966,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$567,182,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$569,833,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$583,720,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$594,084,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$592,625,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$598,840,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$601,577,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$602,988,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$621,241,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$625,226,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$636,800,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$648,216,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$653,208,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$664,923,000,000.
- (14) Social Security (650):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
- (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$183,573,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$181,049,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$198,367,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$195,432,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$203,192,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$201,863,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$209,704,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$207,846,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$225,035,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$223,431,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$222,849,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$220,873,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$217,808,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$216,712,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$235,899,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$234,040,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$243,591,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$241,380,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$252,030,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$249,835,000,000.
- (16) Administration of Justice (750):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$63,596,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$62,328,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$64,092,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$63,865,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,733,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,272,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$69,336,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$65,880,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,965,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$67,534,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,559,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$69,220,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$68,916,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$70,963,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,438,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$78,798,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$78,991,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$81,299,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$80,655,000,000.
- (17) General Government (800):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,065,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$25,734,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$27,477,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$26,458,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,418,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$28,777,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,473,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$28,882,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,156,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,575,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$30,693,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,129,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$31,492,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,848,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,309,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$31,644,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$33,111,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$32,437,000,000.
- (18) Net Interest (900):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$377,635,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$377,635,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$413,674,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$413,674,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$461,176,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$461,176,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$512,434,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$512,434,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$560,400,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$560,400,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$605,893,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$605,893,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$644,696,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$644,696,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$679,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$679,742,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:  
(A) New budget authority, \$714,720,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$714,720,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2027:  
(A) New budget authority, \$743,060,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$743,185,000,000.
- (19) Non-Allowances (920):  
Fiscal year 2018:  
(A) New budget authority, \$134,164,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$70,964,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2019:  
(A) New budget authority, \$43,428,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$66,529,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2020:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,748,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$41,212,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2021:  
(A) New budget authority, \$20,859,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$29,359,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2022:  
(A) New budget authority, \$18,656,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,721,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2023:  
(A) New budget authority, \$24,602,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$27,491,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2024:  
(A) New budget authority, \$29,548,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$30,587,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2025:  
(A) New budget authority, \$32,490,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$33,268,000,000.  
Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,431,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,971,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,372,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,860,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.
- (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2026:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2027:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

The Nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the Republican budget continues to highlight the wrong prior-

ities. It fast-tracks tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and claims that unrealistic economic growth will pay for these cuts when, in reality, those tax cuts will ultimately be paid for by children, seniors, and those in need.

It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare and also cuts programs that support basic living standards, including nutritional assistance, and undermines national security by cutting diplomatic programs and foreign aid.

The Republican budget also cuts education, job training, research and development, and infrastructure. Their budget leaves hardworking American families out in the cold and would devastate our economic recovery after years of consistent job growth.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget. It is compassionate. The numbers add up. It addresses the needs of the most vulnerable and improves our economy. Unlike the Republican budget, the CBC budget uses real numbers, not overly optimistic growth projections and assumptions of things that won't happen.

The CBC budget proposes \$3.9 trillion in revenue enhancements, and unlike the Republican budget, we show exactly how Congress can realistically reach this revenue target by outlining almost \$11 trillion in revenue options from which Congress could pick and choose \$3.9 trillion.

With the additional revenue, the CBC budget protects and strengthens the social safety net and commits the Federal Government to eradicating poverty in America.

Our budget includes a comprehensive infrastructure and jobs program, totaling over \$1 trillion over 5 years, and according to the Economic Policy Institute, it will create 2 million jobs next year.

In addition, the CBC budget eliminates any further threat of sequestration, eliminating the arbitrary budget caps and across-the-board budget cuts that are scheduled for next year.

It allocates \$200 billion for hurricane relief, \$100 billion to address the looming pension crisis, and additional funding for our veterans.

Even with the elimination of the sequestration and strong investment in programs that we know will create jobs and economic opportunity, the CBC budget is still estimated to reduce the deficit, when compared to the baseline, by approximately \$2.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

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

□ 1845

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion today because it is an important one. I know that the gentleman from Virginia and I both want to address the challenges facing our Nation and our fellow Americans.

We agree that the status quo is insufficient to meet the needs of the future, and we share a passion for protecting the vulnerable, breaking the cycles of poverty, and lifting Americans up.

But I must oppose this budget because it will not accomplish those things. This budget raises taxes by \$4 trillion, increases spending by \$1.4 trillion, and it never balances.

It proposes more Washington-mandated answers to problems that States and communities are better equipped to solve. It makes no effort to control Federal deficits and debt, and it will leave our country bankrupt.

I want to be clear what this means. This budget will double down on generational theft—spending more and more money that we don't have today and leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill tomorrow.

In contrast, the Republican budget confronts our Nation's fiscal challenges head on by requiring mandatory spending reductions of at least \$203 billion and balancing within 10 years.

While this budget measures success on how much the Federal Government spends, the Republican House budget proposes to measure success by outcomes. If we have learned nothing from decades of spending on Federal welfare programs, it is that more money cannot resolve the complex issues underlying systemic poverty.

We must change our approach, and this starts with changing how we measure results.

This budget also fails to address a critical piece of the upward mobility agenda: reforming our broken Tax Code. Instead, it calls for tax increases that would stifle economic growth that the country so desperately needs.

America should be the most competitive place in the world to do business, but everything in our Tax Code today tells companies to take their jobs and their investments overseas and to leave them there.

Higher taxes on job creators and small businesses is the exact opposite of what we need to bring workers back into the labor force and get our economy growing again. Now is the time for comprehensive tax reform that unleashes the entrepreneurial spirit of America, increases business and personal investment, and promotes job creation. By failing to move the ball forward on tax reform, this budget leaves the American workers and families behind.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I want to note what this proposal does make cuts in, and that is in our national defense. In a time when we face increasingly complex and evolving international threats from places like North Korea, Russia, and Iran, this budget would cut overall

defense spending and compromise the readiness and safety of our servicemembers and our national freedoms.

The first job of the Federal Government is to provide for our national security. We need to reinvest in our military to deter global threats and protect our homeland. That is why the Republican budget fulfills Congress' commitment to ensure robust funding for our country's national defense.

Mr. Chairman, we will have a lot of conversations today about priorities, because that is what budgets are: clear illustrations of our priorities.

We want to leave our Nation better for our children and grandchildren. We all want every person, regardless of their socioeconomic status or ZIP Code, to have the opportunity to realize the American Dream.

I oppose this budget proposal because it will not help us achieve these goals. It avoids the tough questions and substitutes more spending for better results.

It does nothing to promote vibrant economic growth, and it doubles down on bad ideas that stifle ingenuity and the spirit of entrepreneurship that we need. We have a responsibility to secure our Nation's fiscal future and improve the lives of our citizens, but this budget is not the way forward.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), who is the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, BOBBY SCOTT, for his hard work, and the rest of the CBC in putting this budget together.

Mr. Chairman, I think that what I am having a hard time doing is wrapping my mind around the same failed arguments that we hear over and over again that we are going to cut trillions of dollars in taxes so that we can help the upper middle class and the top 1 percent really, and that is somehow going to benefit the poorest people in the country; we are going to exacerbate the deficit saying that we are going to create jobs.

We know it never happens, and then all of a sudden we find ourselves with an increasing debt and deficit, and then we go to the poorest people in this country and we ask them to pay for it. We cut the programs that are vital to lifting them out of poverty.

I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. My mother is a perfect example that a great education will lift you out of poverty and that having a Historically Black College and University that you can go to will prepare you for your future. But the problem is we don't talk about the fact that the Republican budget cuts education.

So how can we say with a straight face that we propose to lift people out

of poverty, help people achieve the American Dream, help our children dream the impossible dream, and then give them the power so that they can go achieve it while we are cutting their education and we are cutting all the programs that help them to achieve it?

Look, we always hide behind protecting our country and the national defense. The biggest threat to our national defense resides on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is a shame when most people in this country and my colleagues wake up in the morning and say: Are we going to war with North Korea? That is not good for the economy, and that is not good for the mental health of the country. But I think that the Secretary of State has a great disposition and strategy when it comes to the national defense and diplomacy.

I think the key with what we have to do with budgets is understand that they are moral documents and they express our values, and cutting the disabled and others is not a true statement of American values.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget if for no other reason that there is a price on work, savings, and investment. When you raise that price too high, guess what you get? You get less work, savings, and investment, and you get less economic growth.

Look at the growth rates we have had over the last 10 years under astronomical debt and deficits. If spending could create an economic juggernaut, we would have one now. But instead, we have got 1.5 percent growth, 1.9 percent growth, and 2 percent growth—nowhere near what the prospending lobby would suggest.

Yet, if you look at the 1920s, if you look at the 1960s, and if you look at the 1980s—remember JFK in that famous Economic Club of New York speech said that the surest way to raise revenues is to cut tax rates now.

It worked then, it worked in the 1920s, and it will work right now as it did in the 1980s as well.

The reason is simple. The reason is very simple. Once you lower the price of work, savings, and investment, you not only get more of that, but you leave more capital in the private sector where it is put to use.

When you have capital put to use in the private sector, workers become more productive, and they earn more. I have always said the truck driver is much more productive with the truck, and the people who have the capital that can buy the truck is what makes the economy go.

We don't have a revenue problem in this country. Last year, we had record tax revenues: \$3.26 trillion, yet a deficit of \$587 billion. We have a spending

problem, and the CBC budget increases spending above the CBO baseline over 10 years, while our budget is underneath the CBO baseline for 10 years. Our budget cuts taxes across the board including eliminating the bottom rate that we suggest in our tax reform plan.

This is a question of American vision and the American Dream. Our vision is for more capital in the private sector, more incentives to work, savings, and investment, and more people with rising incomes. Their vision is to protect the government budget.

Mr. Chairman, so I stand in opposition to this particular substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. Also I want to thank him for his tremendous leadership in continuing to craft the Congressional Black Caucus' budget which really does reflect our Nation's priorities and our values, so I rise in strong support of this budget.

As a member of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees and as chair of our Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I am really proud that the Congressional Black Caucus budget includes \$300 billion in investments into initiatives that have proven to lift millions out of poverty.

For example, it restores the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, it extends emergency unemployment insurance, it expands access to affordable housing, and it also increases funding for job training and trade assistance programs.

The CBC budget creates a fair Tax Code that provides investments in communities. It boosts GDP by \$329 billion and helps create 2 million jobs. This budget addresses poverty head on by investing \$120 billion in creating jobs, \$25 billion to restore our Nation's public housing, and \$80 billion to modernize our schools.

Also, our budget employs the 10-20-30 formula championed by our assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), by directing at least 10 percent of Federal spending into areas with poverty rates of more than 20 percent over the last 30 years. We will make progress toward ending entrenched and generational poverty that hurts families and communities.

With regard to the Pentagon, yes, we require that we audit the Pentagon and encourage DOD to implement remaining GAO recommendations that would likely lead to tens of billions in costs savings.

This is a budget that stands with the American people. It is a message to the American people that we stand with those who are working hard to find a job, and we stand with those working hard at a job with low wages. It is a message to the country that balancing



the budget on the backs of struggling families to provide giveaways to billionaires and corporations is unacceptable. That is not the American way.

The CBC budget provides for the national security and the economic security of our Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, as one of the youngest Members of Congress, I feel an obligation not only to my district but to my generation. Right now in America, we are midway through the greatest wave of generational theft in all of human history.

The budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus takes the problems of Washington and makes all of them worse by doubling down on deficit spending and irresponsible financial decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I tell my constituents I am on two of the scariest committees in Congress—Armed Services and Budget—because on the Armed Services Committee, I see every day that our adversaries are closing the capability gap. They are able to do more while, after 8 years of the Obama administration, our military has been left in shambles. This budget does nothing to rebuild the military. It leaves our troops on the battlefield without the tools they need to win, and it is absolutely shameful.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the budget today, we absolutely have to get back on a path of fiscal discipline. This budget, however, doesn't do that. It punishes American workers and American businesses with new taxes and more taxes.

It pours billions into the failed experiment of ObamaCare. To take things a step further, it would promote a healthcare system that is a single-payer system. Not only will this bankrupt our Nation, it will bankrupt hard-working Americans.

How much would premiums go up under a State-run single-payer system? \$1,000 a month? \$2,000? Of course, taxes would increase, too. The same families in this system would see enormous challenges meeting their needs because they would be funding irresponsible spending in Washington.

So beyond making our citizens sick and poor, this budget would gut our defense, weaken our military, and put more Americans in danger. Everyone here knows that the threats we face are serious: ISIS, Hezbollah, North Korea, and regional instability and volatility across the Middle East. Yet, bizarrely, this budget cuts funding for the global war on terror.

Under President Obama, readiness fell to the lowest levels in a century, GDP growth sputtered, the quality of healthcare for the middle class got worse, and our debt skyrocketed. These are not policies we should repeat, and certainly not policies we should expand.

Instead, let's vote for the Republican budget that has the greatest reduction

in entitlement spending since Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House and can actually restore the great promise of the American Dream.

□ 1900

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus' Budget Task Force.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC alternative budget, and I commend Representative SCOTT and his staff for the tremendous work that they have done.

The CBC budget provides for all of the essentials, including defense and infrastructure, but what I like most about it is that it is focused on job creation, rebuilding our veterans' hospitals, rebuilding infrastructure in our communities, and putting people to work.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents need jobs and opportunities to work. The CBC budget focuses on jobs. I strongly support it, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this proposed amendment to the budget resolution.

I think it is very important, when discussing spending such as suggested before us, to remember that we do not live in a fantasy world. We live in a world where resources are limited. We have to make difficult choices. These are the same choices every family makes with their budget every day of the year.

Currently, our national debt rests at over \$20 trillion. The entire U.S. GDP in 2016 was only \$18.57 trillion.

Should we continue to spend money that we don't have without restraint?

This proposal never balances. It does raise taxes, though. With the tax increases in this proposal totaling \$3.9 trillion, one would expect this budget to balance.

What this does do is add over \$1 trillion in new spending. What is another trillion when you are only \$20 trillion in debt?

I challenge the supporters of this proposed budget to research the potentially catastrophic impacts of defaulting on our national debt. We are saddling future generations with an unsurmountable burden.

When our grandchildren and children look back on what we have done here, do we want this work to be that we left our country broke?

I don't think so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not kick the can down the road and to not pass this proposed amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, can you advise how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remain-

ing. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to point out that the healthcare plan in the budget is a public option, which CBO scores as a savings of over \$100 billion. We have \$1 trillion in spending for infrastructure, the same as the President has promised, but at least we pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Budget Committee, I find the CBC budget to be a principled and thoughtful budget.

It ends the threat of sequestration, it will accelerate our economic recovery, it will help eradicate poverty in America, and it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

On the other hand, the tax cut that our Republican friends are proposing will cause a deficit by giving a whopping \$2.4-plus trillion in tax cuts, most to the top 1 percent of the American people.

It will not help the young child as he grows to seek opportunities and jobs. This will be a bill that is at a price that is not right. If you work hard, you get less.

Our budget, on the other hand, gives \$665 billion in immediate investments to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. It is crumbling even more so after the devastating hurricanes. It gives \$120 billion to fund a national direct job creation program and full employment trust fund program.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It provides \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools, \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program, \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services, \$25 billion for recapitalization, \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding VA hospitals, \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods program, and \$5 billion for summer jobs for young people.

I can attest to the fact that, in discussions with the Federal Communications Commission, the connectivity in vulnerable neighborhoods and communities is at an all-time low. Expanding broadband services is a vital need.

It is a vital need to expand the educational services for this young man in order for him to be capable of taking a job in the 21st century. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs that go unapplied for because the skill set of our young people have been deprived because of inadequate education.

This budget of the Congressional Black Caucus is a people investor. It invests in people. For that reason, I believe it is the right way to go. It balances our needs for the military and it provides for the American people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It, in fact, provides that roadmap to ensure that the American people are taken care.

I want to make mention that it provides for \$300 billion for programs that are proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

Shouldn't this be what we are doing?

Right now, in my district, thousands are online for the disaster Food Stamp program. That program needs to be extended.

This is what we do. We do not make people dependent. We give them a hand up, not a handout. That is what the budget is supposed to be: a roadmap for opportunity.

I support the Congressional Black Caucus budget, for that is what it is: a roadmap for opportunity.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Black Caucus to H. Con. Res. 71, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018."

I support the CBC Budget for four principal reasons:

1. It ends the threat of sequestration;
2. It will accelerate our economic recovery;
3. It will help eradicate poverty in America; and
4. It will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" and "Work Harder to Get Less" Budget with its discredited economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CBC Budget, we will get instead a comprehensive jobs program that would rebuild our nation's infrastructure and reinvest in our communities totaling \$1 trillion over the next decade.

The jobs created will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches every community in America, while also making the necessary investments to ensure America's long-term economic competitiveness.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will create jobs by providing:

1. \$665 billion in immediate investment to rebuild our nation's crumbling infrastructure;
2. \$120 billion to fund a National Direct Job Creation Program and Full Employment Trust Fund Program;
3. \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools;
4. \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program;
5. \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services;
6. \$25 billion for public housing recapitalization;
7. \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding V.A. hospitals and extended care facilities;
8. \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods Program and for communities that desperately need revitalization; and
9. \$5 billion for summer jobs so young persons can save money to attend college and plan for their futures.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to addressing the poverty that is still too prevalent in our coun-

try, the CBC Budget is clearly superior to the Republican's "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget.

The CBC Budget provides for \$300 billion for programs that have proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

The funding provided will be used to restore cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, extend emergency unemployment insurance, expand access to affordable housing, increase access to quality and affordable education, and increase funding for job training and trade adjustment assistance programs.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, to ensure that federal resources are targeted more efficiently towards eradicating poverty and are actually reaching communities most in need, the CBC budget proposes the codification of the "10-20-30" policy for federal spending.

Under the "10-20-30" policy at least 10 percent of the federal funds in certain accounts are to be directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent for the last 30 years.

Finally, I support the CBC Budget because it puts an end to the draconian sequester burdening the economy and our people for the last several years.

In addition, according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, it is said often, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

The Republican budget resolution fails this moral test; the CBC Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CBC Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly understand our colleagues' desire to fight poverty. I would like to share a little bit of my experience and what we have done to fight poverty at the local level.

For generations now, we have continued to throw more and more money towards eliminating poverty, with fewer and fewer results.

Yes, we have succeeded in alleviating the effects of poverty, but we have made very little progress in actually lifting people out of poverty. Instead of giving people a hand up, we are giving them a handout and essentially telling them life can't get any better than where they are. That is morally wrong, and I think that we can do better.

The key to solving poverty isn't just simply throwing more money at the problem. It is to try something different and find innovative ways to fix our welfare entitlement system, improve our education system, and return

the dignity of work to our fellow citizens.

The proposed amendment does none of these things. It simply perpetuates the cycle of generational poverty that has been passed down from parent to child.

I saw the same situation in my hometown of West Point, Georgia. In fact, it is what motivated me to enter public service and run for mayor.

We had a community that was dying. Folks were trapped in generational poverty and had been stripped of the dignity of work.

Instead of continuing the current system, we made changes. We worked to get the government out of the way and allow the job creators to innovate and grow their businesses to hire more workers. We invested in our infrastructure and we were able to create over 15,000 advanced manufacturing jobs.

For the first time in a generation, we saw more people moving into the middle class than moving into poverty.

We made changes to our education system, working to break through the generational cycle of poverty and prepare today's students to work in a 21st century workforce.

With all of these changes, we saw our community come back to life. People had jobs and opportunity. They took advantage of it. They had the advanced manufacturing sector spring back to life, and we saw a revitalization of not only our community, but of our people.

These lessons are from the folks in the Third District. They sent me here to push those same type of ideas here in Congress.

The Republican budget puts us on a path to this type of reform, and I believe my colleagues and I share the desire to fight poverty in this country. However, I do not believe that the CBC budget proposal does us that justice.

I look forward to passing the House budget.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more responsible alternative than the GOP budget.

A nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the GOP budget continues to push the wrong ones, catering to the wealthy and the special interests.

The GOP likes to say that a rising tide lifts every boat, but that is only if every vessel is seaworthy. The GOP budget leaves too many Americans in dinghies, rubber rafts, and rowboats, subject to being capsized.

It includes trillions of dollars in irresponsible cuts, such as \$5.4 trillion slashed from job-creating programs; \$2 trillion cut from Medicaid and Medicare; \$5 billion eliminated from investments in education, research, and infrastructure that will prevent us from competing globally.

The GOP budget would devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities in Maryland and across our country.

And for what?

To provide tax cuts to the top 1 percent—people who make at least \$900,000 every year.

In stark contrast, the CBC would create a fairer Tax Code and provide for much-needed investments in our communities. Our budget would boost our GDP by \$329 billion.

I, too, Mr. Chairman, served on the House Armed Services Committee, and I stand here to say that the CBC's budget would end sequestration for our military so that we can improve military readiness and, at the same time, restore critical domestic programs that support working families and revitalize our neighborhoods.

Rather than giving the top 1 percent a \$6 trillion tax cut, our budget would call for major investments here at home. We invest \$665 billion to modernize highways and infrastructure, \$120 billion in job-creating programs, \$80 billion so that every child learns in a modern classroom, and \$15 billion to rebuild our VA.

Perhaps, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, we invest \$300 billion over the next decade to eradicate poverty and provide basic standard of living to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, our budget responsibly pays for all of our investments. Our budget is a credible alternative and a real plan for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I stand here to talk a little bit about the Republican budget first. It is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear in America.

Once again, Americans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era. The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and larger corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle- and low-income Americans. This has never helped, and it won't help now.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our community while cutting other important social safety network programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion. Nondefense discretionary spending across the government would also be

cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand tonight with my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget to propose an alternative to this budget we are facing.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear as Americans.

Once again, Republicans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era.

The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle and lower income Americans.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our population while cutting other important social safety programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion.

Non-defense discretionary spending across the government would also be cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to propose an alternative budget amendment that serves the interests of the greater good, and not just a select few.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

Our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Our budget looks to bring \$20 billion in new investment to extend broadband internet to rural areas, so that everyone—not just the wealthy few—can have access to high-speed internet and access to information.

Our budget delivers \$300 billion over the next decade for social programs that help provide millions of Americans a basic standard of living.

This is a reflection of the values and priorities of the American people, not what is embodied in the Republican budget.

I, for one, do not believe that our nation does well by cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans while increasing taxes for the poor.

I do not believe that our nation does well by making massive cuts to social programs while allowing corporations to hide trillions of dollars overseas.

I do not believe that our nation does well by destroying Medicare and Medicaid for our elderly and poor while pushing tax cuts for the top one percent.

This is not the future that I envision for our country and neither do the American people—at least not 99 percent of them.

Mr. Chair, the Republican Budget is not a true; reflection of the priorities of the American people.

This budget serves the interest of a select few at the heavy cost of exploiting millions of others.

We need to oppose the Republican budget in favor of a viable alternative such as the CBC Budget Alternative, which is more reflective of the values that we treasure in our society.

□ 1915

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus is a more compassionate, fiscally responsible alternative to the underlying Republican budget and does not rely on unrealistic growth projections or bizarre suggestions that massive tax cuts can pay for themselves. It makes our Tax Code fairer, protects and strengthens the Affordable Care Act, makes college more affordable, and ensures more Americans are lifted out of poverty. It also improves retirement security for our seniors.

With these targeted investments, our budget creates 2 million jobs next year and reduces our Nation's deficit by \$2.5 trillion over the next decade and puts us on a more sustainable path compared to the CBO projections of our budget. I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the budget presented by the gentleman from Virginia. This budget does nothing to address our mandatory spending challenges. It never balanced. It raises taxes, it increases spending, it cuts funding to our military. We can do better, we must do better, and the House budget is the way forward.

The American people sent us here to get our fiscal house in order. This budget does not accomplish that goal. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) kindly take the chair.

□ 2046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-339 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 314, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—108

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Barragán	Gallego	Pallone
Bass	Gomez	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Al	Pascrell
Beyer	Grijalva	Payne
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Capuano	Jayapal	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Clay	Khanna	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kildee	Serrano
Clyburn	Lawrence	Sherman
Cohen	Lee	Sires
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Loftgren	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takano
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Vargas
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Vela
Doggett	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McEachin	Wasserman
Engel	McGovern	Schultz
Españolat	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meng	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOES—314

Abraham	Arrington	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Bera
Aguilar	Bacon	Bergman
Allen	Banks (IN)	Biggs
Amash	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amodei	Barr	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (MI)	Griffith	O'Halleran
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	O'Rourke
Black	Guthrie	Olson
Blackburn	Hanabusa	Palazzo
Blum	Handel	Palmer
Bonamici	Harper	Paulsen
Bost	Harris	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Perlmutter
Brat	Heck	Perry
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Peters
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)
Buck	Hill	Poliquin
Bucshon	Himes	Polis
Budd	Holding	Posey
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Ratcliffe
Byrne	Hudson	Reed
Calvert	Huizenga	Reichert
Carbajal	Hultgren	Renacci
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Rice (NY)
Carter (TX)	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Cartwright	Issa	Roby
Castro (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cicilline	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cole	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Roskam
Comer	Katko	Ross
Comstock	Keating	Rothfus
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Connolly	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Cook	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Correa	King (IA)	Russell
Costa	King (NY)	Rutherford
Costello (PA)	Kinziger	Sanford
Courtney	Knight	Scalise
Cramer	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Crawford	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Crist	Kustoff (TN)	Schrader
Cuellar	Labrador	Schweikert
Culberson	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	Lamborn	Sessions
Davis (CA)	Lance	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Shimkus
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Shuster
DeLauro	Latta	Simpson
DelBene	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Denham	Levin	Smith (MO)
Dent	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Deutch	Loeb sack	Loudermilk
Diaz-Balart	Love	Smucker
Donovan	Lowey	Speier
Duffy	Lucas	Stefanik
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	Lujan Grisham,	Stivers
Dunn	M.	Swozell
Emmer	MacArthur	Suzuki (CA)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Taylor
Estes (KS)	Marchant	Tenney
Esty (CT)	Marino	Thompson (CA)
Farenthold	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Faso	Massie	Thornberry
Ferguson	Mast	Tiberi
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Tipton
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Torres
Flores	McCaul	Trott
Fortenberry	McClintock	Tsongas
Foster	Foxx	Turner
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Upton
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Valadao
Gaetz	Rodgers	Veasey
Gallagher	McNerney	Visclosky
Garamendi	McSally	Wagner
Garrett	Meadows	Walberg
Gianforte	Meehan	Walden
Gibbs	Messer	Walker
Gohmert	Mitchell	Walorski
Gonzalez (TX)	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walz
Gosar	Moulton	Weber (TX)
Gottheimer	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup
Granger	Neal	Westerman
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Williams
Graves (LA)	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Graves (MO)	Norman	Wittman
Green, Gene	Nunes	Womack

Woodall Yoho Young (IA)  
Yoder Young (AK) Zeldin

Blunt Rochester Long Rooney, Thomas  
Bridenstine Murphy (PA) J.  
Doyle, Michael Napolitano Rosen  
F. Pelosi Titus  
Kihuen

NOT VOTING—11

□ 2110

Mr. MCNERNEY and Mrs. COMSTOCK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. ADAMS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered. The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 292, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—130

Adams Gabbard Meeks  
Barragán Gallego Meng  
Bass Gomez Moore  
Beatty Gonzalez (TX) Moulton  
Beyer Green, Al Nadler  
Bishop (GA) Green, Gene Neal  
Blumenauer Grijalva Nolan  
Boyle, Brendan Gutiérrez Norcross  
F. Hastings Pallone  
Brady (PA) Heck Panetta  
Brown (MD) Higgins (NY) Pascrell  
Butterfield Hoyer Payne  
Capuano Huffman Pingree  
Cárdenas Jackson Lee Pocan  
Carson (IN) Jayapal Price (NC)  
Cartwright Jeffries Raskin  
Castor (FL) Johnson (GA) Richmond  
Castro (TX) Johnson, E. B. Roybal-Allard  
Chu, Judy Kaptur Ryan (OH)  
Cicilline Kelly (IL) Sánchez  
Clark (MA) Kennedy Sarbanes  
Clarke (NY) Khanna Schakowsky  
Clay Kildee Schiff  
Cleverer Krishnamoorthi  
Clyburn Larsen (WA) Scott (VA)  
Cohen Larson (CT) Scott, David  
Connolly Lawrence Serrano  
Conyers Lawson (FL) Sewell (AL)  
Crowley Lee Sherman  
Cummings Lewis (GA) Sires  
Davis, Danny Lieu, Ted Slaughter  
DeFazio Lofgren Smith (WA)  
DeLauro Lowenthal Speier  
Demings Takano  
DeSaulnier M. Thompson (MS)  
Dingell Luján, Ben Ray Tonko  
Doggett Lynch Tsongas  
Ellison Maloney, Vargas  
Engel Carolyn B. Veasey  
Españillat Matsui Vela  
Evans McCollum Velázquez  
Frankel (FL) McEachin Walz  
Fudge McGovern

Wasserman Watson Coleman Yarmuth  
Schultz Welch Williams  
Waters, Maxine Wilson (FL)

Abraham Gallagher Mooney (WV)  
Aderholt Garamendi Mullin  
Aguilar Garrett Murphy (FL)  
Allen Gianforte Newhouse  
Amash Gibbs Noem  
Amodoi Gohmert Norman  
Arrington Goodlatte Nunes  
Babin Gosar O'Halleran  
Bacon Gottheimer O'Rourke  
Banks (IN) Gowdy Olson  
Barletta Granger Palazzo  
Barr Graves (GA) Palmer  
Barton Graves (LA) Paulsen  
Bera Graves (MO) Pearce  
Bergman Griffith Perlmutter  
Biggs Grothman Perry  
Bilirakis Guthrie Peters  
Bishop (MI) Hanabusa Peterson  
Bishop (UT) Handel Pittenger  
Black Harper Poe (TX)  
Blackburn Harris Poliquin  
Blum Hartzler Polis  
Bonamici Hensarling Posey  
Bost Herrera Beutler Quigley  
Brady (TX) Hice, Jody B. Ratcliffe  
Brat Higgins (LA) Reed  
Brooks (AL) Hill Reichert  
Brooks (IN) Himes Renacci  
Brownley (CA) Holding Rice (NY)  
Buchanan Hollingsworth Rice (SC)  
Buck Hudson Roby  
Bucshon Huizenga Roe (TN)  
Budd Hultgren Rogers (AL)  
Burgess Hunter Rogers (KY)  
Bustos Hurd Rohrabacher  
Byrne Issa Rokita  
Calvert Jenkins (KS) Rooney, Francis  
Carbajal Jenkins (WV) Ros-Lehtinen  
Carter (GA) Johnson (LA) Roskam  
Carter (TX) Johnson (OH) Ross  
Chabot Johnson, Sam Rothfus  
Cheney Jones Rouzer  
Coffman Jordan Royce (CA)  
Cole Joyce (OH) Ruiz  
Collins (GA) Katko Ruppertsberger  
Collins (NY) Keating Rush  
Comer Kelly (MS) Russell  
Comstock Kelly (PA) Rutherford  
Conaway Kilmer Sanford  
Cook Kind Scalise  
Cooper King (IA) Schneider  
Correa King (NY) Schrader  
Costa Kinzinger Schweikert  
Costello (PA) Knight Scott, Austin  
Courtney Kuster (NH) Sensenbrenner  
Cramer Kustoff (TN) Sessions  
Crawford Labrador Shea-Porter  
Crist LaHood Shimkus  
Cuellar LaMalfa Shuster  
Culberson Lamborn Simpson  
Curbelo (FL) Lance Sinema  
Davidson Langevin Smith (MO)  
Davis (CA) Latta Smith (NE)  
Davis, Rodney Levin Smith (NJ)  
DeGette Lewis (MN) Smith (TX)  
Delaney Lippinski Smucker  
DeLencastre LoBiondo Soto  
Deming Loebsock Stefanik  
Dent Loudermilk Stewart  
DeSantis Love Stivers  
DesJarlais Lowey Suozzi  
Deutch Lucas Swalwell (CA)  
Diaz-Balart Luetkemeyer Taylor  
Donovan MacArthur Tenney  
Duffy Maloney, Sean Thompson (CA)  
Duncan (SC) Marchant Thompson (PA)  
Duncan (TN) Marino Thornberry  
Dunn Marshall Tiberi  
Emmer Massie Tipton  
Eshoo Mast Torres  
Estes (KS) McCarthy Trott  
Estry (CT) McCaul Turner  
Farenthold McCintock Upton  
Faso McHenry Valadao  
Ferguson McKinley Visclosky  
Fitzpatrick McMorris Wagner  
Fleischmann Rodgers Walberg  
Flores McNeerney Walden  
Fortenberry McSally Walker  
Foster Meadows Walorski  
Fox Meehan Walters, Mimi  
Franks (AZ) Messer Weber (TX)  
Frelinghuysen Mitchell Webster (FL)  
Gaetz Moolenaar Wenstrup

NOES—292

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt Rochester Long Rooney, Thomas  
Bridenstine Murphy (PA) J.  
Doyle, Michael Napolitano Rosen  
F. Pelosi Titus  
Kihuen

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2117

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

MONTANANS DEALING WITH FEDERAL OVERREACH

(Mr. GIANFORTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I met last week with a couple of small business owners in Butte, Montana, who have been the target of an out-of-control Federal bureaucrat in the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

One of the bureaucrat's targets is Riley's Meats. Over a period of 12 years, Dr. Jeffrey Legg with the FSIS ordered Bart Riley to comply with what he told Riley were Federal regulations.

Mr. Riley spent over \$10,000 in compliance costs and suffered years of harassment, but these weren't real Federal regulations. They were costly measures dreamed up by this bureaucrat.

I saw the toll that dealing with this government harassment has taken on the Riley family over the last decade.

No one should have to endure such a nightmare. Stories like these are why the American people demand that Washington is cleaned up.

For the Riley family and other Montanans dealing with Federal overreach, I will continue to focus on this issue until it is resolved.

MASS SHOOTING IN LAS VEGAS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, America has again been rocked by a mass shooting, and our hearts ache and our hands pray for the victims and those who are recovering. You can't help but watch the countless scores of video accounts and not feel an urge to act.

My constituents ask: Are we helpless to stop the next mass shooting?

We are only helpless once the trigger is squeezed and you are in the pathway of a bullet, but we are not helpless in this House. In fact, if we come together, we are more powerful than any weapon.

Aren't the dead owed a dialogue, a conversation about whether we should have background checks, a talk about whether people who have weapons of war should only be warriors, and what about talking about restrictions on ammunition purchases?

I refuse to accept the tradeoff that we must allow and accept that a mass shooting is going to happen in this country for an unfettered access to firearms.

If the police officers who went into that building so blindly and were so brave could do that and show that courage, we can come into this building and have the courage to have a dialogue for those victims.

#### RECOGNIZING THE WORK AND ACHIEVEMENT OF STEVE HILDRETH

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

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and the achievement of Steve Hildreth, an exemplary employee and member of our community. Steve celebrated his retirement last month after working for 30 years at the Georgia Pacific Paper Mill in Camas, Washington.

Steve started at the mill in 1987, as sleeter helper in the print department. By the time he retired, he held the position of the shift team leader for the shift instrumentation technicians. He was well respected by the operators and crews of the machines, and he knew the job was to make their job easier.

He was also a member of the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers union throughout his career and held office in Local 5 for several years.

Fortunately, Steve has options in retirement. According to his wife, Shari, he is a true Renaissance man, in that he can build, troubleshoot, and fix just about anything. He is spending his time remodeling their Washougal home, setting up his new shop, and making his way through Shari's extensive honey-do list.

Mr. Speaker, southwest Washington has been fortunate to have someone like Steve Hildreth as an employee, father, husband, grandfather, and resi-

dent for the past 30 years. I would like to congratulate Steve on his retirement and wish him all the best in the years to come.

#### TRADE AND JOBS HEARING IN BROOK PARK, OHIO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the NAFTA negotiations continue, it is important for us to listen to our constituents on how we can make NAFTA better for them.

To that end, I convened important stakeholders for a hearing in Ohio on how NAFTA has hurt American workers and what we can do to help them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the testimony of Ms. Lee Geisse of the BlueGreen Alliance, Cheryl Johncox of the Sierra Club, and Mark Milko of Workers United.

#### BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE TESTIMONY, LEE GEISSE, REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER

We know that it is possible to have trade agreements that don't engage the U.S. in a race to the bottom, but instead lift up our own workers and workers throughout the world. We applaud Congresswoman Kaptur's work on this issue and so many others that are vital to the future of Ohio's workers, economy and the environment! Thank you for bringing these folks together and inviting the BlueGreen Alliance to participate!

In 2006, the United Steelworkers and the Sierra Club formed this unique Alliance—founded with the belief that we no longer have to choose between good jobs and a clean environment; we can and must have both. In these 11 years, we've convened workers, environmentalists, and industry leaders to forge partnerships that help us find solutions to address historic problems like climate change in ways that create and secure quality jobs. Together, we are a powerful voice for good jobs, a clean environment, and a fair and thriving economy.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, also known as NAFTA, has been in effect since 1994. The current Administration has announced plans for its renegotiation, but without much detail. That renegotiation begins this month. For far too many, NAFTA has meant the loss of good, quality paying jobs and increased pollution, as the deal exacerbated offshoring and profiteering off the backs of workers and the environment. It's time for a trade agreement that levels the playing field and makes deep reforms to strengthen workers' rights and environmental standards. American workers should expect agreements that ensure that other countries have to play by the same worker safety and environmental rules that we do. Anything short of [this] would be a failure.

NAFTA's replacement must support good union jobs, livable wages, healthy communities, clean air and water, and a more stable climate. Through an open, public process, the U.S. can partner with other nations in mutually beneficial trade and climate agreements that are fair, protect workers' rights and jobs, safeguard the environment; ensure the democratic processes of sovereign nations are not overturned by unelected bodies; and raise the bar for consumer and public protections in all nations that are signatories. The BlueGreen Alliance recommends a new approach to trade that lifts up workers

and communities. This requires fundamental changes to NAFTA, including:

1. Creating a transparent and inclusive renegotiation process. NAFTA renegotiations should not be done in secret but should be transparent and allow for public participation. This means inviting and incorporating public input on U.S. proposals for the agreement, and making negotiating texts available for public comment after each negotiating round. Workers, environmentalists, and other key stakeholders should be part of the process to make sure negotiators understand the impact of the deal on jobs and the environment. It is critical that all stakeholders and the general public be involved in a transparent, fair, and participatory negotiating process.

2. Eliminating corporate courts that incentivize offshoring and undermine environmental protections. NAFTA's Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) provision has created private courts in which foreign corporations can demand compensation for environmental protections and other democratically enacted laws before unelected, unaccountable, panels of corporate lawyers. By creating unique privileges for foreign investors, ISDS can incentivize offshoring and threaten the very safeguards we have democratically enacted. NAFTA's broad rights for foreign corporations, including ISDS, must be eliminated—mere tweaks will not be sufficient. NAFTA's replacement must eliminate ISDS so as to safeguard workers and environmental and health protections.

3. Including strong and binding labor and environmental protections—including wage and climate standards—in the core text of the agreement. NAFTA has enabled corporations to offshore production to take advantage of lower environmental and labor standards abroad. This has significantly impacted workers in both the manufacturing and service sectors. It has spurred the loss of good paying jobs, carbon leakage, and the export of pollution, while undermining domestic labor and environmental protections. To fix this, NAFTA's replacement should establish a binding floor of labor and environmental protections across North America. It should require signatory countries to adopt living wages for workers and to implement policies to fulfill important international labor and environmental agreements, including the Paris Climate Agreement and the International Labor Organization's conventions. These commitments should be included in the core text of the agreement and trade sanctions should be used to penalize violations. NAFTA must make a commitment to prioritize workers and the environment.

4. Creating a stronger, independent enforcement mechanism. Rules mean nothing if they aren't enforced. In the history of the U.S. trade agreements, labor and environmental provisions have consistently been ignored. Even post-2007 trade agreements with labor and environmental provisions in the core text have failed to produce disputes over widely documented labor and environmental violations. To fix this, the agreement that replaces NAFTA must create a new, independent dispute settlement mechanism for enforcing labor and environmental provisions rather than replicating the failed system of the past. Stronger enforcement is critical to ensure that the agreement is upheld and that it creates a fair playing field among all parties.

5. Protecting and promoting Buy American and green procurement policies. Currently NAFTA requires that the federal government treat foreign bidders as if they were American bidders when deciding how to spend U.S. taxpayer money. It also includes rules that



limit governments' ability to use "green purchasing" requirements that ensure government contracts support environmental protection. To protect and grow America's manufacturing and service sector employment, create taxpayer funded jobs in the U.S., and safeguard our air and water, NAFTA's replacement should support domestic job creation and responsible bidding standards.

6. Strengthening rules of origin. Rules of origin should benefit producers and workers across North America. For example, NAFTA's replacement needs to adopt more robust rules of origin that require automotive manufacturers to make a higher percentage of new vehicles and their parts in the originating country in order to qualify for tariff free trade. The agreement should ensure the signatory countries receive manufacturing, investment, and production benefits of the agreement. Under the current agreement, many countries that are not part of the agreement take advantage of loopholes to gain market access. The rules of origin and regional value content need to be updated so that they can incentivize manufacturing and production domestically.

We know exactly what causes outsourcing: low wages, exploited workers in unsafe working conditions, and weak, or non-existent, environmental, protections in other countries.

Americans, Ohioans, and working people everywhere need fair trade deals that put workers and the environment first and don't put corporate interests above our health, our rights, and our safety.

The promise of NAFTA being a job creator was hollow, and thousands of Ohio workers watched helplessly as this flawed trade agreement led to the outsourcing of middle-class jobs. While Donald Trump has promised to renegotiate NAFTA, the skepticism is that his billionaire, climate-denying cabinet, could actually make it worse!

All of our partners and allies must commit to helping champions like Congresswoman Kaptur watch closely and ensure that the voices of working people are heard throughout this process to support—not undermine—good jobs, efforts to address climate change, and safe worksites and healthy communities!

CHERYL JOHNCOX, ORGANIZING  
REPRESENTATIVE, SIERRA CLUB

Thank you, Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur, for this very important hearing associated with the North American Free Trade Agreement Renegotiation. My name is Cheryl Johncox and I am a member of the national field team of Sierra Club.

For more than two decades, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has harmed communities across Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.—particularly people of color and lower income families—by undermining environmental protections, eliminating jobs, increasing air and water pollution, eroding wages, and fueling climate change.

To transform NAFTA from a polluter-friendly deal into one that supports environmental protection, any renegotiation must include, at a minimum,

1. Eliminate rules that empower corporations to attack environmental and public health protections in unaccountable tribunals. NAFTA's investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) system has empowered multinational corporations to bypass our courts, go to private tribunals, and demand money from taxpayers for policies that affect corporate bottom lines. Corporations have used NAFTA to challenge bans on toxic chemicals, the decisions of environmental review panels, and protections for our climate. They have extracted more than \$370 million from

governments in these cases, while pending NAFTA claims total more than \$35 billion. The cases are heard not by judges, but by corporate lawyers outside the normal court system. Broad corporate rights, including ISDS, must be eliminated from NAFTA to safeguard our right to democratically determine our own public interest protections.

2. Add strong, enforceable environmental and labor standards to the core text of agreement. NAFTA's weak and unenforceable environmental and labor side agreements facilitated a race to the bottom in which corporations could offshore jobs to exploit lower environmental and labor standards in another country. Any deal that replaces NAFTA must create a fair playing field by requiring each participating country to adopt, maintain, and implement policies to ensure compliance with domestic environmental laws and important international environmental and labor agreements, including the Paris climate agreement, and treaties protecting Indigenous rights. In addition, each country must make commitments to tackle critical conservation challenges related to illegal timber trade, illegal wildlife trade, and fisheries management. These commitments must be included in the core text of the agreement and made enforceable via an independent dispute settlement process in which trade sanctions are used to correct labor and environmental abuses.

3. Safeguard energy sector regulation by overhauling overreaching rules. NAFTA's energy chapter, written before awareness of climate change was widespread, must be eliminated. Other NAFTA rules allow renewable portfolio standards, low-carbon fuel standards, and other climate-friendly energy regulations to be challenged for impeding business and hurting corporate bottom lines. Such rules must be narrowed to protect climate policies in each country.

4. Restrict pollution from cross-border motor carriers. NAFTA encouraged a rise in cross-border motor traffic without doing anything to mitigate the resulting increase in harmful vehicle emissions. Any deal that replaces NAFTA must require cross-border motor carriers to reduce emissions in order for their goods to benefit from reduced tariffs. In addition, all cross-border commercial vehicles must be required to comply with all state and federal standards to limit pollution.

5. Require green government purchasing instead of restricting it. NAFTA's procurement rules limit governments' ability to use "green purchasing" requirements that ensure government contracts support renewable energy, energy efficiency, and sustainable goods. NAFTA's replacement must require signatory governments to include a preference for goods and services with low environmental impacts and fair labor practices in procurement decisions.

6. Bolster climate protections by penalizing imported goods made with high climate emissions and lax labor standards. NAFTA allows firms to shift production to a country with lower climate standards, which can spur "carbon leakage" and job offshoring. To prevent this, and encourage greater climate action from high-emissions trading partners, each country must be required to impose a border tax on imported goods made with significant climate pollution, and unfair labor practices.

7. Add a broad protection for environmental, labor and other public interest policies. NAFTA's many overreaching rules restrict the policy tools that governments can use to protect the environment and other broadly-shared priorities. NAFTA includes no provision that effectively shields public interest policies from such rules—only a weak "exception" that has consistently

failed to protect challenged policies. Instead; any deal that replaces NAFTA must include a broad "carve-out" that exempts public interest policies from all of the deal's rules.

Any NAFTA renegotiation must be conducted through an open process that invites the public to help formulate U.S. positions and to comment on negotiated texts after each negotiating round. Bolstered by resurgent support for a new trade model, we commit to push for this environmental overhaul of NAFTA, and against any polluter-friendly deal that masquerades as change.

WORKERS UNITED,

August 11, 2017.

Re NAFTA field hearing.

Congresswoman KAPTUR,  
Cleveland Office, Cleveland, OH.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KAPTUR: I just wanted to respond in writing on a couple of facts on how NAFTA can affect workers indirectly impacted by NAFTA in manufacturing.

1. Workers that supply the food service in factories that are moved to Mexico.

2. Workers that work in the hospitality industry are impacted because of the loss of good paying jobs, those manufacturing workers no longer have the disposable income to go to a racetrack, ball game or other sporting events at all or as often.

3. The workers that still produce goods like our garment workers are put in a bad bargaining position at contract time because of trade agreements like NAFTA.

Please keep me in the loop on anything we can do to help in this process to get this trade agreement amended.

Sincerely,

MARK A. MILKO,  
Area Director Workers United.

Ms. KAPTUR. Lee and Cheryl underlined the adverse environmental effects of NAFTA and the need to strengthen environmental standards in any renegotiated agreement.

I was proud to note their statements that Ohio has become number one in solar manufacturing. Just as Mark said, it is important that we ensure that these valuable manufacturing skills are passed along to our youth, and not outsourced.

I am grateful for their contributions and welcome their continued engagement as the negotiations proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to include their remarks in the RECORD. They are important for all Americans to read, especially those negotiating the new NAFTA.

#### RECOGNIZING CARE NET PREGNANCY CENTER OF CENTRAL NEW YORK

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Care Net Pregnancy Center of Central New York.

Founded in 1989, Care Net provides free, confidential services for women facing an unplanned pregnancy across our region. Nationwide, Care Net has a network of over 1,100 pregnancy centers.

Through its work, Care Net of Central New York has provided guidance and compassionate care to over 24,000

individuals, equipping women with the resources they need to make an informed decision about their pregnancy.

From pregnancy counseling to post-abortion recovery services, Care Net offers a wide range of support and assistance to women considering this life-changing, difficult decision.

During an emotional and challenging time, Care Net staff provides an unparalleled level of compassion, support, and dedication to the women and men they serve.

Care Net continues to lead the way in the mission to protect the sanctity of life, helping to save the lives of thousands of unborn children each year.

It is an honor to stand here today to recognize Care Net's service to our community and its unwavering commitment to future generations.

COMMENDING THE OFFICE OF  
MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET FOR  
THEIR ATTENTION TO  
WILDFIRES IN THE WEST

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend this evening the Office of Management and Budget and Mr. Mulvaney for the special attention they are taking to the wildfire situation we have in this country, especially in the West.

They have put forward a request for \$576 million additional funding for fire suppression, but even more importantly is to get at the root of the problem with better forest management that will make sense and make a difference over the coming years of getting rid of the fuel, getting the fuel out of the forest that is so much of the problem, with millions and millions of dead trees, brush, and all the other hazards that cause wildfires, that are going to happen anyway, to become catastrophic fires.

So OMB calling for these reforms that we have been talking about, me and my colleagues, for a long time is really a good sign that this administration wants to get serious about cutting way back on the wildfires and the severe damage to air quality, habitat, wildlife, and the asset the American people own, that they are serious about it.

□ 2130

YOU HAVE EARNED YOUR REST  
CORPORAL MICHAEL PAUL MIDDLEBROOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for half the remaining time until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), my friend.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

On October 1 of this year, less than one week ago, my brother of the thin blue line, Corporal Michael Paul Middlebrook, a nine-year veteran of the Lafayette Police Department, was killed in the line of duty while responding to a "shots fired" call at a local convenience store.

Corporal Middlebrook is survived by his wife, three daughters, and his parents. During his tenure at the Lafayette Police Department, Corporal Middlebrook accumulated seven letters of commendation for acts of bravery and outstanding police work.

Michael understood that his job as a cop began with an oath. And that oath was not to a chief or a sheriff or a marshal. It was an oath of allegiance to the constitutional principles that his badge represents. Corporal Michael Middlebrook recognized unwaveringly the civil constitutional rights of the citizens he had sworn to protect and defend and serve.

In March of this year, Michael was awarded the highly prestigious Heart of Law Enforcement Award by the national nonprofit group Beyond the Badge. During the ceremony, Corporal Middlebrook was recognized by Louisiana's Governor and was presented a commemorative State flag. This award was given to recognize Corporal Middlebrook's ongoing contributions to the low-income community that he patrolled.

Michael regularly took donated food items from local convenience stores and distributed the food to the homeless and less fortunate. Michael also collected clothing on his off time and delivered the clothing to poor souls he encountered during his shift deep in the night while the world slept.

In the last 6 months alone, Corporal Michael Middlebrook was recognized for having saved a person's life by placing himself between the victim and the knife-wielding suspect, and for single-handedly apprehending an armed robbery suspect seconds after the 911 call was placed.

Corporal Middlebrook's chief, my friend and brother, Chief Toby Aguilard, provided this quote: "For many in our community, Corporal Middlebrook was a spearhead that brought them to justice. For many others, Corporal Middlebrook was a cradle of compassion. He was an officer's officer, loved and respected by his peers. The void he leaves in our department, in our community, in our hearts will be felt for generations. He will never be forgotten."

That quote was from Michael's chief. Brother Michael, you have earned your rest. Your watch has ended. We have got it from here. The thin blue line will never forget your service. We shall always honor your memory, and we shall watch over your family.

May our Saviour bless your ascension, and may He hold your loved ones close to His own heart.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, when someone with the service of my friend from Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS, pays tribute, you know it is somebody worthy, because my friend from Louisiana served with distinction in the United States Army, wearing the uniform of this country. He served as a law enforcement officer. He knows about serving, protecting others, and a willingness to lay down his life for others.

It has been deeply touching to have seen accounts of what is going on in Las Vegas. To understand what I have seen in my years as a prosecutor, judge, and chief justice, when everyone is running away from the sound of a gun, first responders and law officers are running into harm's way to help and protect others.

It was Jesus who said, "Greater love has no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Those who wear the uniform, as my friend has, of law officer and in the military, they know what that means. My 4 years in Active Duty in the Army, we were not in combat, but Jesus was right.

There were so many there in Las Vegas that put their own lives on the line for the sake of the lives of others.

There are others that couldn't wait to rush to a microphone to demand: Gun control, gun control.

I am waiting for them to rush to the mic and scream: Knife control, knife control.

Or after a van is used as the weapon: Van control, van control.

What is clear is we need to look at the real causation, whether it is machetes being used to torture and kill 800,000 precious humans in Africa, whether it is knives, whether it is ammonium nitrate. People with evil in their hearts are going to find a way to wreak havoc.

We know that without a gun being used, the biggest—worst tragedy and loss of life attack was on 9/11 in 2001. I don't believe there was a gun used in the whole process, yet it was a worse loss of American life than at Pearl Harbor.

You have got to look at what is in the heart, what's causing it. If they are going to use knives, if they are going to use planes, if they are going to use vehicles, yeah, we need to protect ourselves, but we need to look at what is in the heart.

I know the sheriff said the shooter may have been radicalized. We don't know yet. We know there was a trip to the Philippines.

I am very proud to have met out in the jungles of the southern Philippines with some of our special forces. Amazing. Some of the best America has to offer, and they were out in the jungles teaching the Filipino soldiers, the best that the Philippines had, how to go after the radicalized Islamists in the southern Philippines.

But we don't know if this man with evil in his heart had been radicalized.

Others say there were no indications. But one thing was certain, he looked down on that crowd of people enjoying life, enjoying their families, enjoying their loved ones, and all he could see was worthless people that needed to be eliminated.

Why did he have that in his heart? Where do people get those ideas?

I mean, we argue and disagree here on the House floor. When I was a judge, I watched argument. At times it seemed like they wanted to come to blows, but it was part of a civil process in a bastion where we come and we disagree and we don't use physical violence, but we are still supposed to have respect for each other and each other's position.

To hear some comedian say, "Just do something," would have been viewed by those who gave us the documents that have allowed us to be the greatest Nation—I think greater than Solomon's Israel, more assets per person, the only country in the history that I'm aware of where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor is obesity, and it is a serious issue.

But how did we get here?

Obviously, for the Japanese at Pearl Harbor, it was easier for them because they weren't looking in the eyes of people.

It was easier for this guy 32 floors up because he was not looking at the eyes of these people, his people he wanted to kill that he didn't think were worth allowing to live, despite the love they were sharing with each other and the joy.

Where do people get those ideas that somebody is that worthless? Is it from hearing people with whom someone disagrees is deplorable, that they simply cannot be made worthy of living?

Here is a statement from this October 2 article. Some CBS executive said she was not even sympathetic for the victims of the shooting at a country music festival. She said: "I am actually not even sympathetic because country music fans often are Republican gun toters."

□ 2145

Scott Pelley has questioned whether the shooting was "foreseeable, predictable and, to some degree, self-inflicted."

But for someone who appears to know right from wrong, not suffering from mental disease or defect, to inflict that kind of death on people who are just innocent, just having a good time, there has to be so much evil and hate in his heart.

So we have a Supreme Court that has been saying for years: You have got to get prayer out of schools. Never mind the fact that prayer got this country started, that prayer and worship and honoring God have been behind the greatest developments in this country's history that got us to this place, to this plateau, as a nation.

Although some would argue we have hit the height of freedom, some surveys

don't have us anywhere near the top of being one of the freest countries in the world anymore.

It is continuing to be, after tragedies, after people with evil in their heart do evil things, that more cry out: We need to lose more freedom. We need to lose more freedom.

That is not the answer. Let's look at what is in people's hearts and what would be good to have in their hearts.

I know where we came from, but even I was surprised when my pastor, David Dykes, and I and his wife, Cindy, my wife, Kathy, we were going through the State Department. I had not done a tour of the State Department before because it is mostly boring, but we came to a glass case that had a document in it, and it said it was a duplicate.

We know that many of our most important documents, including the Declaration of Independence, were made in duplicate, so I don't know if this was one that was actually signed or it was a duplicate. It appeared to be of the era.

I said to Dr. Dykes: Did you know the Treaty of Paris began like that?

I didn't know. I study history most every day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I did know that rule.

But this was the Treaty of Paris, 1783, and John Adams was there. But this is where we were negotiating with England, the most powerful country in the world, imploring them to recognize this little upstart country of 13 States as an independent country, independent and free of the shackles that were there as Colonies by England.

Here they have got the biggest navy. They have an impressive military, most powerful nation, and we are asking them to swear on a document that we in the United States have the right to be free and independent.

So as I contemplated that, well, these first words that are in much bigger letters than the rest of the document, began to make sense.

What would you have asked somebody swear under, at the beginning of our Nation, asking the most powerful nation in the world to swear that they recognize, something important enough they would not want to break that oath, even with the anger and the despising attitude that many in England had at that time?

Well, the words they chose for those big, tall letters, were these, and this is a copy of the copy. "In the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity."

Well, some say we were started with the Declaration of Independence, recognizing that we are free and, of right, ought to be free because we are endowed by our Creator with these unalienable rights.

And then we have this document where England swears in the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity that they recognize our independence. That came after the Great Awakening, in the 1700s, where pulpits were on fire with the glory of God and the recognition of what God had given us and of the importance of the Bible.

No, everybody wasn't a Christian back then, but of the signers of the Declaration, you had over a third of them were—may have been over half were actually ordained Christian ministers.

There were secularists that supported the end of slavery, but the churches drove that. The churches provided the Underground Railroad, most often, to try to help Africans to be free Americans.

It was an ordained Christian minister who went on to help bring about the full meaning of the Constitution, that this should mean what it said, an ordained Christian minister named Martin Luther King, Jr.

So, Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, he started life early as, bragging to his law partner, he was an infidel. Going from that, as Steve Mansfield discusses, I believe the book is entitled "Lincoln's Struggle With God." By the time he became President, he knew there was a God. And just like Benjamin Franklin said: "I have lived, sir, a long time. The longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that, 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.'"

He said: "I firmly believe this. I also firmly believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel."

So this man, kind of homely looking—I thought Daniel Day-Lewis captured his essence so well. When I met Doris Kearns Goodwin over at the Library of Congress, I said: You've got to tell me, you do such fabulous research—and, yes, she is a more liberal Democrat, I know, but she does fabulous research. And in her book, "Team of Rivals," she has well documented he didn't have a pleasant voice, kind of high, raspy. Daniel Day-Lewis nailed it.

But Lincoln came to know what Ben Franklin testified to in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention. He lost a son. He and his wife lost a son in 1861. There are indications he totally blamed himself because he thought he hadn't done quickly enough what God meant for him to do: end slavery. I don't know if that is true or not.

But in March of 1863, this was Abraham Lincoln's declaration, and I will finish with this, Mr. Speaker. Abraham Lincoln's words were: "But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the

gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all the blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own."

Lincoln goes on and says: "Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness"—Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this was not the act of God punishing Americans for being country music fans or being conservatives. This was not the act of God punishing Americans for turning away. This was from a man with evil in his heart in a country where God has been driven out of the schoolhouse, driven out of government buildings by a majority of Supreme Court Justices who have no clue how far from the original intent of the Constitution they have wandered.

It is the result of years of teaching people that there are those among our what we deem innocent in society who just should not be allowed to live. That is not the teaching of Jesus. It is not the teaching in the Bible, and it is not what this country grew so great believing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

#### LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. KIHUEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of husband's health.

#### BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 29, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3823. To amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2519. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9 a.m.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3937. A bill to require the Federal prudential banking agencies to determine whether certain institutions they regulate engage in a pattern or practice of violations of Federal banking and consumer protection laws and regulations, to provide for the revocation of banking charters and Federal deposit insurance for such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3938. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3939. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3940. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for housing stipends and supply fee payments under Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals affected by extended school closures due to natural disasters; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3941. A bill to improve food safety, to encourage greater production of agricultural commodities for use in the locality in which produced, to reauthorize and expand Department of Agriculture support of these efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration

of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 3942. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 to include sex trafficking victims in the transitional housing assistance grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. GALLEGGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VELA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General from using eminent domain to acquire land for the purpose of constructing a wall, or other physical barrier, along the international border between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3944. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras and securely storing and maintaining recorded data for law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3945. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3946. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Statesboro, Georgia, the "Ray Hendrix Veterans Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr.

CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 3947. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 3948. A bill to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from compelling a person to produce or furnish algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 3949. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the designation of State approving agencies for multi-State apprenticeship programs for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 3950. A bill to specify the scope of judicial review of certain agency actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3951. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to declare that an aviation humanitarian crisis exists for airports impacted by a major disaster or emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to replace the Federal Election Commission with the Federal Election Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3955. A bill to reform public financing for Presidential elections and provide for public financing for Congressional elections; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the treatment of seasonal positions for purposes of the employer shared responsibility requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 3957. A bill to repeal title VIII of the Higher Education Opportunity Act and title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 3958. A bill to establish a pilot program on securing energy infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to give States the option of monitoring covered criteria air pollutants in designated areas by greatly increasing the number of air quality sensors in exchange for greater regulatory flexibility in the methods of monitoring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3960. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Liu Xiaobo, and collectively to all advocates of democracy and human rights in China, in recognition of their extraordinary advocacy for liberty and human rights despite repression and their impact on world peace and global understanding of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition

to the Committees on House Administration, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 3962. A bill to require face to face purchases of ammunition, to require licensing of ammunition dealers, and to require reporting regarding bulk purchases of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BOST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOEBBACK, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATTA, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the first Friday of October as "Manufacturing Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GALLEGRO, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 555. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit, respectively, certain documents and other information to the House of Representatives relating to the executive order on the review of designations under the Antiquities Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 556. A resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 557. A resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 3938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Line 18 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 3946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the general welfare clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 3949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (necessary and proper clause)

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 3950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, and Article III, Sections 1 and 2, of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 3962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 37: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 147: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 246: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 299: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 436: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 445: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 535: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 598: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 613: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 619: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 620: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 632: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 638: Ms. BASS and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 669: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 686: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 750: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 807: Mr. McCAUL and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 820: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 821: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 846: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 850: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 866: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 927: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.



- H.R. 1002: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. BRADY of Texas.  
H.R. 1017: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 1046: Mr. AMODEL.  
H.R. 1057: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. MCHENRY.  
H.R. 1078: Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 1094: Ms. ESHOO.  
H.R. 1111: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
H.R. 1133: Mr. ZELDIN.  
H.R. 1136: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1148: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1150: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.  
H.R. 1164: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. ALLEN.  
H.R. 1167: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.  
H.R. 1241: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.  
H.R. 1273: Mr. STEWART.  
H.R. 1274: Mr. STEWART.  
H.R. 1276: Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
H.R. 1279: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.  
H.R. 1298: Mr. KATKO.  
H.R. 1374: Mr. CONNOLLY.  
H.R. 1406: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. DELANEY.  
H.R. 1444: Mr. AMODEL.  
H.R. 1459: Mr. DUFFY.  
H.R. 1552: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HILL.  
H.R. 1566: Ms. DELAURO.  
H.R. 1568: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.  
H.R. 1587: Mr. POLIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TONKO.  
H.R. 1639: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.  
H.R. 1661: Ms. STEFANIK and Mrs. HARTZLER.  
H.R. 1676: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. CAPUANO.  
H.R. 1729: Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 1762: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. GOWDY.  
H.R. 1825: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. TSONGAS.  
H.R. 1896: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 1953: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CONAWAY.  
H.R. 2133: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.  
H.R. 2193: Mr. MACARTHUR.  
H.R. 2267: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.  
H.R. 2285: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. OLSON.  
H.R. 2318: Mr. KIHUEN.  
H.R. 2321: Mrs. NOEM.  
H.R. 2401: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. ADAMS.  
H.R. 2436: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 2465: Mr. BURGESS.  
H.R. 2481: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2625: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.  
H.R. 2633: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. NADLER.  
H.R. 2644: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 2651: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
H.R. 2705: Mr. STIVERS.  
H.R. 2740: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.  
H.R. 2782: Ms. BORDALLO.  
H.R. 2821: Mr. REICHERT.  
H.R. 2862: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.  
H.R. 2890: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. LIPINSKI.  
H.R. 2901: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.  
H.R. 2908: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.  
H.R. 2936: Mr. NEWHOUSE.  
H.R. 2999: Mr. PALAZZO.  
H.R. 3034: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. LEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. WOMACK.  
H.R. 3040: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MENG, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. LEVIN.  
H.R. 3117: Mr. PERRY.  
H.R. 3222: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.  
H.R. 3303: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 3320: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.  
H.R. 3324: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.  
H.R. 3329: Mr. BUDD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.  
H.R. 3345: Mrs. DEMINGS.  
H.R. 3352: Mr. CORREA and Miss RICE of New York.  
H.R. 3363: Ms. MOORE.  
H.R. 3380: Mr. RUSH, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.  
H.R. 3394: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.  
H.R. 3402: Mr. GALLAGHER.  
H.R. 3464: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.  
H.R. 3479: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.  
H.R. 3497: Mr. HIMES and Mr. SWALWELL of California.  
H.R. 3512: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. FERGUSON.  
H.R. 3528: Mr. KENNEDY.  
H.R. 3548: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. NORMAN.  
H.R. 3554: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SCHRADER.  
H.R. 3576: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.  
H.R. 3632: Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KILMER.  
H.R. 3639: Mr. POLIS.  
H.R. 3711: Mrs. Handel.  
H.R. 3727: Mr. KHANNA.  
H.R. 3730: Mr. ROTHFUS.  
H.R. 3733: Mr. BEYER.  
H.R. 3738: Ms. LEE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. WELCH.  
H.R. 3755: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.  
H.R. 3761: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
H.R. 3767: Mr. KATKO.  
H.R. 3775: Mr. HUDSON.  
H.R. 3808: Ms. STEFANIK.  
H.R. 3826: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. BUCHANAN.  
H.R. 3832: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.  
H.R. 3847: Mr. COOK.  
H.R. 3849: Mr. CORREA.  
H.R. 3862: Ms. MATSUI.  
H.R. 3866: Mr. TAKANO.  
H.R. 3875: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.  
H.R. 3877: Ms. NORTON.  
H.R. 3896: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. RUSH.  
H.R. 3923: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. POCAN.  
H.R. 3925: Mr. GARAMENDI.  
H.J. Res. 48: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. BARRAGÁN.  
H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Miss RICE of New York.  
H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL.  
H. Res. 142: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.  
H. Res. 213: Mr. ELLISON.  
H. Res. 283: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MOULTON.  
H. Res. 367: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, and Mr. GOMEZ.  
H. Res. 370: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.  
H. Res. 401: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIPTON.  
H. Res. 458: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.  
H. Res. 495: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CLEAVER.  
H. Res. 517: Mr. KIND.  
H. Res. 535: Ms. MENG.  
H. Res. 544: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. LOVE.

#### DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 367: Mr. DEFAZIO.