AUTHENTICATED U.S. GOVERNMENT INFORMATION GPO

Congressional Record

United States of America

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163 WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2017 *No. 160*

House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

PRAYER

Reverend Timothy Kesicki, Jesuit Conference, Washington, DC, offered the following prayer:

God of all consolation, from whom human sadness is never hidden, we turn to You to be our strength this day.

The psalmist proclaims that You are close to the brokenhearted and that You save those crushed in spirit.

We pray that You lift the spirit of our Nation this day, and guide those who represent and lead Your people.

Help our leaders to find good counsel and give ear to Your holy words. The Book of Proverbs teaches us that: ''For lack of counsel a nation fails, security lies with many advisers.''

May all who advise, guide, and help to direct our government do so with selfless care. May they put the needs of others before their own cares and lift the burden of those who suffer most.

Grant our leaders discerning minds and hearts, so that ''Your will be done'' today and every day with which You bless us.

We pray this with great faith and hope.

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.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

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

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman from California (Mr. PETERS) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. PETERS 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.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

RECOGNIZING PERRY TECHNICAL INSTITUTE AND TYLER ANDRINGA

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Perry Technical Institute for receiving the Accrediting Commission of Career Schools and Colleges' 2017 School of Excellence Award.

Perry Tech has continually provided high-quality education and technical training for students in the Yakima Valley of central Washington, and this award is well deserved.

On top of that, I would like to recognize Tyler Andringa, who received the commission's 2017 Outstanding Graduate Award. Tyler graduated from Perry Tech in December 2016 with a certificate in information technology and communication systems.

Tyler has cerebral palsy and has overcome many challenges to obtain his certificate. He has served as a role model and a leader among his classmates.

Applying the resources and guidance he received at Perry Tech, Tyler is currently employed with Continuant, a telecommunications service provider, where he is succeeding in advancing his career goals. His achievements are commendable, and I wish him the best in his future endeavors.

Please join me in congratulating Perry Technical Institute on their achievements as they continue to provide excellent education and job training to equip students just like Tyler Andringa.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. PETERS. Mr. Speaker, our tax system is broken and in desperate need of reform. We need a simpler Tax Code that is fiscally responsible, makes American businesses more competitive, and allows working families to prosper in a 21st century economy.

But the Ryan-McConnell tax proposal would do the opposite and fails on the promises made by President Trump to boost the middle class. Middle class families would see an average tax increase of $1,290 per year. That is a 380 percent increase for an average family of four.

A new analysis from the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center said that the Ryan-McConnell proposal would add $5.6 trillion to the national debt, a 27 percent increase from the current debt which is already too high.

Under this proposal, the increased deficits will far outweigh the benefits

☐ 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.

of reductions, and economic growth and hardworking Americans will both suffer.

Instead, we need forward-looking policies that are fiscally responsible and create opportunities for families and businesses in today's economy. That will only come from bipartisan negotiations where we can work together to create the best possible tax conditions for Americans.

RECOGNIZING NATIONAL FARM TO SCHOOL MONTH

(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, October is National Farm to School Month. It is time when we celebrate food education, school gardens, and lunch trays filled with healthy, local ingredients.

Farm to School brings healthy foods from local farms to schoolchildren nationwide. The program teaches students about the path from farm to fork and instills healthy eating habits that can last a lifetime by introducing children to real food.

At the same time, use of local produce in school meals and educational activities provides a new direct market opportunity for family farmers in the area and lessens environmental impacts of transporting food long distances.

More than 31 million children eat a school lunch 5 days a week, 180 days a year. If school lunch can taste great and support the local community, everybody wins. In the early 1990s, there were merely a few Farm to School programs, and today there are thousands.

Mr. Speaker, as chairman of the Nutrition Subcommittee, it is encouraging to see this program grow and our schoolchildren's diets improving. A lifelong love of healthy, locally grown food from your local farmer is something we can all support.

GUN VIOLENCE

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

Ms. ADAMS. Mr. Speaker, 585, the number of people murdered and injured in Las Vegas on Sunday during the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

477, the number of days since the previous deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history in Orlando.

521, the number of mass shootings since Orlando.

91, the average number of Americans killed by gun violence every day.

69, the number of homicides in Charlotte in 2017.

Zero, the number of actions taken by Congress to address the gun violence epidemic in our country.

When is enough enough? What is it going to take for Congress to end gun violence?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to stop wasting time and demand that a joint select committee be established to combat gun violence and the bipartisan King-Thompson bill be brought to the floor for a vote.

It is time that we had the moral courage to act. Our Nation can't wait, and they shouldn't.

RECOGNIZING BRETT RUBIN OF BUCKS COUNTY, PENNSYLVANIA

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of a brave young man in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, Brett Rubin.

A resident of Northampton, Brett's positive attitude and boundless energy make him a promising young leader in our community. This is even more notable due to the challenges Brett faces from type 1 diabetes. Despite these obstacles, Brett has never allowed this illness to define him or hold him back.

More amazing, Mr. Speaker, is that Brett has channeled his desire to cure this illness and to help others. Partnering with the Juvenile Diabetes Research Foundation, Brett and his mother, Sandy, have raised thousands of dollars to combat type 1 diabetes. Participating in foundation walks, the Rubins join a close-knit group of family and friends, and they call themselves Brett's Band, which is a fitting name honoring a teenager who marches to his own beat and steals the show wherever he goes.

It is my honor to recognize this exemplary young man. I know Brett's future will be bright and that type 1 diabetes will never interfere with his ambitions or his aspirations.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE). 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 Idaho (Mr. SIMPSON) kindly take the chair.

□ 0911

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. SIMPSON (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115–339 offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been disposed of.

AMENDMENT NO. 3 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. MCCLINTOCK

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 3 printed in House Report 115–339.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, 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.

(a) DECLARATION.—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 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

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 resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $2,668,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,756,890,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,850,457,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $2,947,616,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,079,775,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,210,906,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,349,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,502,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,672,058,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,842,299,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -$64,692,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -$76,618,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -$100,119,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -$112,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$103,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$107,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -$113,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -$119,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: -$117,320,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: -$116,088,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $2,869,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,894,948,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,895,989,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $2,925,467,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,056,667,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,054,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,152,483,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,296,588,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,397,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,451,336,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $2,809,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,876,701,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $2,881,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $2,955,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,056,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,039,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,124,286,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,264,841,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $3,380,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $3,435,219,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $140,563,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $119,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $31,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $7,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -$23,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -$171,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -$224,927,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -$237,658,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: -$291,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: -$407,080,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $20,705,790,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,342,481,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $21,881,784,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $22,365,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $22,732,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $22,971,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $ 23,180,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $23,283,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $23,324,552,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $23,082,487,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $15,046,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,593,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,095,547,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $16,568,776,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $16,984,250,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $17,277,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $17,552,761,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $17,774,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $17,922,572,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $17,943,641,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the budgetary 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, $676,050,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,657,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $676,241,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $651,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $676,460,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $650,005,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $674,719,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $647,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $673,902,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $660,780,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $688,039,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $673,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $702,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $684,734,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $716,434,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,603,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $732,456,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $719,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $747,635,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,397,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $23,236,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $21,568,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,103,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,517,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,810,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,508,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,469,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $20,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,068,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,712,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $21,881,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $21,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $23,636,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $23,168,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,148,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $22,308,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,775,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $23,253,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $23,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,276,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $24,304,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,709,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $24,844,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $25,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $25,979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $26,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $27,172,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,041,000,000.
(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,602,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$2,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$4,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,977,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$16,964,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$17,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,169,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,702,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$4,421,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,716,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$4,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$5,847,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -$5,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$6,261,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,080,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,096,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -$3,103,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,023,000,000.
(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $25,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,952,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $25,537,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,056,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $26,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,854,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $25,691,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,651,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $26,868,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,566,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $26,593,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $26,062,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,672,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $26,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $25,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $26,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $26,910,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,423,000,000.
(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $14,107,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $9,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,632,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $9,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,313,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $6,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $7,061,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,864,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $7,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,157,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $7,647,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,424,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $8,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $8,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $8,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,702,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$8,186,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,020,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$9,217,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$19,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$12,865,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$22,514,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$15,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$25,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$14,917,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$14,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,184,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$12,818,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,083,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -$11,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$26,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -$12,981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$27,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -$13,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$28,552,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $83,577,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $87,088,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $84,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $78,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $85,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,883,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $73,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $61,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $62,040,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,708,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $62,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $63,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $64,366,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,747,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $65,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,337,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $3,198,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $3,014,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $12,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $3,020,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,434,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $3,058,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $6,715,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $3,206,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,562,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $3,197,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,751,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $3,232,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $3,337,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,275,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $3,463,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,278,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $3,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,239,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $48,903,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $53,383,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $54,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,158,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,683,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,598,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $48,825,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,530,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $50,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $49,941,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $49,334,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,210,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $49,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $49,302,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,344,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $454,509,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,501,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $435,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $457,516,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $448,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $450,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $455,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $456,758,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $461,189,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $465,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $466,743,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $473,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $471,674,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $479,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $476,960,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $484,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $481,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, $483,275,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $485,571,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $591,229,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $590,967,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $650,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $650,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $674,221,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $674,017,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $707,798,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $707,601,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $778,613,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $778,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $774,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,163,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $774,204,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $774,007,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $842,125,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $841,909,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $924,327,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $924,102,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $989,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $989,265,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $472,681,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $458,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $427,283,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $418,415,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $433,650,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $424,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $438,723,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $430,323,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $442,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $439,172,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $421,768,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $415,075,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $428,653,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $417,101,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $434,146,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $423,466,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $441,856,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $436,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $448,955,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $443,434,000,000.
(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, $49,987,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,438,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $56,597,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $58,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $58,361,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $59,354,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $59,249,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $60,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $60,203,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $61,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $61,705,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $63,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $63,252,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $65,105,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,669,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $68,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,333,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $68,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $67,818,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $17,757,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $17,972,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,497,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,346,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,159,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $16,959,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,817,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $16,488,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,407,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $19,594,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,325,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $19,274,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $19,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $18,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $18,518,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $18,400,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $18,035,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $17,942,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $373,956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $373,956,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $399,575,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $399,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $432,397,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $432,397,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $464,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $464,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $492,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $492,279,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $516,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $516,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $532,410,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $532,410,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $544,916,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $544,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $555,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $555,256,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $554,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $554,969,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$103,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$139,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$122,471,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$113,004,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$192,059,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$164,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$192,585,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$160,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$213,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$185,944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$239,872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$219,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$186,688,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$167,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -$165,184,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$150,710,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -$201,905,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$176,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -$237,951,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$216,002,000,000.
(20) 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.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (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.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSION PROVIDING FOR DEFICIT REDUCTION.—Not later than 90 days after the adoption of this resolution, 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 $327,704,000,000 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 $32,601,000,000 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 $441,015,000,000 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 $2,665,188,000,000 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 $154,083,000,000 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 $24,689,000,000 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 $67,178,000,000 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 $59,302,000,000 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 $447,960,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON TRANSPORTATION AND INFRASTRUCTURE.—The Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $5,561,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by $49,022,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(12) 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 $1,417,836,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) REVISION OF BUDGETARY LEVELS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may file appropriately revised allocations, aggregates, and functional levels upon the consideration of a reconciliation measure under section 310 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or amendment thereto, or the submission of a conference report to the House of Representatives pursuant to this section, if it is in compliance with the reconciliation directives by virtue of section 310(c) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(2) REVISION.—Allocations and aggregates revised pursuant to this subsection shall be considered to be the allocations and aggregates established by this concurrent resolution on the budget pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(d) PURPOSE OF RECONCILIATION INSTRUCTIONS.—It is the policy of this resolution that the reconciliation instructions provided pursuant to this section are to be used for—

(1) enacting the mandatory spending reforms recommended by this resolution; and

(2) enacting comprehensive tax reform.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement in the House of Representatives

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a measure would cause a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of $5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning with the first fiscal year that is 10 fiscal years after the budget year provided for in the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget in the House of Representatives, for each bill or joint resolution other than an appropriation measure and any amendment thereto or conference report thereon.

(b) 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 $5,000,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (a).

(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, levels, or limits contained in this concurrent resolution pursuant to section 401.

(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.

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) 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.

(f) ADJUSTMENTS TO FUND OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels related to Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism or the allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations set forth in the report or joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution to account for new information.

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 was 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 period of 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 change 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 change 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, $17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, $15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, $13,000,000,000.

(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.

SEC. 304. GAO REPORT.

(a) GAO SUBMISSION.—At a date specified by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives, the Comptroller General, in consultation with the chair, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, and the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, shall submit to the chair a comprehensive list of all current direct spending programs of the Government.

(b) PUBLICATION.—The chair of the Committee on the Budget shall cause to be printed in the Congressional Record the list submitted under subsection (a). The chair shall publish such list on the Committee's public Web site. Such publication shall be searchable, sortable, and downloadable.

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, or an estimate of an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, an estimate of any change in debt service costs (if any) resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt servicing 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 discretionary programs or to appropriation measures, 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, to the extent practicable, provide a supplemental fair-value estimate of any loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget.

(b) STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide a supplemental fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure establishing or modifying a program providing loans or loan guarantees 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 *Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MAJOR DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.

The Congressional Budget Office shall prepare, to the extent practicable, an estimate of the outlay changes during the second and third decade of enactment for any direct spending legislative provision—

(1) that proposes a change or changes to law that the Congressional Budget Office determines has an outlay impact in excess of 0.25 percent of the gross domestic product of the United States during the first decade or in the tenth year; or

(2) for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives requests such an estimate.

SEC. 308. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.—During the 114th and 115th Congresses, any estimate 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 for major legislation considered in the House of Representatives 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 bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 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

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending and revenue 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. 309. 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 any amendment thereto is offered or any 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 such committee 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 period 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. 310. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making a general appropriation or continuing appropriation 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 bill or joint resolution, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations, for the fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 311. 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 affects the use of any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis.

(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, 2012 (M–12–21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—In the House of Representatives, if any present value calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then such savings may not be used as an offset for purposes of budget enforcement.

(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. 312. ESTIMATES OF LAND CONVEYANCES.

In the House of Representatives, the Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall include in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any measure that conveys Federal land to any non-Federal entity—

(1) the methodology used to calculate such estimate;

(2) a detailed justification of its estimate of any change in revenue, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections resulting from such conveyance;

(3) if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget, any information provided by the Bureau of Land Management or other applicable Federal agency, including the source and date of such information, that supports the estimate of any change in revenue, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections;

(4) a description of any efforts to independently verify such agency estimate; and

(5) a statement of the assumptions underlying the estimate of the budgetary effects that would be generated by such parcel in CBO's baseline projections as of the most recent publication or update.

SEC. 313. 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. 314. PROHIBITION ON THE 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 or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation 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. 315. 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.

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 under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the Committee on Appropriations 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 level 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 allocations and aggregates 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.

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 in accordance with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT UPDATED BUDGETARY ESTIMATES.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect any adjustments to the baseline made by the Congressional Budget Office.

SEC. 325. ADJUSTMENT FOR CERTAIN EMERGENCY DESIGNATIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that designates an emergency under section 4(g)(2) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title, title II, and title VII—

(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

SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, 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 only consists of a full repeal the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act and the health care-related provisions of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010.

SEC. 402. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR ADDITIONAL MEASURES RELATING TO THE REPLACEMENT OF OBAMACARE.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, 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 repeals or replaces provisions of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 403. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATED TO THE MEDICARE PROVISIONS OF THE 2010 HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, 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 repeals all or part of the decreases in Medicare spending included in the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 404. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR REFORMING THE TAX CODE.

In the House, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that reforms the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate 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 period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 when the macroeconomic effects of such reforms are taken into account.

SEC. 405. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR TRADE AGREEMENTS.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that such chair determines are necessary to implement a trade agreement, and the budgetary levels for any companion measure that offsets such trade measure, if the combined cost of each measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 406. RESERVE FUND FOR REVENUE MEASURES.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution reported by the Committee on Ways and Means, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that decreases revenue.

SEC. 407. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INFRASTRUCTURE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms the Federal infrastructure funding system, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 408. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REDUCE POVERTY AND INCREASE OPPORTUNITY AND UPWARD MOBILITY.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms policies and programs to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility, but only if such measure would neither adversely impact job creation nor increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 409. IMPLEMENTATION OF A DEFICIT AND LONG-TERM DEBT REDUCTION AGREEMENT.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution to accommodate the enactment of a deficit and long-term debt reduction agreement if it includes permanent spending reductions and reforms to direct spending program, and does not increase outlays in any fiscal year.

SEC. 410. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE ACCOUNT FOR REFORMING SNAP.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, 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 reforms the supplemental nutrition assistance program (SNAP), but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 411. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR SOCIAL SECURITY DISABILITY INSURANCE REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, 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 reforms the Social Security Disability Insurance program under title II of the Social Security Act, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 412. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR FEDERAL RETIREMENT REFORM.

In the House, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure reforms, improves and updates the Federal retirement system, as determined by such chair, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 413. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR DEFENSE SEQUESTER REPLACEMENT.

The chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure supports the following activities: Department of Defense training and maintenance associated with combat readiness, modernization of equipment, auditability of financial statements, or military compensation and benefit reforms, by the amount provided for these purposes, but only if such measure would not increase the deficit (without counting any net revenue increases in that measure) over the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 414. 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.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON OBAMACARE REPEAL.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148), and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152) should be repealed.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON REPLACING OBAMACARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Obamacare put Washington's priorities before those of patients'. The Affordable Care Act (ACA) has failed to reduce health care premiums as promised. Instead, the law mandated benefits and coverage levels, denying patients the opportunity to choose the type of coverage that best suits their health needs and driving up health coverage costs. A typical family's health care premiums were supposed to decline by $2,500; instead, average premiums have increased 105 percent. A study conducted by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimated premiums to continue rising over the next decade, projecting an average increase of 8 percent per year between 2016 and 2018, and increasing by nearly 60 percent by 2026.

(2) President Obama pledged, ''If you like your health care plan, you can keep your health care plan.'' Instead, CBO now estimated 7 million Americans will lose employment-based health coverage due to the health care law, further limiting patient choice.

(3) Then-Speaker of the House Pelosi stated that the President's health care law

would create 4 million jobs over the life of the law and almost 400,000 jobs immediately. Instead, CBO estimated that by 2025 Obamacare will reduce the number of hours worked by approximately 2 million full-time equivalent workers, compared with what would have occurred in the absence of the law. Additionally, a study by the Mercatus Center at George Mason University estimated that Obamacare will reduce employment by up to 3 percent, or about 4 million full-time equivalent workers.

(4) Since the ACA was signed into law, the Obama administration repeatedly failed to implement it as written. President Obama's unilateral actions resulted in numerous changes, delays, and exemptions. President Obama signed into law another 24 changes made by Congress. The Supreme Court struck down the forced expansion of Medicaid; ruled the individual ''mandate'' could only be characterized as a tax to remain constitutional; and rejected the requirement that closely held companies provide health insurance to their employees even if it violates the companies' religious beliefs. More than 7 years after enactment, the courts continue to evaluate the legality of how President Obama's administration implemented the law. All of these changes prove the folly of the underlying law; health care in the United States cannot be run from a centralized bureaucracy.

(5) Obamacare is unaffordable, intrusive, overreaching, destructive, and unworkable. Its complex structure of subsidies, mandates, and penalties perversely impact individuals, married couples, and families. Those who previously had insurance along with those who did not have been funneled into a new system that is providing less access to doctors and treatments. Millions of Americans have been added to a broken Medicaid system that is incapable of providing the care promised. Cuts made to Medicare to fund a new entitlement are undermining the health security of seniors. Taxes and mandates are distorting the insurance market and harming the broader economy, resulting in fewer jobs and less opportunity. By design, Obamacare put Washington at the center of our health care system, at the expense of patients, families, physicians, and businesses. The ACA should be fully repealed, allowing for real patient-centered health care reform that puts patients first, not Washington.

(b) POLICY ON REPLACING OBAMACARE.—It is the policy of this resolution that Obamacare must not only be repealed, but also replaced by enacting the American Health Care Reform Act.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 50 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Medicare's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement becomes more pronounced. According to the Medicare Trustees Report—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2028 and unable to pay scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase by over 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) current workers' payroll contributions pay for current beneficiaries; and

(D) most Medicare beneficiaries receive about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every one dollar paid into the program.

(3) Failing to address this problem will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with enormous debt to pay for spending levels that cannot be sustained.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.—It is the policy of this resolution to protect those in or near retirement from any disruptions to their Medicare benefits due to the program's impending bankruptcy, and instead offer beneficiaries more options, better care, with reduced costs for both benficiaries and the Federal Government, by modernizing Medicare.

(c) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes reform of the Medicare program such that:

(1) Medicare is preserved for current and future beneficiaries.

(2) Medicare is reformed to provide a premium support payment and a selection of guaranteed health coverage options from which recipients can choose a plan that best suits their needs.

(3) Medicare will maintain traditional fee-for-service as an option.

(4) Medicare will provide additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks.

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and the Medicare program becomes solvent over the long-term.

(6) The Medicare eligibility age is gradually increased to keep pace with increases in longevity.

(7) Medicare is simplified by combining parts A and B and reforms to Medigap plans are implemented.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID STATE FLEXIBILITY BLOCK GRANTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that Medicaid and the Children's Health Insurance Program (CHIP) should be block granted to the States in a manner prescribed by the State Health Flexibility Act.

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 55 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg on the ''three-legged stool'' of retirement security, which includes employer provided benefits as well as personal savings.

(2) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security's long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Social Security becomes more precarious and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced:

(A) In 2022, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(B) In 2034, the combined Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Funds will be exhausted, and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits.

(C) With the exhaustion of the Trust Funds in 2034, benefits will be cut nearly 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(3) The Disability Insurance program provides an income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. However, the program is in serious financial trouble. The number of beneficiaries has skyrocketed from 2.7 million in 1970 to 10.6 million in 2016. At the same time, the labor force participation rate has now fallen to the lowest levels since the 1970s. As a result, the Social Security Actuary now projects that the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be depleted in 2023.

(4) If this program is not reformed, families who rely on the lifeline that disability benefits provide will face benefit cuts of up to 11 percent in 2023, devastating individuals who need assistance the most.

(5) Americans deserve action by the President, the House, and the Senate to preserve and strengthen Social Security. It is critical that action be taken to address the looming insolvency of Social Security.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress should work to make Social Security sustainably solvent. This resolution assumes these reforms will include the following policies, based upon the Social Security Reform Act:

(1) Adoption of a more accurate measure for calculating cost of living adjustments.

(2) Adoption of adjustments to the full retirement age to reflect longevity.

(3) Makes Social Security benefits more progressive over the long term, providing those most in need with a safety net in retirement.

(c) POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress and the President should enact legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2016 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This resolutions assumes that reforms to the Disability Insurance program will include—

(1) encouraging work;

(2) updates of the eligibility rules;

(3) reducing fraud and abuse;

(4) enactment of H.R. 2031, the Social Security Disability Insurance and Unemployment Benefits Double Dip Elimination Act, to prohibit individuals from drawing benefits from both programs at the same time; and

(5) enactment of H.R. 1540, the Social Security Disability Insurance Return to Work Act, to allow the award of time-limited benefits for applicants whose medical recovery is anticipated in order to create new opportunities for beneficiaries.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that:

(1) Too many people are trapped at the bottom rungs of the economic ladder, and every citizen should have the opportunity to rise, escape from poverty, and achieve their own potential.

(2) In 1996, President Bill Clinton and congressional Republicans enacted reforms that have moved families off of Federal programs and enabled them to provide for themselves.

(3) Today, there are approximately 92 Federal programs on which Government at the Federal and State level spend more than $1 trillion annually that provide benefits specifically to poor and low-income Americans.

(4) It should be the goal of welfare programs to encourage work and put people on a path to self-reliance.

(b) POLICY ON MEANS-TESTED WELFARE PROGRAMS.—It is the policy of this resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should be reformed to give states flexibility to implement and improve safety net programs and that to be eligible for benefits, able bodied adults without dependents should be required to work or be preparing for work, including enrolling in educational or job training programs, contributing community service, or participating in a supervised job search; and

(2) the President's budget should disclose, in a clear and transparent manner, the aggregate amount of Federal welfare expenditures, as well as an estimate of State and local spending for this purpose, over the next ten years.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORM OF THE SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) SNAP.—It is the policy of the resolution that the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program be reformed so that:

(1) Nutrition assistance funds should be distributed to the states as a block grant with funding subject to the annual discretionary appropriations process.

(2) Funds from the grant must be used by the states to establish and maintain a work activation program for able-bodied adults without dependents.

(3) It is the goal of this proposal to move those in need off of the assistance rolls and back into the workforce and towards self-sufficiency.

(b) ASSUMPTIONS.—This resolution assumes that, pending the enactment of reforms described in (a), the conversion of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program into a flexible State allotment tailored to meet each State's needs.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON WORK REQUIREMENTS.

It is the policy of this resolution that all means-tested welfare programs should include work activation requirements for able-bodied adults.

SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON A CARBON TAX.

It is the policy of this resolution that a carbon tax would be detrimental to American families and businesses, and is not in the best interest of the United States.

SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Across the Nation, too many Americans are struggling to make ends meet. The slowly falling unemployment rate has masked an underlying crisis as millions of Americans have abandoned the work force and wages have stagnated. The labor force participation rate has plummeted to levels not seen since the Carter presidency.

(2) Looking ahead, CBO expects the economy to grow by an average of just 1.9 percent over the next 10 years. That level of economic growth is simply unacceptable and insufficient to expand opportunities and the incomes of millions of middle-income Americans.

(3) Sluggish economic growth has also contributed to the country's fiscal woes. Subpar growth means that revenue levels are lower than they would otherwise be while government spending (e.g. welfare and income-support programs) is higher.

(4) The unsustainable fiscal trajectory has cast a shadow on the country's economic outlook. investors and businesses make decisions on a forward-looking basis. they know that today's large debt levels are simply tomorrow's tax hikes, interest rate increases, or inflation and they act accordingly. This debt overhang, and the uncertainty it generates, can weigh on growth, investment, and job creation.

(5) Nearly all economists, including those at the CBO, conclude that reducing budget deficits (thereby bending the curve on debt levels) is a net positive for economic growth over time.

(6) If the Government remains on the current fiscal path, future generations will face ever-higher debt service costs, a decline in national savings, and a ''crowding out'' of private investment. This dynamic will eventually lead to a decline in economic output and a diminution in our country's standard of living.

(7) The key economic challenge is determining how to expand the economic pie, not how best to divide up and re-distribute a shrinking pie.

(8) A stronger economy is vital to lowering deficit levels and eventually balancing the budget. According to CBO, if annual real GDP growth is just 0.1 percentage point higher over the budget window, deficits would be reduced by $273 billion.

(9) This budget resolution therefore embraces pro-growth policies, such as fundamental tax reform, that will help foster a stronger economy, greater opportunities and more job creation.

(b) POLICY ON ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION.—It is the policy of this resolution to promote faster economic growth and job creation. By putting the budget on a sustainable path, this resolution ends the debt-fueled uncertainty holding back job creators. Reforms to the tax code will put American businesses and workers in a better position to compete and thrive in the 21st century global economy. This resolution targets the regulatory red tape and cronyism that stack the deck in favor of special interests. All of the reforms in this resolution serve as means to the larger end of helping the economy grow and expanding opportunity for all Americans.

SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A reformed tax code 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) High marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation.

(3) The United States corporate income tax rate is 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.

(4) 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.

(5) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, consumers in higher prices, and investors in diminished returns.

(6) Closing tax loopholes to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(7) Tax reform should curb or eliminate loopholes and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board, not to fund more wasteful Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(8) 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 resolution that Congress should enact legislation that provides for a comprehensive reform of the United States tax code to promote economic growth, create American jobs, increase wages, and benefit American consumers, investors, and workers through fundamental tax reform that is revenue-neutral on a dynamic basis that provides for the following:

(1) Targets revenue neutrality based on a dynamic score that takes into account the macroeconomic effects of reform.

(2) Collapses the current seven brackets for individuals into just three, with a top rate of no more than 33 percent.

(3) Simplifies the tax code to ensure that fewer Americans will be required to itemize deductions.

(4) Gives equal tax treatment to individual and employer healthcare expenditures modeled on the American Health Care Reform Act.

(5) Encourages charitable giving.

(6) Repeals the Death Tax.

(7) Eliminates marriage penalties.

(8) Provides tax-free universal savings accounts to reward saving.

(9) Repeals the alternative minimum tax.

(10) Reduces double taxation by lowering the top corporate rate to no more than 20 percent.

(11) Reduces the rate for capital gains and dividends.

(12) Encourages net investment, savings, and entrepreneurial activity, including full expensing.

(13) Moves to a competitive territorial system of international taxation.

(14) Ends distortionary special interest giveaways, such as the Wind Production Tax Credit.

SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRADE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Opening foreign markets to American exports is vital to the United States economy and beneficial to American workers and consumers.

(2) The United States can increase economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services.

(3) American businesses and workers have shown that, on a level playing field, they can excel and surpass international competition.

(b) POLICY ON TRADE.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution—

(1) to pursue international trade, global commerce, and a modern and competitive tax system to promote domestic job creation;

(2) that the United States should continue to seek increased economic opportunities for American workers and businesses through high-standard trade agreements that satisfy negotiating objectives, including—

(A) the expansion of trade opportunities;

(B) adherence to trade agreements and rules by the United States and its trading partners, and

(C) the elimination of foreign trade barriers to United States goods and services by opening new markets and enforcing United States rights; and

(3) that any trade agreement entered into on behalf of the United States should reflect the negotiating objectives and adhere to the provisions requiring improved consultation with Congress.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON ENERGY PRODUCTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR) and currently unavailable areas of the Outer Continental Shelf (OCS) should be open for energy exploration and production.

SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) has hurt job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from the 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 economic growth.

(2) Federal agencies routinely fail to identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

(3) The United States Code of Federal Regulations now contains over 185,000 pages of regulations in 242 volumes.

(4) Notwithstanding the size and growth of Federal regulations, 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.

(5) Implementation of the Affordable Care Act has resulted in more than 177.9 million annual hours of regulatory compliance paperwork, $37.1 billion of regulatory compliance costs on the private sector, and $13 billion in regulatory compliance costs on the States.

(6) Agencies impose costly regulations without relying on sound science through the use of judicial consent decrees and settlement agreements and the abuse of interim compliance costs imposed on regulated entities that bring legal challenges against newly promulgated regulations.

(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) promotes—

(A) economic growth, job creation, higher wages, and increased investment by eliminating unnecessary red tape and streamlining, simplifying and lowering the costs of Federal regulations; and

(B) the adoption of least-cost regulatory alternatives to meet the objectives of Federal regulatory statutes;

(2) protects—

(A) the poor and lower-income households from the regressive effects of excessive regulation; and

(B) workers against the unnecessary elimination of jobs and loss or reduction of wages;

(3) requires—

(A) an annual, congressional regulatory budget that establishes annual costs of regulations and allocates these costs amongst Federal regulatory agencies;

(B) cost-benefit and regulatory impact analysis for new regulations proposed and promulgated by all Federal regulatory agencies;

(C) advance notice of proposed rulemaking and makes evidentiary hearings available for critical disputed issues in the development of new major regulations; and

(D) congressional approval of all new major regulations before the regulations can become effective, ensuring that Congress can better prevent the imposition of unsound costly new regulations;

(4) reduces—

(A) regulatory barriers to entry into markets and other regulatory impediments to competition and innovation; and

(B) the imposition of new Federal regulation that duplicates, overlaps or conflicts with State, local, and Tribal regulation or that impose unfunded mandates on State, local, and Tribal governments; and

(5) eliminates the abuse of guidance to evade legal requirements applicable to the development and promulgation of new regulations.

SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL FUNDING OF ABORTION.

It is the policy of this resolution that no taxpayer dollars shall go to any entity that provides abortion services.

SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON TRANSPORTATION REFORM.

It is the policy of this resolution that State and local officials are in a much better position to understand the needs of local commuters, not bureaucrats in Washington. Federal funding for transportation should be phased down and limited to core Federal duties, including the interstate highway system, transportation infrastructure on Federal land, responding to emergencies, and research. As the level of Federal responsibility for transportation is reduced, Congress should also concurrently reduce the Federal gas tax.

SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) For years, there has been serious concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care.

(2) In 2015, for the first time, VA health care was added to Government Accountability Office's (GAO) ''high-risk'' list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, which have resulted in untimely and inefficient health care. According to GAO, ''the absence of care and delays in providing care have harmed veterans.''.

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to our veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the administration 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—

(1) the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs continue its oversight efforts to ensure the VA reassesses its core mission, including—

(A) reducing the number of bureaucratic layers;

(B) reducing the number of senior and middle managers;

(C) improving performance measure metrics;

(D) strengthening the administration and oversight of contractors; and

(E) supporting opportunities for veterans to pursue other viable options for their health care needs; and

(2) the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs and the Committee on the Budget should continue to closely monitor the VA's progress to ensure VA resources are sufficient and efficiently provided to veterans.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (GAO) is required by law to identify examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and has so identified dozens of such examples.

(2) In its report to Congress on Government Efficiency and Effectiveness, the Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs could ''lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings.''

(3) In 2011, 2012, 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, and 2017, the GAO issued reports showing excessive duplication and redundancy in Federal programs.

(4) Federal agencies reported an estimated $137 billion in improper payments in fiscal year 2015.

(5) Under clause 2 of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, each standing committee must hold at least one hearing during each 120-day period following its establishment on waste, fraud, abuse, or mismanagement in Government programs.

(6) Clause 2(a)(1) of rule XXI of the House of Representatives prohibits an appropriation for an expenditure not previously authorized by law. Despite this longstanding prohibition, more than $310 billion has been appropriated for unauthorized programs in fiscal year 2016, spanning 256 separate laws.

(7) The findings resulting from congressional oversight of Federal Government programs should result in programmatic changes in both authorizing statutes and program funding levels.

(b) POLICY ON REDUCING UNNECESSARY, WASTEFUL, AND UNAUTHORIZED SPENDING.—

(1) Each authorizing committee annually should include in its Views and Estimates letter required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of programs within the jurisdiction of such committee whose funding should be reduced or eliminated.

(2) Committees of jurisdiction should review all unauthorized programs funded through annual appropriations to determine if the programs are operating efficiently and effectively.

(3) Committees should reauthorize those programs that in the committees' judgment should continue to receive funding.

(4) For those programs not reauthorized by committees, the House of Representatives should enforce the limitations on funding such unauthorized programs in the House rules.

SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government will collect approximately $3.4 trillion in taxes, but spend nearly $4 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 14 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) As of March 16, 2017, the national debt of the Unites States was nearly $20 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Government to hold a constitutional convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

(4) Forty nine States have fiscal limitations in their State constitutions, including the requirement to annually balance the budget.

(5) Five States, including Arizona, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, and North Dakota, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which is seeking 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 Congress should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the most recent estimate from the Office of Management and Budget, Federal agencies held $921 billion in unobligated balances at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(2) These funds comprise both discretionary appropriations and authorizations of mandatory spending that remain available for expenditure.

(3) In many cases, agencies are provided appropriations that remain indefinitely available for obligation.

(4) The Congressional Budget Act of 1974 requires the Office of Management and Budget to make funds available to agencies for obligation and prohibits the administration from withholding or cancelling unobligated funds unless approved by an Act of Congress.

(b) POLICY ON DEFICIT REDUCTION THROUGH THE CANCELLATION OF UNOBLIGATED BALANCES.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) greater congressional oversight is required to review and identify potential savings from canceling unobligated balances of funds that are no longer needed;

(2) the appropriate committees in the House should identify and review accounts with unobligated balances and rescind such balances that would not impede or disrupt the fulfillment of important Federal commitments;

(3) the House, with the assistance of the Government Accountability Office, the Inspectors General, and appropriate agencies, should continue to review unobligated balances and identify savings for deficit reduction; and

(4) unobligated balances in dormant accounts should not be used to finance increases in spending.

SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Enactment of the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 was the first step toward restoring constitutionally endowed legislative responsibility over fundamental budget decision making.

(2) However, the congressional budget process has neither constrained spending nor inhibited the expansion of Government. The growth of the Government, primarily through a multiplicity of mandatory programs and other forms of direct spending, has largely been financed through borrowing and high tax rates.

(3) The enforcement of the current budget process, including congressional points of order and statutory spending limits, have been too often waived or circumvented. This contributes to a lack of accountability, which has led to broad agreement that reforming the system is a high necessity.

(b) POLICY ON REFORMING THE CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET PROCESS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress should—

(1) restructure the fundamental procedures of budget decision making;

(2) reassert congressional power over spending and revenue, restore the balance of power between Congress and the President as the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 intended, and attain the maximum level of accountability for budget decisions through efficient and rigorous enforcement of budget rules;

(3) improve incentives for lawmakers to budget as intended by the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, especially by adopting an annual budget resolution;

(4) encourage more effective control over spending, especially currently uncontrolled direct spending;

(5) revise the methodology used in developing the baseline, which is intended to reflect an objective projection of the budgetary effects of current laws and policies for future fiscal years, by removing any tendency toward assuming higher spending levels;

(6) promote efficient and timely budget actions to ensure lawmakers complete their budget actions before the start of the new fiscal year;

(7) provide access to the best analysis of economic conditions available and increase awareness of how fiscal policy directly impacts economic growth and job creation; and

(8) eliminate the complexity of the budget process and the biases that favor higher spending.

(c) LEGISLATION.—The Committee on the Budget of the House should draft legislation during the 115th Congress that rewrites the Congressional Budget and Impoundment Control Act of 1974 to fulfill the goals of making the congressional budget process more effective in ensuring taxpayers' dollars are spent wisely and efficiently. Such legislation shall—

(1) attain greater simplicity without sacrificing the rigor required to address—

(A) the complex issues of the domestic and world economy;

(B) national security responsibilities; and

(C) the appropriate roles of rulemaking and statutory enforcement mechanisms;

(2) establish a new structure that assures the congressional role in the budget process is applied consistently without reliance on reactive legislating;

(3) improve the elements of the current budget process that have fulfilled the original purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(4) rebuild the foundation of the budget process to provide a solid basis from which additional reforms may be developed.

SEC. 522. 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 Government and its fiscal situation.

(2) Most fiscal analyses produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are conducted over a 10-year time horizon. The use of generational accounting or a longer time horizon would provide a more complete picture of the Government's fiscal situation.

(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 provide a more accurate estimate of the Government's liabilities than cash accounting for some programs, specifically insurance 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 Fannie Mae and 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) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of credit programs on a fair value basis to fully capture the risk associated with Federal credit 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 situation of the United States and the options best suited to improving it.

SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress finds the following:

(1) A number of Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect fees and other offsetting collections and to spend these collected funds.

(2) The total amount of offsetting fees and offsetting collections is estimated by the Office of Management and Budget 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 AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.—It is the policy of this resolution that Congress must reassert its constitutional prerogative to control spending and conduct oversight. To do so, Congress should enact legislation requiring programs that are funded through fees, offsetting receipts, or offsetting collections to be allocated new budget authority annually. Such allocation may arise from—

(1) legislation originating from the authorizing committee of jurisdiction for the agency or program; or

(2) fee and account specific allocations included in annual appropriation Acts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3½ minutes.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to present the Republican Study Committee's 2018 budget, Securing America's Future Economy.

This proposal combines savings that have been proposed by the Congressional Budget Office, many RSC members, and public policy think tanks, including The Heritage Foundation, Citizens Against Government Waste, and the National Taxpayers Union. It is based on a simple principle that government should spend its money as carefully as families spend what they have left after they have paid their taxes.

By restraining the growth of spending and refocusing resources on core government responsibilities, adopting commonsense reforms, and placing Medicare and Social Security back on sound financial footing, we believe there is still time to save this country from financial and economic ruin. But time is running out.

On our current course, the Congressional Budget Office warns that, within 4 years, our deficits will balloon to $1 trillion annually, adding about $8,000 a year to an average family's debt that they will have to pay off in future taxes. Two years after that, interest on the national debt will reach $654 billion. That is more than we currently spend for the entire defense establishment.

Let me repeat that so it sinks in. Six years from now, we will spend more than our current defense budget accomplishing nothing but renting the money that we have already borrowed and spent. Three years later, Medicare will collapse. Six years after that—if we get that far—Social Security runs out of money.

This approaching crisis can be described with just three numbers: 26, 35, and 49. Once you understand those three numbers—26, 35, and 49—you can plainly see the root of our problems.

Twenty-six percent is the combined population and inflation growth over the past 10 years. Thirty-five percent is the growth in Federal revenues. Clearly, this is not a revenue problem. The problem is that third number. Forty-nine percent is the growth in spending—nearly twice the rate of inflation and population combined.

We are about to hear about the draconian cuts from the opposition. Let me emphasize, the RSC budget continues to grow the Federal Government every year. I repeat, the RSC budget spends more every year.

Over the decade, we have provided for more than $1 trillion of government growth. Only in Washington can that be described as a cut. The RSC budget merely restrains the growth of spending over the next decade to give families the time and room to catch up.

□ 0915

By doing so, we can arrest the ruinous spiral of debt and interest costs that now threaten the very solvency of our Nation.

This budget gores a lot of sacred cows, because we want to point out the wide range of savings available to achieve. But I would ask the opponents of this budget to consider one thing as we race toward the looming fiscal crisis just 4 years down the road: you cannot provide for the common defense or general welfare or do all of the other things our government is called upon to do if you cannot pay for them. Our mountainous debt, driven by out-of-control spending, now threatens our ability to do so.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I am going to cut to the chase: the Republican Study Committee budget is so extreme, it cannot be taken seriously. It cuts spending by $10 trillion over 10 years, which is $4 trillion more than the already irresponsible spending cuts in Chairman BLACK's budget.

To its credit, the RSC tells us where those cuts will come from, rather than leaving large amounts unspecified or using matching asterisks or phony economic assumptions to reduce spending.

The RSC budget cuts Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. It cuts programs that ensure basic living standards, protect the environment, and help families afford college.

For 2018, the RSC budget matches the President's level for defense, including war funding. But for nondefense discretionary spending, the RSC budget provides $394 billion, which is $122 billion, or 24 percent, below the austerity cap.

There is no way this House or any House would approve an appropriations bill that inflicted a 24 percent cut on all government operations. If just two programs—veterans' programs and NIH funding—were excluded from those cuts, everything else would be cut by more than 55 percent.

So yes, this budget claims to reach balance, but it would achieve it by making cuts that would be catastrophic. Not even Congress is that self-destructive.

I contend that the two Republican budgets actually show how dismissing the notion that revenues must be a part of any solution to restrain deficits and debt, compounded with the flawed notion that balance must be achieved in the short term, will inflict intolerable hardship on the American people.

While totally unintentional, they make a pretty compelling case that for Congress to responsibly address our debts and deficits, while funding the Federal programs and investments that the American people want and expect, raising revenues has to be part of the equation.

One of the things that amuses me, in a very kind of dark way, is that I remember so well, in 2010, when Republicans actually rode to victory in the House by claiming that we Democrats were going to cut $750 billion out of Medicare. That wasn't true, but they claimed it.

Now, in this Republican Study Committee budget, they have doubled down on that. It is not exactly double, but they are going to cut it by $898 billion. I don't think America's seniors and the disabled population would feel very good about that.

I would like to thank my colleagues for bringing that important issue to the debate.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), the chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Chairman, $20.2 trillion. Our national debt is more than $20.2 trillion.

Let's put it this way: each American's share of the national debt is $62,000. From the retiree in North Carolina who has already done so much to serve the country, to the newborn child in New York with so much potential, that is $62,000. In fact, it is more than the median American family brings home in an entire year.

Our debt continues to mount, even as Federal reserves reach record highs. This leads to an undeniable conclusion, even from Captain Obvious: the Federal Government has a spending problem.

The growing Federal Government has significant negative consequences for the country and its people. The large Federal debt reduces investment, productivity, and wages, while Federal interventions in the economy reduce the incentive to work, resulting in a shrinking labor market.

The debt can have dangerous implications for our national security, recently causing a bipartisan group of leading national security officials to write that ''our long-term debt is the single greatest threat to our national security.''

Most fundamentally, when the Federal Government is too big and too intrusive, it interferes with our unalienable rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Eleven months ago, the American people voted to give Republicans unified control of government. Now it is time to follow through and implement the policy agenda that Congress and the President were elected on.

As the calendar moves into fall, the grade of the 115th Congress will be delivered on whether we can reform our inefficient Tax Code. This process starts with the budget. Along with repealing ObamaCare and securing our border, the Republican Study Committee budget allows us to fulfill these promises, and more.

This fiscal year 2018 RSC budget ensures a strong national security, robust economic growth, equal opportunity for all, a sustainable social safety net, and a return to constitutionally limited government, all with a goal of securing America's future economy.

Instead of a future of high debt and low growth, the RSC budget proposes a positive blueprint for success and opportunity. Our budget focuses on progrowth, profamily policies that will boost America's economy and provide a strong fiscal foundation for generations to come.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would like to thank my friend, Mr. MCCLINTOCK, for his leadership of the RSC budget task force, as well as all the members of the Republican Study Committee who participated in this effort.

With this budget, we have accomplished our goals of detailing the variety of bold policy solutions, as well as helping to influence the balanced budget offered by my friend, Chairman BLACK, to include meaningful, enforceable, reconciliation targets, as the RSC budget does, so that we can begin the essential task of implementing these policies into law.

My fellow Members, when will our debt matter? Next year? The year after?

In 6 years, we are projected to spend more than $650 billion on interest alone on our debt.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from North Carolina.

Mr. WALKER. What will it take for our friends on the left to stop hijacking the American Dream for our children and grandchildren? Is it not a moral injustice to leave this level of debt to the next generation?

Mr. Chairman, we have been making this argument in the House for years. Today, it is time to make a difference.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, it is fascinating to have this debate and speaking in such high-principled ways about the need to reduce deficits and debt. I don't think any Democrat would argue that we need to do something to reduce deficits and debt. We face a very dire, long-term fiscal future.

But we also lose sight of the fact that the American people expect something from their government. They expect our government to keep them safe, but they also expect their government to protect their drinking water, protect their air, to make sure that the food they eat is not dangerous, to provide law enforcement and help local law enforcement to do many things.

The budget, as well as Chairman BLACK's committee budget, would decimate all of those services that the American people expect from the Federal Government.

I think only about what is going on right now with Houston, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands and the enormous cost that the Federal Government is going to have to bear to help restore those communities and those territories to some degree of normalcy. That is what they expect the American Government to do. These budgets would make that all but impossible.

So we look at it both ways. Later, we will propose a Democratic alternative that actually makes those kind of investments and makes sure that the notion of American security is not just a huge military, but is a foundation of investment in human capital and research and infrastructure that will allow this economy to grow. We do it with keeping debt at the same percentage of the economy, as it is now, because we are willing to raise revenues.

On the other hand, Republican budgets, both the Republican Study Committee budget and the chairman's budget, anticipate enormous tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and corporations—tax cuts that have been proven to do exactly the opposite of what many on the other side claim they do, which is to stimulate economic growth.

We will hear claims that, yes, we can cut taxes by $2 trillion or $3 trillion over 10 years, and they are going to be paid for by this renewal of economic activity. But history tells us that is not what happens. Not only history tells us that, but virtually all the economists in the country tell us that, too.

Goldman Sachs, Steve Mnuchin's previous employer, says that the tax cuts outlined last week would maybe create an additional 0.2 percent of growth in the economy.

CBO and the Federal Reserve say tax cuts don't pay for themselves. Even Bruce Bartlett, the author of ''Reaganomics,'' says this whole notion that tax cuts pay for themselves is nonsense. He actually said bull, which is half of what he said, but you get the idea.

This is not easy. We can speak in the darkest terms of how we are imposing this debt on our grandchildren and try to use emotional arguments. But the fact is, we are dealing with a very realistic, pragmatic dilemma, and that is: how to do what the American people expect us to do without making the future impossible.

It is not done by the Republican budgets. We think it is helped along by the Democratic alternative, and we look forward to having that debate just a little bit later this morning.

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I would remind my friend from Kentucky that Ronald Reagan reduced the Federal income tax rate from 70 percent down to 28 percent, and income tax revenues doubled.

He is correct that we expect things from our government. We have seen a 49 percent increase in spending in the last decade. Have we seen a 49 percent increase in the quality of education or a 49 percent increase in our infrastructure or our defense capability?

What we have seen is a 49 percent increase in bureaucracy and government.

I would remind the gentleman that when we squander the people's money, we rob them of the means to meet the disasters and unforeseen circumstances that confront our country.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES), my friend and former chairman of the Republican Study Committee.

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I want to go off script for a little bit and echo the comments the gentleman was making.

He talked about the Reagan tax cuts and what they did to stimulate the economy and to grow tax revenues and to allow hardworking American families to keep more of their paychecks.

I would also go on to remind the gentleman from Kentucky, to disabuse him about his views of tax reform, and remind him that President John F. Kennedy, a Democrat, reduced the top marginal rates from 93 percent to 73 percent. The economy grew, more jobs were created, and more revenue was created for the Federal Government.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal Government doesn't have a revenue problem. It has a spending problem. That is what we tackle with the Republican Study Committee budget.

I thank Mr. MCCLINTOCK for his incredible and insightful leadership in generating the FY 2018 RSC budget that we are now considering.

The House Budget Committee's budget proposals continue to benefit from the framework of the RSC budget by including meaningful, enforceable reconciliation targets, as our budget does. The House budget will begin the essential task of implementing these policies into law.

Other instances where the RSC-led budget proposals have historically wound up being adopted in the larger House budget include the following:

First, balancing the budget within a 10-year budget window.

Two, including policies to ensure the solvency of entitlement programs, such as Social Security, Medicare, and also Medicaid.

Number three, providing the necessary funding and resources for a robust national security.

Number four, fully repealing ObamaCare.

Number five, establishing a pathway to progrowth tax reform that will jump-start our economy and help hardworking American families take home more of their paychecks.

I was humbled to serve as the chairman of the RSC during the 114th Congress. At that time, we generated a new budget for fiscal year 2017, called the Blueprint for a Balanced Budget 2.0. It was written and released in the spring of 2016.

Like the current RSC budget, it provided a robust agenda of conservative policies to show the American people our vision for this Nation.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. FLORES. In the tradition of The Heritage Foundation's 1980 mandate for leadership that provided a policy agenda for the incoming Reagan administration, our Blueprint for a Balanced Budget 2.0 for the new President and his administration set forth an agenda for governing in 2017.

□ 0930

By all accounts, the RSC budget has proven successful in achieving this goal, with President Trump basing many of the policies for his fiscal 2018 budget request on the RSC's fiscal 2017 budget.

I am pleased to see that many RSC-led proposals are included in both the President's budget and the House budget that we will consider later today.

In the coming years, I look forward to continuing to see the RSC putting forth and leading on many conservative, sound policy ideas for our budgetary process.

Mr. Chairman, I urge all our colleagues to vote ''yes'' on the RSC budget and to vote ''yes'' on the House GOP budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I feel like I have to be Paul Harvey for a second and talk about the rest of the story.

Because while what Mr. MCCLINTOCK said was true about the initial phases of the Reagan administration, at the end of the Reagan administration, the national debt had almost tripled, and he had been forced to raise taxes a couple of times in the interim.

So, again, we can argue about how positive cutting taxes were in the Reagan administration, but the end result wasn't particularly good for the American economy.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Chairman, who wins in the Republican budget?

Same old same old; millionaires, billionaires, large corporations. The Republican budget paves the way for their plan, which gives 80 percent of its tax cuts to the top 1 percent of Americans, while 30 percent of middle class households making between $50,000 and $150,000 a year would actually see a tax increase. This is according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center.

It slashes $1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, even worse than TrumpCare, and it ends the guarantee of Medicare benefits for American seniors.

It attacks women's health by defunding, of course, Planned Parenthood, once again. It slashes SNAP—SNAP, the Food Stamp program—by $154 billion, taking nutrition assistance away from up to 7 million households.

Did you really come to Congress to take food out of the mouths of hungry children?

Now we are considering the Republican Study Committee budget, which includes even deeper cuts for children and families and seniors while giving tax cuts to the wealthy.

My Democratic colleagues and I offer A Better Deal for America. The United States is the richest country in the world at the richest time in history. We can have quality healthcare, affordable childcare, debt-free college, secure retirement, and world-class infrastructure, but not if we give massive tax cuts to the wealthiest individuals and corporations.

So I urge my colleagues to reject the RSC budget, reject the Republican budget, and to support the Democratic alternative. Americans deserve a budget that grows our middle class and invests in our future.

I want to read just one paragraph of a letter from Planned Parenthood that says: ''The House Budget Resolution proposes cuts that would be disastrous for women, men, and young people Planned Parenthood sees every day. It sacrifices access to healthcare, repealing the Affordable Care Act, gutting Medicaid, and proposing even deeper cuts to low-income nondefense discretionary spending. It undermines access to critical reproductive healthcare, including no copay birth control, for millions of women.''

The women of America are watching. This budget is a particular disaster for them, for us.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER).

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, Article I, section 9 of the Constitution grants Congress the power of the purse. This assigns to Congress the role of final arbiter of the use of public funds.

Despite this clear declaration of power, the Office of Management and Budget estimates that agencies collected over $513 billion in fines, fees, penalties, and other offsetting collections and receipts in fiscal year 2017. Allowing agencies to have slush funds outside of the normal appropriations process is a recipe for bad acting.

The RSC budget calls for implementing the Agency Accountability Act, which directs that all fines, fees, and settlements go to the Treasury, making them subject to the normal appropriations process. This would end the agencies' ability to operate independently and outside of the oversight of Congress. More importantly, it would allow Congress to fully account for how much money the government actually collects and where that money is coming from.

I am also pleased that the RSC budget does what is increasingly becoming an impossible task: it balances the budget, all while prioritizing defense spending to keep this country secure. This budget sets forth the bold ideas necessary to put the country back on a path of fiscal responsibility.

The Congressional Budget Office reports that if we stay on the current irresponsible fiscal path we are on, by 2047, in 30 years, our debt to GDP will be 150 percent. Stated more simply, our debt will be 50 percent greater than our entire gross domestic product.

We must put our Nation back on a path of fiscal responsibility, and the RSC budget does exactly that. As former chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Michael Mullin warned, our national debt is the greatest threat to our national security. By putting our Nation on a sensible fiscal path of balancing the budget, we reduce the extremely heavy burden that a bloated Federal Government places on America's working families, allowing them to prosper and making the government less intrusive in their lives.

I would also like to add extemporaneously in regard to what we are doing on SNAP benefits. What we are doing is imposing work requirements on able-bodied adults with no children. I want to repeat: able-bodied adults with no children. I think most Americans would agree that if they are getting payments from the Federal Government, they ought to at least do some work.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, I want to state to my colleagues on this budget that there are two fundamental assumptions that are being made that need to be challenged.

One, you are saying that we have a spending problem, not a revenue problem. This country is spending on domestic priorities and defense at a level that existed when the President of the United States was Dwight D. Eisenhower, and that was before Medicaid and Medicare.

We have a significant issue about how we are going to meet the needs of the people of this country, both on defense, where we need some help, but definitely on the domestic side as well.

The second assumption that you are making—and it is an assertion that is made over and over again—is that tax cuts will pay for themselves. That is the theology of your budget: tax cuts pay for themselves.

You know, why not go to zero, and we will all be rich?

That is essentially what is being said here. But the tax cuts are always at the high end of the income spectrum, which is exacerbating inequality and creating a problem for us to meet essential needs in this country.

So this question of tax cuts paying for themselves and fiscal responsibility, let's have a little bit of history here. This was the theology of George Bush when he passed the tax cuts when he became President. They did not pay for themselves. We went from the Clinton-era surpluses to the Bush-era deficits, and in another fiscally, grossly irresponsible move, he put the war on the credit card.

The war was on the credit card. We had unpaid-for tax cuts and we had an unpaid-for war. And this is not just fiscal responsibility; this is governmental, personal, congressional irresponsibility. You have got to pay for things. Whether it is the war or it is food stamps or it is any program that you want to pick, you have got to pay for it.

You don't pay for it by the magic asterisk of saying, ''the tax cuts that we propose,'' when we are going to spend by cutting taxes or going into a war that we don't pay for, $1 trillion, it doesn't work. And that is why we are in this path that is very dangerous with respect to the long-term debt.

I believe in that. We have got to pay our bills. When we had the majority, we had a doctrine that said: Pay as you go.

If any Democrat, the budget chair, or me wanted to propose some spending, we either had to come up with the revenue or we had to cut somewhere else. I believe in that.

But I don't believe in unpaid-for tax cuts paying for themselves. I don't believe that more spending pays for itself and we can just put it on the credit card.

Now, we have got some problems and challenges in this country. We have got an opportunity problem.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Chairman, kids going to school get out with a debt the size of a mortgage. We have got an inequality problem. It has never been worse. It goes back to the Great Depression, when we had this divide between what hardworking people made and what the top 1 percent made.

We have got a healthcare affordability problem, but you don't solve that by slashing access to healthcare and throwing 24 million people off of healthcare. We have got an infrastructure problem that we are totally neglecting. It is not addressed in this budget.

We have got a DREAMer problem.

How is it that, in this Congress, we are literally not allowing 800,000 young people who came here, through no fault of their own, not voluntarily, and we are going to give them the hook and deport them?

It is outrageous?

We have got a rural America problem. Rural America has been left behind. The inequality in this country is really hitting hard on rural America, in parts of Vermont, and in all parts of this country. And there is nothing in this budget that says: We are going to give hope to rural America by investing in them.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. RYAN), the Speaker of the House.

Mr. RYAN of Wisconsin. Mr. Chairman, I rise to urge the whole House to support this Republican budget, H. Con. Res. 71.

Let me just say a few things.

First, this is a budget that reflects our first principles: freedom, freedom enterprise, a government accountable to the people it serves.

It is a budget that will help grow our economy, and it is a budget that will help rein in our debt. It strengthens our national defense. It supports our men and women in uniform. It eliminate mindless, endless spending, and it maximizes American's tax dollars. It reforms Medicaid. It strengthens Medicare.

This is a budget that keeps our responsibilities to our children and our grandchildren. Remember, we have a responsibility here, each and every generation, each and every Member: leave the country better off so your kids and your grandkids can prosper.

That American legacy is seriously at risk because of our growing deteriorating budget situation, because of the coming debt crisis. This budget tackles that.

There is one more thing that this budget does that is so important. It paves the way for historic tax reform. It unlocks the reconciliation process. We need to pass this budget so that we can deliver real relief for middle-income families across this country. We need to pass this budget for the people who are living paycheck to paycheck in America, who are trying to juggle it all. They are looking to get under a hopelessly broken Tax Code.

We haven't reformed this tax system since 1986. We need to pass this budget so that we can help bring more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for people across this country. The time for this is now, and the opportunity is right in front of us.

I want to especially commend Chairman BLACK for her commitment to this vision. I want to especially commend the members of the Budget Committee for their steadfast commitment to this vision. We would not be in a position today to pass this budget without her tireless leadership and the leadership of her members of the committee.

It is so encouraging that the Senate has passed their budget out of committee. They are on the track, too. That means we look forward to working with the Senate to take the next step.

We have an opportunity to make right by our fellow countrymen. We have an opportunity to make right by the people we represent. We have an opportunity to actually restore prosperity in this country.

□ 0945

We haven't seen that kind of economic potential in this country in at least a decade. We can fix that this year.

We know a debt crisis is coming. We know if we do nothing, the next generation will be worse off. We can stop that, fix this, and make them better off.

That is what this budget paves the way for, and that is why I urge all of my colleagues to support this budget.

I thank the chair for her steadfast support. I thank the Members for getting us to where we are today, and I really look forward to the day where we can look at this moment as when we got the country on the right track.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, in closing, I would just say that we need to cut right to the chase.

It is unlikely that either the Republican Study Committee budget or the Republican Budget Committee budget could pass this House. It certainly couldn't pass the Congress.

This is all about moving the ball forward so we can push through a massive tax cut to the wealthiest Americans, with 51 votes in the Senate. That is what this day is about, and that is what this process is about.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to reject both the Republican Study Committee budget and the Republican Budget Committee budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD letters of support of the Republican Study Committee budget from the Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget, the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, FreedomWorks, and Heritage Action for America.

COMMITTEE FOR A RESPONSIBLE FEDERAL BUDGET,
September 8, 2017.

Hon. MARK WALKER,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE WALKER: I am writing you to express our appreciation for the fiscally responsible budget released by the Republican Study Committee.

Your budget would make important progress by putting debt on a downward path as a share of GDP, reducing it from 77 percent today to 56 percent by 2027—instead of letting it rise to 89 percent as under current law.

By calling for spending cuts and entitlement reforms, your budget helps to keep the national debt on a sustainable path.

We applaud the Republican Study Committee for your serious contribution to the ongoing budget debate.

Sincerely,

MAYA MACGUINEAS,
President, Committee for a Responsible Federal Budget.

COUNCIL FOR CITIZENS AGAINST GOVERNMENT WASTE,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: You will soon vote on several different budget proposals for fiscal year (FY) 2018. On behalf of the more than one million members and supporters of the Council for Citizens Against Government Waste (CCAGW), I urge you to support the budget resolution as reported by the House Budget Committee and the Republican Study Committee's (RSC) budget resolution, both of which would put the nation back on the path to fiscal sanity and pave the way for comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

Under the leadership of Chairman Diane Black (R–Tenn.), H. Con. Res. 71, as reported by the House Budget Committee, would reduce spending by $6.5 trillion over 10 years and balance the budget by 2027. H. Con. Res. 71 provides reconciliation instructions for fundamental tax reform that, if enacted, will allow Americans to keep more of their money, simplify the filing of taxes, and allow small businesses to boost wages and create jobs. While H. Con. Res. 71 would increase defense spending above Budget Control Act mandated cap levels, this legislation also calls for $203 billion in spending cuts across various programs and a $700 billion reduction in improper payments.

The RSC budget enacts many of the same reforms as the House Budget Committee's plan, but it proposes to reduce government spending by $10 trillion over 10 years and achieves balance in six years. The RSC plan creates a pathway for tax reform; repeals and replaces Obamacare; makes Social Security solvent; rescues Medicare and disability insurance; and decreases FY 2018 non-discretionary spending to $394 billion.

Tax reform presents an historic opportunity to unleash the economic potential of the American people. While Congress is well-positioned to enact tax reform, that cannot occur until a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions is adopted. I urge you to support both the House Budget Committee's FY 2018 budget resolution as reported and the RSC's FY 2018 budget resolution. All votes on the FY 2018 budget resolutions will be among those considered in CCAGW's 2017 Congressional Ratings.

Sincerely,

TOM SCHATZ,
President, CCAGW.

[From FreedomWorks, Oct. 4, 2017]

KEY VOTE YES ON THE MCCLINTOCK AMENDMENT TO H. CON. RES. 71

On behalf of FreedomWorks' activist community, I urge you to contact your representative and ask him or her to vote YES on the amendment offered by Rep. Tom McClintock (R–Calif.) to H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. The amendment, which includes reconciliation instructions for fundamental tax reform, is the Republican Study Committee's FY 2018 budget alternative.

The Republican Study Committee's (RSC) FY 2018 budget would reduce federal spending by more than $10 trillion over the ten-year budget window, bringing the budget into balance in FY 2023. The RSC's budget would repeal ObamaCare and enact other patient-centered health insurance reforms, make Social Security and Medicare solvent, and reform federal welfare programs. It also promotes free trade, regulatory reform, and other free market, limited government principles.

The current text of H. Con. Res. 71 and the McClintock amendment include language that allows the House Ways and Means Committee to produce legislation to reform the tax code. Riddled with loopholes and special interest deductions, America's tax code has become far too complex. According to the Tax Foundation, Americans spent 8.9 billion hours and $409 billion complying with the more than 74,000-page tax code.

It has been more than 30 years since Congress passed fundamental tax reform. Congress has a generational opportunity to reform the tax code by consolidating and lowering tax rates, broadening the tax base, and promoting job creation and international competitiveness for American businesses. This will make the tax code fairer and simplify the filing process, allowing the vast majority of Americans to file their taxes on a postcard.

FreedomWorks will count the vote on the McClintock amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 on our 2017 Congressional Scorecard. The scorecard is used to determine eligibility for the FreedomFighter Award, which recognizes Members of the House and Senate who consistently vote to support economic freedom and individual liberty.

Sincerely,

ADAM BRANDON,
President, FreedomWorks.

[From Heritage Action for America, Oct. 3, 2017]

''YES'' ON THE RSC'S BUDGET: SECURING AMERICA'S FUTURE ECONOMY

(By Andrea Palermo)

On Thursday, the House will vote on the Fiscal Year 2018 (FY18) Budget offered by the Republican Study Committee (RSC) as an amendment to the committee-approved FY18 budget resolution. The RSC's Budget: Securing America's Future Economy, introduced by RSC Budget and Spending Task Force Chairman Tom McClintock (R–Calif.), would balance in 2023, reduce non-defense discretionary spending, reestablish national defense spending to support the military, break the ''firewall'' between defense and non-defense discretionary spending, fully repeal and replace Obamacare, repeal Dodd-Frank by implementing the Financial CHOICE Act, reform entitlement programs, and finally, enact pro-growth tax reform. If passed, the RSC's budget would give lawmakers a serious conservative blueprint for reform.

Pro-Growth Tax Reform. Republicans campaigned and promised to fix America's broken tax code. The current code has become a significant obstacle to economic growth, job creation and higher wages for American workers. The RSC budget would fulfill the Republican campaign promise by enacting tax reform that cuts taxes for families, makes American businesses competitive around the globe, ends double taxation, and simplifies the code.

Repealing Obamacare. Republicans owe their majorities to their unwavering opposition to Obamacare, a reality that is reflected in the RSC's budget. The budget remains committed to fully repealing the law despite recent Republican failures, and sends a signal to the American people that conservatives will continue to push for free-market, patient-centered health care reforms.

Funding Defense. Although the Budget Control Act of 2011 has put significant pressure on our military, a conservative budget would align military spending with strategic priorities by breaking the firewall. The RSC's budget does not rely on the much-discussed OCO gimmick, but increases defense spending to a total of $668 billion in FY18, which is $119 billion above the current defense cap. Importantly, that cost is offset by lowering non-defense discretionary spending to $394 billion in FY18, which is $122 billion below the cap.

Reforming Entitlements. The RSC's budget maintains the Medicare premium support reforms, which are widely established and broadly supported. In addition, the budget lays down bold markers on Social Security, Social Security Disability Insurance and Medicaid. It takes a similarly aggressive approach on mandatory program spending like food stamps (Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, or SNAP) and Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) by building on the success of the 1996 welfare reforms and enacting work requirements as outlined in the Welfare Reform and Upward Mobility Act (H.R. 2832/S. 1290) and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program Reform Act (H.R. 2996).

Other important items in the budget include: Enacting the Financial CHOICE Act, eliminating the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (CFPB), holding federal agencies accountable, reducing funding for the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), separating food stamps and farm programs, ending commodity subsidy programs, reforming crop insurance, ending unconstitutional amnesty for illegal immigrants, enforcing existing immigration laws, securing our borders, delegating elementary and secondary education to states and localities modeled after the Academic Partnership Leads us to Success (A-PLUS) Act, reforming Higher Education by passing the Higher Education Reform and Opportunity (HERO) Act, eliminating Fannie Mae and Freddie Mac, returning transportation and infrastructure policy to the states, reorganizing the executive branch, and protecting the life of the unborn.

Taken as a whole, the RSC's ''Securing America's Future Economy'' demonstrates a seriousness of purpose when it comes to governing. If passed, this budget would provide a fiscally responsible path forward for our nation, limit the size and scope of our bloated federal government, and unleash economic prosperity for all Americans.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, Just a few steps from this Hall, Thomas Jefferson addressed his first inaugural address. After listing all of the blessings that our country enjoys, he asked what more do we need to maintain a happy and prosperous society. He said: ''Still one thing more, fellow citizens. A wise and frugal government, which shall restrain men from injuring one another, shall leave them otherwise free to regulate their own pursuits of industry and improvement, and shall not take from the mouth of labor the bread it has earned. This is the sum of good government. . . .''

We have it within our power to restore that wise and frugal government and the prosperity and happiness that free societies always produce the moment we summon the political will to do so. The Republican Study Committee seeks that shining city on a hill and today offers this map to get us there.

Mr. Chairman, 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 California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK).

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

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 139, noes 281, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 555]

AYES—139

Abraham
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Banks (IN)
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Chabot
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Culberson
Davidson
DesJarlais
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Franks (AZ)
Gaetz
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hensarling
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Marchant
Massie
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Olson
Palmer
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Posey
Ratcliffe
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ross
Rouzer
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stewart
Taylor
Tipton
Walberg
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Zeldin

NOES—281

Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Bacon
Barletta
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Collins (NY)
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Faso
Fitzpatrick
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallagher
Gallego
Garamendi
Gianforte
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Granger
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hartzler
Hastings
Heck
Herrera Beutler
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marino
Marshall
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
McSally
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Nunes
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Palazzo
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Poliquin
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Rothfus
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stivers
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walden
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Wittman
Womack
Yarmuth
Young (IA)

NOT VOTING—13

Bridenstine
DeSantis
Doyle, Michael F.
Frelinghuysen
Kihuen
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Sarbanes
Titus
Walz
Young (AK)

□ 1011

Ms. STEFANIK, Messrs. DUNCAN of South Carolina, CLEAVER, DENHAM, NORCROSS, CONYERS, CUMMINGS, RUTHERFORD, BACON, and Ms. SLAUGHTER changed their vote from "aye" to "no."

Messrs. WEBSTER of Florida, SESSIONS, Mrs. McMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania 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.

Stated against:

Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD. Mr. Chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 555.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Chair, I was absent during roll call votes No. 553 through 555 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Grijalva of Arizona Substitute Amendment No. 1, aye on the Scott of Virginia Substitute Amendment No. 2, and no on the McClintock of California Substitute Amendment No. 3.

AMENDMENT NO. 4 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 4 printed in House Report 115–339.

Mr. YARMUTH. 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.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution 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:

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 resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $2,844,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $2,964,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,113,506,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,241,213,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $3,423,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $3,597,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $3,764,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $3,953,862,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $4,207,243,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $4,452,763,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $111,412,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $130,875,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $162,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: $181,302,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $240,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $279,624,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $301,711,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $331,684,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $417,865,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $494,376,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $3,367,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,461,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,629,655,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,799,113,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,033,996,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,174,442,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,306,821,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,541,077,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $4,777,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $4,981,428,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $3,298,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $3,458,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $3,600,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $3,772,732,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $4,013,050,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $4,138,267,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $4,256,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $4,494,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $4,734,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $4,939,221,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $453,521,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $493,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $487,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $531,519,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $589,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $540,727,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $491,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $540,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $526,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $486,458,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $21,039,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $21,723,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $22,376,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $23,077,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $23,809,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $24,527,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $25,225,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $25,964,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $26,751,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $27,396,000,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: $15,379,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: $15,974,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: $16,590,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: $17,280,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: $18,061,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: $18,832,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: $19,597,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: $20,455,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: $21,349,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: $22,257,000,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

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, $611,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $605,151,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $624,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $615,594,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $637,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $624,735,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $650,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,887,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $663,854,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $652,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $678,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $661,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $692,193,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $669,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $706,422,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $688,324,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $722,450,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $703,659,000,000.
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, $52,701,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,093,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $52,067,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,535,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $51,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $51,619,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,165,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $50,398,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $50,981,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,156,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $51,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,335,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $52,045,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,582,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $52,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,953,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $53,130,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,388,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $32,607,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,808,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $33,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,550,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $33,918,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,211,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $34,622,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,863,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $35,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $36,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $35,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $36,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,040,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $37,586,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $36,792,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $38,377,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $37,565,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $39,173,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $38,341,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $4,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,963,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $5,341,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $5,742,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $5,858,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,334,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $5,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $4,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $4,807,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,471,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $4,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,003,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $4,166,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $3,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $6,423,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $6,515,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $5,459,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $44,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $44,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $45,009,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $45,350,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,746,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,675,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $47,696,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $47,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $48,734,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $48,169,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $49,784,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $49,162,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $50,694,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,065,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $51,759,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $51,041,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $52,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $52,010,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $53,904,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,122,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $24,863,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $22,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,067,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $21,625,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,766,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $22,833,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,220,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,803,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,319,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $21,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,518,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $22,437,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $23,144,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,523,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, $23,360,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,763,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $23,171,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,596,000,000.
(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $16,417,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $2,791,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $18,159,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $17,785,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $9,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $16,235,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,375,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $18,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $18,843,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $8,358,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $19,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,728,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $20,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $19,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,297,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $19,880,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $7,056,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $94,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $94,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $96,208,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $95,317,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $90,834,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $96,984,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $91,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $98,346,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $92,632,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $99,800,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $93,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $101,474,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $94,477,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $103,104,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $95,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $96,468,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $107,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $97,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $108,930,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $20,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,344,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $19,877,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $24,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $20,707,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $23,465,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $21,132,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $22,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $21,592,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $22,028,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,391,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $22,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $22,957,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,597,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $23,443,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $20,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $23,579,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $21,187,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $106,514,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $105,100,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $109,914,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $115,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $112,802,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $111,590,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $116,131,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $114,730,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $118,614,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $117,458,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $120,755,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $119,721,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $122,813,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $121,720,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $124,791,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $123,693,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $126,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $125,661,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $128,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $127,646,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $571,431,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $579,006,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $602,781,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $603,771,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $646,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $636,581,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $669,489,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $668,431,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $703,074,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $701,107,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $736,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $734,349,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $772,672,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $770,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $810,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $807,924,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $849,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $846,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $890,523,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $887,123,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $598,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $597,691,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $655,963,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $655,485,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $694,178,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $693,880,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $746,379,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $746,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $840,893,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $840,679,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $865,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $865,230,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $888,496,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $888,306,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $986,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $986,568,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $1,070,124,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,069,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $1,152,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $1,151,843,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $522,623,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $504,646,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $538,200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $525,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $554,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $542,383,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $569,091,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $558,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $587,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $583,197,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $596,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $587,818,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $605,530,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $591,214,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $626,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $612,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $641,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $635,202,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $658,210,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $650,880,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $39,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $39,644,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $43,342,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $43,283,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $46,606,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $46,586,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $50,055,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $50,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $53,680,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $53,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $57,643,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $57,653,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $62,003,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $62,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $66,598,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $66,614,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $71,052,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $75,625,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $75,642,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $177,885,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $178,068,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $194,339,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $191,615,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $201,128,000,000.

(B) Outlays, $198,981,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $207,588,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $205,546,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $223,845,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $221,690,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $221,566,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $219,455,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $218,419,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $216,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $236,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $234,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $243,968,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $241,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $252,291,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $250,117,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $72,891,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $64,801,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $64,627,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $65,986,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $66,098,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $68,832,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $67,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $68,297,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $71,222,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $69,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,772,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $71,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $70,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $72,589,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $72,215,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $80,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $80,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $82,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $81,878,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $27,958,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $26,363,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $28,794,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $27,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $29,761,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $28,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $30,771,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $30,062,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $31,792,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,154,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $32,512,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $31,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $32,997,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $32,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $33,743,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,135,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $34,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $33,882,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $35,257,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $34,624,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, $376,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $376,659,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $408,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $408,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $451,939,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $451,939,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $500,021,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $500,021,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $547,271,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $547,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $592,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $592,994,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $633,047,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $633,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $670,462,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $670,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $707,440,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $707,440,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $737,582,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $737,707,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$22,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,395,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$17,085,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$15,770,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$12,336,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$13,661,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$10,553,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$11,494,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$8,900,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$6,624,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$4,666,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$2,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$833,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -$872,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $14,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $13,517,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $15,832,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $16,367,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -$82,115,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$82,115,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -$85,079,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$85,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -$84,777,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$84,777,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -$86,503,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$86,503,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,147,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$88,147,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -$88,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$88,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -$92,072,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$92,072,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -$100,265,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -$100,265,000,000.
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, $76,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, $41,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $19,381,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $7,885,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $3,379,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $1,429,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $623,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $195,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $64,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $30,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, $0.
(B) Outlays, $16,000,000.

TITLE II—RESERVE FUNDS

SEC. 201. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR STRUGGLING FAMILIES.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that improves the lives of struggling families by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027. Improvements may include any of the following:

(1) Ensuring that all Americans have access to good-paying jobs, including funding proven, effective job training and employment programs, such as summer and year-round youth employment programs and registered apprenticeship programs, and national service opportunities.

(2) Tax reform that provides support and relief to hard-working American families, including enhancements to the Earned Income Tax Credit, the Child Tax Credit, and the Child and Dependent Care Tax Credit.

(3) Expanded investments to ensure all working families have access to high-quality childcare programs.

(4) Creation of a permanent summer child nutrition Electronic Funds Transfer program to ensure children receive supplemental food benefits.

(5) Additional investment in the Affordable Housing Trust Fund beyond the base levels provided by the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(6) Reauthorization of the Maternal, Infant, and Early Childhood Home Visiting program that ensures the continuation of successful home visiting programs and additional Federal support to serve a greater share of at-risk families.

(7) Changes to improve the Temporary Assistance for Needy Families (TANF) program, including legislation that increases funding for the base block grant, increases access to education and training, or requires States to spend more TANF funds on the program's core purposes such as work, childcare, and assistance to struggling families.

(8) Funding for research designed to improve program effectiveness in creating positive outcomes for low-income children and families.

(9) Additional investments that end homelessness among America's families.

(10) Changes to improve support for at-risk families, reduce child abuse and neglect, or improve reunification, permanency, and post-permanency services in order to reduce the need for foster care.

(11) Changes to encourage and efficiently collect increased parental support for children, including legislation that results in a greater share of collected child support reaching the child and policies to ensure that non-custodial parents are able to pay the child support they owe and maintain positive relationships with their children.

SEC. 202. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR HEALTH CARE IMPROVEMENTS.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) improves the affordability and quality of health care and expands coverage;

(2) improves access to and affordability of prescription drugs;

(3) improves the stability of the marketplaces for nongroup health insurance;

(4) advances biomedical research and development of more effective treatments and cures;

(5) extends expiring provisions of Medicare, Medicaid, Children's Health Insurance Program and other health programs;

(6) improves access to opioid addiction treatment and prevention programs;

(7) improves availability of long-term care services and supports for senior citizens and individuals with disabilities,

(8) improves the contemporary health care workforce's ability to meet emerging demands;

(9) improves Medicare quality, efficiency, and benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicare; or

(10) improves Medicaid quality, efficiency, and benefit design to make care more affordable and accessible for people with Medicaid;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 203. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR JOB CREATION THROUGH INFRASTRUCTURE AND OTHER INVESTMENTS AND INCENTIVES.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that provides for robust Federal investments in America's infrastructure, incentives for businesses, and support for communities or other measures that create jobs for Americans and boost the economy. Revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) provide for additional investments in highways, transit systems, bridges, rail, aviation, harbors (including harbor maintenance dredging), seaports, inland waterway systems, public housing, broadband, energy, water, and other infrastructure;

(2) provide for additional investments in other areas that would help businesses and other employers create new jobs; and

(3) provide additional incentives, including tax incentives, to help small businesses, nonprofits, States, and communities expand investment, train, hire, and retain private-sector workers and public service employees;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure does not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 204. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EDUCATION.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that supports students by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027. Support may include any of the following:

(1) Efforts to make higher education more affordable and increase college and degree completion by encouraging States and institutions of higher education to improve educational outcomes and access for low- and moderate-income students through support for campus-based aid programs; increased funding for the Pell grant program; and assistance to empower borrowers in lowering and managing their student loan debt through refinancing and expanded repayment options.

(2) Increases in funding for the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) to put the Federal Government on a 10-year path to fulfill its commitment to America's children and schools by providing 40 percent of the average per pupil expenditure for special education.

(3) Increases in funding to ensure access to high-quality child care and early learning programs for every child including investments in the Federal Preschool Development Grant program, Head Start program, and the Child Care and Development Block Grant.

(4) Increases in funding for formula programs authorized by Congress in the Elementary and Secondary Education Act, as amended by the Every Student Succeeds Act, including Title I-A, Title II-A, Title III, The 21st Century Community Learning Center Program, and Title IV-A, to support public school teachers and prepare all public school students, including students who are low-income, students learning to speak English, minority students, and students with disabilities, for success in college and their careers.

(5) Increases in funding for STEM, including computer science, and Career and Technical Education (CTE) programs to close the nation's skills gap by ensuring all students have access to high-quality educational programming that prepares them for high-paying careers in a global economy through the integration of academic content and technical skills.

SEC. 205. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR AMERICA'S VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) reforms or otherwise improves the ability of the Department of Veterans Affairs to provide greater and more timely access to quality health care and to enhance the delivery of benefits to the Nation's veterans, or improves the delivery of health care to servicemembers;

(2) improves the treatment of post-traumatic stress disorder and other mental illnesses, and increases the capacity to address health care needs unique to women veterans;

(3) makes improvements to the Post-9/11 Veterans Educational Assistance Act of 2008 to ensure that veterans receive the educational benefits they need to maximize their employment opportunities;

(4) improves disability benefits or evaluations for wounded or disabled military personnel or veterans, including measures to expedite the claims process;

(5) expands eligibility to permit additional disabled military retirees to receive both disability compensation and retired pay (concurrent receipt);

(6) eliminates the offset between Survivor Benefit Plan annuities and veterans' dependency and indemnity compensation; or

(7) improves information technology at the Department of Veterans Affairs, including for the purchase and implementation of the same electronic health record system used by the Department of Defense;

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

SEC. 206. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR RETIREMENT SECURITY.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that strengthens or protects retirement security by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022. The revisions may be made for measures that—

(1) improve the security of existing pension plans, including public- and private-sector plans, single- and multi-employer plans, and the Central States Pension Fund;

(2) address the impending insolvency of the coal miners' pension plan (1974 United Mine Workers of America Pension plan) that, if left unfunded, will jeopardize the solvency of the Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation insurance fund;

(3) improve access to and quality of existing pension plans, including both defined-benefit and defined-contribution plans; and

(4) create new options or incentives for employers to offer pension or retirement savings plans, and/or for employees to participate in them.

SEC. 207. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR INCREASING ENERGY INDEPENDENCE AND SECURITY.

The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report that—

(1) provides tax incentives for or otherwise encourages the production of renewable energy or increased energy efficiency;

(2) encourages investment in emerging clean energy or vehicle technologies or carbon capture and sequestration;

(3) provides additional resources for oversight and expanded enforcement activities to crack down on speculation in and manipulation of oil and gas markets, including derivatives markets;

(4) limits and provides for reductions in greenhouse gas emissions;

(5) assists businesses, industries, States, communities, the environment, workers, or households as the United States moves toward reducing and offsetting the impacts of greenhouse gas emissions; or

(6) facilitates the training of workers for these industries (''clean energy jobs'')

by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2022 or fiscal year 2018 to fiscal year 2027.

TITLE III—ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS

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 appropriation or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal year 2019 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers to accompany this resolution under the heading ''Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations'' in an aggregate amount not to exceed $28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for 2020, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for all discretionary 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, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, making general appropriations or continuing appropriations that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

SEC. 302. ADJUSTMENTS TO DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.

(a) PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES UNDER THE BUDGET CONTROL ACT.—

(1) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATION PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(B) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(2) HEALTH CARE FRAUD AND ABUSE CONTROL PROGRAM.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates amounts as provided under section 251(b)(2)(C) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(b) ADDITIONAL PROGRAM INTEGRITY INITIATIVES.—

(1) INTERNAL REVENUE SERVICE TAX COMPLIANCE.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates $4,860,000,000 for the Internal Revenue Service under the Enforcement appropriation title to carry out tax enforcement activities and provides an additional appropriation of up to $514,000,000 to the Internal Revenue Service that is designated for enhanced tax enforcement to address the tax gap (taxes owed but not paid), the Chair of the Budget Committee shall increase the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(2) UNEMPLOYMENT INSURANCE PROGRAM INTEGRITY ACTIVITIES.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates $151,000,000 for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor and provides an additional appropriation of up to $35,000,000, and the amount is designated for in-person reemployment and eligibility assessments, reemployment services and training referrals, and unemployment insurance improper payment reviews for the Department of Labor, the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations shall be increased by the amount of additional budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority for fiscal year 2018.

(c) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in this subsection for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 303. COSTS OF EMERGENCY NEEDS, OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS, AND DISASTER RELIEF.

(a) EMERGENCY NEEDS.—If any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated as necessary to meet emergency needs pursuant to this subsection, then new budget authority and outlays resulting from that budget authority shall not count for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, or this resolution.

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for Overseas Contingency Operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations by the amounts provided in such legislation for that purpose up to, but not to exceed, the total amount of budget authority specified in section 102(21).

(c) DISASTER RELIEF.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report makes appropriations for discretionary amounts and such amounts are designated for disaster relief pursuant to this subsection, then the allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, and as necessary, the aggregates in this resolution, shall be adjusted by the amount of new budget authority and outlays up to the amounts provided under section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as adjusted by subsection (d).

(d) WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION OPERATIONS.—

(1) CAP ADJUSTMENT.—In the House, if any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report making appropriations for wildfire suppression operations for fiscal year 2018 that appropriates a base amount equal to 70 percent of the average cost of wildfire suppression operations over the previous 10 years and provides an additional appropriation of up to but not to exceed $1,154,000,000 for wildfire suppression operations and such amounts are so designated pursuant to this paragraph, then the allocation to the House Committee on Appropriations may be adjusted by the additional amount of budget authority above the base amount and the outlays resulting from that additional budget authority.

(2) DEFICIT-NEUTRAL ADJUSTMENT.—The total allowable discretionary adjustment for disaster relief pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(D) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 shall be reduced by an amount equivalent to the sum of allocation increases made pursuant to paragraph (1) in the previous year.

(e) PROCEDURE FOR ADJUSTMENTS.—In the House, prior to consideration of any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report, the Chair of the House Committee on the Budget shall make the adjustments set forth in subsections (b), (c), and (d) for the incremental new budget authority in that measure and the outlays resulting from that budget authority if that measure meets the requirements set forth in this section.

SEC. 304. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 4001 of the Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1989, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 to the House Committee on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) SPECIAL RULE.—For purposes of applying section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any off-budget discretionary amounts.

SEC. 305. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) APPLICATION.—In the House, any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this 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 allocations and aggregates included in this resolution.

(c) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chair of the House Committee on the Budget may adjust the aggregates, allocations, and other levels in this resolution for legislation which has received final congressional approval in the same form by the House of Representatives and the Senate, but has yet to be presented to or signed by the President at the time of final consideration of this resolution.

SEC. 306. ADJUSTMENTS FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

The Chair of the House 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. 307. REINSTATEMENT OF PAY-AS-YOU-GO.

In the House, and pursuant to section 301(b)(8) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, for the remainder of the 115th Congress, the following shall apply in lieu of ''CUTGO'' rules and principles:

(1)(A) Except as provided in paragraphs (2) and (3), it shall not be in order to consider any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report if the provisions of such measure affecting direct spending and revenues have the net effect of increasing the on-budget deficit or reducing the on-budget surplus for the period comprising either—

(i) the current year, the budget year, and the four years following that budget year; or

(ii) the current year, the budget year, and the nine years following that budget year.

(B) The effect of such measure on the deficit or surplus shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget.

(C) For the purpose of this section, the terms ''budget year'', ''current year'', and ''direct spending'' have the meanings specified in section 250 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, except that the term ''direct spending'' shall also include provisions in appropriation Acts that make outyear modifications to substantive law as described in section 3(4)(C) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010.

(2) If a bill, joint resolution, or amendment is considered pursuant to a special order of the House directing the Clerk to add as a new matter at the end of such measure the provisions of a separate measure as passed by the House, the provisions of such separate measure as passed by the House shall be included in the evaluation under paragraph (1) of the bill, joint resolution, or amendment.

(3)(A) Except as provided in subparagraph (B), the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall exclude a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles in the case of a point of order under this clause against consideration of—

(i) bill or joint resolution;

(ii) an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business;

(iii) a conference report; or

(iv) an amendment between the Houses.

(B) In the case of an amendment (other than one specified in subparagraph (A)) to a bill or joint resolution, the evaluation under paragraph (1) shall give no cognizance to any designation of emergency.

(C) If a bill, a joint resolution, an amendment made in order as original text by a special order of business, a conference report, or an amendment between the Houses includes a provision expressly designated as an emergency for purposes of pay-as-you-go principles, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect thereto.

SEC. 308. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House adopts the provisions of this title—

(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, and these rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with other such 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 in the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—POLICY STATEMENTS

SEC. 401. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE COVERAGE FOR WORKING FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Making health care coverage affordable and accessible for all American families will improve their health and financial security, which will make the economy stronger.

(2) Medicaid is the Nation's largest health insurance program, providing quality, comprehensive, and affordable coverage to more than 70 million vulnerable Americans, including more than one in three children.

(3) Millions of low-income seniors and people with disabilities rely on Medicaid to pay for nursing home care and home- and community-based services that provide help with activities of daily living.

(4) Medicaid coverage provides financial stability to families struggling to escape poverty and to parents of children with disabilities and special health care needs.

(5) The existing financing structure of Medicaid ensures that Federal contributions keep pace with costs and enables States to respond to changing needs, such as increased enrollment in coverage during economic downturns or an aging population that requires extensive long-term care services.

(6) Under the Affordable Care Act, 31 States and the District of Columbia have expanded Medicaid eligibility to low-income adults, including working parents who do not receive coverage through their employers.

(7) Roughly 20 million previously uninsured people have gained health care coverage under the Affordable Care Act, reducing the Nation's uninsured rate for working-age adults to one of the lowest levels on record.

(8) The law provides premium tax credits that vary by income and the local cost of coverage and cost-sharing assistance to help low- and middle-income families afford quality insurance and pay their out-of-pocket costs.

(9) The law prohibits insurers from denying coverage or charging higher premiums based on pre-existing conditions, requires coverage of essential health benefits like maternity care and prescription drugs, limits out-of-pocket costs, and prohibits lifetime and annual limits on coverage.

(10) The law put in place significant cost-saving reforms to Federal health programs that have played a part in slowing the rate of healthcare spending growth in recent years, with 2011, 2012, and 2013 experiencing the slowest growth rates in real per capita national health expenditures on record.

(11) On May 4, 2017, the House of Representatives passed H.R.1628, the American Health Care Act of 2017, legislation that would repeal provisions of the Affordable Care Act, make deep cuts in Medicaid, and—

(A) result in 23 million Americans losing health insurance in 2026, including 14 million people losing Medicaid;

(B) dramatically increase costs for older adults, low-income families, and people with pre-existing conditions;

(C) reduce Medicaid spending by $834 billion over ten years;

(D) jeopardize care for seniors in nursing homes, children with disabilities, and families receiving Medicaid benefits as States look to reduce coverage and services;

(E) severely undermine access to substance abuse treatment during the nationwide opioid epidemic;

(F) shorten the life of the Medicare Hospital Insurance Trust Fund; and

(G) provide nearly $1 trillion in tax cuts that mostly benefit millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) Congress should build upon the progress of the Affordable Care Act to make health care coverage more affordable and accessible to all American families, and reject any measures to repeal or undermine the law;

(2) the Administration and Congress should fully implement, enforce, and fund the Affordable Care Act, and stop any efforts to sabotage the health insurance marketplaces; and

(3) Congress should preserve Medicaid and not dismantle it by converting Medicaid into a block grant, per capita cap, or other financing arrangement that would limit Federal contributions and render the program incapable of responding to increased need that may result from trends in demographics or health care costs or from economic conditions.

SEC. 402. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON TAX REFORM THAT PROVIDES SUPPORT AND RELIEF TO HARDWORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Tax plans from House Republicans and President Trump prioritize tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while shifting more of the burden onto everyone else. Their plans fail to close special interest loopholes in the tax code, and even add trillions of dollars of new loopholes for the wealthy. These plans reflect the failed theory of ''trickle-down'' economics, which creates few jobs and instead leads to massive deficits. A return to these policies would—

(A) fail to create good paying middle-class jobs;

(B) do nothing to help low-income or middle-class households with the rising costs of health care, education, housing, child care, or retirement; and

(C) widen the income gap between millionaires and billionaires and the middle class.

(2) Americans today are working harder than ever, but continue to struggle to find good jobs, get ahead, and stay ahead. This is part of a four-decade trend of stagnant wages for middle-class and low-income households, even as millionaires and billionaires become richer and corporations reap massive profits.

(3) The Obama Administration ended with 83 consecutive months of private-sector job growth, but challenges still remain to create more good-paying jobs and broadly shared prosperity. The number of long-term unemployed remains elevated, and unemployment for people of color continues to be higher than the rest of the population. Many areas remain in need of well-paying jobs.

(4) By almost any metric, the middle class has seen little to no improvements in their incomes. Real median household income in 2013 was only $7,000 higher than it was in 1979. Median weekly real earnings for workers increased less than 1 percent from 1979 to 2014. Poorer workers have done even worse. For workers in the lower half of the income scale, real annual wages from 1979 to 2014 grew only $76. And the entire lower 50 percent of the United States population holds a mere 1 percent of total national wealth.

(5) All the while, millionaires and billionaires have seen their incomes and wealth skyrocket. Incomes for the top one percent of households grew five times as fast as for middle-income workers, and now average over $1 million a year. CEOs make nearly 300 times what the typical worker does. Ten percent of the population owns 76 percent of the Nation's total wealth, and the average net assets of the top one percent now exceed $10 million per person.

(6) The top one percent of households receives a disproportionate share—17 percent—of the benefit of major tax expenditures. This uneven distribution of major tax expenditures has exacerbated income and wealth inequality. The tax code treats income from wealth more favorably than income from work by giving preferential tax rates on unearned income, and it contains numerous, wasteful tax breaks for special interests.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House to responsibly reform the tax code to provide support and relief to low- and middle-income families, create good-paying jobs, and drive broadly-shared prosperity, while closing special-interest loopholes and making sure the wealthiest Americans pay their fair share.

SEC. 403. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNDING INCREASES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The current spending limits set by the Budget Control Act of 2011 are too low, for both defense and nondefense funding. Defense and nondefense investments must be at appropriate levels to protect both national security and economic security. The nondefense discretionary spending limit for 2018 is $2 billion less than it was in 2016, in nominal terms, representing a significant cut to purchasing power. If the inflation rate is what the Congressional Budget Office projects, the 2018 cap represents a reduction of nearly $30 billion compared with 2016. Defense spending faces similar reductions.

(2) The Budget Control Act of 2011 is based on parity for defense and nondefense spending, setting up separate caps for both and instituting a ''firewall'' to prevent reductions in one category because of increases in the other.

(3) Bipartisan agreement has provided a solution to the austerity-level caps before, and can be used again to change these arbitrary spending caps to prevent the harsh impact of massive, irresponsible cuts to important Federal programs.

(4) Congress must begin discussions and negotiations immediately, to raise the caps to appropriate levels, and maintain parity between defense and nondefense.

(b) POLICY ON DEFENSE AND NONDEFENSE FUNDING INCREASES.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should enact increases to the current defense and nondefense spending limits, in equal amounts, without using reductions in one category to pay for increases in the other.

SEC. 404. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON IMMIGRATION REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Fixing the country's broken immigration system will mean safer communities, a stronger economy and lower budget deficits.

(2) The Congressional Budget Office estimated that enacting the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, as introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress, would have reduced the deficit by $900 billion over the next 2 decades, boosting the economy by 5.4 percent, and increasing productivity by 1.0 percent.

(3) The Social Security Actuary estimated that immigration reform will reduce the Social Security shortfall by 8 percent and will extend the life of the Social Security Trust Fund by 2 years.

(4) The United States is a Nation founded, built and sustained by immigrants, and the Congress has a responsibility to harness the power of that tradition by implementing an effective and fair immigration policy.

(5) The current immigration system is broken because it keeps families of legal immigrants and United States citizens separated for decades, it allows for the exploitation of undocumented workers to the detriment of all workers, it does not meet the needs of our economy and discourages legal immigration, and it keeps millions of hard-working, law-abiding families who have lived in our communities for decades hiding in the shadows, including many thousands who came to the United States as infants or young children.

(6) Overly aggressive immigration enforcement that focuses on individuals with deep ties to the United States hurts State and local law enforcement efforts to establish and maintain trust with immigrant communities. The number of Latinos reporting crimes in big cities across the country is lower than past years, particularly among domestic violence and sexual assault victims.

(7) The vast majority of individuals in U.S. Immigration and Customs Enforcement (ICE) custody have not been convicted of a serious crime. ICE's own statistics demonstrate that arrests of people with no criminal record increased 157 percent in the first 100 days of the Trump Administration, and only 6.5 percent of those arrested were convicted of violent crimes.

(8) The number of detained asylum seekers continues to rise dramatically and detaining asylum seekers, other vulnerable populations, and those who do not pose risks to public safety is unnecessary and wasteful.

(9) Increasing the use of alternatives to detention rather than expanding immigration detention would be more humane and cost-effective.

(10) It has been nearly four years since the Senate passed, on a bipartisan basis, its comprehensive immigration reform bill.

(11) Immigration reform is needed to secure the sovereignty of the United States of America and to establish a coherent and just system for integrating those who seek to join American society.

(12) A successful immigration system cannot rely on border security alone. The country needs a system that promotes the reunification of families, protects workers and is responsive to the needs of employers, and implements an inclusive legalization program for those who are currently here.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress enact comprehensive immigration reform – such as the Border Security, Economic Opportunity, and Immigration Modernization Act, introduced by House Democrats in the 113th Congress – to boost our economy, lower deficits, establish clear and just rules for citizenship, and make our communities safer.

SEC. 405. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Most of the 61 million Americans who currently receive earned Social Security benefits rely on these benefits for the majority of their income, with nearly a quarter of them relying on Social Security for at least 90 percent of their income.

(2) In the past, Social Security benefits were part of a 3-legged stool where retirees relied on a combination of Social Security, a private pension, and personal savings to finance retirement.

(3) Social Security benefits will be more important to future retirees as few workers will receive traditional pensions, and many workers cannot afford to adequately fund their retirement through employer-sponsored savings plans or IRAs.

(4) Social Security's Disability Insurance (DI) and Old Age and Survivors Insurance (OASI) systems are intertwined both in their benefit structure and in their revenues – DI recipients who reach retirement age receive OASI benefits and beneficiaries in each category have helped finance the other category even if they will never receive those benefits.

(5) Social Security benefits are already being cut as Social Security's normal retirement age is increasing from 66 years for workers retiring now to 67 years for those born in 1960 and later. This cut disproportionately impacts low-earners because life expectancy continues to increase among higher-earners but not low-earners. Thus, high-earners will generally receive benefits for a longer time than low-earners.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the House of Representatives will not adopt changes to Social Security that involve reductions in earned Social Security benefits.

SEC. 406. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON PROTECTING THE MEDICARE GUARANTEE FOR SENIORS AND PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Senior citizens and persons with disabilities highly value the Medicare program and rely on Medicare to guarantee their health and financial security.

(2) In 2018, 60,000,000 people will rely on Medicare for coverage of hospital stays, physician visits, prescription drugs, and other necessary medical goods and services.

(3) The Medicare program has lower administrative costs than private insurance, and Medicare costs per enrollee have grown at a slower rate than private insurance for a given level of benefits.

(4) People with Medicare already have the ability to choose a private insurance plan within Medicare through the Medicare Advantage option, yet two-thirds of Medicare beneficiaries chose the traditional fee-for-service program instead of a private plan in 2016.

(5) Rising health care costs are not unique to Medicare or other Federal health programs, they are endemic to the entire health care system.

(6) Converting Medicare into a voucher for the purchase of health insurance will merely force seniors and individuals with disabilities to pay much higher premiums if they want to use their voucher to purchase traditional Medicare coverage.

(7) A voucher system in which the voucher payment fails to keep pace with growth in health costs would expose seniors and persons with disabilities on fixed incomes to unacceptable financial risks.

(8) Shifting more health care costs onto Medicare beneficiaries would not reduce overall health care costs, instead it would mean beneficiaries would face higher premiums, eroding coverage, or both.

(9) Versions of voucher policies that do not immediately end the traditional Medicare program will merely set it up for a death spiral as private plans siphon off healthier and less expensive beneficiaries, leaving the sickest beneficiaries in a program that will wither away.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that the Medicare guarantee for seniors and persons with disabilities should be preserved and strengthened, and that any legislation to end the Medicare guarantee, financially penalize people for choosing traditional Medicare, or shift rising health care costs onto seniors by replacing Medicare with vouchers or premium support for the purchase of health insurance, should be rejected.

SEC. 407. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON FINANCIAL STABILITY AND CONSUMER PROTECTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010 is an important component of the country's response to the financial crisis and recession. It took a number of steps to protect consumers of financial products and services as well as protect taxpayers from the costs of another financial crisis.

(2) These steps included the creation of an orderly liquidation process to allow regulators to close failing institutions that some argue are ''too big to fail,'' as well as a new Financial Stability Oversight Council (FSOC), an Office of Financial Research to monitor the stability of our financial system, and the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau (the Consumer Bureau).

(3) The Consumer Bureau plays a critical role in protecting older Americans, military service members, student loan borrowers, and other consumers, especially in minority and low-income communities. It has implemented new rules for mortgage markets and prepaid cards, and also successfully recovered nearly $12 billion on behalf of more than 29 million consumers and service members.

(4) The Consumer Bureau's funding from the Federal Reserve's operations help give it important independence from efforts to interfere with its vital mission and activities, independence on par with every other banking regulator.

(5) The Consumer Bureau has already faced and overcome efforts to obstruct its operations.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should continue to support the vital work of the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau as well as its governing and financing structures and other key components of the Dodd-Frank legislation such as orderly liquidation authority, FSOC, and the Office of Financial Research.

SEC. 408. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON WOMEN'S ECONOMIC EMPOWERMENT.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Women's contributions are critical to the economic success of hard-working families.

(2) Not only do women play a key role in maintaining healthy families, they also have unique health care needs and face issues that require special focus.

(3) Every hard-working American deserves to feel safe and supported during retirement. Yet women are more likely to face financial risk during retirement because of their lower lifetime earnings and disproportionate role as family caregivers.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should economically empower women and protect their health and safety. Congress must enact policies that would accomplish the following:

(1) Help families attain better jobs, fight pay inequity, raise the minimum wage, and enable women entrepreneurs and small businesses to achieve their goals.

(2) Give American families control of their own lives, and help them balance the demands of work and family. These policies include paid and expanded family and medical leave, paid sick days, and quality, affordable child care.

(3) Strengthen the retirement security of women and their families by protecting Social Security, Medicare and Medicaid.

(4) Support caregivers, many of whom sacrifice their own careers to provide for family members.

(5) Maintain health insurance protections for women, increase funding for the prevention and treatment of women's health issues such as breast cancer and heart disease, and support access to full reproductive care.

(6) Prevent and protect women from domestic violence and sexual abuse.

SEC. 409. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON NATIONAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The country faces many national security challenges and we must continue to support a strong military that is second to none.

(2) Those who serve in uniform are our most important security resource and the Administration and Congress shall continue to provide the support they need to successfully carry out the missions the country gives them.

(3) A growing economy is the foundation of our security and enables the country to provide the resources for a strong military, sound homeland security agencies, and effective diplomacy and international development.

(4) Austerity-level spending caps threaten adequate investment in activities critical to our economy and national security, which include activities funded by both the defense and nondefense portions of the discretionary budget.

(5) Diplomacy and foreign aid are essential components of our security and the President's proposal to cut these activities by 32 percent below current levels prompted more than 120 retired admirals and generals who have first-hand knowledge of their effectiveness in securing our Nation to forcefully object.

(6) The Nation's projected long-term debt could have serious consequences for our economy and security, and that more efficient military spending has to be part of an overall plan that effectively deals with this problem.

(7) Reining in wasteful spending at the Nation's security agencies, including the Department of Defense—the last department still unable to pass an audit—such as the elimination of duplicative programs and better controlling delays and cost overruns on weapon systems that have been identified by the Government Accountability Office (GAO) needs to continue as a priority.

(8) The Department of Defense should continue to review defense plans and requirements to ensure that weapons developed to counter Cold War-era threats are not redundant, are affordable, and are applicable to 21st century threats; and such review should include, with the participation of the National Nuclear Security Administration, examination of requirements for, and cost of, the nuclear weapons stockpile, nuclear weapons delivery systems, and nuclear weapons and infrastructure modernization.

(9) Nonwar operation and maintenance costs per active-duty service member have grown at a rate well above inflation for decades—from $59,000 per service member in 1980 to $157,000 per service member in 2015 (measured in constant 2017 dollars), and it is imperative that unsustainable cost growth be controlled in this area.

(10) Cooperative threat reduction and other nonproliferation programs (securing ''loose nukes'' and other materials used in weapons of mass destruction), which were highlighted as high priorities by the 9/11 Commission, need to be funded at a level that is commensurate with the evolving threat.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) the austerity-level spending caps required by the Budget Control Act of 2011 for fiscal years 2018 through 2021 should be rescinded and replaced by a fiscal plan that is balanced and takes into account a comprehensive national security strategy that includes careful consideration of international, defense, homeland security, and law enforcement programs; and

(2) efficiencies can be achieved in the national defense budget without compromising our security through greater emphasis on eliminating duplicative and wasteful programs, reforming the acquisition process, identifying and constraining unsustainable operating costs, and through careful analysis of our national security needs.

SEC. 410. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Department of Veterans Affairs (VA) continues to face challenges meeting the needs of the next generation of returning veterans, including sufficient funding to provide critical services and benefits.

(2) Access to quality health care and veterans' benefits has been an ongoing challenge for the VA, highlighted most recently in the ongoing claims backlog and veterans waiting months for health care appointments.

(3) Providing health care where veterans live and ensuring a sufficient number of health care professionals, especially in the area of mental health treatment, have also been challenges.

(4) The VA has made progress in reducing the number of initial benefit claims, dropping the claims backlog to less than 94,000 from a peak of 611,000 claims just a few years ago, but that statistic leaves out the many veterans who are still waiting many months or even years to have their appeals decided.

(5) The President's budget includes a 6 percent increase over current-year funding but shifts funding away from critical programs that veterans rely on in favor of expanded funding that pays for certain veterans to get private health care at the expense of care provided at VA hospitals and clinics.

(6) The President's budget also cuts funding from other Federal agencies that provide lifesaving programs and services for veterans, including deep cuts to Medicaid benefits veterans rely on, the elimination of the Interagency Council on Homelessness, steep cuts at the Department of Housing and Urban Development, elimination of the Legal Services Corporation, and severe cuts to entrepreneurship outreach programs targeted to veterans through the Small Business Administration.

(7) The VA currently has advance appropriations for approximately 85 percent of its discretionary budget. The residual 15 percent, which includes funding for the day-to-day operations at the Veterans Benefits Administration, remains vulnerable to a Government shutdown.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that—

(1) Congress should support a funding level no less than the President's request for veterans' discretionary programs so that the VA has the resources it needs to ensure veterans get the health care and benefits they earned in a timely fashion;

(2) Congress should lift the austerity-level funding cap on nondefense programs for 2018 and beyond to ensure adequate funding for veterans' programs;

(3) advance appropriations be expanded to cover all of VA's discretionary budget to prevent delays in veterans' benefits and services during a Government shutdown;

(4) the VA submit along with its annual budget a ''Future-Years Veterans Program'' that projects its needs over five years to help facilitate the appropriations and oversight processes;

(5) Congress should provide sufficient resources for the VA's Office of the Inspector General to guarantee veterans are properly served and that resources are spent efficiently;

(6) no changes be made to the Individual Unemployability benefit to ensure that disabled veterans, many of them severely disabled, who are deemed unable to engage in substantial work as a result of their service to our country, continue to receive the full disability and social security benefits they earned and were promised; and

(7) Congress shall provide sufficient funding and staff resources for VA hospitals and clinics, and that any increased funding for private and community care not provided directly by the VA should not come at the expense of necessary resources for VA hospitals and clinics.

SEC. 411. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON DISASTER RESPONSE FUNDING.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House find the following:

(1) Natural disasters such as hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria require swift congressional action to help storm survivors get their lives back on track, rebuild disaster-stricken communities, and prevent further damage to the economy.

(2) The Budget Control Act of 2001 provides procedural tools specifically to respond to

natural disasters, by allowing adjustments to the spending caps for disaster and emergency spending.

(3) Mitigation and prevention is an important part of disaster recovery and response, providing investments that make future disasters less costly in terms of both dollars and lives.

(b) POLICY ON FUNDING FOR DISASTER RESPONSE AND RECOVERY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should act swiftly to assist with recovery from hurricanes and other natural disasters. Such funding should be provided using the budgetary provisions in place for this purpose: providing adjustments to the spending caps for disaster and emergency response, recovery, and mitigation. Congress must also support efforts to address future disaster damage and loss, by appropriately funding mitigation and prevention efforts.

SEC. 412. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE FEDERAL WORKFORCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation on a daily basis. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cyber-attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe.

(2) Veterans make up 31 percent of the Federal workforce.

(3) Many Federal workers are paid at a rate that is far below their private sector counterparts.

(4) The Federal workforce is older than in past decades and older than the private sector workforce. Nearly one third of the Federal workforce is eligible to retire.

(5) Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of the country's deficits and debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed more than $180 billion toward reducing the country's deficits in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions. The President's budget for 2018 continues to unfairly target the Federal workforce by proposing an additional $149 billion in compensation and retirement benefit cuts.

(6) Since 1975, the Federal workforce has declined 35 percent relative to the size of the population of the United States.

(7) Nearly all of the increase in the Federal civilian workforce from 2001 to 2016 is due to increases at security-related agencies, including the Department of Defense, Department of Homeland Security, and Department of Veterans Affairs.

(8) Proposals to reduce the size of the workforce at nonsecurity agencies by 10 percent have excluded an assessment of their impact on government services.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress should not target Federal employees to achieve further reductions in the deficit as they have already contributed more than their fair share, that Federal workers should be compensated with pay and benefits at a level that enables the government to attract high quality people—which is especially important during this period when more workers will be retiring—and that no proposal to reduce the size of the workforce should be considered without an assessment of its impact on government services.

SEC. 413. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON CLIMATE CHANGE SCIENCE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Global climate change is a threat to national security, public health, and economic growth.

(2) The United Nations' Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change concluded that the effects of climate change are occurring worldwide, stating: ''The impacts of climate change have already been felt in recent decades on all continents and across the oceans''.

(3) The United States Government Accountability Office described climate change as, ''a complex, crosscutting issue that poses risks to many environmental and economic systems—including agriculture, infrastructure, ecosystems, and human health—and presents a significant financial risk to the Federal Government''.

(4) In March 2017, Secretary of Defense James Mattis, in written testimony to the Senate Armed Services Committee, stated that ''climate change can be a driver of instability and the Department of Defense must pay attention to potential adverse impacts generated by this phenomenon''.

(5) The National Aeronautics and Space Administration and National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration reported that 2016 was the warmest year on record, setting a new record for global average surface temperatures for the third year in a row. Furthermore, 16 of the 17 warmest years on record have occurred since 2001.

(6) The United States National Research Council's National Climate Assessment and Development Advisory Committee found climate change affects ''human health, water supply, agriculture, transportation, energy, coastal areas, and many other sectors of society, with increasingly adverse impacts on the American economy and quality of life''.

(7) The most vulnerable among us, including children, the elderly, low-income individuals, and those with underlying health conditions, face even greater health risks as a result of climate change.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that climate change presents a significant public health, environmental, and financial risk to the United States. The United States must continue to play a leadership role on climate change policy and should not retreat from global commitments on climate change. Congress must provide robust funding for climate change science, which provides critical information for protecting human health, defending the United States, and preserving economic and environmental systems throughout the world.

SEC. 414. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON INCREASED EFFICIENCY AND ELIMINATING WASTE.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office (''GAO'') identifies examples of waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs, and makes regular recommendations regarding ways to reduce costs and increase revenue.

(2) The Comptroller General has stated that addressing the identified waste, duplication, and overlap in Federal programs ''could lead to tens of billions of dollars of additional savings, with significant opportunities for improved efficiencies, cost savings, or revenue enhancements in the areas of defense, information technology, education and training, health care, energy, and tax enforcement.''

(3) The tax gap, the difference between taxes owed and taxes paid, now averages $458 billion annually. Even modest improvements in enforcing existing law could yield a boost in revenue without any changes to the tax code.

(4) Tax expenditures, or spending through the tax code, total $1.5 trillion per year and represent the largest category of spending in the budget — exceeding Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. However, unlike other types of spending, tax expenditures are not reviewed in any systematic way in the annual budget process.

(5) Improper payments, payments that should not have been made or that were made in an incorrect amount, totaled $144 billion for 2016. While some improper payments are the result of fraud, the vast majority are due to unintentional errors, such as payments to eligible beneficiaries that were not properly verified, or overpayments or underpayments because of a data entry mistake.

(6) Shutting down the government, arbitrarily cutting agency budgets, and funding large portions of the government through stop-gap appropriations do not lead to efficient and effective government.

(b) POLICY.—It is the policy of the House that Congress must continue to root out wasteful spending, make government operations more efficient, pass appropriations bills on time, and avoid costly government shutdowns. Congress must task agencies with shrinking the error rate in government programs and provide adequate budgetary resources for agencies to develop new processes, review expenditures, and improve information technology systems.

SEC. 415. POLICY OF THE HOUSE ON THE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Free and fair elections are the cornerstone of our democracy, and foreign interference in them undermines the public trust and casts doubt on the legitimacy of our government.

(2) The country's intelligence agencies all agree that Russia launched a campaign to undermine the 2016 U.S. presidential election, which included cyber-attacks, dissemination of false information, and other intelligence operations to malign Secretary Hillary Clinton and increase the odds of a Donald Trump presidency.

(3) Members of the Trump campaign had repeated contact with Russian government officials and oligarchs and then failed to report this contact in testimony to Congress and in security clearance applications. One such meeting reportedly included a request for a back-channel line of communications with the Russian government using Russian facilities, which would preclude U.S. Government oversight. Another involved a Kremlin-linked Russian lawyer and a former Soviet counterintelligence officer under the assumption that they would provide politically damaging information about Secretary Hillary Clinton as part of the Russian government's effort to support the Trump campaign.

(4) Under the direction of Federal Bureau of Investigation Director James Comey, the FBI was investigating whether members of President Trump's campaign colluded with Russia to influence the election.

(5) On May 9, 2017, President Trump fired FBI Director Comey and then made statements suggesting his dismissal was to stop the investigation of collusion.

(6) On May 17, 2017, the Department of Justice announced the appointment of former FBI Director Robert S. Mueller III to serve as Special Counsel to investigate Russian interference into the 2016 presidential election and any coordination between the Russian government and individuals associated with the Trump campaign.

(b) POLICY ON THE INVESTIGATION OF RUSSIAN INTERFERENCE IN THE 2016 U.S. PRESIDENTIAL ELECTION.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that to restore confidence in our government and to preserve the sanctity of our electoral process, Congress must ensure adequate funding for the

Special Counsel appointed by the Department of Justice so that he can perform a thorough and nonpartisan investigation of Russia's campaign to affect the 2016 U.S. presidential election and any individuals in the United States that may have colluded in those efforts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, Democrats and Republicans are looking at the same challenges facing our country and American families. Education, healthcare, and housing costs have all increased while wages stay stagnant.

It used to be that the two parties would debate different strategies to address the problems facing the American people. Sadly, those times are behind us.

In giving millionaires, including the majority of this Congress, the President, and wealthy donors a giant tax cut, the Republican budget does not even pretend to address the problems facing the American people. Not only does it ignore working families, it increases their challenges.

The Democratic budget alternative, in stark contrast to the Republican budget, begins to address the real challenges our country faces now and in the long term.

□ 1015

We are less than a decade removed from the worst economic crisis in most of our lifetimes, and we have a chance to rebound in a way that builds a foundation for our country to thrive for generations, but we have to seize that opportunity.

Rather than giving resources to people and businesses that already have them, we are calling for targeted investments in programs that grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families and real security in retirement.

Rather than sending thank-you notes to the corporations that bankroll campaigns, we have an opportunity to make vital public investments that lead to a brighter future rebuilding roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure, all of which lead to good jobs now and in the long run.

Rather than giving the President a multimillion-dollar refund on taxes he refuses to disclose, we can invest in retirement security for seniors who didn't inherit millions. We can invest in affordable education so young people do not have to grow up wealthy to have a shot at earning it in their future careers.

Instead of taking healthcare away from people, straining emergency rooms, and making Americans sicker, we have an opportunity to continue investing in affordable quality healthcare for all of us, finally eliminating a great burden on American families, a burden that no other developed nation shares.

This budget is an opportunity for our country to invest in our future, and if we adopt the Republican budget plan, we will have squandered it.

Democrats believe in a government that prioritizes American families, and they should be the priorities of this Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this budget substitute, which is, put simply, an abdication of our fiscal responsibility as a governing body.

Our country is $20 trillion in debt, with $9 trillion added to the national debt during the Obama years. We have the responsibility to our children and our grandchildren to stop this Congress' addiction to spending. It is a responsibility that I take seriously; it is a responsibility that the members of my committee take seriously; and it is a responsibility that Republicans in the House take seriously.

Clearly, it is not a responsibility that our friends across the aisle take seriously. Our budget works to end the addiction to spending that has dominated Washington for far too long.

The House budget, passed out of committee with unanimous Republican support in July, begins to address our spending addiction by balancing the budget over 10 years so that we can start paying down our national debt, and it addresses mandatory spending in a significant way for the first time since 1997.

This budget substitute does quite the opposite. The Democrats' budget raises taxes by $2.7 trillion, which would be the largest tax increase in U.S. history. It increases spending by $6.2 trillion, compared to the budget passed by my committee. It never balances, with a deficit in 2027 of $852 billion.

What we hear from the other side of the aisle and what we see in this budget is simply more of same: more spending, more tax increases, and more debt. I don't think that is acceptable, and neither do the American people.

Since we began this budget debate yesterday, my counterparts on the other side of the aisle have been throwing out misleading numbers about our budget and our tax reform effort in order to hide the fact that they offer no new solutions to the most pressing problems our country faces.

Here is a number that they should keep in mind while they discuss this fiscally irresponsible substitute. The national debt for every person is over $63,000. Every man, woman, and even child in our country has a $63,000 weight hanging over their heads. Our budget takes real steps to fix this crisis. This budget substitute does not. Honestly, it is as simple as that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this Democrat substitute, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, once again, House Republicans are determined to visit cruel and unusual punishment on the American people by presenting a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It is a budget that will hurt working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and rural America.

It is a budget that will eradicate the social safety net, end Medicare as we know it, rip away health insurance from 23 million Americans, and impose billions and billions of dollars in life-altering debt on younger Americans.

It is outrageous that this is all being done to enact tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-off, tax cuts for the privileged few, tax cuts for special interests here in Washington, D.C.

This parade of horribles is being jammed down the throats of this country so that everyday Americans can subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless.

We deserve better. The Democratic budget will invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in education and job training, invest in the social safety net, invest in research and development, invest in affordable housing, and invest in the wellbeing of everyday Americans.

The Republican budget is a raw deal. The Democratic budget is a better deal, focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future. It is worthy of our support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chair, with all respect, the cruel and unusual punishment is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment. The raw deal is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment that increases spending $6.2 trillion over our budget.

This thing raises taxes—$2.7 trillion, the largest tax increase in American history, at a time when we are drowning in debt and stagnant wage growth.

It requires a one-to-one match of defense and nondefense discretionary spending at a time when we can't keep our F–18s flying and we have airplanes crashing around the country for lack of maintenance.

This is unconscionable. This budget never balances. It will leave us with an $852 billion deficit by fiscal year 2027. It expands ObamaCare, the most disastrous and heinous trick played on the American people that I can remember. It prioritizes amnesty over security.

We are never going to get our country straight and preserve our sovereignty if we don't protect our security. On the other hand, we have got the Republican budget that offers to do a lot of things. One thing it offers to do is put a work requirement for able-bodied adults with no dependent children into welfare.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD an article by Nicholas Eberstadt of AEI talking about the horrible condition of our labor force now and how drastically important this is and how much it will improve the opportunities for people to rise out of poverty. We have got three 25- to 54-year-old males sitting out of the labor force collecting benefits for every one that is unemployed. The unemployed rate is 4.7 percent. That makes the total 20 percent. It is almost over 5 million people that we owe them a moral obligation to offer them an opportunity to rise out of poverty through work, and that is what the Republican budget does.

[Commentary, Feb. 15, 2017]

ECONOMY: OUR MISERABLE 21ST CENTURY

(By Nicholas N. Eberstadt)

On the morning of November 9, 2016, America's elite—its talking and deciding classes—woke up to a country they did not know. To most privileged and well-educated Americans, especially those living in its bicoastal bastions, the election of Donald Trump had been a thing almost impossible even to imagine. What sort of country would go and elect someone like Trump as president? Certainly not one they were familiar with, or understood anything about.

Whatever else it may or may not have accomplished, the 2016 election was a sort of shock therapy for Americans living within what Charles Murray famously termed ''the bubble'' (the protective barrier of prosperity and self-selected associations that increasingly shield our best and brightest from contact with the rest of their society). The very fact of Trump's election served as a truth broadcast about a reality that could no longer be denied: Things out there in America are a whole lot different from what you thought.

Yes, things are very different indeed these days in the ''real America'' outside the bubble. In fact, things have been going badly wrong in America since the beginning of the 21st century.

It turns out that the year 2000 marks a grim historical milestone of sorts for our nation. For whatever reasons, the Great American Escalator, which had lifted successive generations of Americans to ever higher standards of living and levels of social well-being, broke down around then—and broke down very badly.

The warning lights have been flashing, and the klaxons sounding, for more than a decade and a half. But our pundits and prognosticators and professors and policymakers, ensconced as they generally are deep within the bubble, were for the most part too distant from the distress of the general population to see or hear it. (So much for the vaunted ''information era'' and ''big-data revolution.'') Now that those signals are no longer possible to ignore, it is high time for experts and intellectuals to reacquaint themselves with the country in which they live and to begin the task of describing what has befallen the country in which we have lived since the dawn of the new century.

Consider the condition of the American economy. In some circles people still widely believe, as one recent New York Times business-section article cluelessly insisted before the inauguration, that ''Mr. Trump will inherit an economy that is fundamentally solid.'' But this is patent nonsense. By now it should be painfully obvious that the U.S. economy has been in the grip of deep dysfunction since the dawn of the new century. And in retrospect, it should also be apparent that America's strange new economic maladies were almost perfectly designed to set the stage for a populist storm.

Ever since 2000, basic indicators have offered oddly inconsistent readings on America's economic performance and prospects. It is curious and highly uncharacteristic to find such measures so very far out of alignment with one another. We are witnessing an ominous and growing divergence between three trends that should ordinarily move in tandem: wealth, output, and employment.

Depending upon which of these three indicators you choose, America looks to be heading up, down, or more or less nowhere. From the standpoint of wealth creation, the 21st century is off to a roaring start. By this yardstick, it looks as if Americans have never had it so good and as if the future is full of promise. Between early 2000 and late 2016, the estimated net worth of American households and nonprofit institutions more than doubled, from $44 trillion to $90 trillion.

Although that wealth is not evenly distributed, it is still a fantastic sum of money—an average of over a million dollars for every notional family of four. This upsurge of wealth took place despite the crash of 2008—indeed, private wealth holdings are over $20 trillion higher now than they were at their pre-crash apogee. The value of American real-estate assets is near or at all-time highs, and America's businesses appear to be thriving. Even before the ''Trump rally'' of late 2016 and early 2017, U.S. equities markets were hitting new highs—and since stock prices are strongly shaped by expectations of future profits, investors evidently are counting on the continuation of the current happy days for U.S. asset holders for some time to come.

A rather less cheering picture, though, emerges if we look instead at real trends for the macro-economy. Here, performance since the start of the century might charitably be described as mediocre, and prospects today are no better than guarded. The recovery from the crash of 2008—which unleashed the worst recession since the Great Depression—has been singularly slow and weak. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), it took nearly four years for America's gross domestic product (GDP) to re-attain its late 2007 level. As of late 2016, total value added to the U.S. economy was just 12 percent higher than in 2007. The situation is even more sobering if we consider per capita growth. It took America six and a half years—until mid-2014—to get back to its late 2007 per capita production levels. And in late 2016, per capita output was just 4 percent higher than in late 2007—nine years earlier. By this reckoning, the American economy looks to have suffered something close to a lost decade.

But there was clearly trouble brewing in America's macro-economy well before the 2008 crash, too. Between late 2000 and late 2007, per capita GDP growth averaged less than 1.5 percent per annum. That compares with the nation's long-term postwar 1948–2000 per capita growth rate of almost 2.3 percent, which in turn can be compared to the ''snap back'' tempo of 1.1 percent per annum since per capita GDP bottomed out in 2009. Between 2000 and 2016, per capita growth in America has averaged less than 1 percent a year. To state it plainly: With postwar, pre-21st-century rates for the years 2000–2016, per capita GDP in America would be more than 20 percent higher than it is today.

The reasons for America's newly fitful and halting macroeconomic performance are still a puzzlement to economists and a subject of considerable contention and debate. Economists are generally in consensus, however, in one area: They have begun redefining the growth potential of the U.S. economy downwards. The U.S. Congressional Budget Office (CBO), for example, suggests that the ''potential growth'' rate for the U.S. economy at full employment of factors of production has now dropped below 1.7 percent a year, implying a sustainable long-term annual per capita economic growth rate for America today of well under 1 percent.

Then there is the employment situation. If 21st-century America's GDP trends have been disappointing, labor-force trends have been utterly dismal. Work rates have fallen off a cliff since the year 2000 and are at their lowest levels in decades. We can see this by looking at the estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) for the civilian employment rate, the jobs-to-population ratio for adult civilian men and women. Between early 2000 and late 2016, America's overall work rate for Americans age 20 and older underwent a drastic decline. It plunged by almost 5 percentage points (from 64.6 to 59.7). Unless you are a labor economist, you may not appreciate just how severe a falloff in employment such numbers attest to. Postwar America never experienced anything comparable.

From peak to trough, the collapse in work rates for U.S. adults between 2008 and 2010 was roughly twice the amplitude of what had previously been the country's worst postwar recession, back in the early 1980s. In that previous steep recession, it took America five years to re-attain the adult work rates recorded at the start of 1980. This time, the U.S. job market has as yet, in early 2017, scarcely begun to claw its way back up to the work rates of 2007—much less back to the work rates from early 2000. U.S. adult work rates never recovered entirely from the recession of 2001—much less the crash of '08.

And the work rates being measured here include people who are engaged in any paid employment—any job, at any wage, for any number of hours of work at all.

On Wall Street and in some parts of Washington these days, one hears that America has gotten back to ''near full employment.'' For Americans outside the bubble, such talk must seem nonsensical. It is true that the oft-cited ''civilian unemployment rate'' looked pretty good by the end of the Obama era—in December 2016, it was down to 4.7 percent, about the same as it had been back in 1965, at a time of genuine full employment. The problem here is that the unemployment rate only tracks joblessness for those still in the labor force; it takes no account of workforce dropouts. Alas, the exodus out of the workforce has been the big labor-market story for America's new century. (At this writing, for every unemployed American man between 25 and 55 years of age, there are another three who are neither working nor looking for work.) Thus the ''unemployment rate'' increasingly looks like an antique index devised for some earlier and increasingly distant war: the economic equivalent of a musket inventory or a cavalry count.

By the criterion of adult work rates, by contrast, employment conditions in America remain remarkably bleak. From late 2009 through early 2014, the country's work rates more or less flatlined. So far as can be told, this is the only ''recovery'' in U.S. economic history in which that basic labor-market indicator almost completely failed to respond.

Since 2014, there has finally been a measure of improvement in the work rate—but it would be unwise to exaggerate the dimensions of that turnaround. As of late 2016, the adult work rate in America was still at its lowest level in more than 30 years. To put things another way: If our nation's work rate today were back up to its start-of-the-century highs, well over 10 million more Americans would currently have paying jobs.

There is no way to sugarcoat these awful numbers. They are not a statistical artifact that can be explained away by population aging, or by increased educational enrollment for adult students, or by any other genuine change in contemporary American society. The plain fact is that 21st-century America has witnessed a dreadful collapse of work.

For an apples-to-apples look at America's 21st-century jobs problem, we can focus on the 25–54 population—known to labor economists for self-evident reasons as the ''prime working age'' group. For this key labor-force cohort, work rates in late 2016 were down almost 4 percentage points from their year-2000 highs. That is a jobs gap approaching 5 million for this group alone.

It is not only that work rates for prime-age males have fallen since the year 2000—they have, but the collapse of work for American men is a tale that goes back at least half a century. (I wrote a short book last year about this sad saga.) What is perhaps more startling is the unexpected and largely unnoticed fall-off in work rates for prime-age women. In the U.S. and all other Western societies, postwar labor markets underwent an epochal transformation. After World War II, work rates for prime women surged, and continued to rise—until the year 2000. Since then, they too have declined. Current work rates for prime-age women are back to where they were a generation ago, in the late 1980s. The 21st-century U.S. economy has been brutal for male and female laborers alike—and the wreckage in the labor market has been sufficiently powerful to cancel, and even reverse, one of our society's most distinctive postwar trends: the rise of paid work for women outside the household.

In our era of no more than indifferent economic growth, 21st-century America has somehow managed to produce markedly more wealth for its wealthholders even as it provided markedly less work for its workers. And trends for paid hours of work look even worse than the work rates themselves. Between 2000 and 2015, according to the BEA, total paid hours of work in America increased by just 4 percent (as against a 35 percent increase for 1985–2000, the 15-year period immediately preceding this one).

Over the 2000–2015 period, however, the adult civilian population rose by almost 18 percent—meaning that paid hours of work per adult civilian have plummeted by a shocking 12 percent thus far in our new American century.

This is the terrible contradiction of economic life in what we might call America's Second Gilded Age (2000—). It is a paradox that may help us understand a number of overarching features of our new century. These include the consistent findings that public trust in almost all U.S. institutions has sharply declined since 2000, even as growing majorities hold that America is ''heading in the wrong direction.'' It provides an immediate answer to why overwhelming majorities of respondents in public-opinion surveys continue to tell pollsters, year after year, that our ever-richer America is still stuck in the middle of a recession. The mounting economic woes of the ''little people'' may not have been generally recognized by those inside the bubble, or even by many bubble inhabitants who claimed to be economic specialists—but they proved to be potent fuel for the populist fire that raged through American politics in 2016.

So general economic conditions for many ordinary Americans—not least of these, Americans who did not fit within the academy's designated victim classes—have been rather more insecure than those within the comfort of the bubble understood. But the anxiety, dissatisfaction, anger, and despair that range within our borders today are not wholly a reaction to the way our economy is misfiring. On the nonmaterial front, it is likewise clear that many things in our society are going wrong and yet seem beyond our powers to correct.

Some of these gnawing problems are by no means new: A number of them (such as family breakdown) can be traced back at least to the 1960s, while others are arguably as old as modernity itself (anomie and isolation in big anonymous communities, secularization and the decline of faith). But a number have roared down upon us by surprise since the turn of the century—and others have redoubled with fearsome new intensity since roughly the year 2000.

American health conditions seem to have taken a seriously wrong turn in the new century. It is not just that overall health progress has been shockingly slow, despite the trillions we devote to medical services each year. (Which ''Cold War babies'' among us would have predicted we'd live to see the day when life expectancy in East Germany was higher than in the United States, as is the case today?)

Alas, the problem is not just slowdowns in health progress—there also appears to have been positive retrogression for broad and heretofore seemingly untroubled segments of the national population. A short but electrifying 2015 paper by Anne Case and Nobel Economics Laureate Angus Deaton talked about a mortality trend that had gone almost unnoticed until then: rising death rates for middle-aged U.S. whites. By Case and Deaton's reckoning, death rates rose somewhat slightly over the 1999–2013 period for all non-Hispanic white men and women 45–54 years of age—but they rose sharply for those with high-school degrees or less, and for this less-educated grouping most of the rise in death rates was accounted for by suicides, chronic liver cirrhosis, and poisonings (including drug overdoses).

Though some researchers, for highly technical reasons, suggested that the mortality spike might not have been quite as sharp as Case and Deaton reckoned, there is little doubt that the spike itself has taken place. Health has been deteriorating for a significant swath of white America in our new century, thanks in large part to drug and alcohol abuse. All this sounds a little too close for comfort to the story of modern Russia, with its devastating vodka- and drug-binging health setbacks. Yes: It can happen here, and it has. Welcome to our new America.

In December 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that for the first time in decades, life expectancy at birth in the United States had dropped very slightly (to 78.8 years in 2015, from 78.9 years in 2014). Though the decline was small, it was statistically meaningful—rising death rates were characteristic of males and females alike; of blacks and whites and Latinos together. (Only black women avoided mortality increases—their death levels were stagnant.) A jump in ''unintentional injuries'' accounted for much of the overall uptick.

It would be unwarranted to place too much portent in a single year's mortality changes; slight annual drops in U.S. life expectancy have occasionally been registered in the past, too, followed by continued improvements. But given other developments we are witnessing in our new America, we must wonder whether the 2015 decline in life expectancy is just a blip, or the start of a new trend. We will find out soon enough. It cannot be encouraging, though, that the Human Mortality Database, an international consortium of demographers who vet national data to improve comparability between countries, has suggested that health progress in America essentially ceased in 2012—that the U.S. gained on average only about a single day of life expectancy at birth between 2012 and 2014, before the 2015 turndown.

The opioid epidemic of pain pills and heroin that has been ravaging and shortening lives from coast to coast is a new plague for our new century. The terrifying novelty of this particular drug epidemic, of course, is that it has gone (so to speak) ''mainstream'' this time, effecting breakout from disadvantaged minority communities to Main Street White America. By 2013, according to a 2015 report by the Drug Enforcement Administration, more Americans died from drug overdoses (largely but not wholly opioid abuse) than from either traffic fatalities or guns. The dimensions of the opioid epidemic in the real America are still not fully appreciated within the bubble, where drug use tends to be more carefully limited and recreational. In Dreamland, his harrowing and magisterial account of modern America's opioid explosion, the journalist Sam Quinones notes in passing that ''in one three-month period'' just a few years ago, according to the Ohio Department of Health, ''fully 11 percent of all Ohioans were prescribed opiates.'' And of course many Americans self-medicate with licit or illicit painkillers without doctors' orders.

In the fall of 2016, Alan Krueger, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, released a study that further refined the picture of the real existing opioid epidemic in America: According to his work, nearly half of all prime working-age male labor-force dropouts—an army now totaling roughly 7 million men—currently take pain medication on a daily basis.

We already knew from other sources (such as BLS ''time use'' surveys) that the overwhelming majority of the prime-age men in this un-working army generally don't ''do civil society'' (charitable work, religious activities, volunteering), or for that matter much in the way of child care or help for others in the home either, despite the abundance of time on their hands. Their routine, instead, typically centers on watching—watching TV, DVDs, Internet, hand-held devices, etc.—and indeed watching for an average of 2,000 hours a year, as if it were a full-time job. But Krueger's study adds a poignant and immensely sad detail to this portrait of daily life in 21st-century America: In our mind's eye we can now picture many millions of un-working men in the prime of life, out of work and not looking for jobs, sitting in front of screens—stoned.

But how did so many millions of un-working men, whose incomes are limited, manage en masse to afford a constant supply of pain medication? Oxycontin is not cheap. As Dreamland carefully explains, one main mechanism today has been the welfare state: more specifically, Medicaid, Uncle Sam's means-tested health-benefits program. Here is how it works (we are with Quinones in Portsmouth, Ohio):

[The Medicaid card] pays for medicine—whatever pills a doctor deems that the insured patient needs. Among those who receive Medicaid cards are people on state welfare or on a federal disability program known as SSI. . . . If you could get a prescription from a willing doctor—and Portsmouth had plenty of them—Medicaid health-insurance cards paid for that prescription every month. For a three-dollar Medicaid co-pay, therefore, addicts got pills priced at thousands of dollars, with the difference paid for by U.S. and state taxpayers. A user could turn around and sell those pills, obtained for that three-dollar co-pay, for as much as ten thousand dollars on the street.

In 21st-century America, ''dependence on government'' has thus come to take on an entirely new meaning.

You may now wish to ask: What share of prime-working-age men these days are enrolled in Medicaid? According to the Census Bureau's SIPP survey (Survey of Income and Program Participation), as of 2013, over one-fifth (21 percent) of all civilian men between 25 and 55 years of age were Medicaid beneficiaries. For prime-age people not in the labor force, the share was over half (53 percent). And for un-working Anglos (non-Hispanic white men not in the labor force) of prime working age, the share enrolled in Medicaid was 48 percent.

By the way: Of the entire un-working prime-age male Anglo population in 2013, nearly three-fifths (57 percent) were reportedly collecting disability benefits from one or more government disability program in 2013. Disability checks and means-tested benefits cannot support a lavish lifestyle. But they can offer a permanent alternative to paid employment, and for growing numbers of American men, they do. The rise of these programs has coincided with the death of work for larger and larger numbers of American men not yet of retirement age. We cannot say that these programs caused the death of work for millions upon millions of younger men: What is incontrovertible, however, is that they have financed it—just as Medicaid inadvertently helped finance America's immense and increasing appetite for opioids in our new century.

It is intriguing to note that America's nationwide opioid epidemic has not been accompanied by a nationwide crime wave (excepting of course the apparent explosion of illicit heroin use). Just the opposite: As best can be told, national victimization rates for violent crimes and property crimes have both reportedly dropped by about two-thirds over the past two decades. The drop in crime over the past generation has done great things for the general quality of life in much of America. There is one complication from this drama, however, that inhabitants of the bubble may not be aware of, even though it is all too well known to a great many residents of the real America. This is the extraordinary expansion of what some have termed America's ''criminal class''—the population sentenced to prison or convicted of felony offenses—in recent decades. This trend did not begin in our century, but it has taken on breathtaking enormity since the year 2000.

Most well-informed readers know that the U.S. currently has a higher share of its populace in jail or prison than almost any other country on earth, that Barack Obama and others talk of our criminal-justice process as ''mass incarceration,'' and know that well over 2 million men were in prison or jail in recent years. But only a tiny fraction of all living Americans ever convicted of a felony is actually incarcerated at this very moment. Quite the contrary: Maybe 90 percent of all sentenced felons today are out of confinement and living more or less among us. The reason: the basic arithmetic of sentencing and incarceration in America today.

Correctional release and sentenced community supervision (probation and parole) guarantee a steady annual ''flow'' of convicted felons back into society to augment the very considerable ''stock'' of felons and ex-felons already there. And this ''stock'' is by now truly enormous.

One forthcoming demographic study by Sarah Shannon and five other researchers estimates that the cohort of current and former felons in America very nearly reached 20 million by the year 2010. If its estimates are roughly accurate, and if America's felon population has continued to grow at more or less the same tempotraced out for the years leading up to 2010, we would expect it to surpass 23 million persons by the end of 2016 at the latest. Very rough calculations might therefore suggest that at this writing, America's population of non-institutionalized adults with a felony conviction somewhere in their past has almost certainly broken the 20 million mark by the end of 2016. A little more rough arithmetic suggests that about 17 million men in our general population have a felony conviction somewhere in their CV. That works out to one of every eight adult males in America today.

We have to use rough estimates here, rather than precise official numbers, because the government does not collect any data at all on the size or socioeconomic circumstances of this population of 20 million, and never has. Amazing as this may sound and scandalous though it may be, America has, at least to date, effectively banished this huge group—a group roughly twice the total size of our illegal-immigrant population and an adult population larger than that in any state but California—to a near-total and seemingly unending statistical invisibility. Our ex-cons are, so to speak, statistical outcasts who live in a darkness our polity does not care enough to illuminate—beyond the scope or interest of public policy, unless and until they next run afoul of the law.

Thus we cannot describe with any precision or certainty what has become of those who make up our ''criminal class'' after their (latest) sentencing or release. In the most stylized terms, however, we might guess that their odds in the real America are not all that favorable. And when we consider some of the other trends we have already mentioned—employment, health, addiction, welfare dependence—we can see the emergence of a malign new nationwide undertow, pulling downward against social mobility.

Social mobility has always been the jewel in the crown of the American mythosand ethos. The idea (not without a measure of truth to back it up) was that people in America are free to achieve according to their merit and their grit—unlike in other places, where they are trapped by barriers of class or the misfortune of misrule. Nearly two decades into our new century, there are unmistakable signs that America's fabled social mobility is in trouble—perhaps even in serious trouble.

Consider the following facts. First, according to the Census Bureau, geographical mobility in America has been on the decline for three decades, and in 2016 the annual movement of households from one location to the next was reportedly at an all-time (postwar) low. Second, as a study by three Federal Reserve economists and a Notre Dame colleague demonstrated last year, ''labor market fluidity''—the churning between jobs that among other things allows people to get ahead—has been on the decline in the American labor market for decades, with no sign as yet of a turnaround. Finally, and not least important, a December 2016 report by the ''Equal Opportunity Project,'' a team led by the formidable Stanford economist Raj Chetty, calculated that the odds of a 30-year-old's earning more than his parents at the same age was now just 51 percent: down from 86 percent 40 years ago. Other researchers who have examined the same data argue that the odds may not be quite as low as the Chetty team concludes, but agree that the chances of surpassing one's parents' real income have been on the downswing and are probably lower now than ever before in postwar America.

Thus the bittersweet reality of life for real Americans in the early 21st century: Even though the American economy still remains the world's unrivaled engine of wealth generation, those outside the bubble may have less of a shot at the American Dream than has been the case for decades, maybe generations—possibly even since the Great Depression.

The funny thing is, people inside the bubble are forever talking about ''economic inequality,'' that wonderful seminar construct, and forever virtue-signaling about how personally opposed they are to it. By contrast, ''economic insecurity'' is akin to a phrase from an unknown language. But if we were somehow to find a ''Google Translate'' function for communicating from real America into the bubble, an important message might be conveyed:

The abstraction of ''inequality'' doesn't matter a lot to ordinary Americans. The reality of economic insecurity does. The Great American Escalator is broken—and it badly needs to be fixed.

With the election of 2016, Americans within the bubble finally learned that the 21st century has gotten off to a very bad start in America. Welcome to the reality. We have a lot of work to do together to turn this around.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, the other day, a young man who lives in my neighborhood came over, and he asked me to try to teach him how to drive a car. And I told him: Son, it is real easy to drive a car. It is just kind of like these budget proposals you will see in Congress. If you want to go forward and do things down the road, you put the car in D, like Democrat, for drive, and your car will go forward. But if you want to go backwards and reverse back to the 1950s, you put it in R, like a Republican.

He learned quick, and that is what these budgets are about. If you want to go forward, you go with the Democratic budget—forward on building highways, school construction, broadband expansion; research, research on the deadly diseases that are killing each and every one of us and our children in time to come, and research by the National Institutes of Health that are cut by the budget. There is nothing more important that can be in the budget than moneys for the National Institutes of Health, yet they are being cut. Cancer, Alzheimer's, AIDS, stroke, diabetes, all are going to come at us and our relatives.

Some will say, and I said this one time before, and Mr. Kingston on the other side said: Well, our children and our grandchildren will have to pay for it. Who do you think is going to get the cures and the treatments? Our children and our grandchildren and generations to come.

And they cut research. They cut opportunities for America. You talk about taxes and the debt, the Republican plan gives billionaires the biggest cuts in history, over $50 billion with estate tax elimination for people like the Koch brothers and the Waltons and all those folks, and that money will never come back.

The alternative minimum tax is eliminated. That is the only thing that made clear that President Trump paid any taxes in the only tax return we know about. If it weren't for that, he wouldn't have paid anything. We are talking multimillion- and billion-dollar tax cuts for the richest that create deficits in the future, but that is okay when it is giving money to those who already have it.

Franklin Roosevelt was right. You judge a society not by what it does for those who have an abundance, but you judge it by what it does for those who have the least.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee that I think the D stands for debt for Democrats, and I think the R stands for Republicans and recovery.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee for her outstanding work.

My friend from Tennessee talks about driving forward. I think we need to pump the brakes. You are driving right off a cliff with this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. It is my strong belief that our Nation has a debt crisis on its hand, and I am astonished by how many people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, just refuse to acknowledge the problem. It is as if the problem doesn't exist.

Under their plan, taxes are going to be raised nearly $3 trillion. We are going to continue to raise spending to the tune of over $6 trillion. We will have a meager $2.6 billion in deficit reduction, by the way, compared to our budget that does well over $6 trillion in deficit reduction.

Our Nation is $20 trillion in debt, and it is a complete absurdity to think that we could begin to relinquish this process if we enacted such a burdensome budgetary proposal that is being offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

This budget would also diminish our national security apparatus. It would end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. Let's go ahead and telegraph that we are going to end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. The only people who I know who would support that would be our adversaries.

It seeks to promote the collapsing Affordable Care Act by keeping those burdensome mandates in place. This resolution before us right now refuses to do anything about the runaway entitlement programs that are the primary drivers of the deficit and debt in the country.

Mr. Chairman, their budget just will never balance. Never.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACK. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. It will give no reconciliation instruction so that we can finally get control and protect for long-term sustainability the social safety net program that many depend on.

The bottom line is, you either acknowledge we have a deficit and a debt crisis, or you do not. And if you believe as I do, you will refuse this budget, and you will support ours.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I rise in support of the Democratic budget alternative and in opposition to the Republican budget that has been proposed.

It has been often said that gracious living and good politics is all about gratitude. Paying something forward is how you show your gratitude.

Quite frankly, the simple truth about this Republican budget is that it rolls back a century of progress. It sets the stage for the dismantling of Social Security, which lifted more people out of poverty than anything, and for Speaker RYAN's plan to turn it over to Wall Street.

It sets the stage for turning Medicare over to the insurance industry—Medicare that provided our elderly with insurance and life opportunities that heretofore had not existed.

This century of progress that this budget rolls back includes clean air and water. It includes healthy, safe working places and conditions. It includes an opportunity society that invests in our people.

And guess what? In a little over a century, we doubled life expectancies. Wow, what a marvelous accomplishment.

We created the best and biggest middle class in the history of the world. We became a model for the world; jobs with living wages and healthcare benefits and pension benefits.

This Republican budget proposes to roll back that entire century of progress. It is nothing about paying it forward. It is nothing about paying things back. It is about rolling back a century of progress, and we can not let that happen.

That is what the Democratic budget is really all about, investing in people, investing in infrastructure, investing in America, and investing in people's jobs and living wages, and in their benefits. That is how you show your gratitude, and we have got a lot to be grateful for.

Let's vote and enact this Democratic budget proposal which invests in America, which invests in people, which invests in opportunities. That is what this debate is really all about.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I saw recently, and I remember Ronald Reagan said something when he finally got his tax reform package done back in 1986—why it took so long and why it was so difficult. And at the end the day, he said: You know, the lawmakers and the policymakers forgot one important factor in their calculations that brought us to this point; they forgot to include what the American people have to say about this.

That is what is happening here today, Mr. Chairman. The American people have told us they want economic growth. They want opportunities for their kids and their families, a better quality of life. They want Washington to live within its means and stop taking more and more and more from them out of their paychecks.

So let's do a little bit of comparison. Let's look at, my colleagues, the Democrat budget. It raises taxes by $2.7 trillion, compared to the CBO January baseline. That is almost $3.8 trillion more than revenue levels in our House Republican budget. It increases spending by $6.2 trillion, compared to the Republican budget over that 10-year period. It increases the debt held by the public by $3.9 trillion, almost $4 trillion relative to the House Republican budget.

And what is important, Mr. Chair, it never balances. There is not even an attempt to balance; not to mention that there are no reconciliation instructions that would give us an opportunity to deal with healthcare and other economic growth reforms.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a responsible budget that is being offered by our colleagues on the other side. I urge my colleagues to oppose it and to support the House Republican budget later today.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his astute analysis on what the American people really want. I thank the manager, the chairwoman of this bill, and I acknowledge the position that they take.

But what America really wants is for Washington, for America, for the government, to stand by them in their time of need.

I am very grateful to be part of a party that is not about politics but is about values. We are the better choice party. We offer a better deal on this project that we have worked so hard on called the American budget.

The American budget, in contrast to our friends on the other side of the aisle, recognizes, as I visited the National Institutes for Health, that 80 percent of their budget that we are going to lose goes for research and researchers—looking those researchers in the eyes when they explain the research in medical science to help save lives, and to know that the Republican budget cuts the NIH, the Centers for Disease Control, and takes up the TrumpCare that cuts trillions in Medicaid and $500 billion in Medicare. That is the story of this bill.

Then, as my good friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) indicated, we invest in infrastructure, and we help this young man, not only with his healthcare but with education. Do we realize how many jobs go unable to find individuals in this country? Hundreds of thousands because of the lack of training.

So if my friends want growth, you know how you get growth? You invest in the American people. Or you tell the American people when tragedies strike, whether it is the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, or Florida, or Texas, or tragically, in Nevada, that you will stand by them. You provide them with the infrastructure to be able to overcome.

Not the Republican budget, because the Republican budget is giving trillions in tax cuts, and the distribution of those moneys will not see the front door of low-income, moderate-income, middle class working Americans.

That is the distinction between the Democratic budget. It increases opportunity through a higher minimum wage. It believes in equal pay for equal work. It knows that immigration reform will bring in billions of dollars. It will create opportunities for work.

Then, of course, we know that the Democratic budget strengthens our healthcare, and it provides that her Social Security, her Medicare, will not be in jeopardy. The Medicare trust fund will not lose with a Republican budget and the trillions of dollars of tax cuts, her life, as she continues to seek some balance of good life will be lost.

We are the right direction. We are for the American people. We are standing by the American people with the Democratic budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Tennessee, the chair of the Budget Committee, for the wonderful work she has done on bringing us to this position.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

As chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee, my priority this Congress is to ensure that our policies promote a climate of job creation through economic growth, a sound fiscal policy, and a global economic competitiveness.

Our budget helps achieve all of these priorities by laying the foundation for a robust and comprehensive simplification of our burdensome Tax Code. The Democrat substitute not only fails to do so but would decimate America's workforce.

Our budget reforms our broken Tax Code so that it works for every American at every income level, regardless of where they live or how much money they earn.

The top U.S. tax rate for individuals has been as high as 90 percent and as low as 28 percent. At the same time, income tax revenue has remained fairly steady, despite these sharp rate swings. It turns out that the biggest driver of Federal revenue is not higher tax rates but economic growth.

In fact, a sizeable majority of economists point out that a broad base and low rates are key in a tax system that fosters economic growth and competitiveness. Legislators on both sides of the aisle agree on this basic principle, and history has shown it to be true.

Instead of raising taxes, we should, instead, embrace the policies contained in this budget resolution that encourages economic growth, like reducing regulatory burdens, welfare reform, and comprehensive tax reform for all individuals, not just a select few.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

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. Chairman, I rise, as well, in opposition to the substitute amendment, and I do so because I am struck by the ways in which you can, at times, agree on the diagnosis but disagree on the cure.

I think we would all agree, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we have a real problem in the way that wages have indeed stagnated over the last 30 years. A lot of my Democratic colleagues are nailing it in terms of that diagnosis.

The question though, is the cure. And the question there is: Can we fix that problem by raising taxes by $2.7 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing spending by $6.2 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing the debt by $3.9 trillion and, in essence, having a budget that never balances?

I would argue, no, and I would say, instead, what we have to look at is the basics, which we have been dancing around, which is the mathematic formula that says: Savings drives investment, which drives productivity gain which, ultimately, impacts standard of living or wages. And what we don't focus on enough is this notion of the investment part of investment; if you want to increase productivity, you have got to increase investment.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, part of that is public investment, but another part is private.

What my colleague from Virginia was just getting at a moment ago was, for 50 years, regardless of tax rate, 90 or 28 percent, the take to government has been about 18 percent of GDP very consistently.

So what I would argue is we, indeed, need more public investment, but we also need private investment to go with it. And if we don't watch out, what is being contemplated with this Democratic substitute is a process that will ultimately crowd out that much more in the way of private investment so key to increasing productivity.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, it is clear that we have a very different budget and a very different understanding of the challenges facing our country. We see that so many Americans are working harder and longer and can't remember the last time they got a raise.

We know families are worried about how to pay for college, or if their parents' retirement is secure, or if they will ever be able to afford to stop working. And we know that trillions of dollars in tax cuts for millionaires and large corporations will turn these fears of hardworking Americans families into reality.

□ 1045

Just a few minutes ago, my Republican colleague from Ohio talked about what the American people want. On many of those things, we agree. But I know one thing the American people don't want. They don't want massive tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans.

The Democratic budget rejects tax cuts for the wealthy. We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, provide real support for working families and real security in retirement. We make education and childcare more affordable, and we support policies to help every American get the healthcare that they need.

Those are the priorities of our budget, and they are the priorities of the American people.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I look into my children's and grandchildren's eyes, and I say: I want you to know that right now you owe $63,000 for your part of the debt of this country.

What we are doing in Congress right now, if we were to vote on and accept this amendment, we would be increasing that burden on our children and grandchildren.

I, for one, cannot do that, and I think that we have got to be responsible. We have got to look at how we in this country can get back to the place, as has already been said, that we ask families and businesses to do, and that is to live within their means.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and 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 Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—156

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—268

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

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine
DeSantis
Doyle, Michael F.
Kihuen
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Rosen
Titus
Walz

□ 1111

Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. GAETZ, MARSHALL, MAST, BANKS of Indiana, and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mses. VELÁZQUEZ, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. KEATING, and CARSON of Indiana 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.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. WALORSKI). Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider 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.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the hard work the Budget Committee has put forth to produce a budget that prioritizes our national defense and sets forth bold policy reforms that will get this country back on track to fiscal responsibility.

Specifically, I am pleased to see that this budget commits to reducing the substantial amount of improper payments throughout the Federal Government. The Government Accountability Office estimates that there were $144 billion—I want to emphasize $144 billion—in improper payments in 2016 alone, and that is not even a complete estimate. In fact, 18 Federal programs did not report their improper payments, so the total is undoubtedly higher.

To make matters worse, since 2013, the amount we have been incorrectly sending out has been trending upwards. Instead of reducing our fraudulent payments, the rate at which we pay them out has been increasing. Since 2003, there has been a total of $1.2 trillion in improper payments. Let me repeat, that is $1.2 trillion plus interest.

□ 1115

Because we have been running deficits over that timeframe, we have literally had to borrow that money to send it to fraudsters and others who would not have received it. This is unacceptable.

As you can see from this chart, this represents improper payments for 2016 alone. It is money borrowed that we pay interest on to send to people who are not supposed to get it. We are borrowing money and adding to our debt through improper payments.

This budget, for the first time, sets forth a bold strategy for cutting these payments in half over the budget window, saving us $700 billion over our 10-year window.

While I hope, in the near future, we can zero these payments out, I am thrilled to see that we are beginning to tackle a problem that is putting an additional strain on this country's fiscal problems.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Chairwoman, I suppose I should be saying thank you. I will get a huge tax cut under the Republican tax cut plan, as well the majority of those people sitting here—the majority of our colleagues in Congress—who are, like me, fortunate enough to be millionaires already.

Forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you, because I was elected not just to represent millionaires, but to represent aspiring millionaires, working families, seniors, and veterans. For all of them, for anyone who isn't already a millionaire, this budget is a slap in the face.

With all of the problems facing our country right now, all the people struggling to get ahead, it is unfathomable to me that this Congress could look at people like me and say: Hey, that guy, let's give him more money. In fact, let's give all millionaires hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax cuts.

Really, I am small potatoes. President Trump, according to his financial disclosure, will get hundreds of millions of dollars in tax cuts.

Where is all that money coming from? If you are listening to this and you are not a millionaire, probably from you.

To pay for our own tax cuts and the tax cuts for wealthy donors, Republicans are going to increase taxes on 45 percent of American families with children. That is just the start. Seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families will see their healthcare cut.

Poor seniors will lose benefits that help them keep food on the table and their homes heated in the winter. Veteran benefits, meals for hungry schoolchildren, programs that make education affordable and job training available, investments that generate economic growth and create good-paying jobs are all at risk in this budget.

They are also cutting corporate tax rates, which we will be paying for by plunging our Nation into deeper and deeper debt, giving multinational giants another advantage over small- and mid-size businesses in the name of perpetuating the myth of supply-side economics.

Supply-side failed. They renamed it trickle-down, but nothing trickled down. Now it is job creators. When that fails, maybe they will call it ''I get mine now; you get yours later—maybe.'' But whatever they name it, it is a sham. This plan is a hoax on the American people, and it will make most people's lives more difficult.

So forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you for the extra money in my pocket. With millions of Americans struggling and scraping to get ahead, and with my tax cut increasing their challenges, I cannot begin to justify my extra money, and, quite frankly, I cannot fathom how my Republican colleagues are able to justify theirs.

With this budget, Republicans aren't just passing the buck, they are pocketing it. Madam Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Republican budget.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great leadership as the ranking member on the Budget Committee in the House, and I thank all of the members of the Budget Committee for their great work to make the budget that was proposed earlier, the Yarmuth budget, a statement of our values. That is exactly what a budget should be.

A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values, and what is important to us as a country should be reflected in the priorities that we place into that budget. The budget before us, proposed by the Republicans, is just the opposite of that. It is accompanied by a tax proposal that they put in, one of the biggest transfers of wealth to the wealthiest people in our country in our country's history. Every time they do it, they make it worse.

I let you be the judge: Is a statement of our national values to cut a trillion dollars from Medicaid, cap and take Medicaid down a bad path, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in our country?

Is it a statement of our values to take a half trillion dollars out of Medicare to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country?

Our distinguished ranking member has listed some of the things that would be cut if we went down this unfortunate path posed by our colleagues on the other side.

This is a budget that steals from the middle class. It steals hundreds of billions of dollars from critical job-creating, wage-increasing investments, infrastructure, job training, and clean energy. It harms veterans, it cuts education, it abandons rural America, and it guts education.

This is really a mystery to me. When you cut education, with the stiff competition we have, this is one of the worst budget decisions that you have made. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than investing in education: early childhood, K–12, higher education, postgraduate, and lifetime learning for our workers.

That is how you grow the economy. That is how you bring money to the Treasury, and not by cutting it in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country.

Is it a statement of values to cut education so that you have a tax cut that benefits 80 percent?

I know you don't want the public to hear this, and I can understand why. How could it be a statement of the values of the American people to cut the education of our children in order to have a tax cut where 80 percent of it benefits the top 1 percent of people in our country? It is just not right.

As they do that, the deficit hawks, who seem to be an endangered species on the Republican side of the aisle these days, are adding close to $2.4 trillion to the deficit, not counting debt service or interest on that national debt. Then they say: Oh, that is okay; we need to increase the national debt by trillions of dollars so that we can give tax cuts.

Where do the tax cuts go? $2.6 trillion goes to corporate America.

Guess what happens to the middle class. There are $470 billion in tax increases to the middle class, about a half trillion dollars in increases to the middle class, $2.5 trillion in tax cuts for corporate America. Again, it is adding so much to the deficit.

Now they say: Oh, trickle-down economics is going to pay its own way. We will get that money back.

Not so. It never happens. Nonsense. But don't take it from me. No less a figure than Bruce Bartlett, who worked for Congressman Jack Kemp, a real supporter of supply-side economics—and, as was said, supply-side turn into trickle-down, et cetera. As a proponent of supply-side economics, he said: We never said it would pay for itself. We just advocate it as an economic approach.

But anyone who says, and this is from him, that the whole supply-side dynamic scoring pays for itself—part of this argument—is all nonsense. It is not true. He went on to say that it was bull—you finish the sentence.

So, here we are at a place where we can increase the deficit, decrease job creation, hurt the middle class, benefit the top 1 percent, and add to the national debt in historic proportions that will be very hard to collect from deficit hawks—if any of you exist over there.

Instead, we have an opportunity today for a better deal for the American people—better jobs, better pay, better wages, and a better future—where we lower costs for America's working families and middle class families, and where we prepare them with the tools for the economy of the 21st century.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chair of the Bourbon Caucus, for his great leadership in bringing a better budget that is a statement of our national values, that supports American workers with responsible tax reform, calls for parity between defense and nondefense, and strengthens the ACA and protects Medicare.

Every time the Republicans come to the floor and try to stack the deck even further for their wealthy friends, we have to have this conversation. Democrats will fight these tax cuts and this unfortunate, deceptive budget that they have on the floor. I urge my colleagues to start by voting ''no'' today and to continue the conversation with the American people to fight this unfortunate path they want to take us down: the road to ruin.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chairman, I am going to be brief in my closing comments.

I do want to ask my colleague to consider this: Are we proud of a country where we are leaving our children and grandchildren in further and further debt?

During our discussion in this Chamber, we have shared our ideas for building a better America, an America that we would be proud to entrust to future generations. While it requires confronting real challenges along the road ahead, it is, undoubtedly, worth the journey.

First, our budget forces the Federal Government to live within its means, just like hardworking Americans and small businesses do on a daily basis.

Second, our budget identifies wasteful spending and finds much-needed savings and reforms for unsustainable mandatory spending. In fact, our committee has put forward the largest reform package for mandatory programs that has been seen in 20 years.

Third, it calls for a robust funding of our military, ensuring the resources that will allow us to be ready and protect our mainland. It also starts the process of restoring our military readiness, which suffered dramatically during the Obama administration.

Finally, our budget is the golden key that unlocks progrowth tax reform and takes us one step further to the great ideas unveiled in the framework last week.

Without question, our budget plan reflects American values and shared priorities. I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for a win for all Americans, because doing so will begin to ensure a brighter and better future for generations to come, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WALORSKI, 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, and, pursuant to House Resolution 553, she reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 206, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—219

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
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
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
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.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
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
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—206

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
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.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
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 (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Titus
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Walz
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano	
	Rosen	

□ 1148

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 556 through 557 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Yarmuth of Kentucky Substitute Amendment No. 4, and no on final passage of the Budget Resolution.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House on account of Columbus Day. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, sponsored by Senator RON JOHNSON. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a psychologist who was fired from the VA medical center where he worked after raising concerns about patients' medications. He committed suicide the day he was fired.

This bill will enhance whistleblower protections while ensuring supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers are punished. I look forward to the House passing this bill and continuing our work to fundamentally change the culture of the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I also expect the House to make a motion to go to conference on the National Defense Authorization Act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider an additional supplemental package to assist the ongoing recovery efforts following Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, will the supplemental that the gentleman mentioned—which is, as I understand, approximately $29 billion, which will take care of forest fires in the West; $16 billion, as I understand it, in debt relief, which will raise the borrowing level for FEMA; and then, of course, money directly for the victims of the hurricanes. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there will be any, what I will call, extraneous matters that might be controversial, or will this be a straight supplemental without controversy? We all want to make sure that we have the resources to help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

The gentleman is correct. The White House has sent up a supplemental, and I do not believe this will be the last of the supplementals, based on the damage that has been done from the numerous hurricanes. But, yes, there will be more money for the Disaster Relief Fund to help throughout Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

As you know, too, the West had devastating forest fires, so there is roughly $577 million there. And the National Flood Insurance Program has hit a ceiling. To deal with all of the flooding that has gone on, we have to deal with that, as well.

The Appropriations Committee has just received that last night. They are working through it now. I don't intend on seeing other things with it. I look forward to the Member working with me on that to make sure we get it right from what the President has asked.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thought that there will not be anything in there that would make it a partisan bill. I think, as the President sent it down, it is, obviously, something that we need to do quickly and in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and I have talked about the Dream Act. Another week has gone by and, therefore, the 6-month deadline is closer, and the President has urged us to pass legislation.

Can the gentleman tell me what the expectations are to address the Dream Act?

As you know, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, has filed a discharge petition on the bill sponsored by LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Can the gentleman tell me what progress we are making on that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

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

Yes, we are dealing with the DACA situation and the situation along the border.

As you know, the Speaker has put together a task force. They have met numerous times. I have had dinner with the President just this week dealing with this issue, and you and I have talked, as well.

I think the best way to solve this problem, to make sure we get to the root cause, we have to secure the border, we have to deal with DACA, and, more importantly, I think we do it in a manner where we are all working together.

I am, as you know, not a fan of a discharge petition. I think the best way to handle this is continuing to work through the matter with the committees—and on your side of the aisle, as well—to solve this problem. The President gave us 6 months. I would like to get this done before then.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Let me, if I might, Mr. Speaker, simply suggest to the gentleman, we certainly understand, and this side agrees, we want to have secure borders. There is, obviously, a disagreement on the President's proposal of a wall, I think, frankly, on your side as well as on my side of the aisle. I would hope that we would not, in effect, hold hostage the 800,000 students, workers, and young people brought here as children who know no other country.

In my discussions with Mr. RYAN, and his public comments have indicated, he is sympathetic to making sure that we address that issue. He urged, as you know, President Trump not to rescind DACA. The President did anyway.

I am hopeful that we can deal with the DREAMers, which I think certainly has very robust support on both sides of the aisle, in my view, Mr. Leader. I hope we can deal with that without clouding it with an issue, i.e., the wall. Not security; security I think we can reach agreement on. But I am hopeful that we can do that.

The DREAMers are extraordinarily anxious. I presume you have met with some of the DREAMers. They are really very impressive people and are enhancing our communities and our country.

So I would hope that we could do that. I look forward to talking to you personally about how we move forward and, hopefully, move quickly. I would like to have done it by next week.

As you know, I said that it would be nice to do it in this work period, to lay to rest the anxiety of the 800,000-plus people who will be affected. But, if we can't do that, certainly I would hope that we could do it shortly after we get back after the next district work period.

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

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 6, 2017, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 10, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow; and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

□ 1200

BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, it is Breast Cancer Awareness Month. Every day, nearly 1,000 women in this country receive a life-changing diagnosis that they will be affected by breast cancer. Nearly 200,000 of these diagnoses occur each year. One in eight women in our country will face breast cancer.

Breast cancer has a devastating effect on our families, taking away wives, mothers, aunts, uncles, sisters, and daughters.

I wish I was a brilliant scientist and could develop a cure. I wish I was a magician and could wave a magic wand and cure breast cancer, but I am just a Member of Congress. Actually, there are things this Congress could do to make breast cancer less likely, less deadly, and less painful.

Cannabis has shown promise in cancer research for over 2 decades. This research finally came to fruition in 2007, when Dr. Sean McAllister showed that cannabis-related compounds helped fight malignant forms of breast cancer. In the decade since, other research has confirmed and built on Dr. McAllister's findings, and there is now conclusive research that shows that cannabis-related compounds have antitumor properties.

Yet, despite these findings, scientists are going too slow. It is time for cannabis research to begin, and we should declassify it as a schedule I drug.

LOCKING PEOPLE UP WITHOUT DUE PROCESS IS UN-AMERICAN

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

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, this week, Congressman ADAM SMITH and I introduced the Dignity for Detained Immigrants Act. This legislation is critical to dismantle President Trump's mass deportation machine, to protect families, and to restore justice and due process to our broken immigration system.

Our detention system brings huge profits for large private corporations. About 38,000 people are detained every single day at a cost to taxpayers of over $2 billion a year.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is about two things: dignity and justice for families, pregnant women, people with serious illnesses, survivors of torture and violence. It is unconscionable that we are detaining these people sometimes for months or even years.

Congress can't afford to sit on the sidelines anymore. It is time to make clear that locking people up without due process is not only unconstitutional, it is un-American.

At a time when net migration is zero, when DREAMers are at risk of losing their DACA status, and the world reels from unprecedented numbers of refugees fleeing for their lives, we must act with compassion.

I urge my colleagues to pass the Dignity for Detained Immigrants Act, and I thank the over 55 cosponsors who have already come on to this piece of legislation.

GUN CONTROL DOESN'T WORK

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, within minutes of the tragic shooting in Las Vegas, Democrats and the liberal media called for more gun control measures.

A recent Washington Post op-ed describes how one gun control advocate researched restrictive gun laws in Great Britain and in Australia, only to discover that gun buybacks and gun bans do not reduce mass shootings or gun-related crimes.

She said: ''The case for the''—gun control—''policies I had lobbied for crumbled when I examined the evidence. . . . But I can't endorse policies whose only selling point is that gun owners hate them. Policies that often seem as if they were drafted by people who have encountered guns only as a figure in a briefing book or an image on the news.''

This researcher concluded that more lives would be saved by focusing on individuals instead of guns.

We should ensure that background checks work as intended and prevent those with mental health issues from acquiring guns. This actually will do some good, as opposed to meaningless gun regulations.

CONGRESS MUST REAUTHORIZE THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to urge the swift reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

CHIP helps families provide care for their children. Throughout our Nation, it covers 9 million children and pregnant women. In California, it covers 2 million children. And in my district, half of the kids get their healthcare from Medicaid or CHIP.

Now, CHIP was implemented over 20 years ago, championed by two Senators on opposite sides of the political spectrum, ORRIN HATCH and Ted Kennedy, and it has continued to receive strong bipartisan support. But because of inaction by the House of Representatives, because of the distractions by this administration, millions of our children may be denied coverage.

They may not get to see their doctors for routine checkups. With the upcoming flu season, kids may not be able to get the necessary care when they are sick, and children with allergies may not have access to lifesaving medications and health services.

If this Congress does not step up to fix this mistake before it is too late, children will pay the price of our inaction.

Congress must take action to come together to pass CHIP for the millions of kids who continue to depend on us for this healthcare.

HELP IS ON THE WAY TO PUERTO RICO AND THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

(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 sit as the chairman of the Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs that deals directly with the jurisdiction of Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands, and other territories of the U.S.

We had a very good briefing this week led by JENNIFFER GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN from Puerto Rico, as well as STACEY PLASKETT of the Virgin Islands. It was very important information. As we all know of the difficult situation, especially we are seeing so much in Puerto Rico as well as the Virgin Islands; President Trump visiting Puerto Rico this week.

Help is on the way. Indeed, it has been on the way, and we need to just keep pushing to rebuild that infrastructure and push out into the islands where the need is still felt.

So we know, we see, we are aware, and we will keep working to achieve positive results in the short term as well, as we look at the situation with Puerto Rico and the difficulty with PREPA, the power company, and other issues that we will address as a committee in order to have a long-term, positive solution for the U.S. citizens of Puerto Rico and what they need.

CONGRESS NEEDS TO BEGIN WORK ON GUN SAFETY

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, many of us will be going home to our districts, facing constituents who will be asking the question: Why?

It really is painful when fellow Americans lose their lives. It is painful as we watch our soldiers go off into battle, and many of them do not come home in any other way but as a fallen soldier.

This past week, Americans, who were not in battle but were enjoying the life and the liberty of this Nation, fell by a murderous actor. I think we will have to go home and comfort our constituents, and we will also tell them what we are going to do.

I don't know why we have to climb this high mountain of understanding that laws can make a difference; not end all violence, but make a difference: legislation that says that guns have to be locked to save the lives of children; gun legislation that deals with banning armor-piercing bullets that would harm and injure our first responders; and then to get rid of the kits that this murderous individual utilized to make a semiautomatic an automatic.

Mr. Speaker, I ask this Congress, together, to begin to do work on gun safety that will save American lives. I go home to my district to meet with my constituents, and I am going to tell them that I am going to do something that makes sense for the American people.

UNDERSTANDING WHAT LATE-TERM ABORTION IS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GARRETT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, earlier this week, the Chamber took up H.R. 36, a bill dealing with pain-capable unborn children; and a bill that, in its result, would cause the United States to join the vast bulk of nations in the world wherein the termination of lives of children who are not only capable of feeling pain, but under what we understand to be the best science may, in fact, feel more pain because of the density of the nerve tissue, as they are in this roughly fifth month of development.

I guess four times in the brief time that I have been in this building, we have seen the Chamber erupt into applause, oftentimes over partisan-perceived victories.

The first time the Chamber erupted into applause is when my colleagues across the aisle were giddy with joy when a bill that would have ensured that the Department of Defense didn't spend money to perform transgender procedures on soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines failed in the form of an amendment. Another had to do with healthcare. Another had to do with the return of Majority Whip STEVE SCALISE. That was indeed a bipartisan eruption in applause.

Then there was an eruption from this side of the Chamber when H.R. 36 passed, as there was a recognition that late-term abortion is barbaric and counter to the ideas put forth to the world when, in the Declaration of Independence, it was written that we hold certain truths to be self-evident, and among those was life.

Too many people have failed to grasp the nature of what late-term abortion is, yet to grapple with the problem will require to understand what exactly that problem is.

So to look at the other six nations in the world that allow the termination of life after 5 months, we see nations like Vietnam, North Korea, China, and the United States.

Then to listen to the doctors who have performed these procedures describe in what was literally excruciating detail how the procedure is performed, that an instrument is inserted into the uterus, and probing is done until something is found, and the instrument is latched on, and then there is pulling, and out comes an arm or a leg or a piece of a head or a torso. Then, in fact, that unborn child, who science tells us can feel pain, dies by virtue of bleeding to death inside its very host. That is the nature of these procedures.

Estimates tell us that if the United States joined the fast bulk of the nations on the planet in outlawing late-term abortions, somewhere between 14,000 and 20,000 children every year wouldn't experience an unspeakable demise of literally being ripped from their host limb by limb and bleeding to death, all whilst, in the best estimates of scientists, feeling the pain of that death.

To put that in terms of Virginia's Fifth District, that is the population of Cumberland County twice every year, roughly.

So there was applause from the Members who saw that the United States would join the ranks of the civilized nations in the world who put appropriate value on life, Mr. Speaker, and disappointment from some on the other side of the aisle, other than a few brave individuals to be distinguished by departing from the herd and recognizing the value and sanctity of life thereto, and immediate news stories about how H.R. 36 was dead on arrival in the United States Senate.

Mr. Speaker, it is my sincere hope that the American people will not let that be the case.

I often speak of the history of the Fifth District of Virginia that gave us great Americans like Booker T. Washington and Barbara Johns, Thomas Jefferson, John Marshall, James Madison, James Monroe, and Patrick Henry.

As I thought about how to best address the need for action in the other Chamber, Mr. Speaker, I determined that there were no better words than those delivered by Patrick Henry from Virginia, slightly amended, on March 23, 1775, in St. John's Cathedral as he addressed the second Virginia Assembly in Richmond, Virginia.

So with all credit to the author, whom I paraphrase, I would read: Mr. Speaker, no man thinks more highly than I do of the patriotism and abilities of the very worthy people who have served and do serve in this Senate.

□ 1215

But different people often see the same subject in different lights; and, therefore, I hope it will not be a thought disrespectful to those Senators if entertaining, as I do, opinions of a character very opposite of many of theirs, I shall speak forth of my sentiments freely and without reserve. This is no time for ceremony.

The question before the Senate is one of an awful consequence to this country. For my part, I consider it nothing less than a question of life or death, and in proportion to the magnitude of the subject, ought to be the freedom of debate. It is only in this way that we can hope to arrive at truth and fulfill the great responsibility which we hold to our creator and country.

Should I keep back my opinions at such times through a fear of giving offense or political loss? I should consider myself guilty of treason and of cowardice, an act of disloyalty towards the majesty of our creator, who I revere above all earthly kings.

Mr. Speaker, it is natural to man to indulge in the illusions of hope. We are apt to shut our eyes against painful truth and listen to the song of the siren until she transforms us into beasts. Is this the role of wise people engaged in a great and arduous struggle for life? Are we disposed to be of the number of those who, having eyes, see not, and having ears, hear not the things which so nearly concern their temporal salvation?

For my part, whatever anguish of spirit it may cost, I am willing to know the whole truth, to know the worst, and to provide for it. I have but one lamp by which my feet are guided, and that is the lamp of experience, of history. I have no way of judging the future but by the past.

In judging the past, I wish to know for what has been the conduct of the abortion industry for the last 44 years to justify those hopes with which gentlemen are pleased to solace themselves.

The Senate, is that insidious smile which our petition has been received lately? Trust it not, sir. It will prove a snare at your feet. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with the promise of later action. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with these nearly 60 million lives lost in this country alone, which cover our waters and darken our lands. Is taking an unborn life a work of love and reconciliation? Is subjecting to pain a 5-month-old child as no other nation save six on the Earth allowed to happen? Let us not deceive ourselves. These are the implements of death and destruction.

I ask what means this perpetual delay of voting? What is its purpose? What is the force of inaction? Can gentlemen assign another possible motive for it than to ensure that it never occurs?

Destruction? No, sir, destruction. They are set to send and perpetuate this loss of life, and have so long supported this loss of life, and now an opportunity presents itself to vote, and what do we have to oppose inaction? Mr. Speaker, we have our voices. Shall we try again and again? Shall we bring this bill back next year? We have been trying that for 40 years. Have we anything new to offer upon the subject? Nothing.

We have held this subject in every light of which it is capable. It has all been, to this date, in vain. Shall we resort to entreaty and supplication? What terms shall we find that have not already been exhausted? Let us not, I beseech you, Mr. Speaker, deceive ourselves.

We have done everything that we could do to avert this death that has claimed nearly 60 million lives and 14 to 20 million unborn lives after the age of 5 months in utero every single year. We have petitioned, we have remonstrated, we have supplicated, we have prostrated ourselves and have implored its inner position to arrest the tyrannical hands of the abortion industry and its champions in Washington, and our petitions have been slighted. Our remonstrations produce additional death and insult. Our supplications have been disregarded, and we have been spurned with contempt from the floor of the Chamber of the opposing body. In vain these things we may indulge the fond hope of life and justice.

If we support life, if we mean to preserve and violate this fundamental right for which we have been so long arguing, if we mean not basely to abandon this noble struggle which we have been so long engaged in, in which we have pledged ourselves to never abandon until the glorious object of our contest shall be obtained, we must hope the American people demand the Senate hold a vote. We must hope the American people demand the Senate hold a vote.

An appeal to democracy and to the Lord of hosts is all that is left to us. Suffer not yourselves to be betrayed with a promise of later action. Ask yourselves how this gracious reception of our petition comports with the nearly 60 million lives ended.

We can be heard in numbers across the fruited plain. A vote should be held for or against life. Let us have it. Let us have it. In this vein, sir, to extenuate the matter, gentlemen may cry: Later; later; next year. But there is no later. The killing has continued for over 40 years. The next gale that sweeps to the North will bring to our ears cries of the yet born. The House has voted. Why is the Senate idle? What is it that they wish? What would they have? Is political victory so dear or a title so sweet as to be purchased at the price of human life? Forbid it, Almighty God.

Mr. Speaker, I know not what course others may take, but as for me, my hope is that there is a vote. My hope is that we stand for life.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MURPHY of Pennsylvania (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for October 4 after 8 p.m. and for the balance of the week on account of personal reasons.

Ms. ROSEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 178. An act to prevent elder abuse and exploitation and improve the justice system's response to victims in elder abuse and exploitation cases.

S. 652. A act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize a program for early detection, diagnosis, and treatment regarding deaf and hard-of-hearing newborns, infants, and young children.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 23 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 6, 2017, at 10:30 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2774. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Persimmons From New Zealand Into the United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2015-0052] (RIN: 0579-AE26) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

2775. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting a determination that a negotiated comprehensive subcontracting plan did not meet the subcontracting goals negotiated in their prior fiscal year, pursuant to 15 U.S.C. 637 note; Public Law 114-92, Sec. 872(d)(2); (129 Stat. 939); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2776. A letter from the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting notification that in FY 2017 and FY 2018, the Department proposed no military construction projects under the Sec. 2803(c)(1) of the Defense Laboratory Modernization Pilot Program; to the Committee on Armed Services.

2777. A letter from the Chairman, Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, transmitting the Board's report on the Availability of Credit to Small Businesses, September 2017, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 252(a)(1); Public Law 104-208, Sec. 2227(a)(1); (110 Stat. 3009-417); to the Committee on Financial Services.

2778. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel, Pension Benefit Guaranty Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's final rule — Allocation of Assets in Single-Employer Plans; Benefits Payable in Terminated Single-Employer Plans; Interest Assumptions for Valuing and Paying Benefits received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2779. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2780. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13067 of November 3, 1997, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2781. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to South Sudan that was declared in Executive Order 13664 of April 3, 2014, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2782. A letter from the Director, International Cooperation, Office of the Under Secretary, Acquisition, Technology and Logistics, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's intent to sign the Memorandum of Understanding Among the Department of Defence of Australia, and the Ministry of Defence of the Kingdom of Denmark and the Department of Defense of the United States of America, Transmittal No. 01-17, pursuant to Sec. 27(f) of the Arms Export Act, and Executive Order 13637; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2783. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the annual report entitled "Report of U.S. Persons Expropriation Claims and Certain Other Commercial and Investment Disputes", dated October 2017, pursuant to Sec. 527(f) of the Foreign Relations Authorization Act, Fiscal Years 1994 and 1995, Public Law 103-236 dated October 2017; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2784. A letter from the Director, Defense Security Cooperation Agency, Department of

Defense, transmitting Transmittal No. 17-44, pursuant to the reporting requirements of Section 36(b)(1) of the Arms Export Control Act, as amended; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2785. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Updated Statements of Legal Authority for the Export Administration Regulations to Include the Continuation of Emergency Declared in Executive Order 13222 [Docket No.: 170316279-7279-01] (RIN: 0694-AH38) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2786. A letter from the Auditor, Office of the District of Columbia Auditor, transmitting a report entitled, ''Significant Improvements Needed in DCRA Management of Vacant and Blighted Property Program'', pursuant to Public Law 93-198, Sec. 455(d); (87 Stat. 803); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2787. A letter from the Chairman, National Endowment for the Arts, transmitting the Endowment's FY 2017 Commercial and Inherently Governmental Activities Inventory, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2788. A letter from the Chairman, National Transportation Safety Board, transmitting the Board's annual submission regarding agency compliance with the Federal Managers' Financial Integrity Act and revised Office of Management and Budget Circular A-123; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2789. A letter from the Acting Branch Chief, Unified Listing Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for Pearl Darter [Docket No.: FWS-R4-ES-2016-0037; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB55) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2790. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Land and Minerals Management, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Negotiated Noncompetitive Agreements for the Use of Sand, Gravel, and/or Shell Resources on the Outer Continental Shelf [Docket ID: BOEM-2010-0041] (RIN: 1010-AD90) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2791. A letter from the Acting Manager, Species Assessment Team, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Guadalupe Fescue; Designation of Critical Habitat for Guadalupe Fescue [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0099 and FWS-R2-ES-2016-0100; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BA74) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2792. A letter from the SAT Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Threatened Species Status for the Iiwi (Drepanis coccinea) [Docket No.: FWS-R1-ES-2016-0057; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-BB54) received October 4,2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2793. A letter from the SAT Manager, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Endangered Species Status for Sonoyta Mud Turtle [Docket No.: FWS-R2-ES-2016-0103; 4500030113] (RIN: 1018-AZ02) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2794. A letter from the Chief, Branch of FS, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's final rule — Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Technical Correction for Tonkin Snub-nosed Monkey [Docket No.: FWS-HQ-ES-2017-0026; 4500090024] (RIN: 1018-BC64) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2795. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's notice — Subsistence Taking of Northern Fur Seals on the Pribilof Islands; Final Annual Subsistence Harvest Levels for 2017-2019 [Docket No.: 170303228-7752-02] (RIN: 0648-BG71) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2796. A letter from the Assistant Attorney General, Office of Legislative Affairs, Department of Justice, transmitting a report regarding settlements and consent decrees/orders, approved by an officer of the Department of Justice (Second Quarter 2017), pursuant to 28 U.S.C. 530D(a)(1); Public Law 107-273, Sec. 202(a); (116 Stat. 1771); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2797. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Revised Guidance Related to Obtaining and Reporting Taxpayer Identification Numbers and Dates of Birth by Financial Institutions [Notice 2017-46] received September 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2798. A letter from the Chief, Regulations and Publications Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Treatment Under Section 956(c) of Certain Inventory Temporarily Located in the United States Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria [Notice 2017-55] received September 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2799. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Fringe Benefits Aircraft Valuation Formula (Revenue Ruling 2017-19) received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2800. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — Extended Due Date under Notice 2017-10 for Participants Affected by Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, or Maria [Notice 2017-58] received October 4, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2801. A letter from the Chairman, U.S. International Trade Commission, transmitting the 23rd report of the Caribbean Basin Economic Recovery Act: Impact on U.S. Industries and Consumers and on Beneficiary Countries, pursuant to 19 U.S.C. 2704(a)(1); Public Law 102-182, Sec. 206(a) (as amended by Public Law 106-200, Sec. 211(d)(2)); (114 Stat. 287); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2802. A letter from the Inspector General, Office of Inspector General, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a report on Medicare payments for clinical diagnostic laboratory tests, pursuant to the Protecting Access to Medicare Act of 2014, Public Law 113-93; jointly to the Committees on Energy and Commerce and Ways and Means.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2989. A bill to establish the Frederick Douglass Bicentennial Commission; with an amendment (Rept. 115–340). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

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. DELBENE (for herself, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. COHEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. HECK, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PETERS, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Ms. BONAMICI):

H.R. 3963. A bill to provide for the establishment of a pilot program to encourage the employment of veterans in manufacturing positions; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee (for himself, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, and Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico):

H.R. 3964. A bill to amend the Controlled Substances Act to establish additional registration requirements for prescribers of opioids, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. RUTHERFORD (for himself and Mr. LAWSON of Florida):

H.R. 3965. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to make grants to eligible organizations for the provision of transition assistance to members of the Armed Forces recently separated from active duty service and spouses of such members; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. PALMER (for himself, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. BIGGS, and Mr. BRAT):

H.R. 3966. A bill to provide that provisions of title 46, United States Code, popularly known as the Jones Act and relating to carriage of passenger and merchandise in coastwise trade shall not apply for 5 years with respect to such carriage to and from Puerto Rico; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Armed 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. CARTWRIGHT (for himself and Mr. MCNERNEY):

H.R. 3967. A bill to amend the Solid Waste Disposal Act to authorize States to restrict interstate waste imports and impose a higher fee on out-of-State waste; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER (for himself, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. EVANS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, and Miss RICE of New York):

H.R. 3968. A bill to amend the Small Business Act to provide loan guarantees for the acquisition of cybersecurity technology and services by eligible small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business.

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio (for himself and Mr. NORCROSS):

H.R. 3969. A bill to amend title 11, United States Code, to include certain pension as administrative expenses in bankruptcy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3970. A bill to assist communities affected by stranded nuclear waste, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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 Ms. TENNEY (for herself, Mr. SHERMAN, and Mr. WILLIAMS):

H.R. 3971. A bill to amend the Truth in Lending Act and the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify the requirements for community financial institutions with respect to certain rules relating to mortgage loans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3972. A bill to clarify that family offices and family clients are accredited investors, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. DAVIDSON (for himself and Mr. SHERMAN):

H.R. 3973. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934 to require certain entities to develop internal risk control mechanisms to safeguard and govern the storage of market data; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3974. A bill to limit the use of taxpayer dollars on non-commercial flights for cabinet officials, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CORREA (for himself, Ms. NORTON, Ms. HANABUSA, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 3975. A bill to require covered entities to provide notification in the case of a breach of unsecured sensitive personally identifiable information in electronic or digital form, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. CRAMER (for himself, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. LAMBORN, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. COOK, Ms. MCSALLY, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. BRAT, Mr. PETERSON, Mr. GALLAGHER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana, and Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee):

H.R. 3976. A bill to amend the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act to allow for certain third party payments; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3977. A bill to establish the Infrastructure Bank for America to serve as a lender for infrastructure projects, both directly and through State and local governments, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, and 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. HILL (for himself and Mr. KIHUEN):

H.R. 3978. A bill to amend the Real Estate Settlement Procedures Act of 1974 to modify requirements related to mortgage disclosures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. LOBIONDO, and Mr. THOMPSON of California):

H.R. 3979. A bill to amend the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 to reauthorize the volunteer services, community partnership, and refuge education programs of the National Wildlife Refuge System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI (for himself, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. EVANS, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. RUSH, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. KEATING, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SIRES, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. POLIS, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. KHANNA):

H.R. 3980. A bill to establish a United States Commission on Hate Crimes to study and make recommendations on the prevention of the commission of hate crimes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 3981. A bill to establish a cost of greenhouse gases for carbon dioxide, methane, and nitrous oxide to be used by Federal agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, 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. MESSER:

H.R. 3982. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to increase the amount of, and remove the marriage penalty with respect to, social security benefits excludable from gross income; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3983. A bill to direct the Secretary of the Interior to remove the statue to the memory and in honor of Albert Pike erected near Judiciary Square in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. SCHIFF (for himself, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COHEN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HIMES, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. YARMUTH):

H.R. 3984. A bill to repeal the Protection of Lawful Commerce in Arms Act, and provide for the discoverability and admissibility of gun trace information in civil proceedings; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TROTT (for himself and Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana):

H.R. 3985. A bill to establish a working group of public and private entities led by the Food and Drug Administration to recommend voluntary frameworks and guidelines to increase the security and resilience of Internet of Medical Things devices, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SERRANO):

H.R. 3986. A bill to provide for the establishment of a national standard for incorporating a passive identification ability into all firearms sold in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ (for herself, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 3987. A bill to reduce gun violence, fund gun violence research and victim assistance, and enhance the tracking of lost and stolen firearms, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, 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. WALKER:

H.R. 3988. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to allow above-the-line deductions for charitable contributions for individuals not itemizing deductions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H. Res. 558. A resolution recognizing October 7th as National Trigeminal Neuralgia Awareness Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (for himself, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Mr. BOST, and Mr. LIPINSKI):

H. Res. 559. A resolution recognizing Navy Pier as a public community resource and treasured Chicago landmark; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. WITTMAN, Mr. KIND, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. HECK, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. LEE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. VELA, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. COSTA, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. MOOLENAAR, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Ms. LOFGREN):

H. Res. 560. A resolution encouraging observance of National Wildlife Refuge Week with appropriate events and activities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

128. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Senate of the State of Michigan, relative to Senate Resolution No. 82, strongly denouncing and opposing the violent terrorism, totalitarian impulses, xenophobic biases, and bigoted ideologies that are promoted by radical hate groups and declare these groups to be domestic terrorist organizations; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

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. DELBENE:

H.R. 3963.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. ROE of Tennessee:

H.R. 3964.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1, with respect to the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises," and to provide for the "general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. RUTHERFORD:

H.R. 3965.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. PALMER:

H.R. 3966.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 4, Section 3, Clause 2—The Congress shall have Power to dispose of and make allneedful Rules and Regulations respecting the Territory or the other Property belonging to the United States . . . "

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 3967.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes).

By Mr. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3968.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RYAN of Ohio:

H.R. 3969.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8: To Make 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. SCHNEIDER:

H.R. 3970.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Ms. TENNEY:

H.R. 3971.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 3972.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, to regulate commerce

By Mr. DAVIDSON:

H.R. 3973.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

. . . 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."

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. AGUILAR:

H.R. 3974.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CORREA:

H.R. 3975.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

(1) The U.S. Constitution including Article 1, Section 8.

By Mr. CRAMER:

H.R. 3976.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. FASO:

H.R. 3977.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. HILL:

H.R. 3978.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3979.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI:

H.R. 3980.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article II, 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. MCEACHIN:

H.R. 3981.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MESSER:

H.R. 3982.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Ms. NORTON:

H.R. 3983.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 2 of section 3 of article IV of the Constitution.

By Mr. SCHIFF:

H.R. 3984.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Equal Access to Justice for Victims of Gun Violence is constitutionally authorized under Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, the Commerce Clause and Article I, Section 8, Clause 18, the Necessary and Proper Clause. Additionally, the Preamble to the Constitution provides support of the authority to enact legislation to promote the General Welfare.

By Mr. TROTT:

H.R. 3985.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I section 8

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3986.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Ms. VELÁZQUEZ:

H.R. 3987.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1

The Congress shall have Power to . . . provide for the . . . general Welfare of the United States; . . .

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. WALKER:

H.R. 3988.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 60: Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. KILMER, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, and Mr. SHUSTER.

H.R. 389: Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 559: Mr. PEARCE.

H.R. 785: Mr. MCCAUL, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 807: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 850: Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 930: Mr. MESSER, Mr. LONG, Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. HIMES.

H.R. 936: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. ALLEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MARSHALL, and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 1318: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1405: Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 1474: Mrs. LOWEY.
H.R. 1475: Ms. ROSEN.
H.R. 1552: Mr. SESSIONS and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 1568: Mr. FERGUSON.
H.R. 1626: Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 1651: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H.R. 1655: Mr. SESSIONS.
H.R. 1676: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, and Mr. SCHIFF.
H.R. 1683: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HARPER, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mr. CROWLEY.
H.R. 1832: Ms. ROSEN and Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.
H.R. 1898: Mr. WALBERG.
H.R. 1919: Mr. ROKITA.
H.R. 1953: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan and Mr. ROUZER.
H.R. 2004: Mr. MULLIN.
H.R. 2092: Mr. MESSER.
H.R. 2095: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 2259: Mr. JONES.
H.R. 2295: Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. TSONGAS.
H.R. 2436: Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. MENG, and Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 2472: Mr. GUTIÉRREZ.
H.R. 2482: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 2583: Mr. NADLER and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 2687: Ms. DELBENE.
H.R. 2690: Ms. PINGREE and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.
H.R. 2712: Mr. LATTA.
H.R. 2740: Mr. WELCH and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.
H.R. 2832: Mr. WOMACK, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. WILLIAMS, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BUDD, and Mr. GAETZ.
H.R. 2836: Mr. SOTO, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 2899: Mr. TURNER.
H.R. 2926: Mr. POLIQUIN.
H.R. 2936: Mr. BYRNE.
H.R. 2954: Mr. SMITH of Nebraska.
H.R. 3117: Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio.
H.R. 3124: Mrs. BEATTY.
H.R. 3145: Mr. HUNTER.
H.R. 3161: Ms. PINGREE.
H.R. 3192: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3222: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas and Mr. VARGAS.
H.R. 3227: Mr. SOTO.
H.R. 3271: Mr. LONG.
H.R. 3273: Mr. HIMES, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. KILMER, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, and Mr. KHANNA.
H.R. 3380: Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. ESPAILLAT, and Ms. FUDGE.
H.R. 3395: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. BROWN of Maryland.
H.R. 3473: Mr. BERGMAN.
H.R. 3497: Mr. GIBBS, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 3509: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 3699: Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3712: Mr. VISCLOSKY, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHI, Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana, Mr. POCAN, Mr. O'HALLERAN, and Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia.
H.R. 3738: Mr. PAYNE.
H.R. 3770: Mr. GARRETT, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GOODLATTE, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. KATKO, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, and Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia.
H.R. 3773: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. KENNEDY, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3784: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. SHEA-PORTER.
H.R. 3792: Mr. TONKO and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H.R. 3808: Ms. TENNEY.
H.R. 3822: Mr. POSEY, Mr. FRANKS of Arizona, Mr. HARRIS, and Mr. GIBBS.
H.R. 3832: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia and Mr. WALDEN.
H.R. 3845: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SIRES, and Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.
H.R. 3847: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska.
H.R. 3905: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 3930: Mr. BARTON and Mr. WEBER of Texas.
H.R. 3936: Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.
H.R. 3947: Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. BERA, Mr. RUIZ, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. COOPER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOEBSACK.
H.R. 3957: Mr. GROTHMAN.
H. Con. Res. 56: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H. Res. 128: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. SLAUGHTER.
H. Res. 142: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.
H. Res. 220: Mr. CRAMER and Mr. FASO.
H. Res. 257: Mr. FERGUSON.
H. Res. 283: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. BLUMENAUER.
H. Res. 313: Mr. OLSON.
H. Res. 466: Mr. YOUNG of Alaska and Mrs. DINGELL.
H. Res. 467: Mr. ENGEL.
H. Res. 511: Ms. NORTON and Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 555: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.