



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2017

No. 159

House of Representatives

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

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

WASHINGTON, DC,

October 4, 2017.

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

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

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

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

HARVARD RAPE VICTIM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

And that is just the way it is.

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H7753

HAPPY BIRTHDAY, DR. VIRGINIA KIMBROUGH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. GEORGE HAMILTON

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

REMEMBERING THE LIFE OF MR. HERMON BUTLER

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

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

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

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

Mr. Butler certainly will be missed.

RECOGNIZING REAR ADMIRAL UPPER HALF RANDY CRITES

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

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

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

GUN VIOLENCE

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1015

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

I hope that we can act to save American lives.

REFORMING AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL

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

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

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

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

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

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

Why is that?

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

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

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

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

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

I couldn't agree more.

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

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

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

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

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

Quickly, let me bust a few myths here.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ASSISTANCE FOR PUERTO RICO

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

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

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

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

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

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

She said:

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

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

Manny writes:

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

Yanny writes:

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Really? We should feel proud?

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

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

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

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

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

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

21ST CENTURY AVIATION REFORM

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1030

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

PASSING COMMONSENSE LAWS REGARDING FIREARMS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GRATITUDE FOR PASSAGE OF MICAH'S LAW

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING BERTHA McMORRIS

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1045

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

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

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

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

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

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

RECOGNIZING THE LIFE OF TOM McNAMARA

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ENOUGH IS ENOUGH

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

What was the Pulse nightclub?

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COMMEMORATING THE DEDICATION OF THE SOUTH TEXAS AVIATORS MEMORIAL

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

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

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

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

□ 1100

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

SERVICE ACADEMY NIGHTS IN THE 27TH DISTRICT OF TEXAS

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

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

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

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

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

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

For more information, you can contact my office or visit my website, farenthold.house.gov.

DOUBLE TEN DAY IS THE NATIONAL DAY OF
TAIWAN

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

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

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

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

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

BIRTHDAY WISHES TO BOB HAUETER AND LUIS
BUENTELLO

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

Happy birthday, guys, and thanks for the help.

THE RELIEF EFFORT IN PUERTO RICO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Puerto Rican people are stronger than Donald Trump thinks.

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

We can't wait any longer.

We are with you.

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

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

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

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

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

RECESS

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

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

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

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

PRAYER

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

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

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

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

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

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

In Your most holy and beautiful name, we pray.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

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

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

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

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

Mr. KATKO led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

WELCOMING IMAM ABDULLAH ANTEPLI

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

AIR TRAFFIC REFORM

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

TAX CUTS DON'T PAY FOR THEMSELVES

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CRITICAL BILL FOR AMERICAN AVIATION

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

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

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

These words are still true today.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HONORING THE LIFE OF NOLAN WATSON

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

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

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

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

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

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

HOW TO BECOME A BETTER AND STRONGER NATION

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

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

His speech made three clear points:

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

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

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

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

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

DESIGNATING MANUFACTURING DAY

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

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

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

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

These small businesses have a substantial impact on local communities

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

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

□ 1215

COURAGE TO ACT ON GUN LEGISLATION

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

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

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

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

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

CELEBRATE NATIONAL MANUFACTURING DAY

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

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

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

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

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

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

RYAN-McCONNELL REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

HUMANITARIAN CRISIS IN PUERTO RICO

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

INTRODUCING LEGISLATION TO BAN BUMP STOCKS TO CONVERT SEMIAUTOMATIC WEAPONS

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

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

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

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

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

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

PASS TAX CUTS FOR THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

CRITICAL NEED TO FUND CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1230

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

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

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

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

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

tional right to privacy, including the right to choose.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 553

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

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

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1245

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1300

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

UNITED STATES CONFERENCE OF

CATHOLIC BISHOPS,

Washington, DC, August 31, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

COALITION ON HUMAN NEEDS,

Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely yours,

DEBORAH WEINSTEIN,
Executive Director.

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

NATIONAL HISPANIC
LEADERSHIP AGENDA,
July 26, 2017.

Re NHLA opposition to House Budget Resolution.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

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

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

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

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

AARP,
Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

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

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

MEDICARE AND SOCIAL SECURITY

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

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

MEDICAID, LONG-TERM SERVICES AND SUPPORTS AND SNAP

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

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

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

Sincerely,

JO ANN C. JENKINS,
Chief Executive Officer.

JOYCE A. ROGERS,
SVP Government Affairs, AARP.

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

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

MEMBERS OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Signed,

AMANDA BALLANTYNE,
National Director, Main Street Alliance.

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

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

GENE KARPINSKI,
President.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Have we had a hearing?

No.

Have we had a vote?

No.

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

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

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

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

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

What are your ideas?

Nothing. Silence.

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

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

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

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

That is not responsible.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

□ 1315

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

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

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

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

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

Washington, DC, October 3, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

JOSH NASSAR,
Legislative Director.

SEIU STRONGER TOGETHER,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

MARY KAY HENRY,
International President.

THE NATIONAL TREASURY
EMPLOYEES UNION,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

ANTHONY M. REARDON,
National President.

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

Washington, DC, October 2, 2017.
MEMBER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

SCOTT FREY,

Director of Federal Government Affairs.

AMERICAN FEDERATION OF
GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO,
Washington, DC, September 29, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Thank you for your consideration of our request.

Sincerely,

THOMAS S. KAHN,

Director, Legislative Affairs.

NATIONAL ACTIVE AND RETIRED
FEDERAL EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION,
Alexandria, VA, October 3, 2017.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC.

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

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

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

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

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

Sincerely,

RICHARD THISSEN,

National President

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

GUN SAFETY BILLS IN THE 115TH CONGRESS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

11. H.R. 163 Gun Manufacturers Accountability Act

12. H.R. 2033 Undetectable Firearms Modernization Act

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

22. H.R. 1478 Gun Violence Research Act

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

24. H.R. 3361 SECURE Firearm Storage Act

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

26. No Fly No Buy (not yet reintroduced)

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT
IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 551]

YEAS—231

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

Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman

Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—189

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

NOT VOTING—13

Amodei
Bridenstine
Doyle, Michael F.
Kihuen

Long
Loudermilk
McCarthy
Palmer
Pelosi

Poe (TX)
Rosen
Scalise
Titus

□ 1351

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

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

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

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

[Roll No. 552]

AYES—232

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

NOES—188

Adams	Beatty	Blumenauer
Aguilar	Bera	Blunt Rochester
Barragán	Beyer	Bonamici
Bass	Bishop (GA)	

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

NOT VOTING—13

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

□ 1359

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

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

OCTOBER 4, 2017.

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

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

Soboleff Commission on Native Children Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1402

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, our budget, Building a Better America. Our budget takes real, tangible steps to balance the budget, build a stronger military,

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

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

Today, we have the opportunity to fulfill our promises to the American people. Balancing the budget by 2027 is our top priority. Our national debt stands at \$20 trillion, with \$9 trillion added over just the last 8 years. For too long, both parties in Washington have failed to abide by a simple principle that all American families and small businesses do, that we must live within our means.

Balancing the budget requires us to make some tough decisions, but the consequences of inaction far outweigh any political risk we may face.

Unless we take bold steps to bring our excessive spending and debt under control, a sovereign debt crisis is the natural conclusion. Failure to take swift and decisive action is not only inexcusable, it is immoral.

The budget resolution before us takes real steps to put our country on a sound fiscal path that balances in 10 years and will allow us to start paying down our national debt.

Building a Better America also assumes bold reforms to strengthening programs that our seniors and our most vulnerable citizens rely on and ensure that these programs can continue to serve them for generations to come.

While our budget includes reforms to discretionary spending, we also strongly believe that mandatory spending must be addressed in this budget resolution and in budget resolutions to come.

Mandatory spending is already more than two-thirds of all of our Federal spending, and that number will only continue to grow, and that is why our committee felt strongly about addressing mandatory spending programs in this budget through reconciliation.

Our budget requires 11 authorizing committees to find a minimum of \$203 billion in savings and reforms over the 10-year budget window with an expectation that the reforms will result in significantly higher savings.

This package of mandatory reforms is the largest since the 1990s, through reconciliation, and it is the first step to change the culture of Washington in our spending.

Our budget also promotes tax reform and regulatory reform to get the Federal Government out of the way and allow our free market economy to thrive. The larger the government, the less freedom individuals and businesses have to thrive, grow, hire, and innovate. The Obama economy left millions of Americans behind with over 14 million people leaving the labor workforce in just the last 8 years.

Through reconciliation, our budget specifically paves the way for progrowth tax reform that will reduce taxes for the middle class Americans and free up American businesses to grow and to hire. It will also simplify the Tax Code, allowing about 9 out of 10 Americans to file their taxes on a simple postcard.

Many of our friends across the aisle and in the media said that a 1.9 percent economic growth is the new normal and that we are doomed to continue the economic stagnation of the Obama years.

They have a pessimistic view of our Nation's ability to create jobs and to build our foundation of greater opportunity for all.

America has the greatest workers, the greatest innovators, and the entrepreneurial ethos to far surpass the economic growth of the last 8 years, if only the Federal Government would get out of the way.

In this budget, we put our trust in the American people. But a stronger economy is not enough; we must also strengthen our military.

The number one job of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens. Over the last 8 years, the weak foreign policy of President Obama has led to an increase in threats from all corners of the globe while the funding for our men and women in uniform has failed to keep pace. Building a Better America invests \$621.5 billion in our military and \$75 billion specifically for the global war on terrorism for fiscal year 2018. These resources will help our men and women in uniform complete the mission with which they have been tasked.

Building a Better America presents us with an opportunity to change the trajectory of our country forever. The election of President Trump was a signal to all of us that the American people will no longer accept the status quo.

This budget is also a very personal one for me. As I and my committee have gone through the long and arduous process of getting this budget to the floor, I have had to stop and think about not just what we are doing but where we are going.

I have a picture of my six grandchildren taped to the back of my voting card. I was a nurse for more than 40 years and still hold my license today. Government and public service was never an ambition of mine, but when I saw what was happening in my State and in this country, I couldn't sit back and do nothing.

Every time I put my voting card into a slot, I am reminded of why I left the career that I loved to join the political fray. It is for them. It is for my children and grandchildren and for yours as well.

I grew up in an America where a poor girl, whose parents' only ambition was for her to finish high school, could graduate from college, become a nurse, and eventually become a Member of the House of Representatives.

I grew up in an America that was a land of—that is a land of opportunity and was a land of opportunity then of strength and of compassion. But that America is slipping away from us. For too many young people in this country, the opportunity to live the American Dream is out of reach. A government that was supposed to be of, by, and for the people has left them behind.

Building a Better America requires a government that spends within its means, a military with the resources to complete the mission, an economy that creates the opportunity for all, and a Federal bureaucracy that respects the taxpayers.

It also requires an understanding that the greatness of America does not lie in the grand buildings and the stone pillars of Washington, D.C. The greatness of America lies in the spirit and the tenacity of the people.

We designed Building a Better America to put this vision into practice, to empower individuals to live their version of the American Dream. Future generations of Americans are counting on us, and failure is not an option.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of this committee for their hard work that they have done, for the months that we have worked tirelessly to come together and build a budget that reflects our principles.

It hasn't been easy, but producing a budget that puts our vision for fiscal sanity into practice will be worth it, and I thank each and every one of you for your hard work.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget we are debating here today is a shockingly extreme document that gives to the rich and takes from everyone else. It calls for more than \$5 trillion in spending cuts that threaten our economic progress and our national security, and it willfully ignores the needs and priorities of the American people.

This budget isn't about conservative policy or reducing the size of our debt and deficits. It is not even about American families. This budget is about one thing: using budget reconciliation to ram through giant tax giveaways to the wealthy and big corporations and to do it without bipartisan support.

□ 1415

This budget and the tax cuts it exists to support are built on a foundation of lies. They are part of a dangerous and deceptive three-step process Republicans have used before with serious consequences for our Nation and the American people.

This is what they do. First, my Republican colleagues call for massive tax cuts for the rich, claiming they will generate so much economic growth, that they will pay for them-

selves. Last week, congressional Republicans announced a \$2.4 trillion tax cut plan that benefits the wealthy at the expense of everyone else. Yes, I said trillions with a T.

For example, under this tax plan, millions of families making \$50,000 a year would be subject to a tax increase, while millionaires get a \$230,000 average tax cut. That is not tax reform. That is a shakedown.

In total, individuals will see their taxes go up by more than \$450 billion, while corporations, wealthy pass-through entities, and rich estates get a tax cut totaling \$2.9 trillion.

One might justifiably ask why anyone would want to do that. After all, the income disparity in the United States is greater than almost every other country on Earth, and it is getting larger. Just a few decades ago, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans earned about one-fourth of all national income. Today, it is close to 40 percent. Yet, once this plan is fully phased in, 80 percent of the entire tax cut in this plan goes to just the top 1 percent, while 45 percent of all households with children see a tax increase.

You could be someone who gets a \$1 million salary, owns billions in corporate stock, be a partner in a hedge fund, or just the heir to a massive fortune, no matter the type of millionaire you are, Republicans make sure you will get a tax cut. No matter how many times President Trump, Secretary Mnuchin, or my colleagues across the aisle say it and how much they hope the American people will fall for it, these tax cuts won't pay for themselves.

That is not just my argument. That is the conclusion of the Federal Reserve, the Congressional Budget Office, and respected economists of all stripes.

Conservative economist and former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin said: "There is just no evidence that the tax cuts actually pay for themselves."

Even Goldman Sachs, Secretary Mnuchin's former employer, says any growth will be minimal, maybe up to two-tenths of a percent.

Bruce Bartlett, the man who wrote Reaganomics, which codified the trickle-down theory, told Congress last week that he now thinks it is: "bull." Well, that is half of the word he used, but you get the idea.

The historical record is clear. We went through this in the early 1980s, the early 2000s under George W. Bush, and we recently saw it play out to disastrous effect in Kansas. Now congressional Republicans want to try it again.

We all know the truth. The tax cuts in this plan will increase deficits and debt by approximately \$2.4 trillion in the first 10 years alone and trillions more in the years after. These aren't special, supernatural tax cuts. They aren't going to magically defy expert analysis, historical precedence, and empirical evidence. This budget will

blow enormous holes in the Federal budget, which brings me to the second part of the Republican deception.

When the growth fails to happen as promised and these tax cuts keep digging our economy down deeper and deeper, Republicans will again bemoan the horrors of deficits and debt.

These cries will lead us to the third and final part of the plan. They will call for congressional action, not to roll back the tax cuts to the wealthy that caused all the damage, but for drastic cuts to important programs that the American people need and support. Education, healthcare, research, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits are already threatened in this budget. It includes an astonishing \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts; \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid alone. It even assumes \$49 billion in cuts to veterans' benefits.

The enormity of these cuts and the severity of the consequences for American families cannot be overstated, but more cuts will be coming if my Republicans get their way with this budget. We will see more attacks on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, nutrition assistance, on important benefits and services that help American families get ahead, and on key investments that keep our economy and our Nation strong.

To be clear, and with all due respect to my friend and colleague from Tennessee, by voting on this budget, for this budget, they are jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 515,000 hungry children in Tennessee so that the wealthiest person in that State, who has a net worth of \$8.8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Democrats have a different budget and a far different vision for our country. Our priorities reflect the priorities of the American people.

We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families; public investments that lead to a brighter future, such as rebuilding roads, bridges, and other vital infrastructure; retirement security for seniors now and for millions of Americans who fear they will never be able to afford to stop working; affordable education so that young people will be able to compete for the careers of the future; affordable, quality childcare for hardworking parents; and affordable quality healthcare for all Americans.

We believe in a government that helps individuals with nowhere left to turn and a Tax Code that helps families get ahead. Those are American priorities, and they should be the priorities of this Congress.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman and all the members of the Budget Committee who voted for this budget, and now it is on the floor.

I encourage all Members of the House to vote in favor of this budget, and that is because our national debt continues to grow exponentially every day, every hour, every minute, and every second. We cannot afford to have any more time waiting to address the spending crisis that we are in.

This budget begins to put these irresponsible elitist policies behind us, and creates a culture around here that makes sure that our friends and neighbors who really need the help get the help without forcing our Nation's bills on our children and grandchildren, future generations, some of whom don't even exist yet.

Specifically, this budget reforms mandatory spending so it is focused on those, Mr. Chairman, in our communities who really need help. This will ensure that our country will focus limited resources on those who are most vulnerable, while encouraging a culture of self-reliance instead of government dependence.

We should be measuring, Mr. Chairman, success of these programs on how many people we get off of them, not how many people we trap in them.

Mr. Chairman, as the chart I am holding shows, because mandatory spending is over two-thirds of our total annual spending, reforming this part of our spending is the only way to really get our debt and deficits down. This budget, for the first time, starts addressing this part of the pie, \$203 billion worth, and that is because of the leadership here of Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Now, this budget also protects our friends and neighbors by making sure our families are safe, that the military has the tools that they need, and that the administration has the money it needs to secure our border.

This budget also jump-starts tax reform, which will put money back in the pockets of hardworking Hoosiers and all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, as President Ronald Reagan once said: "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much."

That is still true today, Mr. Chairman, except that that \$1 trillion is now \$20 trillion and growing.

Again, I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Indiana that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,150,553 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Indiana to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax break.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today as a member of the Budget Committee to express my strong opposition to this budget resolution, which, if passed, would leave countless working families behind, and not to mention would, in fact, raise the Federal debt by at least \$3 trillion over the first decade and by at least \$6.6 trillion by the end of the second 10 years.

This proposed budget is an atrocious representation of our values. As more Americans find it harder and harder to get by, this budget guts what people need to be most successful. It takes away dollars from education; it takes away dollars from the programs we rely on for retirement, for switching between jobs, for healthcare.

We should be focused on funding the things that will enable the workforce to prepare for the 21st century, not gutting programs that will leave them falling further behind.

Rather than funding luxury travel for the Trump administration, let's invest in quality education, job skills training, and properly fund the State Department and foreign aid programs that Secretary of Defense Mattis and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dunford have said are critical to our national security.

This budget puts working families, our economy, and our national security at risk.

Passage of this budget would also pave the way for Republican tax reform, if you want to call it that, which would favor big businesses that destroy our small towns.

It shouldn't be easier for a company to get a tax break on buying another robot than training their employees to gain skills for the modern economy. We need a tax plan to incentivize companies to invest in their workers instead of engaging in a race to the bottom where workers are viewed as a burden rather than an asset.

We need a budget that will foster economic growth for all of our people, and we need to make taxes more simple and fair for working families, not give handouts to the rich.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this proposed budget so that we can go back to the table—or, actually, to go to the table for the first time as Democrats and Republicans, and have a conversation about funding the resources that will actually move our economy and country forward into the 21st century and beyond.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is also a member of our committee and also of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I must first start by thanking Chairwoman BLACK for her excellent work on this bill.

There are a lot of things that I can talk about that are very positive in

this budget, but today I want to emphasize how it prioritizes our national security.

With the growing threats around the globe, it is imperative that we fund defense of our Nation in an appropriate and a substantial way. We need to invest in our Armed Forces. We have to upgrade our defense systems and weapons systems, and we have to ensure the readiness of our military.

The United States must continue to lead on a global scale. This budget takes us in that direction by investing in our national defense. Obviously, coupled with targeted soft diplomacy funding, we accomplish that.

This budget takes us, as I said, in that direction, and it does so in a very positive way. I believe this budget makes those critical investments.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have to tell you that under the previous administration, cuts to our defense spending left the world a more dangerous place and it left our country in a more vulnerable place. Thankfully, the current administration recognizes the failure of the last 8 years and is, again, willing to lead again. Now it is up to us to do our part to provide the resources to allow the administration and our military to lead again. This budget gets us there. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for her invaluable leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the same and, again, make sure that we stand toe to toe with our adversaries and we stand, most importantly, with the national security interests of the United States.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my friend and colleague from Florida that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 1,448,000 hungry children in Florida so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$13.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this dangerous budget proposal.

With many working families and businesses still struggling to adapt to a rapidly changing economy, our top priority in Congress should be to help expand opportunities and sustain long-term economic growth and security so no American is left behind as we forge new paths ahead.

□ 1430

To spur robust job growth, we must invest in our education system to provide the training and skills workers need to be prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow.

We should invest in infrastructure that will put people to work and make our communities better places to do business, and we should invest in growing a strong middle class, the backbone of our economy.

But instead, we are debating a budget that will go nowhere in the Senate simply so it can be used as a vehicle to give the wealthiest Americans a massive tax cut on the backs of middle class families.

This reckless budget cuts early childhood, K-12, and higher education programs, as well as job training and apprenticeships. It guts nutrition assistance, which provides benefits to more than 43 million Americans a year, almost half of whom are children. It continues the destructive cycle of neglecting our already crumbling infrastructure, even though we know the longer we wait, the more costly repairs will be in the future and the less economically competitive our communities will be.

Slashing programs that help working families in order to line the pockets of the wealthiest Americans has never led to jobs or economic growth, and it never will. Every dollar we spend is a reflection of our values, which is why I am deeply disappointed that this budget demonstrates an utter disregard for middle class Americans, a lack of vision for what our future could look like with smart, targeted investments, and a complete lack of empathy for the most vulnerable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for yielding time to me, and I particularly want to congratulate her on doing something that is going to be pretty remarkable today. She is bringing a budget that actually balances in 10 years.

My good friends on the other side will bring us three budgets, none of which come into balance in 10 years. In that, to be fair, they follow the tradition that President Obama set, who never ever brought us a budget that balanced and left us with a national debt roughly twice the size of the one he had when he came into office. If we don't do what Chairwoman BLACK suggests here, we are going to be in exactly that same position.

I particularly want to congratulate the chairwoman for having the courage to take on the tough issue of entitlement and mandatory spending reform. She has \$200 billion of it. It sounds like a lot of money, but it is out of \$30 trillion over 10 years. This is something we can do—frankly, we should do more of—and that is the way to actually move toward balance.

I also want to congratulate the chairwoman for actually working with other committee chairmen to help them identify the cuts so they are real. They are not just fictional things in an imaginary document.

Finally, I particularly want to commend her for a wise investment in national security. That is a tough decision to make, but we have all seen the

ravages left by sequester and by continuing resolutions that are the number one enemies of the United States military. We have actually, under the last administration, inflicted more damage on the military than any enemy could do on any battlefield anywhere in the world. Our chairwoman and our committee stops that, reverses that, and begins to invest.

Mr. Chair, I just want to end by pointing out the long-term solution here to our problems really is entitlement reform. We have to get serious about mandatory spending. It is two-thirds of the budget now. Without changing the direction we are going, it will be 81 percent a decade from now. It is simply not sustainable.

It is nice to talk about this discretionary program or that discretionary program. The fundamental problem that we face is mandatory spending. The chairwoman addresses it in her budget. We can come back and build on what she does next year and continue to go after the area that really unbalances the budget.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note, for my friend and colleague, that by voting for this budget, he will force 678,763 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Oklahoma to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$10.2 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 2018 Republican budget resolution, a budget that comes nearly 6 months late and days into the new fiscal year. This Republican budget betrays millions of hardworking middle class families, while showering billionaires with irresponsible tax cuts.

By cutting \$211 billion over the next 10 years for student loans and college aid, it makes it harder to send our kids to college. It abandons our Nation's crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$245 billion over 10 years for transportation. It turns its back on families putting food on the table with SNAP by cutting \$150 billion from the program over the next 10 years. It neglects our grandparents and our seniors with a \$487 billion cut to Medicare in the next decade, and it assumes the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, leaving over 20 million Americans uninsured.

I offered two amendments during the markup of this budget—one to fully fund programs for our veterans, and another to reject paying for a border wall—both of which were blocked by my Republican colleagues.

This budget boosts defense spending to \$622 billion, \$72 billion above the budget cap for defense and well over even the President's request, and it underfunds nondefense spending at \$5 billion below the cap.

At the same time, Republicans have included instructions to fast-track a tax proposal that would add trillions to our Nation's deficit—trillions. It would end almost all itemized deductions, and according to the Tax Policy Center, increase taxes for roughly one in four taxpayers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlemen from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, this budget completely ignores a balanced approach to achieving fiscal sustainability and stacks the deck even higher against middle class families, seniors, and students.

Mr. Chair, I reject today's Republican budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I want to remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that, during the time of the previous administration, there was \$9 trillion added to the debt, 1.9 percent economic growth, and that was the high of that period of time, and there were 14 million people who left the labor workforce. If their policies worked, we wouldn't see these kinds of statistics.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in many years, this budget uses reconciliation for the purpose it was intended: to bring mandatory spending under control.

The appropriations that dominate so much of the debate comprise less than one-third of our total spending, and that is called discretionary spending. The budget sets a level; the appropriations process spends to that level. That is everything from general government to defense.

We have actually been able to bring that under control, but the other two-thirds of spending is called mandatory spending. It is beyond the annual control of Congress. It continues automatically until and unless the statutes that call for it are actually changed.

It is the mandatory spending that is eating our country alive. Mandatory spending is supposed to be controlled by reconciliation. Instructions are sent to the various authorizing committees to make whatever changes are necessary in current law to stay within our means. But this powerful fiscal tool has been ignored or squandered in past budgets, and this neglect is undermining the solvency of our country.

For the first time in many years, the House budget finally restrains mandatory spending by instructing our committees to find at least \$200 billion in savings over the next decade. That means this budget will get us back to

balance within the decade, and this is why it is so important.

If the Democrats had their way and we maintain our current path, the Congressional Budget Office warns that in just 4 years, in 2022, our deficits will surpass \$1 trillion a year. That is where economists warn we run the risk of damage or even loss of our access to credit, a sovereign debt crisis.

If you want to know what that looks like, Venezuela is going through it right now, and within our own territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—pension systems implode, basic services falter, the economy collapses.

Two years after that, in 2024, 6 years from now, the CBO warns that the annual interest cost on our debt will reach \$654 billion. That is more than we currently spend on defense.

I would remind my friends on the left that you cannot provide for the common defense or promote the general welfare if you can't pay for it, and the ability of our country to do so is being undermined by our spending trajectory.

At the same time, we charge the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, sending trillions of dollars of capital and hundreds of thousands of jobs to other countries. In the last 8 years, we have averaged only half of our postwar economic growth.

I remind my friends that corporations do not pay corporate taxes. Corporate taxes can only be paid in one of three ways: by consumers through higher prices, by employees through lower wages, by investors through lower earnings. Cutting corporate taxes means lower prices for consumers, higher wages for employees, and higher earnings for investors.

Tax relief is absolutely vital to reviving the economy, but experience does warn us that revenue growth only partially offsets revenue lost to tax reductions. Indeed, when we are told that the choice is between taxes and debt, those are two sides of the same coin.

Taxes and debt are the only two possible ways to pay for spending. Once we have spent a dollar, we have already decided to tax it. We either tax it now, or we borrow it now and tax it later. Either way, it is entirely driven by spending. By restraining spending, this budget makes possible the tax relief that our economy desperately needs to grow.

Frankly, we could do much more if we summon the political will, and I will be presenting such a budget tomorrow on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

But this budget moves us a long way in the right direction. It sets in motion the policies that Presidents from Calvin Coolidge to John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan have all used to revive and expand our economy. It brings us closer to that day when families will be awakened to a new and prosperous morning for America.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I want to note for my colleague that, by voting

for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,319,000 hungry children in California so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$62.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chair, since the gentlewoman, my friend from Tennessee, remarked upon economic growth, let me, as one who was here at the time, perhaps correct the RECORD.

Bill Clinton's economic growth was higher than Ron Reagan's, and that is not in dispute. Barack Obama's economic growth was higher than George W. Bush's. We were losing 800,000 jobs a month at the end of the Bush administration, to bring up one point, which, by the way, is closer to 2.1 percent.

People here know I follow these issues like a hawk, but the truth is that this budget today that is being put forward is a threat to Medicare and Social Security down the road.

The previous speaker said he is concerned about mandatory spending. I gotcha. Put out a plan. Put out a plan on Social Security and Medicare. And don't do it in the backdoor way here as they complain about deficits and they prepare to embrace a tax cut of \$1.5 trillion or, over 10 years, \$2.2 trillion on top of the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 which amounted to \$2.3 trillion. So we are at \$5 trillion worth of tax cuts, and the Clinton administration left us with four balanced budgets and \$5 trillion worth of surplus.

This is not a budget that supports meaningful tax reform. I am ready, and she knows because of our working together in the past, prepared to work with Republicans on fundamental tax reform. The system is begging for it.

Don't call tax reform tax reform when it is really a tax cut. And that is where this is headed, and I think they know that as well.

This is a partisan roadmap that has failed in the past. They are using reconciliation instruction so that the majority can ram through a tax plan here. That is all it is about.

Last night, by the way, the tradeoff is in some States you can keep the mortgage interest deduction if you are willing to give up the State and local tax deduction.

I want to tell you something, I guarantee you right now, based on long history, we will end up keeping both, and they will have to add more to the debt as time goes on.

Is this a cut for the wealthy? Eighty percent of the tax cut goes to the top 1 percent in 2027.

□ 1445

This is from the Tax Policy Center in Washington. Incidentally, how great is it to have a nonpartisan scoring committee offer us a snapshot of the future?

The average tax cut for millionaires, \$230,000 a year in 2027. The average tax

cut for the top one-tenth of 1 percent is \$1 million in the year 2027.

The people in this country who need tax relief are the middle class. We should be investing in human capital, community colleges; we should be investing in vocational education.

So 45 percent of all households with children will see a tax increase in 2027. Among households earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000, you are going to see a one-third tax increase in 2027.

I look at this and say: Why are we not offering some relief to middle class Americans? Why are we not investing in them? Do we not have enough faith in them to help them get through what have been difficult times with children in college and costs mounting all of the time?

Instead, it is back to tax relief for people at the very top. I guess concentrated wealth in America now is not a big issue. I guess the top 1 percent in America who, by the way, aren't even asking for tax relief—that is the irony of this. They are not asking for tax relief. They are arguing for more investment in America rather than concentrating more money in fewer hands.

The American people deserve a Tax Code that is based on fairness. Our code should reward hardworking, middle class families, small business, innovation, and ensure that no one, no matter how wealthy they are, can avoid paying their fair share.

Our focus is going to be on helping the middle class, creating jobs, boosting wages, and giving people the assistance they need in a complicated economy with their grocery bills and childcare as well. Invest in human capital today.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it kind of blows my mind. You look at the sign that was just displayed by our colleague; it says that the Republican budget is a bad deal for working Americans.

Well, I don't know what Americans you folks are talking to, but the middle class Americans that I talk to, they want an economic growing, job creating, tax cutting budget and tax relief effort. That is what they want out of the House. That is what the Republican plan is bringing.

We not only rebuild our military, but we do something that has not been done in years. We begin to get into that mandatory spending and the out-of-control spending that we have here in our Nation's Capitol.

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the biggest threat to our national security is our national debt. How are we ever going to do that if we don't begin to address mandatory spending?

Mr. Chair, we have brought a good budget, a responsible budget, one that balances in 10 years to the floor. We need to get every colleague in this

Chamber to get behind it because it is good for working Americans, it is good for working families, and it is the responsible thing to do.

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

I want to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,154,337 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Ohio to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$6.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

And just in case my colleagues on the other side are wondering where this information comes from as to the wealthiest person in each State, it is from that notoriously leftwing magazine, *Forbes*, this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, any budget requires an examination of how and who pays for it and how that budget impacts the economy.

We were told by President Trump and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin that there would be no new tax cuts for the wealthy; and that this budget, and its blueprint, is a middle class miracle. That was last Wednesday.

One week later, this Wednesday, the facts are in. If you make \$730,000 in America, next year your income will rise by 8.5 percent, or \$129,000, or \$10,750 a month.

If you make \$67,000, your income will rise by 1.2 percent, or \$670 next year, or a whopping \$56 a month. This is no miracle. This is fraud being perpetrated against the middle class.

We are told that tax cuts pay for themselves through the magic of dynamic scoring. Their budget will increase the deficit by \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. Where are all the deficit hawks? Where are any of the deficit hawks?

Goldman alumnus Mnuchin and Gary Cohn, the National Economic Adviser, said that this bill will grow the economy. Goldman economists said that their budget will have no good impact in terms of growth in the Federal budget over the next several years.

Finally, infrastructure. The infrastructure budget for America, a nation of 300 million people, for the next 10 years is about the same as we spent rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq and Afghanistan over the last 10 years. This is unacceptable. We can do much better.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her work on this incredible budget that we are talking about here today.

I rise today in support of the FY18 budget entitled "Building a Better

America." Never has a budget had a more fitting title. The budget set forth by the House Budget Committee will balance the budget within 10 years, provide our military with the resources they need for national defense, and cut more than \$200 billion in mandatory spending.

Picture this: \$6.5 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years. On that fact alone, I would hope my colleagues would support this legislation.

This budget also paves the way for the recently released Unified Framework for Fixing Our Broken Tax Code.

On a telephone townhall with thousands of constituents on the phone from my district, 53 percent of participants reported that their most important priority for tax reform is a simpler, fairer Tax Code. The framework does just that and more.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the budget, to reduce the deficit, and take a huge step toward progrowth tax reform that will increase paychecks, spur economic growth, and make our Tax Code simple, affordable, and competitive.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 809,000 hungry children in Georgia so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget Act, adopted in 1974, requires that the House complete work on its budget for the next fiscal year by April 15. That is 172 days ago.

Yet we now have a budget resolution on the floor, already into the fiscal year for which the budget supposedly is planned. Some may ask why. The answer is a simple one.

This is, first of all, not a realistic budget which could or should stand as a budget resolution. No, this budget is not about putting our country on a sustainable fiscal path, and—this is indisputable—it is not a budget to inform the appropriators of budget priorities and constraints.

No, the Appropriations Committee will not be informed. Why? Because we have already passed the appropriations bills. This budget doesn't have anything to do with the appropriation bills. They are passed, they are gone. They are in the Senate.

This is merely a vehicle for achieving partisan tax reform of the kind that President Trump and Republican leaders in Congress outlined last week. Despite what this sham of a budget pretends, their plan is to push through tax changes that massively increase deficits—I call it the granddaddy of all debt increases—while shifting even more wealth from middle class and

working families to people like Donald Trump.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the tax cuts in this proposal would go only to those who make over \$900,000 a year. Hear me. The tax cuts mainly go to those making, in this Nation, over \$900,000 per year.

Despite promises from President Trump and Republicans here in the House, their plan actually raises taxes—hear me—while cutting taxes on those over \$900,000, it actually raises taxes on 1 in 3 middle class families who earn between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Even though Republicans continue to assert the discredited supply-side mantra that tax cuts pay for themselves, no responsible economist believes that, not one—responsible is the operative word. The Tax Policy Center's analysis found that their tax cuts would add \$2.4 trillion to deficits over the next 10 years.

The previous speaker said this balances the budget in 9 years. That is Alice in Wonderland balance. It will never happen. I have been here for 36 years; I have heard those comments all the time. It never happened.

But it is even worse, Mr. Chairman. The budget resolution also proposes to disinvest in job creation, pretends Republicans were able to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it hasn't been repealed, yet they pretend it has been repealed—to kick 23 million off their coverage and make those with preexisting conditions uninsurable.

It guts Medicaid and would end the Medicaid guarantee.

Furthermore, it would severely cut programs that reduce poverty and provide the kind of job training proven to get more people back into the workforce.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. This resolution is a grab bag of all the worst Republican policies: partisan tax cuts for the wealthy that leave the middle class behind, the cruelty of TrumpCare, and draconian reductions in domestic investment. The product is just as bad as the sum of its parts; indeed, it is worse.

Instead, we ought to be working together to enact bipartisan tax reform that is fiscally responsible and focused on the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution, and I ask Republicans, who believe that tax reform must be permanent and, therefore, bipartisan, to join us in doing so.

Only one person can stop spending; that is the President of the United States. He can veto spending bills.

The debt under Ronald Reagan increased 189 percent. Under Bush I, 55

percent; he had 4 years. Under Clinton, 37 percent; under Bush II, 86 percent; and under Obama, who was dealing with the deepest recession of our lifetimes, 87 percent.

A budget is supposed to inform the Appropriations Committee of how it ought to proceed. This budget comes after the fact, and it is only for tax cuts for the wealthy.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues on the other side that we are talking about the budget. We are not talking about tax reform. We are going to have an opportunity to talk about that later.

Our budget does not assume that tax cuts pay for themselves, and our budget does not reflect that claim. Our budget includes a host of pro-growth economic policies, including comprehensive tax reform, as one of those, but regulatory reform; a reform in the improper payments; restoration of incentives for people to work and save and invest.

Most economists believe that this bundle of pro-growth tax policies will lead to a stronger economy than what we have under the current law. But we are talking about the budget here. So I would like for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to speak about the budget, and we will talk about tax reform at another time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK on her leadership and tireless efforts.

Much has been said about our \$20 trillion debt, and I would like to add that we know that that debt can only be paid back with tax dollars that will be extracted from future taxpayers.

We debated and passed 12 appropriations bills in this Chamber. As heated as those debates were, they were on less than one-third of Federal spending. To attack our debt, we have to attack mandatory spending. This budget does that.

As I traveled around my district and talked to people in my district, I have been pleased to hear that business is good. Businesses want to grow, and they want to expand. But I have not been pleased when they told me that they cannot find employees. So I went back and looked at data. Arkansas has our lowest unemployment rate ever right now, but we have also got the lowest labor participation rate.

In the years from 2008 to 2016, we saw a 5.7 percent population growth. We saw a decrease in unemployment from 6 percent down to 4 percent, or 5½ down to 4 percent, but we had fewer people actually working in 2016 than we had in 2008. We had a decrease of 0.8

percent of people working and a decrease of 2.4 percent of people in the labor force during that time period.

We have to put plans and programs in place to get our economy growing. We have to get more people back to work. During that same time, we saw an increase in SNAP benefits. We saw 330,000 people, or over 14 percent of our State's population of able-bodied, working-age adults, getting their health insurance through Medicaid expansion.

We need to focus on addressing our budget woes. We need an economy that is growing and a labor force that is working. We need a military that is strong. We have to address the 70 percent component of spending that is driving our debt. This budget is the first step in achieving those results, and I urge everyone to vote for this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 594,596 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Arkansas to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership as our ranking member on our Budget Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's so-called budget plan. I am a member, yes, of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and I know, because we work on this each and every day, that our national budget is a statement of our national priorities and our values. I know very well that the Republicans have put forward, quite frankly, a sinister budget whose chief purpose is to hand tax breaks to billionaires.

Budgets are moral documents. They should not be rigged in favor of special interests and the wealthy few, but the Republican budget is. Our Nation's budget should prioritize working families and the middle class, too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line.

It should assist those struggling to find a job and investment in workforce training, education, job creation, and job training. Instead, this Republican budget creates tax cuts for billionaire, millionaires, and corporations.

Our budget should expand to protect healthcare for all. Instead, this budget steals nearly \$2 trillion from lifesaving Medicaid and Medicare.

Our budget should also invest in our crumbling infrastructure, which, of course, creates jobs. But the Republican budget cuts funding for our roads, our bridges, and our railways.

Finally, with nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, our Nation's budget should contain a serious and effective strategy to end poverty, especially for communities of color and

rural communities who have higher poverty rates.

The House Republican budget does not do this. In fact, it slashes programs that help create good-paying jobs for struggling families by \$5.4 trillion. No family in America should be forced to go hungry. Yet, because wages are so low across this country, millions of families now rely on nutrition and food assistance. Yet this budget cuts \$150 billion from SNAP, food assistance, and nutrition assistance, which will create more poverty for people who are working. It doesn't make any sense. It is fundamentally immoral.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Mrs. LEE. Mr. Chair, once again, Republicans are determined to balance their budget on the backs of the most vulnerable; to hand tax breaks to millionaires, and billionaires, and corporations; and slush funds for Pentagon contractors.

This budget is cruel and unusual punishment for those who are not rich. I urge my colleagues to reject this un-American, heartless budget, and to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would say to my colleague from Kentucky, I think the rhetorical device that he is using at the end of each speaker is very effective and it is persuasive. But I would challenge him with this: I think one of the things that we have got to struggle with as a body, both Republicans and Democrats alike, is not being selective on the issue of the deficits. What we can't say is deficits are okay if it involves more spending for all of us as a body to distribute as we see fit, but deficits are not okay if they involve a tax cut and sending money back to individuals within each of our communities.

It is for that reason, again, I have voiced my concerns with regard to some of the components of this budget. But I think that the big issue for me is, simply, we cannot continue to spend as we are and have the ship of America sail forward.

It was Erskine Bowles who was the Democratic Chief of Staff to former President Clinton who observed: "We are walking our way toward the most predictable financial crisis in the history of man if we don't get our arms around spending."

So, for me, while not perfect—and I certainly cede that point—I think the building blocks of what this budget is trying to get toward is a sustainable economy.

How do you have a sustainable economy?

Many of the things that my Democratic colleagues have talked about in

terms of education, workforce development, those things. But it is also about the foundation of: Is our spending sustainable?

You can't go on spending more than you take in forever without having bad things happen at the individual level, at the corporate level, and certainly at the governmental level.

I think it is about: Is our tax load sustainable?

Spending drives tax loads, which is interesting. I pulled a chart that shows for the first 100 years of our country's existence, we spent about 3 percent of GDP. It bumped up after World War II. We are now roughly around 20 percent, and we are on our way to 30 percent.

The question we have to ask in this budget or any other budget like it is: Can we continue to do this without going to the exact spot that Erskine Bowles was talking about?

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Finally, I would simply make this point: Not only can you only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip—and there are certainly limits that have shown themselves, which is around 18 or 20 percent of GDP, regardless of tax rate, up, down; there is that—but there is also this: You can pay me now, or you can pay me later in life.

A deficit is simply a deferred tax. A debt is simply an accumulation of deferred taxes. One of the things, again, we have to get our arms around is that we are stacking up deferred taxes. We are stacking up an accumulation of taxes with debt and deficits. This budget, I think, begins to nudge us in the right direction in doing something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from South Carolina, and I certainly have a great deal of respect for his thoughtfulness. But I also must note that if he votes for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 366,000 hungry children in South Carolina so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and its intent to fast-track tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations. This resolution, first of all, is not serious. It assumes \$800 billion in savings from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which we know will not happen. We have the Treasury Secretary being quoted as saying that "massive tax cuts will actually reduce the deficit. . . ."

Well, we know how that works. You cut taxes for the wealthy and say they

are going to pay for themselves. When that doesn't work and the deficit explodes, you come back and demand massive tax and massive cuts in Medicare, Social Security, and education.

Anyway, the Republican budget resolution, even if it did add up, makes the wrong choices for America. By calling for trillions of dollars in spending reductions, the Republican budget undermines America's investments in infrastructure, the environment, scientific research, and much more.

I wanted to use my limited time to focus on its harmful impacts on the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee, where I serve as the Democratic ranking member. Under the Republican budget resolution, children in need of a healthy school meal, students in pursuit of an affordable college education, and workers in search of skills and training to get a better job all take the back seat to tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

In education, the budget harms students and families by undermining our Nation's education system, and instructs the House Education and the Workforce Committee to eliminate \$20 billion in investments in higher education by providing less funding for Pell grants and student loans.

In terms of other instructions, it instructs the Department of Labor to reduce funding designed to provide job training, protect workers from wage theft, and ensure that there is a sufficient number of inspectors to make sure that workers can come home safely from their jobs.

The budget also threatens child nutrition programs. In fact, during the Budget Committee's hearings, it was made clear that child nutrition programs are a target for savings to pay for tax cuts.

Today, almost 10 million children and 20,000 schools have access to universal, healthy school meals, where children are served nutritious meals without the stigma or need for paperwork. Cutting investments in programs to ensure that children have healthy school meals to partially fund tax cuts shouldn't be our Nation's goal.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal budget is a statement of our values. Unlike other Democratic substitutes that responsibly strengthen our economy and expand opportunity for all Americans, the Republican budget undermines priorities in which students, workers, and their families take a hit, and lays the groundwork for a return to a regressive framework benefiting a wealthy few.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the Republican budget resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), who is the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman BLACK for yielding.

Imagine what our opinion would be of a movie review where the reviewer simply looked at a movie poster and then

wrote the review and came to a conclusion that they didn't like the movie. They didn't listen to the music. They didn't see the direction. They didn't see the pacing. They didn't see the acting. They didn't see the script. They didn't see the cinematography. They saw nothing other than a movie poster and they came to a conclusion.

We would dismiss that and we would say: How ridiculous. How absurd.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the Tax Policy Center did this past week. They wrote a review of a proposal as it relates to tax reform, and they didn't have the details.

Why didn't they have the details?

Because many of these details don't exist.

□ 1515

Specifically, they wrote a review which was very pejorative, which the Wall Street Journal completely trashed. They made this finding, and they had no notion of what the income brackets are like in our proposed tax reform plan. They had no notion about the anti-abuse rules that the Ways and Means Committee is working through to make sure there is not an abusive situation as it relates to pass-through entities. They had no notion about some of the offshore protections that are being contemplated.

Let's avoid the hyperbole. Let's avoid the hackneyed, old, tired, and faded bumper sticker that says that any kind of pro-growth tax reform is a sop to the rich. It is complete nonsense.

I think the proof will be in a tax reform proposal that this House hopefully will be considering in the coming weeks and months that will bring buoyancy, optimism, and a real opportunity for us to take advantage of a once-in-a-generation opportunity for a Tax Code that nobody can defend and nobody likes. But let's get real and evaluate real numbers and not just look at posters and bumper stickers.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Illinois that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,066,376 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Illinois to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member YARMUTH for the time to speak in opposition to the Republican budget.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I am really perplexed as to why the majority continues their assault on American excellence, following President Trump's lead and divesting from investments in American global leadership, science, and infrastructure.

This budget would cut \$5 billion for domestic and international invest-

ments, while violating the Budget Control Act for defense spending and triggering a \$72 billion sequester of all defense accounts.

My Republican colleagues might argue that slashing nondefense investments is necessary to reduce the debt, but this is a false choice. Why would the Republican majority give tax cuts to the very wealthiest if it means this country has to take a backseat to China in research and development or let our own workforce go without the training to fill 21st century jobs?

We know there is a role for government where the private sector has left voids. Many in the private sector believe we should be investing more in basic research, STEM programs, and public transportation. This budget and the appropriations bills that enact this budget have fallen short in these areas.

Given the budget is 6 months late and the appropriations process has actually moved before the budget, we do not have to guess the implications of the budget. We have seen what the Republicans would do under these draconian levels.

Just look, Mr. Chairman, at the Labor, Health, and Education bill that passed the House last month. That bill eliminated entire job training programs like apprenticeship grants, cut the Pell grant surplus, and eliminated Supporting Effective Instruction State grants, a \$2 billion investment that reduces class sizes and improves classroom instruction. This cut would cost 8,500 teachers their jobs.

The transportation spending bill eliminated the Department of Transportation's major infrastructure grant program, TIGER, a direct contradiction to the President's promise to improve our Nation's infrastructure and which Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao confirms "funds innovative projects that improve the safety of America's passengers and goods."

Mr. Chairman, we can and should—we must—do better than this. I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for too long Congress has been allowed to play by a different set of rules than the American people in regard to how we budget. No one lives in a world where there is seemingly an endless supply of money, that is, until you enter the fantasy world of Washington, D.C.

However, hardworking American families, businessmen, and businesswomen live in the real world. They have to budget. They have to prioritize and make trade-off decisions: wants versus needs, what is good and what is essential. The bottom line, they have to live within their means.

But, apparently, our government has been exempt from such basic principles of fiscal responsibility under which we the people must live. The prevailing budget philosophy over the years

among our representative leaders has been as follows: as long as we can borrow it, you can bet your bottom dollar we can spend it. And spend it they have.

This borrowing-and-spending delusion has left us on the brink of bankruptcy. We are \$20 trillion in debt, which puts our country in the worst debt position in the history of America, and this with the sacred constitutional charge to secure liberty for our posterity. That means give freedom to our children.

Mr. Chairman, there is no freedom with this level of debt. If we don't do something about this looming debt crisis and stay on our current spending trajectory, in less than 10 years, we will be at \$30 trillion in debt. We will have \$1 trillion in annual deficit. We will be spending more—get this—on our interest on the debt we owe than on national defense.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. I rise in support of this budget, a budget that begins to rein in this reckless spending, a budget that funds our national priorities and our core responsibilities and initiates a historic opportunity for tax relief for middle and working class families.

Let's stop spending our children's future and stop pretending that they won't inherit a disaster as a result. Let's live in the same reality as every other American. Let's focus on our main mission as a limited Federal Government by rebuilding our military, by maintaining our infrastructure, and by securing our food supply so we can maintain the ability to feed our own people.

Let's unleash our job creators from the highest tax burden in the free world. Let's allow our families and individuals to keep more of their hard-earned money, and let's hand this country safer, stronger, and freer than we found it.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,060,000 hungry children in Texas so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, my fellow alum, for his leadership. I recognize and thank the chairwoman of the committee.

To my good friend that was on the floor, I think he wants limited government when disaster is not in his district.

So I think it is important as a member of this Budget Committee of which I am so very proud of its service, as the Democrats have worked so hard, and as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, a committee called upon

for domestic tranquility and domestic security, might I just add that we are now marking up a bill just a few floors away from this House that is asking for \$15 billion to pay for a border wall in the midst of the horror of tragedy and in the midst of a lowering number of individuals even coming to the United States across the border, the very border wall that was told to us would be paid for by the people of Mexico.

But I think the important point is that my good friends who are supporting this dastardly budget that tears at the fabric of America are, as well, supporting a tax cut for the wealthy that will provide \$2.9 trillion of debt to the American people and increase the debt as well as the deficit. It will mean that working and middle class families will have taxes raised on them by \$470 billion. We will see the heavy brunt of this budget on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

Just a few hours ago, I said the American people do not need to have the government step on them; and I can assure you, with this budget, which cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare, we will step on the American people.

We will end the Medicare guarantee, and it will narrowly shortchange soft power by cutting and decimating the State Department, the very partner that we need to continue the security of the American people, raising defense, of whom I support all of our military. Texas is a military State. But it is \$72 billion above cap, and that is not giving our military personnel their due. It is going above the needs of the military.

We need to be prepared, but this skinny budget will undermine education and the workforce at \$326 billion, energy and commerce at \$1.56 billion, homeland security by \$25 billion, justice and the needs of civil justice by \$67 billion, and veterans by \$49 billion.

It will cut the Community Development Block Grant, and it will hurt Virgin Islands U.S. citizens, Puerto Rico U.S. citizens, and Texas, that is still struggling.

Before I came to this floor, I was engaging with my State about more disaster food stamp sites because I have people who are unhoused in the 18th Congressional District, who are needing the resources.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have individuals who our wonderful first responders had to drag out of the raging waters in Hurricane Harvey. I have homes that were underwater that need disaster relief. I have individuals who are walking along highways like oceans, and then I have children who are with families who do not have jobs

because of Hurricane Harvey, who need the Children's Health Insurance Program or need the disaster food stamps.

This is a budget that steps on the American people. It steps on our disaster relief, and it does not recognize what the United States Government is. It is a refuge and a relief for the American people.

Vote "no" on the Republican budget.

Mr. Chair, as a member of the Budget Committee, a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the proud representative of the 700,000 residents of 18th Congressional District of Texas who are still coping with the devastation caused by Hurricane Harvey, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

Why do I urge every Member of this House to vote against this Republican budget resolution, laughingly called the "Building a Better America Budget," but which more accurately should be named the "Nightmare on Capitol Hill Budget"?

Let us count the ways; here are eight to start.

1. Republican budget mandates \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts to top priorities like disaster relief, education, infrastructure, research, veteran benefits, and programs that expand opportunities for American families.

2. Republican budget provides \$2.9 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while raising taxes on working and middle class families by \$470 billion.

3. The budget includes fast-track reconciliation procedures to push through cuts to programs that tens of millions of Americans count on totaling \$203 billion across 11 House committees.

4. The steep reductions in program investments proposed in this Republican budget fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

5. Republican budget immediately guts investment critical to expanding economic opportunity by lowering the already inadequate austerity-level spending caps by an additional \$5 billion in 2018 and by even more in subsequent years.

6. Republican budget adopts Trumpcare but does even more damage because in addition to depriving more than 20 million Americans of healthcare, denying protection to persons with preexisting conditions, and raising costs for older and low-income adults, cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

7. Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee and calls for replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with fixed payments for the purchase of health insurance, shifting costs and financial risks onto seniors and disabled workers; this represents a \$500 billion cut to Medicare over ten years.

8. The Republican budget focuses too narrowly on the military, shortchanging American soft-power and other essential elements of national security by increasing defense spending by \$72 billion above the cap and hollowing out the State Department and foreign aid agencies with cuts of \$11 billion and environmental and natural resource protection by more than \$6 billion.

Mr. Chair, the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of our values and priorities as a nation.

Sadly, this Republican budget, just like the President's "skinny budget" fails this moral test of government.

America will not be made great by stealing another \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, abandoning seniors and families in need, depriving students of realizing a dream to attend college without drowning in debt, or disinvesting in the working families just to give unwanted tax breaks to wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent.

America will not be positioned to compete and win in the global, interconnected, and digital economy by slashing funding for scientific research, the arts and humanities, job retraining, and clean energy.

Even a cursory review leaves the inescapable conclusion that this budget represents a betrayal—of our values as a nation, and of the promises made by the President during the election campaign.

This Republican budget is not a budget for the real world that real Americans live in but is as much a fantasy budget as the Trump "Skinny Budget" in that it pretends to achieve balance by assuming that painless spending cuts can and will be made by the following standing committees of Congress in the following amounts:

1. Agriculture Committee: cut \$207 billion
2. Armed Services Committee: cut \$33 billion
3. Education and Workforce Committee: \$326 billion
4. Energy and Commerce Committee: \$1.656 trillion
5. Financial Services Committee: cut \$124 billion
6. Homeland Security Committee: cut \$25 billion
7. Judiciary Committee: cut \$67 billion
8. Natural Resources Committee: cut \$59 billion
9. Oversight and Government Reform Committee: cut \$282 billion
10. Transportation and Infrastructure Committee: cut \$3 billion
11. Veterans Affairs Committee: cut \$49 billion
12. Ways and Means Committee: cut \$800 billion
13. Unassigned (i.e., Intelligence; Foreign Affairs; Small Business; Science, Space, and Technology Committees: cut \$747 billion
14. Total Cuts: \$4.38 trillion

To put these reckless, irresponsible, and draconian budget cuts in perspective, it is useful to examine what they mean when applied to the programs depended upon by Americans to rise up the economic ladder, plan for the future, provide for their families, and strive to achieve the American Dream.

The elimination of funding for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) drains resources from communities, even in times of disaster because CDBG provides flexible grants to local communities for a wide range of unique needs, including Meals on Wheels, housing programs, and community infrastructure improvements.

The Republican budget targets disaster grants made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which help families and businesses when their disaster-related property losses are not covered by insurance.

The Republican budget makes higher education more expensive by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs, like Pell Grants, over ten years.

The Republican budget also eliminates subsidized loans, making it difficult for students, particularly low-income students, to afford college and compounds the damage by making it more difficult to repay student loans by eliminating the Public Sector Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs.

The Republican budget's solution to the affordable housing crisis currently facing cities large and small all across the country is to convert all discretionary spending on affordable housing into a block grant, which means there will be even less assistance to help the 71 percent of extremely low income renter households who spend more than half their income on housing.

The Republican budget cuts \$154 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) over the next ten years by essentially converting it to a block grant, cutting off funding for eligible individuals and requiring cash-strapped states to either fill in the gap or take away food assistance from millions of working families, children, and seniors.

Mr. Chair, as economists and policy experts have documented time and again, immigration reform would expand the size of the U.S. workforce, and in turn would increase the size of the economy and reduce deficits.

The Republican budget, however, again rejects comprehensive immigration reform that would bring clear and just rules for those seeking citizenship and help secure the nation's borders.

In doing so, the Republican budget squanders an opportunity to reduce deficits by an estimated \$900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and extend the solvency of Social Security.

Mr. Chair, none of us can forget the President's favorite boast and central campaign promise that he would build a wall on our southern border and guarantee that Mexico would be made to pay for it.

The Republican budget deprives the President of the opportunity to make good on his foolish boast by forcing American taxpayers to foot the bill for President Trump's \$1.6 billion border wall that will do nothing to stop unauthorized entry into the country and will not fix our broken immigration system.

The Republican budget continues to target federal employees by cutting their compensation and benefits by at least another \$163 billion over ten years, which comes on top of the \$182 billion in cuts federal employees have already absorbed in the form of higher retirement contributions, pay freezes, and furloughs.

The Republican budget puts U.S. transportation network on the road to ruin by slashing transportation spending, by \$254 billion over ten years, or 25 percent below current estimates.

The Republican budget cuts hurts veterans by cutting veterans benefits by nearly \$50 billion over the next ten years, with newly eligible veterans experiencing cuts in programs that pay for education benefits as well as loan guarantees.

Finally, Mr. Chair, it must be pointed out that the Republican budget's pretension to balance is based on reliance on trillions of dollars in budget games and gimmicks to rig the numbers.

The Republican budget counts a dubious \$1.8 trillion "economic dividend" from cutting taxes and taking away consumer protections that is not backed up by any credible analysis and assumes \$1.5 trillion of this "dividend" will go toward deficit reduction.

The Republican budget assumes, despite all precedent and evidence to the contrary, that tax reform will be revenue neutral, even though Republican tax plans are projected to lose between \$3 trillion and \$7 trillion.

Given these budgetary shenanigans, never could it more truly be said that "figures don't lie, but liars figure."

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards.

Because the American people deserve to know exactly what ills Republicans have in store for them, I strongly oppose H. Con. Res. 71 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this reckless, cruel, and heartless measure that will do nothing to improve the lives or well-being of middle and working class families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been an honor to work with the chairman of the Budget Committee as a new Member of Congress because it is such a learning curve to understand the challenges that we have in our country in so many ways, but especially on the fiscal side of things.

I would like to spend my time talking to my grandchildren right now. I am talking to your grandchildren as well.

In the last 48 hours, I have had an opportunity—it was more of a responsibility—to chat with my grandchildren about the horrific events that occurred in Las Vegas. When you are 8 or 16, you assimilate those things in different ways. I talk to them a lot about responsibility for behavior, responsibility for money, and responsibility for their own lifestyles.

I talked to them today to say that we are not going to put you into the debt hole caused by the spending that has occurred over the last decades in this country. We are not going to pass that along to you, because the hole is only getting deeper and more extensive, and we are passing it along to those next generations. Not only is it not right, it is morally wrong and absolutely irresponsible.

We have to ask ourselves the questions: If not now, then when do we

begin to bend the spending curve? If we don't do it, then who will?

We know that mandatory spending within our grandchildren's lifetime will eclipse almost, if not, 100 percent of the Federal budget. That means no money for research, for medical, for education, and for all of those discretionary dollars that are so wisely spent.

We have to begin to bend the spending curve now, and that means cuts in mandatory spending, while responsibly using the other dollars, the discretionary dollars, to advance good programs.

□ 1530

That takes discipline, that takes effort, that takes making tough decisions that are unpopular but necessary for the future of our country.

Our Budget Committee wrestled long and hard to present what you are going to vote on, and I am proud of the fact that with the discourse and debate that we had over tough issues, in the end, the American people are taking a next first step forward towards fiscal responsibility that reflects the reality that we owe to our grandchildren, just like our parents and grandparents felt that they needed to do for us during the Great Depression and a couple of World Wars to make sure that we have a physically viable country. This budget is a next first step.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and an alumnus of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, ugly is ugly.

This is an ugly budget, and it exists primarily to be a vehicle for tax cuts for the already fortunate, the top 1 or 2 percent in America, at the expense of everybody else. It will hemorrhage red ink for as far as the eye can see.

That is not a theory. That is what happened in the previous massive tax cuts, both under Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush.

Let me give you one example of the ruinous aspects of this budget, and it has to do with Federal employees.

This budget cuts Federal employee compensation and benefits by another \$163 billion over the next 10 years, \$32 billion of which is included in reconciliation and instructions which I sought to strike with an amendment submitted to the Rules Committee that was not allowed.

The Republican cuts include higher retirement contributions; elimination of the FERS supplement, which law enforcement retirees heavily benefit

from; lower annuities by changing the retirement calculation and reduced healthcare benefits; a 10 percent reduction in the Federal workforce at non-security agencies, even though nearly all of the workforce increases, since 2001, occurred in security-related agencies.

The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cybersecurity attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe. Veterans make up 31 percent of those Federal employees.

Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of this country's deficit and debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed nearly \$200 billion toward reducing the country's deficit in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions.

We should honor and revere the service of our Federal workforce, not denigrate it with the attacks included in this ugly budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my dear friend.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, I came to the floor today to weigh in on this budget debate.

I find it incredible that my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be in a state of denial on the fact that this country, the greatest on the planet, is \$20 trillion in debt.

These are the same people in opposition, Mr. Chairman, who will present a budget tomorrow that will add nearly \$3 trillion in more taxes and more than \$6 trillion in more spending. This debt is going to land squarely on the shoulders of our children, our grandchildren, and—let me just say it for the record—is so large that it is going to land on our grandchildren's grandchildren.

When does this insanity stop?

There is not an easy way out of the mess. This budget puts us on a path to fiscal sanity. It targets Federal spending that is outside the purview of the Appropriations Committee.

The budget ensures a strong national defense. It puts us on a path to fiscal sustainability, and it gives us the opportunity to do deficit reduction. The budget has progrowth policies that move us in a more sustainable direction.

I understand the opposition coming from the other side. Their answer, Mr. Chairman, as always, is: let's tax more and let's spend more. That is not a responsible course. It won't lead to a good outcome for this country.

Mr. Chairman, let me finally say that it is time we had a national conversation about the math problem facing this country. This budget starts that conversation. I encourage all my col-

leagues to support it, recognize where we are as a country, and resolve to do something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 200,000 hungry children in Arkansas all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

You have got to get a charge out of what you are hearing and listening to today.

If one were to draw a chart from 2001 and 2003 to the present time, what contributes to the deficit and the debt?

I am glad to hear someone from the other side talk about that debt, because I thought you forgot all about it. This budget seems to think that you have amnesia.

If you look at the chart, what grows the debt? The tax cuts that you put into effect in 2001 and 2003, which helped the rich and brought us to an economic abyss 4 years later. You did it, and you are trying to do it again.

So we will see if Democrats are irrelevant, since you didn't include us, so far, up to this point. So much for our bipartisanship.

You asked for \$203 billion in mandatory spending cuts across 11 committees. It will have to be reconciled with a Senate budget that explodes our deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Good luck.

While this Republican budget claims to balance in 10 years, it does so with unnamed cuts, gimmicks, and magical thinking about the economic growth.

The budget is built on the same premise on which you tried to cut the ACA, the Affordable Care Act. Let's take \$750,000, cut down on Medicaid, and we will give that money in tax cuts to the very wealthy. That was your plan. You saw how the country received it.

This budget cuts Medicare by \$487 billion by eliminating the Medicare guarantee. How can you justify that and look into the eyes of seniors in this country?

It assumes repeal of the Affordable Care Act. You want to use the Affordable Care Act's money, but you want to dissolve it, choke it, and starve it. It assumes an appeal of that act, which would take 23 million Americans off their healthcare insurance.

It assumes a \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid—it is in your budget—and \$2.5 trillion in other mandatory cuts, with no specifics.

The gentleman from Michigan needs to study the facts. You have got to get him the facts.

The greatest contributor, as I said, were the two tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. We know the breakdown of where that went to.

This is not a serious budget. It is a desperate attempt to enact deficit-exploding tax cuts.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PASCRELL. I am making all my remarks through the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, 1 percent would be the recipients of 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts within 10 years.

This budget, like the phony tax plan, is a joke and is insulting to us as Members of Congress. I know you have some problems with your own Conference. I don't know how you are going to figure that out. Don't expect us to bail you out.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentlewoman from Tennessee for her leadership during this budget process. She has done an amazing job of showing wisdom and patience and negotiating this all through this process. My sincere thanks are given to the gentlewoman.

This budget is a critical step in getting our economy growing and our national debt under control. Not only does it balance in 10 years and put our country on the path to fiscal stability, it also lays the groundwork for tax reform.

With this budget, we are demonstrating that it is possible to have fiscal discipline and keep our promises to the American people. We can no longer continue to kick the can down the road on our mandatory spending crisis. We are leaving behind more and more debt for our children and grandchildren, and it is morally wrong.

We must put politics aside and have tough conversations to ensure that we can keep the promises that we have made to Americans and to future generations.

This budget does not solve our mandatory spending crisis overnight, but it begins that process by achieving a \$203 billion savings in mandatory spending.

By passing this budget, we will also kick-start tax reform. I have said time and time again that America should be the best place in the world to do business, yet we have a Tax Code that tells our businesses that they should take their jobs and their profits overseas.

Every American benefits from lower taxes and growing the economy. The tax reform framework we released last week will do just that. Americans will get to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks, companies will have the freedom to reinvest in their businesses and workers, and more people can move to the American Dream.

Before we can make these changes, we must pass the budget. The reconciliation instructions in the budget will set us on a path to comprehensive tax reform in both the House and the Senate.

This is not just a conversation about dollars and cents. It is about Americans who are counting on us to keep our commitments. We must do the tough work of reforming our mandatory spending programs and reforming our Tax Code.

I am excited to support this budget to build a better America and pledge to continue working toward comprehensive mandatory spending reform.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,519,461 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Georgia to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) the Democratic Caucus chairman.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Kentucky, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget proposal is just cruel. It isn't just cruel; it will set our country backwards. It is worse than cruel.

It puts more than \$5 trillion in cuts on the backs of working and middle class Americans. At the same time, it doles out billions of dollars in tax breaks to wealthy individuals, while leaving everyday Americans empty-handed.

Are you a senior who relies on Medicare or Medicaid for important healthcare needs?

Too bad, says the Republican budget. Your care will simply be cut.

Are you a student looking to get a good education and launch your career?

Tough luck, says the Republican budget. Pell grants are on the chopping block, if Republicans have their way.

Are you struggling to recover after a natural disaster?

Forget about it, says the Republican budget. Grants from FEMA and other programs that help rebuild our Nation will be eliminated.

The facts are clear: this Republican budget does nothing to invest in America, the American people, or our future. It cuts funds for our crumbling infrastructure, rather than rebuilding our schools and roads and putting millions back to work. It slashes investment in green energy technology, rather than preparing a new generation of Americans to lead us into the economy of tomorrow.

Worst of all, it ramps up funding for endless wars overseas while gutting programs that help the brave veterans who served their country so well.

Eighty years ago, then-President Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke of a

national nightmare when he saw a third of our Nation "ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished."

□ 1545

When you look at this budget, it is not hard to see why FDR's words haunt us to this day, because this budget would take us back to that terrible time when dreams were dashed, futures were uncertain, and hope was all but lost, put back to a time when people were hurting.

That is not the America I want. That is not the America our constituents deserve. They deserve a better deal for all Americans.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Democrats believe that our constituents deserve a better deal, a better deal for all Americans, a plan to bring better jobs, better wages, and a better future to everyone, and a vision to give every American the opportunity to prosper and to succeed.

That is the kind of America we should be working towards. That is the better idea that America should be working towards. That is why I will vote "no" on this terrible plan.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I tell you what is cruel. That is doing the same thing over and over again and getting the same results. That is cruel. Especially when we look in our grandchildren's eyes and say: We are really sorry we didn't take 40-year-old programs and reform them so they could be better, so we could reduce the spending, we could give good services and reduce the spending. That is cruel when you don't do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Building a Better America budget. Last month, our country's national debt exceeded \$20 trillion. Interest payments under that alone are scheduled to go up to \$768 billion per year and will skyrocket to \$1 trillion should these artificially low interest rates return to their normal levels.

The debt not only threatens to bankrupt our country, it threatens our children's future and the American Dream.

Now, we can't change the culture of spending in Washington overnight, but this budget puts us on the right path to fiscal sustainability. Our budget balances in 10 years, works to begin paying down the debt, and promotes job growth policies like tax, regulatory, and entitlement reform.

For the first time in decades, this budget resolution finally directs Congress to address mandatory spending, the main driver of these deficits. As this graph shows, if nothing is done to address entitlement programs and our

interest payments, mandatory spending will fully eclipse the Federal budget in the next few years.

Now, politicians in Washington have promised to address exploding debt and deficits for years, but now we have the opportunity to actually do it. We cannot solve our debt crisis, however, without economic growth. That is why our budget provides reconciliation instructions for tax reform.

Today we have a Tax Code that is overly complicated, punishes work, rewards special interests, and discourages job creation and investments here in America. The result has been an anemic recovery of only 1 or 2 percent. This stagnation has made it harder for families in Minnesota and all over the United States to realize the American Dream.

That is what this is about. Every time tax reform has been tried in the 1920s, in the 1960s, in the 1980s, it has worked to make America globally competitive by encouraging private sector investment that is more productive.

That is why today I urge my colleagues to support this budget, tax reform, economic growth, and fiscal sanity.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my friend and colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 216,000 hungry children in Minnesota so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's 2018 budget, which would dramatically increase our deficit and debt by trillions of dollars to give millionaires and billionaires a massive tax cut.

Don't be fooled. This plan directly benefits President Trump, his family, and his administration, including Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, Education Secretary DeVos, and Commerce Secretary Ross, but offers breadcrumbs for the middle class and nothing for low-income Americans.

The craziest thing about all of this is that Republicans have been crowing for 7 years that the deficit is too large and that it is hurting our job growth, yet here they go abandoning their principles to cash out their rich benefactors.

I also want to talk about some of the ways Republicans partially pay for this tax cut for the rich. During the same week that Equifax and Wells Fargo executives are testifying about the harm they have caused to millions of Americans, Republicans propose gutting the Consumer Bureau, which has successfully helped millions of our constituents receive compensation by effectively eliminating its funding and independence.

What is more, Republicans would eliminate the backup authority to safely unwind failing megabanks without harm to our economy. Rather than eliminate this tool, we should instead be talking about how to break up bad megabanks like Wells Fargo, who repeatedly break the law and harm millions of consumers. Yet, both the Consumer Bureau and the megabank wind-down authority are sacrificed to pay for the richest 1 percent tax cut.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to reject this measure.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Building a Better America budget. That is truly what it does. For too long, our government has spent money on a credit card with our children and grandchildren's name on it. It shocks some here in this Chamber, but the era of overspending is over.

Adopting this budget will allow us to deliver the key promises we have made to Americans: getting our spending under control, balancing the budget, and paving the way to deliver meaningful tax reform.

This resolution balances the budget within 10 years and produces a \$9 billion surplus in fiscal year 2027. It achieves deficit reduction of \$6.5 trillion over 10 years. It also reduces the size of our bloated government by giving instructions to 11 House committees to achieve at least \$203 billion in mandatory savings.

This resolution curbs our unsustainable spending while maintaining a strong defense and protecting critical programs like Medicare.

There is much work to be done to create jobs and get our economy moving beyond the pathetic 2 percent growth. This budget is an important step to doing just that.

This budget allows us to deliver on our promise to the American people to fix our broken Tax Code. Workers living paycheck to paycheck, like my parents did, need relief and they need it now. We cannot delay any longer.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek to raise taxes by \$3 trillion and simply spend more. I suggest they study how that approach worked in Greece.

I urge my colleagues to support the Building a Better America budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, here is the Republican and the President's case. They want you to

believe that if you cut corporate taxes, if you cut taxes on the investor class, that this is going to raise wages. That is the President's argument.

Here is what I don't understand. If you want to raise wages, why not just raise wages? Why not just give the tax credits to working families?

The President's Wall Street bankers have a different theory that only gets credence in the beltway. This is not about economics. This is about common sense. Think about it. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that the better way to raise wages is not to cut taxes for corporations, but to actually give the tax relief to people making under \$75,000.

You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you cut taxes for shareholders and corporate CEOs, they are probably going to invest it overseas. If you cut the taxes or give the tax relief to people making 50 grand in Michigan or Ohio, they are going to spend it and create jobs in the United States.

This is just common sense. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you really want to create jobs, invest in technical training for the million skills gap we have, instead of putting hopes on corporate CEOs who already have record profits, that somehow they are going to create more jobs.

Mr. Chair, it used to be that there were serious thinkers on the Republican side, people like Jack Kemp. I disagreed with him, but at least he had innovative ideas of enterprise zones and how to really create jobs. But for the past 20 years, the Republican party has been devoid of ideas.

It is a mantra: tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Oh, we are changing into a digital economy. How do we solve it? Tax cuts. That is not a constructive solution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to talk about common sense just for a moment. Common sense is if our other OECD countries have an average corporate rate of 18 to 20 percent and ours is between 35 and 39, and we have companies that now decide to go overseas. It seems to me to be common sense to at least be equal to what other countries are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the national debt is a staggering \$20 trillion. We are handcuffing future generations with what—if we don't take action—will become an unsurmountable fiscal crisis. This budget resolution before us today is a step toward putting our Nation back on a sustainable fiscal path. But even more, it will lead to greater prosperity and opportunity for American families and generations to come.

My own experience as a 17-year-old, I had the good fortune to be able to buy a small construction company from my older brother for \$1,000 when I was

fresh out of high school. Through a lot of hard work and a dedicated team of individuals, we were able to grow that company, employing over 150 people with family-sustaining jobs, family-sustaining wages.

That is what we call the American Dream. There are countless stories like that: the idea that we can begin with little or nothing, work hard, play by the rules, and achieve our dreams.

Unfortunately, in today's economic environment, for many, the American Dream seems out of reach.

Mr. Chair, that is why this budget is so important. Not only will it put us on a sustainable fiscal path, but it lays out the path forward for tax reform that will give American families the opportunity to improve their lives.

Consider a constituent that I spoke to this week. This particular constituent is a single father of 5 in Lancaster County. He asked me if our tax plan means more money in his paycheck. Now, he makes it work today, but it is difficult for him, and he could use some help. This is exactly the kind of hardworking American we are trying to help with our reforms.

Americans deserve this budget because it lets us pass tax reform to help families like the one I just described. They deserve it because too many Americans today do everything right but still struggle to make ends meet. Americans deserve it because they should have a more honest Federal Tax Code and a simplified filing process that allows them to spend more time with their family, to save for their children's college fund, or to plan for their retirement.

Passing this budget helps to make these things possible, and I strongly urge my colleagues in this Chamber to support it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 734,000 hungry children in Pennsylvania all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3.8 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, debating this budget resolution is a partisan and pointless exercise, and I will point out to the chairman that it is October, after the fiscal year has expired and after we have already passed every single appropriations bill out of the House of Representatives, and, I might add, a continuing budget resolution.

□ 1600

Just as when we considered it in committee this summer, this resolution stands as a demonstration of the

majority's willful and disgraceful neglect of the needs of the American people.

With so many critical legislative issues for us to discuss, the majority has decided it is a better use of our time to discuss tax breaks for millionaires and wealthy corporations; taking healthcare away from 20 million Americans; blowing up our deficit with an ineffective, immoral border wall; and gutting crucial investments in jobs, education, and medical research.

Instead, this House should be enacting legislation to expand background checks and ban assault weapons to combat senseless firearm violence after this Nation witnessed, once again, the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

This House should be passing the Dream Act to protect DREAMers who call this Nation home and protect them from this administration's heartless deportations.

Finally, instead of wasting taxpayer dollars and our constituents' time with this harmful budget resolution, this House should be reauthorizing CHIP, the bipartisan-backed Children's Health Insurance Program, which expired over the weekend and which potentially is going to leave children who badly need healthcare insurance twisting in the wind without it.

Congressional Republicans have chosen instead to bring this incredibly irresponsible and extreme bill to the floor.

In stunning ignorance of reality, it assumes TrumpCare will still pass. Just how many times must the majority be reminded that TrumpCare is not going to become law and the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land that Americans support?

How many times will the majority try to cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, cut Medicare benefits, and raise insurance costs on elderly and low-income Americans?

Enough is enough. Instead of pandering to the well connected and our worst impulses, this budget should embody America's best values, and it is far from it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sadly, this budget does not reflect our responsibility to care for and invest in the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the proposed budget resolution, which will provide the spending cuts that Washington needs and give a pathway to reconciliation for tax reform.

Our national debt sits at an astronomical \$20 trillion and is projected to

reach close to \$30 trillion within 10 years. Washington's out-of-control spending hinders our economy, Mr. Chair, and by kicking the can down the road, it puts the financial burden on the backs of our children and of our grandchildren.

Not only is our debt unsustainable, but high levels of government debt needs substantial resources, and taxpayers' dollars must go to servicing our debt. Over the next decade, the cost to service our debt will rise 219 percent, meaning we will spend close to \$800 billion by the year 2027 simply to pay the interest on our debt.

This budget reduces spending by \$5.4 trillion over a 10-year window. It does not expand the size of Federal Government. It does not encroach on State or local authority.

This is a conservative path forward and will help us accomplish what we came here to do: meaningful tax reform.

While I would like to see our government make even more wise choices with taxpayers' dollars, this budget resolution puts us on the road to achieving that goal. With this resolution as a vehicle for updating our outdated Tax Code, Mr. Chair, I truly believe we can accomplish something that has not been done in over 30 years.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 941,169 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in South Carolina to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the budget before us today sets up a tax plan that would harm hundreds of thousands of working families in Illinois and millions across the Nation.

It has been widely reported that this tax plan enables a budget that would eliminate the State and local tax deduction, also known as the SALT deduction, S-A-L-T, SALT deduction.

In my home State of Illinois, this SALT deduction represents a sizeable portion of taxpayers' income, accounting for approximately 6 percent of the average itemizers' average gross income.

Within my district, the SALT deduction allows families in Cook County to save an average of \$4,000 a year. In Kane and DuPage Counties, the numbers are even greater, \$5,000 and \$6,600, respectively.

Simply put, Mr. Chair, this SALT deduction prohibits double taxation on

working families. That is why numerous bipartisan and nonpartisan organizations have spoken out in support of the SALT deduction, including the National Governors Association and the United States Conference of Mayors.

If this budget passes, the tax structure it creates will cause a dramatic increase in the tax burden on working families.

There is no doubt that our Tax Code needs to be updated, but we need to do so in a way that upholds the President's promise that working families would not see a tax increase.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this double taxation budget and this increase in taxes on working families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and I thank Chairman BLACK for her hard work developing this blueprint.

Our Nation's national debt now exceeds \$20 trillion. While there are many factors driving our Nation's fiscal health and long-term spending outlook, I am working to address one of those items this year: our Nation's need to dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

In 1982, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and enacted a formal nuclear waste management program for the Federal Government and set a 1998 deadline for the Department of Energy to begin to dispose of used fuel. Nuclear utilities signed a contract with DOE requiring this deadline to be met. Unfortunately, the Federal Government did not meet that deadline and has yet to take title to this material.

Since then, the Federal Government has been held liable for not meeting this deadline, and the courts awarded financial damages to utilities due to the breach of contract. The payments resulting from these lawsuits are paid from a specific Department of the Treasury account, known as the judgment fund, a permanent, unlimited fund not subject to budget caps or annual appropriations.

Since 2009, DOE's total liability has escalated from \$12 billion to nearly \$30 billion, or over \$2 billion in total liability for each year of delay. Last year alone, the nuclear waste costs were about one-third of all Federal Government payments due to litigation. Put another way, American taxpayers are paying over \$2 million every single day in which we neglect our moral and legal obligation to permanently dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

It is time to get our nuclear waste management program back on track. Bipartisan legislation I introduced, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which passed out of the Committee of Energy and Commerce by an overwhelming vote of

49-4, would do just that. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address this budget challenge.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK again for her leadership and support of this important issue.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, first, let me thank Chairman BLACK for her leadership on this remarkable budget.

When I ask my constituents from Texas about their biggest concerns for their family and the Nation's future, the overwhelming response is about the debt our country faces. Washington's spending just continues to grow too fast. Our national debt has topped \$20 trillion, and without action, our great country is poised for a difficult and painful fiscal reckoning.

Today, with this budget, we have the opportunity to do something about it, the opportunity to tackle our Nation's fiscal challenges head-on with a strong, two-part approach.

First, this budget provides real fiscal responsibility. It balances within 10 years. It preserves and improves Medicare for the long term. It returns power to our State and local governments so they can do what is best for their communities, not Washington.

Now, these measures get us moving in the right direction, but fiscal accountability is only one crucial piece of the puzzle. If we want a healthier American economy for the long term, we need a growing American economy for the long term. That is why this budget by Chairwoman BLACK also lays the groundwork—the runway, if you will—for a once-in-a-generation pro-growth, pro-family, pro-middle class tax reform.

The House and the Senate are unified with President Trump in delivering a new Tax Code for a new era of American prosperity. We have released bold ideas to deliver more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for the American people, especially our middle class families.

We are united in getting tax reform legislation to the President's desk this year, but if we do not pass the budget, tax reform doesn't move forward. So I would like to ask all my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle: Where do you stand? Are you content with an unsustainable national debt, a slow-growth economy, and a broken pro-Washington, pro-special interest Tax Code, or do you stand in support of fiscal responsibility and pro-growth tax reform that allows all Americans to keep more of their paychecks?

This is our time to show the American people we don't accept that slow-growth future.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman BLACK of the Budget Committee for her remarkable leadership in bringing this budget forward.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 37½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution.

On behalf of Chairman HENSARLING, I would like to take a moment to speak about the instructions given by the chairwoman of the Budget Committee to the Financial Services Committee to find savings of \$14 billion.

Now, that is what we were sent here to do: to find those places where it makes sense to cut the budget and we don't harm anything. In fact, in this case, the Financial Services Committee is going to help things in rural communities by finding those savings that the chairwoman instructed us to find.

Several years ago, the Democratic majority passed the Dodd-Frank resolution, the Dodd-Frank Act. That enshrined too big to fail. It created unaccountable agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Earlier this year, this body passed H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act. That was trying to prune back the capabilities of CFPB to hurt the rural areas, which it had been doing in my district.

Carlsbad National Bank recently shared with us how it takes them 185 pages to complete a mortgage loan, 185 pages for a small bank for just the simple resolution of buying a home.

Many times our community banks are simply stopping to offer that service. No one else is willing to come in to New Mexico and lend into these rural communities. So we are facing a very serious problem.

Sometimes community banks are having to consolidate. That hurts rural communities even worse, because the consolidation usually moves the bank's headquarters outside the State or outside the community. It weakens the fabric of the community.

So by finding the savings in this budget resolution which we were instructed to do, we not only save the money, but we also stop the encroaching regulations that CFPB is putting out, harming the rural communities, harming rural homeowners.

So for those reasons, I gladly support H. Con. Res. 71, the Budget Resolution Act, and urge its passage.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK and Chairman BISHOP for including ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, in the budget process.

I am looking forward to this. With this legislation, we contribute money to solving some of our national debt.

The small area of 1002 in the National Wildlife Refuge is an area of 2,000 acres, smaller than Dulles Airport.

□ 1615

Potentially, though, we have a little over 20 billion barrels of oil. Think how much money that would bring to the Treasury immediately through the bidding process.

This is an issue I have been working on for the last 45 years. It is time we passed it. Once it went to the Senate, and President Clinton vetoed it because it wouldn't help us with that embargo we had at that time.

Now is the time to make sure this Nation is independent totally. It won't happen overnight, but only Congress can do this. It is not a wilderness area. It is designated to be drilled at the behest of the Congress for the good of the Nation.

It will reduce the debt. Again, I said I expect bids of about \$10 billion to \$20 billion just to have the right to drill. With the new royalties that are coming down from the Secretary of the Interior, we will have not only a large amount going into the Treasury, we will have about 776,000 new jobs created by the discovery of this oil.

We have already seen what we have been able to do in other States by fracking and becoming more energy independent and how that controls the OPEC nations. But this is the area which oil has been developed by God. It is only going to be available to the United States, and it is time that this Congress steps forth and brings this to fruition for the people.

We will hear a lot from the other side of those interest groups that have no knowledge at all about the area I am talking about. We hear that the caribou herd will be affected. It is ironic that Prudhoe Bay has produced 17 billion barrels of oil, and when we started, there were 5,000 caribou. Now we have about 31,000 caribou. Oil didn't disturb them.

Oil is not evil. It is the necessity for this Nation socially to create jobs. It will make a healthier economy. I am asking my colleagues again to consider this legislation. It is necessary for this Nation. It is necessary, very frankly, for the good of this Congress. With \$20 trillion in debt, I have yet to hear anything that will create new wealth. You can cut all you want to cut, I will cut what I want to cut, but you have to create new wealth. You have to bring it into the fold of the general budget process and for the economy of this Nation.

Let's not keep putting our heads in the sand and saying: Oh, we don't need to do this; it is not the time to do it. Now is the time for the good of the Nation and because we are in debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this in this budget. I compliment Mrs. BLACK and her work, her chairmanship, on the budget. It is a very difficult process.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time so we can hear from the Joint Economic Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, we are making a choice today about the kind of future that we want. We can choose a future of more deficits and more debt piled onto our children, or we can continue having a weak economy where people in their prime working years can keep leaving the job market.

Or we can choose a future where America's job creators, people who go to work every day, decide that they will be better off starting or moving their business overseas.

Or we can choose the future of more of the same, and it is not the wealthy who will suffer more of the same. It is the most vulnerable, low-income Americans trying to climb out of poverty. It is the middle class families who find it harder and harder to keep up, to get ahead—people like my dad, a machine operator who is now retired as a United Steelworker.

It is our children and our grandchildren who will have to pay tomorrow for the mistakes that we make today.

But we can instead choose a better future, Mr. Chair, where the government learns to live within its means and move forward toward balanced budgets; a future where job-creating small businesses aren't punished by our Tax Code when they succeed; a future where we stop losing jobs and businesses to foreign countries with lower tax rates, when workers can finally get the pay raises they deserve, more money in their pockets, and more prosperity is widespread, not just concentrated on our coasts and a few large urban cities.

We will be voting soon on a budget that restores fiscal responsibility and paves the way for a world class Tax Code built for growth and a better future for our kids and our grandkids.

Yesterday, at the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Chair, we held a hearing on the decline in business startups, the engines of job growth and innovation in America, and the role tax reform could play in reversing this downward spiral.

Among other things, here is what we heard yesterday at the hearing. First, simplify the Tax Code. Entrepreneurs spend way too much time and way too much money complying with the Tax Code instead of focusing on growing their businesses.

Second, lower the tax rates that our companies and employers pay. That is something that foreign governments around the world, both friends and foes, have already done to attract more jobs, more businesses.

Third, let companies of all sizes write off the cost of their growth-producing investment immediately, this is called expensing, instead of deducting them slowly from the taxes over many years under very complicated depreciation rules.

Fourth, stop punishing our businesses for investing overseas profits by bringing them back home to America. Move away from the system that double taxes American companies that do business overseas.

These steps will boost economic growth. Growing markets will give entrepreneurs the confidence to risk starting a business, which many won't even do today, as we have seen more and more startups not making it to the starting line.

More startups create more jobs, an average of six new jobs per startup, and more economic growth means continuing to spread that prosperity.

I am happy to report that these recommendations are a large part of our tax reform framework that has just recently been unveiled: simplicity, lower tax rates, expensing, stop double taxing our American businesses that do business abroad, reward investment in America, and boost economic growth.

We need a Tax Code that makes America the best place in the world to do business and grow your business and keep your business.

Our job creators who are corporate taxpayers now face the highest tax rate in the developed world. While other countries aggressively lower their tax rate, Mr. Chair, to attract new businesses, we left our businesses standing still.

Mr. Chair, the tax reform framework would slash our corporate rate from the highest in the world, at 35 percent, to a competitive 20 percent. Instead of the worst, we get much better. In a global economy, that is just not a luxury, that is a necessity.

Our tax reform framework will not only help American companies compete with foreign ones, but also bring capital back to America to invest and grow jobs here at home.

Let's look at how the Tax Code is punishing our small businesses who pay individual taxes as pass-throughs, not just with complex taxes but also high tax rates.

When Main Street businessowners went to sleep on December 31 of 2012, their highest tax rate was 35 percent. When they woke up the following year in January of 2013, Mr. Chair, their top

rate spiked to 44.6 percent due to Obama administration policies.

Many on the other side of the aisle will say that most small businesses don't pay the top rate, but taxpayers who do pay the top rate, those small businesses, in many cases, are responsible for much of our economic activity and our employment as pass-through businesses.

Every small business owner dreams of being successful, and the high top rate punishes the very success that we want them to achieve in America. Adding to the Federal rate, the tax rate, the local rate, many of these small businesses pay over 50 percent in taxes.

The tax reform framework not only slashes rates for American employers but our small businesses as well. The top rate for pass-throughs will be 25 percent.

Another feature of the tax reform framework, Mr. Chair, would allow businesses of all sizes to deduct their business expenses, their investments, immediately through expensing. This would encourage companies to make the kind of investment like buying state-of-the-art equipment that would lead businesses to grow, create more jobs, pay better wages, higher economic growth, and the best part of all, larger paychecks for workers.

Mr. Chair, we have a choice to make. We can turn our backs on the most vulnerable Americans and doom them to more of the same, subpar growth, stagnant wages, more debt, less opportunity, a complex and outdated Tax Code that punishes job creation and investment in America, or I hope we choose a better path forward, a better future for Americans, bigger paychecks, and it starts today with the passing of this budget.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this budget.

Ultimately, a national budget is like a deal between the American taxpayers and Congress about how this country will spend their money. Anyone who looks at the fine print in this budget plan can tell, with a glance, that the American people want, need, and deserve a better deal.

In the Republican tax plan that goes with this budget, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts.

A better deal would drop plans to slash Medicare and Medicaid to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthiest few—a deal that instead would be a bipartisan effort to bring middle class tax relief, badly needed investments, and greater opportunity.

But what we have instead is a budget that cuts \$5.4 trillion in spending over 10 years, including \$4.4 trillion in cuts to the mandatory programs that help average Americans get and stay ahead.

These aren't just paper cuts. These are huge cuts—cuts that would cause enormous damage in the lives of children, students, veterans, and other Americans. About half of these cuts in nondefense spending are in programs that help people who need the help the most—cuts in programs that provide food to those in need, programs that help students from low-income families afford a college education. They even have cuts in the badly needed disaster relief that is helping so many in our country.

In fact, by 2027, more than one-third of the resources for low- and middle-income people would be gone. Struggling Americans deserve a better deal than that. And who pays under the Republican tax plan? Seniors, single parents, and middle class families, it goes up.

Nondefense discretionary is already at its lowest level since the category has been tracked. Republicans want to cut even more, and so they target senior citizens and healthcare.

This budget cuts half a trillion dollars from Medicare, replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with a voucher-like system and increasing its eligibility age to 67.

□ 1630

The CBO estimates that these cuts would cause part B premiums to increase 25 percent by 2020. And this budget claims that it "saves" \$1.5 trillion by repealing the Affordable Care Act, even though they have already tried to repeal it about 60 times on this floor, without success, thank God, and the American people have made it clear that they don't want it repealed.

They still have no replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act. So that means that they would just be leaving millions without health insurance and threatening the coverage of all those with preexisting conditions and chronic illnesses, and would leave millions facing huge premium increases.

Their plan also cuts \$114 billion from Medicaid, ripping away coverage from low-income families and the disabled. This is just plain wrong. Our seniors deserve a much better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak a little bit here about the tax reform opportunities that we are seeing now.

Some people don't like to admit it, but there is a proven, inescapable correlation among tax treatment, capital investment, and job creation. As this chart right here shows, unequivocally correlating an investment of capital with economic change, when you have more money put in, you get more jobs and more economic growth. And some people don't like to admit that connection, but it is inescapable. It has been that way ever since the first commerce took place in the Roman era.

We have a second chart that shows the post-World War II GDP change, an average of 3.1. The American middle class was built on opportunity, lower taxes, economic stimuli, and growth. It wasn't built on this 2.3 to 1.6 that we are going to get if we don't get back to some serious business-centric, investment-centric tax reform.

There is another equally inescapable fact, and that is that capital is fungible. If tax treatment nurtures it, like watering your yard, it will grow. If not, it will be invested somewhere else. Just look at Texas, just look at my home State of Florida, and look at Ireland, for example.

When the tax climate is nurturing and favorable for investment, you get money put in, you get jobs created, you get economic growth. Investment goes where it is most favorably treated. So going to 20 and 25 percent from 35 to 40 percent will unleash a torrent of capital investment and job formation.

Rapid capital recovery by expensing capital assets purchases will attract massive investments, stimulate our economy, make our manufacturing companies do better, and build up the capital stock of our country again, like we used to do. This is going to create one thing: job-creating economic growth.

That is what we need and that is what the Republican reform program offers.

It also offers one more thing and it changes treatment of foreign income, which is something I have some experience in, and it will incentivize companies to keep their income here. That is a good thing for America.

So I might just mention for just a second about what they say and what we say. They say tax cut for the wealthy. No, it is not a tax cut for the wealthy. It lowers taxes on all businesses and middle class Americans.

They say rising brackets on low income. This is an absolute incorrigible falsehood. No. We are taking the 10 percent rate to zero. We are taking the 15 percent rate to 10. By the way, Ronald Reagan reduced the 11 percent rate to zero.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. They say it will explode the deficit, but we all know that economic growth shrinks deficits. Ronald Reagan proved that in spades, and we are going to see it again. When we eliminate many of these narrowly-crafted, special interest, lobbyist-driven credits and deductions, we are going to save enough money. Especially when we eliminate the State and local tax deduction, we are going to save a couple of trillion dollars that will help balance this.

Then they say loss of itemized deductions is a bad thing. When we double the standard exemption, no one is going to need to itemize. The people that do itemize, fine, they can have

mortgage interest reduction, charitable reduction, whatever. But most Americans are going to be able to pay their taxes on a postcard.

In the polling in this country, the frustration of Americans with the IRS is directly related to the fact that nobody can fill out a tax form anymore. So we have great progress here.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent, and the top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts. And what we see in this budget is a slashing of investments in the future strength of our country.

Instead of slashing infrastructure spending, as this budget does, we should be increasing our spending to fill the giant infrastructure pothole that Republican policies have left us with.

We have airports that feel Third World. We have bridges that are crumbling, tunnels that need replacing, roads that need fixing. Failing to do so costs all of us in time, money, and economic development.

This budget totally fails to recognize the value of infrastructure investment. It cuts \$254 billion from transportation over 10 years. Funding would drop from \$92 billion next year to just \$65 billion in 2022.

It eliminates the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery grant program used for infrastructure development and repair projects for interstate highways, bridge improvements, and ports. This is incredibly shortsighted.

According to a study by the American Society of Civil Engineers, failing to close the infrastructure investment gap brings serious economic consequences: \$3.9 trillion in losses to the U.S. GDP by 2025; \$7 trillion in lost business sales in 2025; and 2.5 million lost American jobs in 2025.

I have seen with my own eyes what infrastructure development can mean to business development and the quality of life in the city that I serve. The Second Avenue Subway, built with the help of Federal funds, opened in January and has already had a huge economic impact. Stores say their business is up 20 to 30 percent along that line and it has cut overcrowding and reduced traveling times.

New York's old Kosciuszko Bridge, which was first opened in 1939, was originally designed for 10,000 vehicles a day. It was carrying 18 times that and had become an accident choke point.

Thanks to Federal funding, it has been replaced, and the biggest city in the country will have a brand-new, 21st century bridge soon because these kinds of investments boost productivity and bolster our economy, with each \$1 in infrastructure investment

generating up to \$1.80 in additional economic activity.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives our national infrastructure an overall grade of D-plus and our transit system a D-minus. It is just plain irresponsible to slash spending on our crumbling highways and bridges now, because if we don't make needed investments today, we will jeopardize our competitiveness tomorrow.

Let's be clear: we are already significantly underinvesting in infrastructure. As you can see from this chart, public investments in infrastructure and other public fixed assets have fallen over the last few years, dropping to a low of \$274 billion in 2014, from more than \$357 billion in 2009.

We have created a giant infrastructure spending pothole that you see right here. All told, it costs our Nation more than half a trillion dollars in lost investment over 5 years.

The people of this country deserve modern infrastructure. They deserve a better deal.

This budget also cuts \$154 billion from nutrition, from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, ignoring the more than 40 million low-income families, including children, the working poor, the elderly, and the disabled, to say nothing of the 8 million people, including 4 million children it lifts out of poverty. The hungry children of America deserve a better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a senior member of the Joint Economic Committee, as well as a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, the budget that is being considered here today sets in motion the process of the first major tax reform that we will have been able to see in 3 decades. We are on the cusp of a really exciting opportunity to give Americans what they deserve: a Tax Code that works for them, not against them.

Now, on the House Ways and Means Committee, we spent many months meeting, holding hearings, discussing, working on almost a daily basis ways to craft a tax plan that is simpler and fairer for all Americans. The framework that was just rolled out last week takes that into account and lays out a plan that will lead to more jobs and, most importantly, bigger paychecks.

You know, the economic "recovery" since the Great Recession hasn't worked for a lot of Americans. It certainly hasn't worked for a lot of Minnesotans that I represent. Economic growth has been anemic, and we remain uncompetitive in far too many areas. Many are living paycheck to paycheck, and either have or now are at risk of having a lower standard of living than their parents.

Young people, like my daughter's generation, will go backwards if this

country is not fundamentally more competitive economically. They feel like they just can't get ahead.

Meanwhile, seniors, and baby boomers who will soon become seniors, are also at great risk. Their savings, as well as the government's ability to fulfill its commitment to Social Security and Medicare, could be undermined if we don't grow our economy at a higher rate.

So both Republicans and Democrats agree that it is time to fix our broken Tax Code. No one is defending the status quo, Mr. Chair. Our current Tax Code punishes American workers and manufacturers. It is a maze of special-interest loopholes that are unfair to hardworking Americans. It burdens families and small businesses with excessive paperwork and compliance costs, creating unnecessary frustration each and every tax season throughout the year. That is why 9 out of 10 Americans either pay someone to do their taxes or have to buy the financial software to do their taxes.

Mr. Chair, our Tax Code is holding our country back. It is holding our economy back. So we have a stark choice. We can either truly grow the economy and put ourselves back on a path to real prosperity, or we can continue with weak economic growth, which only benefits "the few" and will do nothing for the rest of us when the next economic downturn happens.

Tax reform, for me, is about one thing and one thing only. It is about restoring the hope for a prosperous future for ourselves, for our parents, and, most importantly, for our children.

It is about Paula in my district, in Plymouth, Minnesota, who said that the Tax Code is hurting her small business and preventing her from hiring more employees and giving them a raise.

It is about an owner of an extrusion company in Chaska, Minnesota, that I just spoke to. He said he would invest in new equipment and machines if this tax plan passes.

And it is about lowering rates across the board for all Americans, as well as small businesses, so that they can keep more of their first dollars earned.

Tax reform means increasing the personal income for average Americans and reducing the cost of living so that day-to-day expenses are more affordable. This will lead to families being able to save for their future and their retirement. It will allow people to take more control of their lives and their finances so that they can save and spend and invest their hard-earned money as they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, this is a really important opportunity we cannot let slip away to help middle-income families and small businesses. Passing this budget puts us on a path for tax reform that has so much potential to unleash and grow our economy to the benefit of middle-income families in Minnesota and across the country.

□ 1645

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in 2001, some of our colleagues across the aisle said many of the same things we are hearing today about the miracle of tax cuts: that huge tax cuts for the most fortunate would pay for themselves, and that they would help grow our economy by trickling down through the miracle of so-called dynamic scoring.

But as we know from history, that was not the case. One year after the Bush tax cuts in 2002, here is what Brookings Institute said was happening in real life:

Our findings suggest that Bush tax cuts will reduce the size of the future economy, raise interest rates, make taxes more aggressive, increase tax complexity, and prove fiscally unsustainable.

A year after that, in 2003, the Brookings Institute said: "Over the past 2 years our country has experienced a dramatic deterioration in the Federal budget outlook."

In January 2001, when President George Bush took office, the Congressional Budget Office projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion—as in "T," trillion—from 2000 to 2011.

But in 2011, nearly a decade after the GOP promised their budget would unleash the economy through tax cuts for the wealthy and budgets that cut services to the vulnerable, this is what we found, from National Public Radio: "Conservatives often promote tax cuts as a way to stimulate economic growth, but the years after 2001 were marked by the slowest growth since World War II."

All of us remember when President Obama came to office that this country was shedding 800,000 jobs a month and it was a long time to dig ourselves out of that big Republican hole and get us moving in the right direction with job growth.

So let's not go down that road again. I call upon my colleagues to remember history.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I would again like to point out this little chart that shows facts. At the bottom of the chart, if the viewers can see, is the United States with our corporate tax rate. All of these other countries, most of whom are our friends, even France, is lower than the United States, Spain, Canada, Netherlands, Austria, Turkey, Italy, New Zealand, Japan—you can go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we have the highest corporate rate in the industrialized developed world. Facts are a stubborn thing to deal with, Mr. Chairman. This budget, as Congressman PAULSEN said, is the first step into dealing with something that we haven't dealt with in 31 years.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this issue. I hear so much from my friends on the other side that I agree with, and I very much would like to work closely with them.

I point out to the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, my friend from Ohio, that while we have the highest corporate rate in the world, 35 percent, which is clearly not desirable, I served in Switzerland for 4 years, where there were 700 American companies because the tax rate was so much lower. Yet that 35 percent rate, in actuality, turned out to be less than 14 percent across all American corporations, and a quarter of American corporations pay zero.

As we look at refining this, it is not just about dropping that rate. It is about making sure that every American corporation pays a fair share of their taxes to the U.S. citizens.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution. Budget resolutions, by their nature, are political documents. But this one also has an instrumental purpose, because the only reason this budget resolution is on the floor is to pave the way for the partisan process for the tax bill, which will significantly increase the deficit in order to give tax breaks to those who need them least.

I think everyone in this body agrees that the average American taxpayer, those who have had virtually no raise for 30 years, deserve and need tax breaks. If we can give them that tax relief, the economy will grow faster.

But the Senate reconciliation instructions that will ultimately pass are written to allow for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the deficit, and that is assuming that the fuzzy math and the rosy expectations actually work out. I appreciate the charts that my friend and colleague, Mr. ROONEY, showed that pointed out that we would like to get to 3.1 percent economic growth. I heartily agree.

But if we look at the period right now where we now have the worst disparity in wealth and the worst disparity in income that we have had in a long time, that tracks this decline from 3.1 percent to 1.6, 1.8, 2 percent.

When I started off in our family business, the corporate tax rate was 78 percent, and our economic growth was a lot higher. Not that we want to go back to 78 percent, but putting more money in the hands of the top 1 percent is not what is going to make this economy grow more quickly.

Actually, looking at the critical programs that are cut in this Republican budget gives us almost a handy guide of more effective ways to spend money. For example, this budget cuts transportation spending by 25 percent at a time when we have a D in our infrastructure by the American Society of Civil Engineers, when President Trump and candidate Hillary Clinton both

campaign hard on more infrastructure investment, not a cut.

This budget cuts student aid by \$211 billion when we know from our Joint Economic Committee hearings that the student debt our young people carry is one of the reasons they don't start new businesses, one of the things that suppresses the growth of new businesses in America.

We also know that human capital is the key to economic growth all through history and today. It contains massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, making healthcare more expensive for those who can least afford it, and that is not a way to grow the economy.

We have an opportunity to enact fiscally responsible, sustainable, bipartisan tax reform that focuses on the Americans whose wages have been stagnant for 30 years. I believe the Democrats are prepared to engage in real reform. It should be simpler. It should be fairer. We should absolutely do away with the special deals and credits and gimmicks, but we need a lower rate for most Americans, and not make sure that 80 percent of the tax benefits go to the people who need them the least, who have the smallest propensity to spend and to invest.

There are many other things wrong with this budget. Let me just point out two particular problems. Number one, the budget attacks the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It essentially sacrifices wildlife and environmental protections to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest.

ANWR encompasses more than 19 million acres and is one of the last intact landscapes in America. It is essential that we protect this wild and spectacular land. The government briefly opened ANWR to seismic testing in the 1980s, and the damage from that activity is still visible today. Truck tracks still scar the expansive tundra where the permafrost never healed. Since then, the Federal Government has protected ANWR from harmful oil and gas drilling because of concerns about the impact on species like polar bears, muskoxen, and caribou.

Mr. Chairman, there are 37 land mammal species, 8 marine mammal species, 42 fish species, and more than 200 migratory birds that inhabit the ANWR. Seismic testing could do lasting damage to the fragile ecosystem way before drilling. Seismic activity sends shock waves underground, disturbing denning polar bears.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, the caribou are a food source for Alaskan indigenous groups who have lived off the land for thousands of years. All of this devastation will likely do very little in the short run to reduce the deficit. The oil prices are so low that no oil com-

pany is going to attempt to extract fossil fuels at this time.

We believe the ANWR must be protected from the budget for future generations, its wildlife, and the native people who inhabit it.

Part two, Mr. Chairman, is the budget also attacks Federal Government employee retirement benefits. It instructs the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to reduce the deficit by \$32 billion. This clearly targets Federal employee retirement benefits because that is the only substantial mandatory spending within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdiction.

By slashing these promised benefits, the budget will eliminate any sense of financial security that Federal employees currently have. We should be protecting their rights and benefits. This was the original bargain they made. Most gave up much more lucrative careers in the private sector for the opportunity to serve all Americans, and for a small but secure Federal pension.

It is also going to make it a lot more difficult for us to recruit and retain the quality employees who make America great.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this budget, and let's work together to create a Tax Code that really does simulate our economy and that works for all Americans.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who represents the central part of Illinois, and is a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This bill makes necessary and responsible funding determinations by reducing the size and scope of government, cutting Federal spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, and balancing the Federal budget in fiscal year 2027.

Given our Nation's more than \$20 trillion in debt, it is past time to get serious about our Federal spending so that important programs are able to be sustained long term. In addition, this bill sets the stage for much-needed tax reform. Small businesses and farmers are the bedrock of the American economy. For decades, we have allowed our Tax Code to balloon with loopholes and tax breaks for special interests, hurting our local economies and middle class workers.

That is why it is so crucial that we pass this commonsense budget as the first step in reforming our Nation's outdated Tax Code. Our current system continues to fail small business owners, farmers, and middle class families with its overwhelmingly complex system. That is why over 90 percent of Americans have to pay for help with filing their taxes every year.

Not only does this cost people their hard-earned money, but this also costs us our valuable time. Every year we

spend a combined 8.9 billion hours filing our taxes. That is time we could be using to focus on our work and families. For businesses, that is time they could use for expanding and growing our economy.

The solution here is not to defend the status quo, as some on the other side of the aisle continue to do, but to simplify our Tax Code and lower the rates for businesses and the middle class.

Another crucial part of reforming our Tax Code must be the elimination of the death tax, which harms farmers like those in the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. Family-owned businesses and farms that use their hard-earned dollars to invest back in their businesses are often forced to sell off parts or all in order to pay the death tax.

There is nothing fair about penalizing our job creators and the drivers of our economy for investing in and growing their business. In fact, it is estimated that repealing the death tax would grow our economy by 0.9 percent over 10 years.

These small business investments are often necessary for small businesses and farmers who depend upon expensive machinery to earn their living. Our current Tax Code, however, encourages businessowners to put off their investments as they are only able to deduct the cost of equipment over many years. By allowing full expensing, businesses and farmers can fully invest in the tools they need to become more productive, all the while earning more savings.

According to the Tax Foundation, full expensing would save businesses money, leading to nearly a 5 percent increase in income for low- and middle-income workers.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chair, tax reform is about getting our economy back to working for the middle class, and for our small businesses, growing it from the inside out. This budget is the necessary first step in that process, and I am proud to support it. It will help bring relief to those who need it most.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, just to remind my colleagues, the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center points out that 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent.

But in this budget resolution that we are discussing, it slashes education funding, putting the drain of a college education for average Americans even further out of reach. It asks the American people who already experience crippling student loan debt to reach even deeper into their pockets for their education by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs.

□ 1700

It freezes the maximum level awarded by a Pell grant at \$5,900, covering just 23 percent of an education by 2026, compared to the 30 percent it covers today or the 77 percent it covered in 1980. In addition, it also cuts \$3.3 billion from the Pell grant surplus, which provides a much-needed reserve to cover the cost of future education.

If that is not enough, after students graduate, this budget makes it increasingly difficult to pay off student loans and steers graduates away from public service and teaching jobs by eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs. Our students and our teachers deserve a better deal than that.

I must say that we are suffering from three hurricanes, devastating hurricanes, yet this budget eliminates three programs that play very key roles in disaster relief. The Community Development Block Grant program, AmeriCorps, and the Legal Services Corporation are all eliminated. This budget abolishes these programs that are literally supporting our relief efforts from Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Our Nation's veterans—our Nation's veterans—our bravest, are not spared the carnage of this heartless proposal. The GOP budget proposes \$50 billion in cuts to mandatory spending on veterans programs over 10 years, including education benefits and loan guarantees. So after we have already asked so much of our men and women in uniform, this budget refuses to give them the tools they need to transition to civilian life. Our veterans deserve a better deal than that from the country that they have served so honorably.

Cuts to research, where research is the future of our country, and this budget would also cut investments that are directly tied to our country's future prosperity by slashing basic research funding.

I want to point out how important research funding is to our country. In 1996, two Stanford graduate students took a \$4.5 million research grant from the National Science Foundation and developed a new algorithm called PageRank. Two years later, these same students took PageRank and launched a new internet search engine we now call Google. Today Google is worth over \$600 billion and employs over 72,000 Americans, and it all began with a Federal basic research grant of \$4.5 million.

Google is just one example on a long list of technological advancement companies and, most importantly, jobs that trace their roots to basic research investment. It is what has kept this country on top.

According to the Brookings Institution, two-thirds of the most influential technologies over the past 50 years were supported by Federal research grants. It has brought us lifesaving vaccines, the laser, touchscreen, GPS, and even the internet, technology that has served as a launching pad for cutting-edge medical treatment.

Sadly, the chart behind me reflects a sharp decline in the Federal share of funding of basic research dropping from 72 percent in 1967 to 44 percent in 2015. This GOP budget proposal follows that same trend with instructions to cut \$41 billion from science, space, and technology precisely at a time when we should be increasing investments in these sectors.

It is important to the future prosperity of America. Cuts now mean fewer jobs and economic growth in the future; they mean less innovation and less prosperity. So if my colleagues across the aisle want to grow the economy, turning this trend around is an important way to do it.

Now, I have heard all day from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle how very, very concerned they are about the deficit, but the GOP tax plan makes it worse. The tax framework released last week by the White House and Republican leaders would add \$2.4 trillion to the deficit in the first 10 years and another \$3.2 trillion in the next 10 years.

So the Republican budget is just totally unacceptable. This budget flat-out ignores the reality. So if Republicans are concerned about the deficit, then they should really rewrite their budget proposal.

In conclusion, look at the fine print of this proposed deal and imagine the harm it would cause to millions of American families, to our children, to our seniors, to our sick and suffering, to our disabled and our destitute, to our economy, to our research, and to our infrastructure. It is clear—clear—beyond any and all doubt that Americans deserve a better deal.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), who is the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget before the House.

As a legislator, but more importantly, as a father and grandfather, I am seriously concerned about the mountain of debt our Nation is passing on to our children and grandchildren. Our Nation's total Federal debt is now bigger than our gross domestic product.

Think about that. As the leader of the free world and the driver of global innovation and entrepreneurship, over the next 10 years, we expect to reach a point where annual interest payments to our creditors will exceed the amount we spend on defending our Nation.

It is imperative that we change this trajectory, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK and her colleagues on the Budget Committee for providing a blueprint for tackling the problem. While Congress has made many decisions ahead of us to rein in mandatory spending, this budget is a critical starting point.

Not only is budgeting a fundamental principle of good governance, it is essential to our efforts to reform our outdated tax system to ensure it is simpler and reduces the tax burden for all Americans.

As a CPA with a current license, I look forward to the very real prospect of fundamental tax reform. This budget is the vehicle that can make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I request the amount of time that is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ZELDIN). The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe that this proposal that is before us is an absolute disaster. We should be charting a fundamentally different course.

When you listen to people around their dinner table in America tonight, they would be talking about their concerns in education, infrastructure, jobs, healthcare, security, environment, and disaster relief. But this plan delivers, instead, deep and sometimes disabling cuts to badly needed programs for millions in order to give away benefits to a fortunate few. This is just plain wrong. Budgets are about values and priorities, and the people of this country deserve better.

We should not be cutting our education spending. Failing to train the world's most highly educated workforce is irresponsible and puts our entire economy at a disadvantage. We should be investing more in education at every level—early education and high schools—motivating students to become engaged in science, technology, math, and engineering. We should be leading the way in developing new and improved technical and trade training programs for those who would prefer it. We should be doing more, not less, to make college and postgrad study affordable once again. To do anything less is to fail in our obligation to the rising generation.

We already trail much of the economically advanced world when it comes to healthcare. We get sicker, die sooner, and pay more for our care than most developed nations. Millions are just one serious illness away from financial ruin. But this budget plan would cut spending for healthcare, and this budget would weaken the pillars of financial security for our seniors. The proposed cuts to Medicare and Medicaid will come at the expense of seniors, the disabled, and the middle class.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford this budget. I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, America is at a crossroads, and this budget is about choices.

Mr. Chairman, there are moms and dads, single moms and elderly folks sitting at the kitchen table every night making choices on what to buy and what to pay for. They have to live within their means, Mr. Chairman.

The Federal Government, for too long, hasn't lived within its means, and this budget is about that. This budget is about tax reform. This budget is about growing our economy. We haven't seen the growth in this recovery that we have seen in others.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when I got my first job at McDonald's. My immigrant mother and my immigrant father sat me down and talked to me about the taxes that I would pay coming out of my first paycheck. I clearly remember my dad saying to me: Don't let the taxes that you pay stop you from saving most of this money, because in America, not only do you get taxed when you earn it, you get taxed when you save it, and if you save enough, you will get taxed when you die. That was my immigrant father with a fifth grade education. He was a steelworker.

Mr. Chairman, it is incredibly sad in America today when a successful entrepreneur will pay over 50 percent of what he or she makes in taxes at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 31 years since we reformed our outdated Tax Code, and now is the time—now is the time—at this crossroads to change the direction of America for our kids and our grandkids. I urge a “yes” vote on this responsible budget to live within our means, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 33 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I do want to just begin this next section by making a brief comment about my good friend from Kentucky, who has been using some information off of Forbes as he responds to our speakers. I just want to say, I went out to look at Forbes to see what was on Forbes while we were on this brief intermission, and I found this article that was in Forbes just the day before yesterday that does say that the GOP tax framework is a pay raise for middle class families.

□ 1715

I encourage people to take a look at this. It actually does some scenarios for what we know at this point in time. However, I do want to say that what has been put out is a framework. It doesn't really have enough details to give too much on these scenarios, because there are some very important pieces that are missing.

Guessing on these key points really doesn't allow us to do a proper analysis. Things like the brackets have not

been definitively defined, and neither have the income thresholds or the enhanced child credit.

I think it is a little bit disingenuous to think that is really where we should be using those numbers right at this point in time to give a definitive scenario. I did want to say that that would be a good thing for people to look at if they would like to get a brief idea.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), our ranking member, for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this deeply flawed Republican budget resolution.

When we considered this resolution in July, Democrats offered 28 amendments. The amendments that we offered were meant to help set a course away from the disastrous path that the Republican majority and the Trump administration are steering us down.

We offered amendments on a broad range of issues important to our communities and our families. These included protecting our communities from the effects of climate change; preserving healthcare; investing in public health, research, and diplomacy; and investing in our Nation's workforce and infrastructure. Not surprisingly, not a single one of those made it through.

Instead, we have the resolution: a love letter to millionaires, billionaires, and corporations, and nothing but a manifesto of contempt for America's working families.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution we will be asked to vote on is based on the same faulty assumptions as the bill that came through committee. These include assuming that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act happened, which it did not, and an unrealistic economic growth of 3 percent.

The Republican budget resolution does little but hurt millions of American families in order to fast-track tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and corporations.

In addition, after all the Republican talk of deficit reduction, this cruel budget resolution massively increases the Federal debt by over \$2.4 trillion over the next 10 years and \$3.2 trillion in the 10 years after.

Where does putting the interests of corporations and the wealthiest ahead of working families get us?

Well, we have seen where this ends.

Earlier this summer, the Republican-dominated Kansas Legislature was forced to roll back its 2012 tax cuts. In fact, a recent Brookings Institution analysis found that the tax cuts resulted in an “anemic level of revenues,

which led to ballooning shortfalls, causing significant cutbacks in vital programs such as Medicaid, education, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, court funding, and infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Washington an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JAYAPAL. This Republican budget resolution will lead us into that same hole, yet we know that this will only give Republicans license to call for further cuts to critical programs like Medicare, Social Security, and education.

We know who wins under this budget resolution. It paves the way for a Republican tax proposal that gives a huge tax cut to the wealthiest in our country.

Consider this: 80 percent of the Republican tax cut goes to the top 1 percent by 2027; the average tax cut for the top 1 percent would be \$207,000; for millionaires, the tax cut would provide \$230,000 a year; and 42 million middle class households would face a tax increase, including those people earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is unfair to working families and to our country's future. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's work together on a moral budget blueprint that supports all Americans.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, typically, a budget is a blueprint for how our government plans to meet our obligations to our people; but not this time.

By including reconciliation instructions for their tax plan, the Republicans are using this budget as a blueprint to give tax cuts to the wealthiest few, without requiring bipartisan support.

Under this bill, a family making \$50,000 a year could see their tax burden go up, while millionaires will save \$230,000. And who will pay to make the rich richer? Our working families, children, and seniors.

This budget slashes priorities like education, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits, and even guts Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion.

"You can't make guarantees," is how Treasury Secretary Mnuchin responded when asked if the Republican tax plan would help the middle class. But the thing is, you can make guarantees. If this Republican budget moves forward, it will guarantee that inequality gets worse, while the rest of us pay to help make millionaires into billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution.

A budget is a moral document. It reflects our values. This budget is a stark reminder that the majority and the Trump administration are waging a war on the middle class and eviscerating the social safety net programs that help our most vulnerable citizens.

The social safety net was built on a bipartisan basis. Why is the majority hell-bent on destroying it?

Older Americans will suffer under this budget. It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid. It betrays middle class job seekers by cutting job training, education programs, and other nondefense programs by 34 percent over the next 10 years.

It decimates the Food Stamp program, SNAP benefits and assumes the enactment of the House-passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act, targeting American families who are struggling to get by.

If we were serious about addressing the problems that face middle class families, we would be voting on a budget resolution that invests in their priorities: job training, apprenticeships, paid family and medical leave, fair trade, and equal pay for equal work.

Instead, we are considering a budget that is merely a means for the majority to jam through their tax cuts for the wealthy and for corporations.

The biggest economic challenge of our time is that too many people now are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. We should be growing the middle class and looking for solutions that work for America's families.

We ought to be prioritizing the needs of working families, the ones who have entrusted us to come to Washington to fight for them and to fight for their families. Instead, this budget puts corporate profits first. It caters to those with the most lobbyists.

This budget is a disgrace to the promises that we have made to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. DEFAZIO. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal.

As the ranking member on the Transportation Committee, I want to focus in a little bit on what they do to transportation.

We heard great promises from President Trump of a trillion dollars in new investment. Nothing has come from the White House. The first substantive

action on transportation in this Congress is going to be the Republicans in the House of Representatives cutting transportation funding by \$254 billion.

That is right. No trillion dollars of new spending. We are going to spend \$254 billion less.

They are going to eliminate all long-route trains, isolating rural America. They are going to lose essential air service in rural America. And, by the way, the Republicans want to toll your interstate. So if you live in rural America, you can get in your car to go somewhere, but now you are going to have to pay to use the highway you already paid for.

Secondly, it eliminates critical funding for our urban areas, the economic engines of this country. It eliminates TIGER grants for freight and multimodal projects. It eliminates new investment in transit, new start projects. It eliminates all investments in high-speed rail and eliminates specific funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects. The Republicans just hate bicycles.

It also goes on—and this is totally amazing—seriously, you are going to cut funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency? Haven't you been watching television? I think they are already out of money. You are going to cut funding?

We want to do away with those programs that might mitigate the disaster of future floods and hurricanes. You are going to cut grants for firefighters.

Then, that is not enough. We are going to roll back Davis-Bacon protections for people who work on federally funded projects. We are going to roll back Buy American? Really? So it is "Buy Chinese" in the Republican budget. Buy Chinese.

They want to devolve the obligation to fund Federal highways to the States. I have got news for you: we have tried that.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentleman from Oregon an additional 1 minute.

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is Kansas and Oklahoma. This is Kansas before we had the Eisenhower—by the way, a Republican—National Highway Program. They built their turnpike. Oklahoma said they would build theirs. They didn't. They were out of money. They didn't build it until they got an 80 percent Federal match.

So let's go back to the good, old days. We are going to devolve the obligations of putting together a 21st century transportation system in this country, knitting our country together, getting rid of congestion, moving people and goods more efficiently, but we are going to do it on a State-by-State basis. That is nuts. I just can't believe this.

Then, there is another little trick. The chairman of my committee wants to privatize the airspace in the United States and reduce the ticket tax that

pays for air traffic control. That would be a \$10 billion windfall to the airline industry, because they will raise prices. Then they are going to charge you a head fee to get on the plane.

Even better, it creates \$100 billion of new deficit. So this nifty little thing here contains a reserve fund of \$100 billion to try and make up for the fact and hide the fact that they are cutting \$100 billion of taxes that pay for the current system.

How are you going to pay for the next system?

The airlines will determine that, not Congress.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter that has been signed by 242 agencies and think tanks supporting this budget.

Among those who have signed this letter are the American Bankers Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Tax Reform, Business Roundtable, Financial Services Forum, Manufactured Housing Institute, National Association of Manufacturers, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Grocers Association, National Retail Federation, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, The Kentucky Chamber, and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, among many others.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: We urge Congress to expeditiously pass a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions so that the promise of tax reform can be made a reality.

It has been 31 years since Congress last reformed the tax code. Since then, the code has become an anchor weighing down the economy, job creation, and wage growth for American families.

This Congress has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to fix the problem. Over the past several years, tremendous work has been done to prepare for this moment. In the 113th Congress the Ways and Means Committee conducted a comprehensive look at tax reform. Last year House Republicans released a Blueprint for reform. During the last Congress, the Senate Finance Committee convened bi-partisan working groups that tackled all the major aspects of reform.

President Trump has outlined his goals for reform, and the "Group of Six"—consisting of members from the House, Senate, and Administration—has presented a framework to guide the drafting and markup of legislation in the Ways and Means and Finance Committees.

While much work remains to be done, we believe Congress is well-positioned to move forward with comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

The single-most important next step is for Congress to adopt a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions that will permit tax reform to move forward without the threat of a filibuster.

Just like Members of Congress, each of our organizations will continue to advocate for specific priorities within tax reform as the relevant committees and ultimately the full House and Senate consider tax reform legislation.

But failing to pass a budget resolution now may mean that tax reform never moves forward. That outcome is unacceptable to all of

us and ought to be unacceptable to every Member of Congress who has advocated for reform.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association, African American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA), Alabama Retail Association, Alaska Chamber, Allen Fairview Chamber of Commerce (TX), Alliance for Competitive Taxation (ACT), American Bakers Association, American Bankers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Exploration & Production Council, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Forest & Paper Association, American Foundry Society, American Gas Association, American Hotel & Lodging Association, American International Automobile Dealers Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Made Coalition, American Petroleum Institute (API).

American Supply Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Ames Chamber of Commerce (IA), Argentum, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Asian American Hotel Owners Association, Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Association for Hose and Accessories Distribution (NAHAD), Association of American Railroads, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Washington Business, Auto Care Association, Baton Rouge Area Chamber (LA), Battle Creek Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (FL), Brainerd Lakes Chamber of Commerce (MN).

Bristol County Chamber of Commerce (MA), Buckeye Valley Chamber (AZ), Buffalo Niagara Partnership (NY), Business Council of Alabama, Business Council of New York State, Business Roundtable, Cedar Rapids Metro Economic Alliance (IA), Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association (CTIA), Central Louisiana Regional Chamber of Commerce, Chambers of Commerce Alliance of Ventura & Santa Barbara Counties (CA), Chester County Chamber of Business & Industry (PA), Coeur d'Alene Chamber of Commerce (ID), Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry, Colorado Retail Association, Consumer Bankers Association, Convenience Distribution Association, Coral Gables Chamber of Commerce (FL), Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, Covington County Chamber of Commerce (MS), Crowley Chamber of Commerce (LA).

Davis Chamber of Commerce (UT), Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Eatonton-Putnam Chamber of Commerce (GA), Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Edmond Area Chamber of Commerce (OK), Edwardsville/Glen Carbon Chamber of Commerce (IL), Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Entertainment Software Association, Financial Services Forum, Florida Chamber of Commerce, Florida Retail Federation, Food Marketing Institute, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce (WI), Gas and Welding Distributors Association, Georgia Chamber of Commerce, Georgia Retail Federation, Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association & Film Commission (CO), Granbury Chamber of Commerce (TX).

Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Greater Bakersfield Chamber (CA), Greater Cedar Valley Alliance & Chamber (IA), Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Greater El Paso Chamber of Commerce (TX), Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce (AK), Greater Lehigh Valley Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Louisville Inc. (KY), Greater North Dakota Chamber, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber

(OK), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (VA), Greater Toms River Chamber of Commerce (NJ), Greater Yakima Chamber of Commerce (WA), Grocery Manufacturers Association, Hastings Area Chamber of Commerce (NE), Heating, Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Henderson Chamber of Commerce (NV).

Hilliard Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce (OR), Home Furnishings Association, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, Independent Office Products & Furniture Dealers Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, International Foodservice Distributors Association, International Warehouse Logistics Association, Iowa Chamber Alliance, Irrigation Association, ISSA, The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Jefferson Chamber of Commerce (LA), Jenkins County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Job Creators Network, Johnson City/Jonesborough/Washington County TN Chamber, Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce & Industry (MO), Kalispell Chamber of Commerce (MT), Kansas Chamber of Commerce, Kingsport Chamber (TN), Kyndle (Henderson County KY Chamber of Commerce).

Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Lancaster Chamber (PA), Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce (NV), Lemont Chamber of Commerce (IL), Lima Allen County Chamber of Commerce (OH), Little Rock Regional Chamber (AR), Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Louisiana Association of Business and Industry, Manufactured Housing Institute, McLean County Chamber of Commerce (IL), Metals Service Center Institute, Metro South Chamber of Commerce (MA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (WI), Michigan Retailers Association, Minnesota Retailers Association, Missouri Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Monroe Chamber of Commerce (LA), Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (SC), National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Association of Professional Employer Organizations.

National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association of the Remodeling Industry, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Club Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Office Products Alliance, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Nebraska Retail Federation, NFIB—National Federation of Independent Business.

North Carolina Chamber, North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Dakota Retail Association, North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce (RI), North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce (SC), North Orange County Chamber (CA), North San Antonio Chamber (TX), Office Furniture Dealers Alliance, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio

Council of Retail Merchants, Oklahoma Retail Merchants Association, Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce (WI), Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), PA Chamber of Business and Industry, Pennsylvania Retailers Association, Plano Chamber of Commerce (TX), Portland Cement Association, Prattville Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Precious Metals Association of North America, Professional Beauty Association.

Reforming America's Taxes Equitability (RATE) Coalition, Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce (NV), Retail Association of Nevada, Retail Association of New Mexico, Retail Council of New York State, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Retailers Association of Massachusetts, Richardson Chamber of Commerce (TX), River Heights Chamber of Commerce (MN), S Corporation Association, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce (CA), Salt Lake Chamber (UT), San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce (CA), San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (CA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Service Station Dealers of America and Allied Trades (SSDA-AT), Silver City Grant County Chamber of Commerce (NM), South Summit Chamber of Commerce (OH), Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Southwest Indiana Chamber, St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce (MN), St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, St. Tammany West Chamber of Commerce, State Chamber of Oklahoma, Steel Manufacturers Association, Tampa Bay Beaches Chamber of Commerce (FL), Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Texas Retailers Association, The Chamber of Commerce of the Santa Barbara Region (CA), The Chamber of Medford/Jackson County (OR), The Chamber Grand Forks/East Grand Forks (ND), The Fertilizer Institute, The Financial Services Roundtable, The Kentucky Chamber, The Longview Chamber of Commerce (TX), The Ohio Society of CPAs, The Real Estate Roundtable, Tile Roofing Institute, Tioga County Chamber of Commerce (NY).

Tire Industry Association (TIA), Truck Renting and Leasing Association, Tucson Metro Chamber (AZ), Tulsa Regional Chamber (OK), U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Union County Chamber of Commerce, United Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce (TX), USTelecom—The Broadband Association, Utah Food Industry Association, Utah Retail Merchants Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Small Business Partnership, West Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce (LA), Wholesalers Association of the Northeast (WANE), Window and Door Manufacturers Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, WMDA/CAR Service Station and Automotive Repair Association.

Mrs. BLACK. There are 242 different entities that signed this letter to say that passing a budget is what we should be doing and that would lead us to tax reforms.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee and a fellow rabid Cleveland Indians fan.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

As Vice President Biden stated: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget and I will tell you what you value."

The Republican's so-called Building a Better America budget shows us they do not value education, infrastructure, research and development, veterans' benefits, and other programs which expand opportunities for America's families.

□ 1730

This budget is immoral. It provides trillions of dollars in tax money to millionaires and wealthy corporations while shifting the burden onto the middle class. It cuts \$5.4 trillion from programs that American families rely on; programs like SNAP, Pell grants, Social Security, and healthcare.

The budget ends the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicare alone by almost \$500 billion over 10 years. A vote for this budget destroys American families in favor of a select few. This budget does not build a better America. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, we have had numerous letters submitted to us taking a position in opposition to this budget resolution, and I think they are pretty compelling, and I would like to read from some of them.

Here is a letter from the Main Street Alliance:

Main Street Alliance, a network of small business owners throughout the country, strongly urges you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This budget, if enacted into law, would cut \$3.4 trillion from Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending over the next 10 years. This will significantly harm small business owners and their employees, damage local economies, and decimate State budgets.

We urge you to protect Main Street small business owners, working families, communities, and economies, and oppose the House budget resolution. Reject any budget that enables tax cuts for the very wealthy and large profitable corporations to lose revenue, since it will force deep cuts in vital programs that harm small business.

This letter from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare:

On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and the Republican Study Committee budget. Instead, I ask you to support the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus budgets.

The committee-passed budget resolution would slash funding to Medicare and Medicaid, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and make it easier for Congress to cut Social Security, all to pay for massive tax cuts for the very wealthy and profitable corporations.

This from the American Public Health Association:

On behalf of the American Public Health Association, a diverse community of public health professionals who champion the

health of all people and communities, I write in strong opposition to the House FY 2018 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 71. This proposal does not eliminate sequestration and would drastically cut nondefense discretionary spending. Such cuts would devastate our Nation's public health and safety net system and would have a disproportionate impact on our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

The proposal also includes the House passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act that would force millions to lose coverage, end the Medicaid expansion, drastically reduce Federal funding for the Medicaid program, and lead to increased cost and fewer benefits for millions of Americans.

This letter from the AFSCME, American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees:

On behalf of the 1.6 million members of AFSCME, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee and scheduled to be considered in the full House.

This budget would impose considerable hardship on many Americans in order to slash taxes for the wealthy and corporations to boost defense spending. Rather than increasing revenues for investment that creates jobs and spurs economic growth, the proposed budget creates a fast-track process for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit corporations and the wealthy.

In fact, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Trump GOP tax cut would largely benefit the richest 1 percent. The budget also relies on the gimmicks of dynamic scoring and sham accounting, hiding the true cost of unnecessary and harmful tax cuts.

And this, from AARP:

Proposals creating a defined contribution premium support program, restricting access by raising the age of eligibility, or allowing hospitals and providers to arbitrarily charge customers higher prices than Medicare can make healthcare unaffordable for older Americans. These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of healthcare but simply shifts cost from Medicare on to individuals, many of whom cannot afford to pay for their care.

Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through this program.

Furthermore, caps could result in significant cost shifts to State governments unable to shoulder the cost of care without sufficient Federal support.

Proposals to block grant the program or impose work requirements will make SNAP less responsive and accessible in times of need, and without clear work requirement exemptions for the elderly and disabled, would bar these individuals from receiving SNAP benefits.

We ask you to reject the cuts proposed in H. Con. Res. 71. We stand ready to work with you to develop proposals that protect and improve Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, and SNAP.

This from the Alliance for Retired Americans:

On behalf of the more than 4.3 million members of the Alliance for Retired Americans, I am writing to urge you to vote against H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. This budget blueprint cuts spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, disseminating numerous domestic programs, including those that benefit older Americans.

It is shocking that the same budget that cuts services for many low-income Americans and raises taxes on the middle class will

also carry instructions to provide \$2.4 trillion in tax cuts to corporations and wealthy Americans.

These tax cuts, which will increase the deficit, sets up the perfect scenario for Congress to slash Medicare and Medicaid. We are not fooled by the House leadership's tax giveaway to the wealthy at the expense of ordinary Americans and urge you to oppose this draconian budget. We will be watching how you vote on this important issue.

This is a letter from the Coalition on Human Needs:

On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 budget resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we have made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well prepared for productive lives.

But the majority's proposed budget does not build. It breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our Nation weaker for decades to come.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity.

Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education, and housing assistance, these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut.

The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have chosen to lavish huge tax breaks on large multinationals and the top wealthiest few in our country instead of growing our economy by investing in all Americans. Investing in our workforce, in our physical infrastructure, in entrepreneurship, that is the way to really grow the economy; not these retread Republican tax policies that offer all the benefits to the top and hope something will eventually trickle down to everyone else, that only grow the national debt, as has been shown time and time again.

Our Republicans today call their budget a vision for our country, and what a grim vision it is for anyone who does not count themselves among the top 1 percent. Republicans would only widen income inequality with massive tax breaks for the few, while slashing trillions from initiatives that give more Americans the chance to get ahead, while, at the same time, strengthening our overall economic future.

For seniors, this is a budget that breaks Trump's promise not to cut Medicare to the tune of about half a trillion dollars in cuts, and it would slash an additional \$1 trillion for Medicaid, upon which so many seniors rely.

For students and families that are struggling to get a college education,

the ticket into the middle class, and into economic competitiveness, this budget will make it harder to climb the economic ladder with major cuts to Pell grants and other student assistance programs, and it will limit our investment in education and job training for American workers that are already out there trying to upgrade their skills.

What does the Republican budget do with all the money they save from cutting the middle class and working people, seniors, and those who are trying to get ahead? Well, it stuffs the pockets of those at the top and the large multinationals.

What President Trump and his Republican cohorts say their plan is, it isn't. You know, only last week, Trump said this about his tax plan: "I don't benefit. I don't benefit. In fact, very, very strongly, as you see, I think there is very little benefit for people of wealth."

Well, the analysis of the one tax return that leaked out suggests that President Trump will benefit to the tune of more than \$1 billion. Eighty percent of the tax breaks in this proposal go to the top 1 percent. That is people who are making more than \$730,000 a year while one in four Americans could actually see a tax increase.

That is why you can understand that they say they can't guarantee that taxes won't go up for many people in the middle class. And overall, this is a budget that is dripping in red ink.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we begin to understand why Trump calls himself "the king of debt," because there is plenty of debt that will be added onto this plan.

For Trump and his cohorts, fiscal responsibility is just a political slogan that they use to undermine those education and social service programs they were never for in the first place.

The Republican budget is not just numbers. It has a real human cost. By slashing investments in our economic future, it is a recipe for weakness, not strength. I urge my colleagues to side with the middle class, with working folks all over America, and reject this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Compact for a Balanced Budget Commission, and I will read a portion of this letter. They say: "Dear Chairman Black: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your committee, H. Con. Res. 71, and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

"Our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the Federal budget returns to balance within the 10-year

budget period because runaway Federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational, and civil rights issue. We commend you and your committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest."

And again, this comes from The Compact Commission, Compact for a Balanced Budget.

THE COMPACT COMMISSION, C/O COMPACT FOR AMERICA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.,

Houston, TX, August 8, 2017.

Re 2018 House Budget Resolution and the Compact for a Balanced Budget.

Hon. DIANE BLACK,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLACK: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your Committee (House Concurrent Resolution 71) and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

Our nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the federal budget returns to balance within the ten-year budget period because runaway federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational and civil-rights issue. We commend you and your Committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest.

We also commend the Committee for including Section 501 in the resolution, which endorses adding a balanced budget requirement to the Constitution.

Section 501 identifies the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which we represent on behalf of current and future member states. We believe the most practical, prudent enforcement mechanism is the state-of-the-art balanced budget amendment (BBA) being proposed by the Compact. This state-of-the-art BBA has been specifically designed to overcome concerns expressed in 40 years of congressional hearings that have considered how a BBA should be drafted. Such concerns may have prevented prior BBAs from being proposed.

To advance the policy prescription in Section 501 of the budget resolution in the House, we recommend: updating this section to reflect that the concurrent resolution to effectuate the Compact (House Concurrent Resolution 73) was introduced on July 26, 2017; and incorporating the language of House Concurrent Resolution 73 into Section 501. This could be done as one of several amendments you are probably already planning to bring up during floor consideration as the manager's package, and requires only a majority vote as opposed to the two-thirds required for balanced budget amendment proposals made by members of Congress.

Taking these steps establishes a strong enforcement mechanism, sustaining the budget resolution following its adoption. It would also strengthen the appeal of the budget resolution to fiscal conservatives in the House and taking these steps prior to the consideration of legislation to raise the debt ceiling should expedite approval of that legislation.

Supermajorities of Americans have demanded a balanced budget for decades. Our nation's debt threatens future generations to default or austerity, but we believe there's a chance here for a third option: principled leadership on the matter of debt and spending.

We hope you and your Committee members will agree that there is a path here which acknowledges the need for long-term fiscal

sanity while also meeting shorter-term political and policy needs.

Regards,

CHAIR MEAD TREADWELL,
Alaska Commissioner.
VICE CHAIR PAULATE
RAKESTRAW,
Georgia Commissioner.
GREG SNOWDEN,
Mississippi Commissioner.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to just bounce off of that and take a look at the chart that we have here. When we take a look at interest—and somehow we don't always talk that much about interest here. We talk about borrowing money and raising our debt ceiling continually. I have been here now for 6½ years, and the conversation is about raising that debt ceiling so that we can pay for our debt, but there comes interest on that.

Just as when we go to a bank and we borrow money, we have to pay interest on that. I remember years ago, when I bought my first house, we were at a period of time when President Carter was the President and the interest rates were outrageous, and our interest rate on our house at that time, when we purchased it as a young married couple, was, I think, somewhere between 14 and 16 percent.

Interest rates now are very much more reasonable for young couples purchasing. And so I want to turn our attention to this chart here to take a look at the outlays in 2027 under the CBO baseline.

If we continue down this path that we are going in, without taking a look at our mandatory spending, the amount of money that we borrow, and the debt that we pile up with an interest to it, just what will that look like?

□ 1745

I think if we look at our own household and we would say that our interest that we are paying on the credit card or whatever, or the car interest or the House mortgage, if it were more than all of the other things like the food and maybe the education for our children and buying books and pencils and things that they need for school, we would be looking at the way in which we were managing our household income and saying, wow, that is not something we want to keep doing. We are going to have to get on some kind of a budget plan and reverse the trajectory of where we would be going.

So here we are. At the end of the period of 2027, if we look at 17 years down the road and we don't do anything about the kind of mandatory spending, which is two-thirds of our budget, currently, and continues to grow, here is what happens:

We see \$768 billion being spent on interest alone.

We see the next one down, the defense, at \$741 billion. We would actually be paying more in interest than we were in the security of our Nation and supporting our men and women who serve in the military, and all of the

supplies and the necessary equipment that it takes to protect them as they protect us.

Look at what happens with Medicaid. We will be spending less on Medicaid that is for people who are the blind, the disabled, the elderly, the children, the pregnant mothers.

We talk about wanting to put our money and our values where we see the values really belong. Is this really where we want our values to be in the money that we spend, \$768 billion in interest compared to what we are spending on our military, what we are spending on our Medicaid?

Look at our veterans, our veterans that we talk about how much we honor them: \$248 billion as opposed to \$768 billion in interest.

Again, we must question where we are going and if this is the right direction. Is this the direction that we can all just raise our hand up and say, yes, we are making good decisions for the future of our country? Because look at where the interest is compared to the other programs that we both, Republicans and Democrats, have said are so important to us.

Over and over again, we have had colleagues on both sides of the aisle go and speak about the importance of what our values are. Our budget is a vision of what our values are.

Transportation, and I have heard more and more times on both sides of the aisle talking about infrastructure, how important that is for our Nation. Look at what our transportation and our infrastructure will be. I don't know that we want to spend only \$110 billion on that and \$768 billion on interest. Think of how many roads we could build, how many bridges we could repair if we reverse this trajectory.

Then, finally, at the bottom here is science-based technology. We all want to be competitive with those around the world to make sure that we are spending the money where we need to spend the money to stay in front of these other nations with our science and our space and our technology.

I want to recommend here that there are only two other programs, Social Security and Medicare, that exceed that net interest. So we will say Social Security, Medicare, and then our net interest; and from there, everything else that we say, both the Republicans and the Democrats, are so important, that we say are our values, are going to be underneath the interest. I don't think that is really where we want to go.

I have to think, my oldest grandchild right now is 19 years old, soon to turn 20, when he is 30 years old, he might say to me: Mimi, what were you doing when you were in Congress? What were you doing to help us, because now we are paying more in interest than we are all of these other programs that we contend to be so important to us?

So these are difficult decisions to make, I will acknowledge that. But I will also say to you, as someone who—

I consider myself to be a policy wonk. As I look at these various programs, I say there is nothing that we are doing in my life that I did 40 years ago that I am doing exactly the same. So if a program has been around for 40 years, should we not want to say maybe we can reform it? Not necessarily cut, but, in the reforming, you may find a way to decrease the spending that you are doing in that program.

Can't we all lock arms, Democrats and Republicans, and acknowledge that there are some decisions that have to be made with programs that have been there for a very long time?

Can we not acknowledge that there are some programs that perhaps have fraud, waste, and abuse that we can take care of, take that money and use it in these places where we really say our values lie?

So I would say that, as we talk about this budget, I am very proud of what we have done in this budget, in the cuts or, as I say, reforms in those programs that would result in \$203 billion worth of savings over a 10-year period, that these are programs that we gave the committees of jurisdiction an opportunity to look within their jurisdiction and to make those decisions and do the homework. It is your jurisdiction; it is not mine. We gave them recommendations and suggestions, but it is their jurisdiction.

Let them evaluate where it is that there are programs that can have new and creative ideas, things that can save us money, not necessarily using the word "cut," but in savings. Yes, you may have some cuts that are done, but these are good cuts. These are things that you have spent a lot of time thinking about.

That is really where we want to go. That is what this budget does is it says: Open up your minds. Think differently. Let's not do things the same old way and keep putting the same old programs out there that maybe aren't working.

And you know what? Maybe they are not even working for the people that we give them to. Maybe they are not working for them, because work is dignity.

When we say that someone who is able-bodied and without any dependents should be at work, that is not cruel. Do you know what that is? That is dignity. When people go to work, it is a dignified activity.

I always say, after I ask you what your name is, and we all do it, we say: What do you do? And when someone cannot tell you what they do, they don't feel dignified.

Look, I don't want to be cruel to people who are disabled, people who are having a really tough time and have other circumstances, but we should acknowledge that there is dignity in work; and when we can give people an opportunity to have that dignity, we should be willing to stand up and do that.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a robust debate. We had a robust debate in the Rules Committee yesterday, and we have had robust debates in the committee markup and during hearings, as well, over the priorities of this country.

As we close this debate tonight, recognizing there will be a few minutes tomorrow for comments, I just want to say that, since this could very well be the last time that I get to appear in Budget Committee business with Chairman BLACK, I have truly cherished the 9 months that we have spent working together.

The chairman is a gracious, fair, thoughtful, and very, very collegial individual, and I wish her the best in her campaign, at least through the primary. I thank her and her very, very competent and professional staff for all of the courtesies they have shown us during this year and this process.

I also want to pay tribute to the Democratic staff, people who work very, very hard every day and are brilliant in their fields and make me sound smarter than I probably am, but I would like to read their names: Jon Antista; Erika Appel; Ellen Balis, the staff director; Hayden Flanery; Jon Goldman; Elliott Grantz; Jocelyn Harris; Najy Kamal; Sam Lau; Sheila McDowell; Diana Meredith; Farouk Ophaso; Kimberly Overbeek; Scott Russell; and Ted Zegers.

They do terrific work, and I want them to know how much I and all the members of the Budget Committee, the minority, appreciate their work.

I would also like to thank my personal staff, led by my chief of staff, Julie Carr, for the work they contribute to this process as well.

In closing, there are a few comments I want to make about this debate.

We heard several times during the day that it is really not fair to talk about the consequences of the tax proposal that will be the end result of this process because the details haven't been ironed out yet. That is, you know, fair enough as it goes, but there were enough details in the outline that we saw last week to make a pretty good guess as to what the impact of these tax cuts would be.

Now, we have read over and over, as Republican speakers spoke, the fact that they were willing to jeopardize the health and safety and nutrition of their citizens to give the wealthiest people in their State tax cuts. Most of these numbers that we read were in the billions of dollars: \$38 billion, \$16 billion. These are individuals with net worths of astounding amounts.

The outline that was publicly released last week said that the Republicans intend, under this tax proposal, to eliminate the estate tax. If they eliminate the estate tax, much of that money is not going to be taxed. They will get to keep it. I don't think that they are going to be out there creating

new companies. Maybe their children will do it if they inherit it. Maybe they have given some of it away so those estates aren't quite as big. I suspect many of them have.

The point is, when you are talking about wealth, collectively, the wealthiest persons in the 50 States, collectively, have \$750 billion in net worth, which means that, if they paid the estate tax, there would be over \$300 billion in money that they would save if you eliminated the estate tax.

So while, yes, we may be off plus or minus 3 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent, the fact is that this is an enormous break for the people who have been the most fortunate in this country. I think it is more than fair to say, if you say you are going to eliminate the estate tax, if you say you are going to eliminate the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, and we can go look at President Trump's 2005 tax return, which said he paid \$31 million in tax because of the alternative minimum tax, it doesn't take any details to know that he would have saved \$31 million in that year if you eliminate the alternative minimum tax.

So, yes, the rates may vary. Ultimately, the tax bill that we have presented to us may not lower the highest rate from 39.6 to 35 percent, but if it does, we know the impact that that will have. We know who will benefit most from that. It is the wealthiest 1 percent of this country.

As I will say tomorrow when we close this debate, I am in the top 1 percent. Half of this body are millionaires. They are all going to benefit. We are all going to benefit. Meanwhile, the people who rely on many of the programs that will be slashed under this Republican budget will suffer. That is not fair.

Now, Republicans will make the argument, as they always do because this is a matter of religious faith to them, that if you give people more money, they will magically create all this growth. Well, has that really happened?

Out of the Fortune 500 companies, I think, in a recent study, 92 of them paid 20 percent or less in corporate tax. Collectively, they eliminated 300,000 jobs over a 5-year period. So they had more money than corporations paying 35 percent. Did they use it to create more jobs, more wealth among middle class and working families? No. They used it to pay dividends, to buy back stock, and to increase the wages of their CEOs.

That is what has happened in modern history every time we lower corporate tax rates or we let them bring taxes in from overseas. They do not create more jobs with the money that they save.

So I think it is very, very fair for us to look at this entire process, the budget proposal, which does anticipate a tax cut—which they claim is revenue neutral, but it is a tax cut—and the outline that we saw last week and say: Who, really, is this going to help?

It is not going to help the people who need the help. It is going to give more

money to the people who already occupy one of the strongest economic positions in a country with the greatest disparity of wealth in the world.

So as we conclude this debate, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the alternatives that will be proposed by the Democratic Caucus, by the Congressional Black Caucus, and by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and compare the values and the priorities of those budgets to those that the Republican budget represents.

I think, on balance, anybody in good faith will say that those budgets, not the Republican budgets, are the budgets that will create a stronger, fairer society in this country, and those are the ones that we should proceed to adopt.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

□ 1800

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I likewise, would like to just say that the ranking member, Mr. YARMUTH, has just been wonderful to work with, and we may have differences of opinion, but we can do it in a very Southern hospitality way. I just so much appreciate his demeanor, his leadership on the committee, the way he honors the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, and it has just been a joy to work with him. I am going to miss working with him and being able to have lively debate, which is good for this body and it is good for America.

I want to also thank all the members who participated in the debate today, both the Democrats and the Republicans. This is what our democracy is about, being able to voice our opinions and at the end of the day being able to come to a conclusion after that debate. I look forward to continuing discussion and voting on the final passage tomorrow.

As we finish up, I also want to thank our staff for their hard work, and there are many of them, so I am not going to read all of them to you. I do want to mention some of those who are the leaders of the House Budget Committee staff and have just been great to work with.

Rick May, who is the staff director; Jenna Spealman; Andy Morton; Tim Flynn; Mary, who has been here with me at my side the entire time. What would I do without having somebody to pass papers to us? So Mary has been great. Jim Bates, and I am going to leave it at that because I am going to get in trouble if I don't announce all of them.

The staff has just been tremendous to work with, many hours, weekends, and, indeed, even holidays that they have been here helping to gather the information both for the Budget Committee hearings and then, also, for this today.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to a more lively debate tomorrow. I include in the RECORD the names of the staff of the Budget Committee.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Rick May
 Jenna Spealman
 Andy Morton
 Tim Flynn
 Patrick Louis Knudsen
 Benjamin Gardenhour
 Gary Haglund
 Chris Hartline
 Sarah Corley
 Sage Peterson
 Jim Bates
 Mary Popadiuk
 Jonathan Romito
 Elise Anderson
 Policy Advisors
 Jenna Spealman
 Steve Gonzalez
 Robert Cogan
 Eric Davis
 Robert Yeakel
 Ellen Johnson
 Andy Morton
 Emily Goff
 Brad Watson
 Brittany Madni
 Steve Waskiewicz
 Alex Stoddard
 Joe Guillen

PERSONAL STAFF (REPRESENTATIVE DIANE BLACK, TENNESSEE, 6TH DISTRICT)

Teresa Koeberlein
 Dean Thompson
 Heather Douglass
 Jon Toomey
 Ace Burch
 Katie Mitchell
 Hillary Lassiter
 Zachary Royster
 Greg Dowel
 Nicholas Ayers

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I rise to share my concern regarding potential budget reconciliation instructions to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. These instructions could potentially result in significant harm to federal employees and federal retirees, many of whom I represent.

The national debt is a serious challenge that Congress must address, but I urge members of this body to maintain the promises made to federal employees at the time of their hiring. At a minimum, any changes to federal employee retirement or benefits should only be made on prospective employees, not current or former employees.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 71

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) **DECLARATION.**—The Congress determines and declares that prior concurrent resolutions on the budget are replaced as of fiscal year 2018 and that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) **TABLE OF CONTENTS.**—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
 Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

Sec. 301. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.
 Sec. 302. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.
 Sec. 303. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.
 Sec. 304. Limitation on advance appropriations.
 Sec. 305. Estimates of debt service costs.
 Sec. 306. Fair-value credit estimates.
 Sec. 307. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.
 Sec. 308. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
 Sec. 309. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.
 Sec. 310. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
 Sec. 311. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.
 Sec. 312. Prohibition on use of guarantee fees as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 321. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
 Sec. 322. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
 Sec. 323. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
 Sec. 324. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.
 Sec. 325. Application of rule regarding limits on discretionary spending.
 Sec. 326. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for commercialization of air traffic control.
 Sec. 402. Reserve fund for investments in national infrastructure.
 Sec. 403. Reserve fund for comprehensive tax reform.
 Sec. 404. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
 Sec. 405. Reserve fund for the repeal or replacement of President Obama's health care laws.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 501. Policy statement on a balanced budget amendment.
 Sec. 502. Policy statement on budget process reform.
 Sec. 503. Policy statement on Federal regulatory budgeting and reform.
 Sec. 504. Policy statement on unauthorized appropriations.
 Sec. 505. Policy statement on Federal accounting.
 Sec. 506. Policy statement on Commission on Budget Concepts.
 Sec. 507. Policy statement on budget enforcement.
 Sec. 508. Policy statement on improper payments.
 Sec. 509. Policy statement on expenditures from agency fees and spending.
 Sec. 510. Policy statement on promoting real health care reform.
 Sec. 511. Policy statement on Medicare.
 Sec. 512. Policy statement on combating the opioid epidemic.

Sec. 513. Policy statement on the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
 Sec. 514. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery, and innovation.
 Sec. 515. Policy statement on public health preparedness.
 Sec. 516. Policy statement on Social Security.
 Sec. 517. Policy statement on Medicaid work requirements.
 Sec. 518. Policy statement on welfare reform and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program work requirements.
 Sec. 519. Policy Statement on State flexibility in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
 Sec. 520. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
 Sec. 521. Policy statement on supplemental wildfire suppression funding.
 Sec. 522. Policy statement on the Department of Veterans Affairs.
 Sec. 523. Policy statement on moving the United States Postal Service on budget.
 Sec. 524. Policy statement on the Judgment Fund.
 Sec. 525. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
 Sec. 526. Policy statement on tax reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS**SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.**

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,670,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,767,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,870,414,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,963,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,077,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,195,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,325,690,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,475,784,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,642,629,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,811,687,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$63,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$66,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$80,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$95,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$105,330,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$122,777,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$136,738,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$146,394,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$146,749,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$146,700,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,232,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,286,018,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,299,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,290,186,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,483,686,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,528,872,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,655,413,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,746,208,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,824,652,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,164,885,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,265,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,283,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,323,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,467,047,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,497,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,620,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,727,971,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,806,792,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$494,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$497,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$412,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$359,511,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$364,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$271,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$171,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$144,426,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$85,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$4,895,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,059,756,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,720,619,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,263,387,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,717,657,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,120,068,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,414,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$23,577,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$23,665,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$23,701,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$23,484,672,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,399,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,971,804,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,477,150,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,920,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,371,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,720,326,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$17,949,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$18,156,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$18,299,466,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$18,345,826,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,595,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$607,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$660,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$636,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$693,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$666,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$728,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$698,761,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$731,818,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$717,568,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$735,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$739,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$742,886,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$729,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,414,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$751,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$737,798,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$41,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,585,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,285,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,102,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,025,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,175,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,524,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,072,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,702,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,360,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,346,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,718,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,018,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,259,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,694,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,112,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,928,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,550,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,602,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,162,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,559,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,714,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,813,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$491,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,052,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,233,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,324,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$1,370,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,720,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,641,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,856,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,751,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,255,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,704,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$32,652,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,295,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,684,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$34,598,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,081,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,520,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,921,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,186,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,526,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$36,742,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$36,078,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,223,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,913,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,200,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,786,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,217,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$17,835,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,339,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,153,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,880,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,331,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,863,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,225,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,214,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,593,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,422,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$19,817,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, -\$7,287,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$19,601,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, -\$7,517,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$15,753,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, -\$10,358,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$18,126,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, -\$13,446,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$22,106,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, -\$12,880,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$22,470,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, -\$12,330,000,000.

(B) Outlays, -\$22,598,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$10,989,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$22,362,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$10,255,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$22,849,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$11,141,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$23,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$11,933,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$24,521,000,000.
(8) Transportation (400):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$88,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$91,796,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$88,892,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,602,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$37,190,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,995,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,950,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,895,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$68,694,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$67,483,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,617,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$68,481,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,074,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,714,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,044,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,741,000,000.
(9) Community and Regional Development (450):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,365,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,626,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,170,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,983,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,240,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,353,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,558,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,487,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$6,386,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,556,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$5,090,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,745,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,857,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,767,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$5,077,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,805,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$4,953,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$4,809,000,000.
(10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,920,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$89,295,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$79,090,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,404,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$80,305,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,129,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,922,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$82,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,350,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$83,539,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,279,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$85,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,641,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$87,897,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,977,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$88,522,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$87,459,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$89,186,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$88,216,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,080,000,000.
(11) Health (550):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$579,328,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$551,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$564,387,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$570,419,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$552,405,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$541,949,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$512,289,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$518,445,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$528,560,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$533,688,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$547,998,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$549,687,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$571,335,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$569,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$594,923,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$591,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$618,119,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$613,682,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$623,810,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$626,774,000,000.
(12) Medicare (570):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$593,830,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$593,567,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$652,984,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$652,740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$692,126,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$691,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$739,367,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$739,161,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$826,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$826,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$845,800,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$845,593,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$850,393,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$850,177,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$916,244,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$916,009,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$988,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$987,942,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,053,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,053,435,000,000.
(13) Income Security (600):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$491,789,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$477,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$464,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$454,786,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$475,015,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$464,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$484,414,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$475,140,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$492,453,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$489,299,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$475,767,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$468,217,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$484,425,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$471,370,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$493,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$480,920,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$502,057,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$496,505,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$511,675,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$505,382,000,000.
(14) Social Security (650):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$176,704,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$178,038,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$191,507,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$190,235,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$194,930,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$193,931,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$199,751,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$197,856,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$215,442,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$213,337,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$212,567,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$210,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$209,943,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$207,908,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$227,991,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$225,820,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$234,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$232,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,718,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$241,501,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$51,367,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$63,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,722,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,722,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$376,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$376,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$409,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$409,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$450,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$450,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$493,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$493,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$531,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$531,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$565,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$565,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$589,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$589,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$607,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$607,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$620,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$620,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$623,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$623,911,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$44,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$23,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$34,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$45,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$40,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$48,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$44,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$47,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$49,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$53,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$51,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$51,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$52,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,919,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings and adjustments (930):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$2,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$67,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$47,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$120,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$97,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$153,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$137,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$174,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$159,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$194,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$179,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$193,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$187,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$246,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$223,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$258,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$240,977,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$90,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$93,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$100,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$105,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$105,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, -\$115,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$115,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$117,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$117,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$127,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$127,808,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$4,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$1,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$165,000,000.
(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,099,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR RECONCILIATION.—Not later than October 6, 2017, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations on changes in laws within their jurisdictions to the Committee on the Budget that would achieve the specified reduction in the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to

reduce the deficit by \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$14,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$45,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$32,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$52,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 con-

secutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) LIMITATION.—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 302. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriations Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in

mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading—

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) VETERANS.—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 305. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 306. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office

provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives or the Senate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means—

(A) in the Senate, a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(I) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(II) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(B) in the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 308. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 309. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President's annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 310. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 311. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 312. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions**SEC. 321. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 322. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 301 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

SEC. 323. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 325. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

(1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title and title II—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels established in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a Federally-chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

(1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;

(2) sets user fees to finance its operations;

(3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;

(4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and

(5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

SEC. 402. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 403. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 405. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.**

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) In fiscal year 2017, the Federal Government will collect approximately \$3.3 trillion in taxes, but spend more than \$4.0 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 15 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of fiscal year 2016, the national debt of the United States was more than \$19.5 trillion.

(3) A majority of States have petitioned the Federal Government to hold a constitutional convention to adopt a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution.

(4) As of the spring of 2016, 46 States have requirements to annually balance their respective budgets.

(5) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Currently in the 115th Congress, 8 joint resolutions proposing a balanced budget amendment have been introduced.

(6) In the 111th Congress, the House considered H. J. Res. 2, sponsored by Representative Robert W. Goodlatte of Virginia. Although it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(7) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed to pass by one vote in the United States Senate.

(8) Five States, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Arizona, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which seeks to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget through an Article V convention by April 12, 2021.

(b) **POLICY ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should enact legislation that reforms the congressional budget process to—

(1) reassert congressional control over the budget process by reorienting the Views and Estimates that committees submit to the Committee on the Budget, as required under 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to emphasize congressional rather than executive branch priorities;

(2) strengthen enforcement of budgetary rules and requirements by—

(A) enabling Members of the House of Representatives to enforce budget requirements in a manner that does not jeopardize the ability of the majority to work its will on legislation; and

(B) permitting members of Congress to determine whether emergency-designated appropriations are for unanticipated situations that pose a threat to life, property, or national security;

(3) increase control over the costs of Federal activities by—

(A) incorporating debt service costs into cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office;

(B) establishing a process for setting limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President;

(C) transitioning to fair-value accounting;

(D) budgeting for Federal insurance programs on an accrual basis; and

(E) developing and implementing a regulatory budget as provided in section 503;

(4) achieve greater control over mandatory spending by reforming reconciliation procedures and requirements to ensure they are transparent, objectively applied, and maximize opportunities for deficit reduction;

(5) increase the efficiency of the congressional budget process by—

(A) realigning the budget cycle with the calendar year and the congressional calendar;

(B) simplifying the procedures by which the Committee on Appropriations adjusts its section 302(b) suballocations to ensure they are consistent with the Committee's overall section 302(a) allocation; and

(C) increasing congressional accountability for budget decisions;

(6) improve the transparency of the Federal Government's obligations by—

(A) modifying the content of the budget resolution to reflect the budgetary decisions that Congress actually makes and enforces;

(B) requiring the Comptroller General to periodically report to Congress on the consolidated financial report of the Federal Government; and

(C) restructuring the baseline, as set forth in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to treat mandatory spending and revenue on a comparable basis; and

(7) achieve control over long-term budget obligations by—

(A) establishing declining limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President; and

(B) codifying limits on the amount legislation can increase the deficit beyond the ten fiscal-year period of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Federal regulations are estimated to cost \$1.9 trillion per year or approximately \$15,000 per household. Such costs exceed 10 percent of the Gross Domestic Product of the United States.

(2) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) retards job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from economic recession and harming American households;

(B) operates as a regressive tax on poor and lower-income households;

(C) displaces workers into long-term unemployment or lower-paying jobs;

(D) adversely affects small businesses, the primary source of new jobs; and

(E) impedes the economic growth necessary to provide sufficient funds to meet vital commitments and reduce the Federal debt.

(3) Federal agencies do not systematically analyze both the costs and benefits of new regulations or identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

(4) Agencies too often impose costly regulations without relying on sound science, through the use of agency guidance, judicial consent decrees, and settlement agreements, and through the abuse of high interim compliance costs imposed on regulated entities that bring legal challenges against newly promulgated regulations.

(5) Congress lacks an effective mechanism to manage the level of new Federal regulatory costs imposed each year. Other nations, meanwhile, have successfully implemented the use of regulatory budgeting to control excess regulation and regulatory costs.

(6) Significant steps have been taken already by President Trump and the 115th Congress, including the imposition of a regulatory pay-as-you-go regimen for new and revised regulations by the Trump Administration and the enactment of 14 measures under the Congressional Review Act that repealed regulations promulgated in the final 60 legislative days of the 114th Congress.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with the public, consider legislation that—

(1) requires the President's budget submission to include an analysis of the costs of complying with current and proposed regulations;

(2) builds the institutional capacity of the Congressional Budget Office to develop a regulatory baseline and estimate regulatory costs;

(3) codifies the Trump Administration's regulatory pay-as-you-go requirements, which require agencies to offset the costs of new or revised regulations with the repeal or modification of existing regulations; and

(4) requires Federal agencies to give notice and allow for comments on proposed guidance documents.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Article I of the Constitution vests all legislative power in Congress.

(2) Central to the legislative powers of Congress is the authorization of appropriations necessary to execute the laws that establish agencies and programs and impose obligations.

(3) Clause 2 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures that provide appropriations for unauthorized programs.

(4) In fiscal year 2016, more than \$310 billion was appropriated for unauthorized programs, spanning 256 separate laws.

(5) Agencies such as the Department of State have not been authorized for 15 years.

(6) The House adopted a requirement for the 115th Congress, as part of H. Res. 5, that requires each standing committee of the House to adopt an authorization and oversight plan that enumerates all unauthorized programs and agencies within its jurisdiction that received funding in the prior year, among other oversight requirements.

(b) **POLICY ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**—In the House, it is the policy of this concurrent resolution that legislation should be enacted that—

(1) establishes a schedule for reauthorizing all Federal programs on a staggered five-year basis together with declining spending targets for each year a program is not reauthorized according to such schedule;

(2) prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures in the House that provide appropriations in excess of spending targets specified for such measures and ensures that such rule should be strictly enforced; and

(3) limits funding for non-defense or non-security-related Federal programs that are not reauthorized according to the schedule described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Current accounting methods fail to capture and present in a compelling manner the full scope of the Federal Government and its fiscal condition.

(2) Most fiscal analyses produced by the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) are conducted over a 10-fiscal year period. The use of generational accounting or a longer time horizon would provide a more complete picture of the Federal Government's fiscal condition.

(3) The Federal budget currently accounts for most programs on a cash accounting basis, which records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received. However, it accounts for loan and loan guarantee programs on an accrual basis, which records revenue when earned and expenses when incurred.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has advised that accrual accounting may be

more accurate than cash accounting in estimating the Federal Government's liabilities for insurance and other programs.

(5) Accrual accounting under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) understates the risk and thus the true cost of some Federal programs, including loans and loan guarantees.

(6) Fair-value accounting better reflects the risk associated with Federal loan and loan guarantee programs by using a market based discount rate. CBO, for example, uses fair-value accounting to measure the cost of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(7) In comparing fair-value accounting to FCRA, CBO has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance".

(8) The Department of the Treasury, when reporting the principal financial statements of the United States entitled *Balance Sheet and Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position*, may omit some of the largest projected Federal Government expenses, including social insurance programs. The projected expenses of these programs are reported by the Department in its *Statements of Social Insurance and Changes in Social Insurance Amounts*.

(9) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of Federal credit programs on a fair-value basis to fully capture the risk associated with these programs.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with CBO and other appropriate stakeholders, reform government-wide budget and accounting practices so Members and the public can better understand the fiscal condition of the United States and the best options to improve it. Such reforms may include the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance analysis by considering the Nation's fiscal condition comprehensively, over an extended time period, and how it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair-value accounting to better capture market risk.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1965, the President's Commission on Budget Concepts made a series of recommendations that were adopted and continue to provide the foundation for the Federal budget process.

(2) Over the ensuing 52 years, the Federal budget process has undergone major transformations, including the following:

(A) Congress asserted its Article I "power of the purse" through the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the form of a congressional budget process predicated on the adoption of an annual budget resolution setting forth its priorities independent of the executive branch.

(B) Congress and the President have periodically augmented the President's budget submission and the budget resolution by establishing statutory budget rules and limits enforced through sequestration.

(C) The share of Federal spending that is not controlled through the annual appropriations process has ballooned from 32 percent of total Federal spending in 1967 to 69 percent in 2016.

(D) Activities previously considered the exclusive domain of the Federal Government have been fully commercialized, contracted out to the private sector, financed through third party arrangements, or devolved to State and local governments.

(E) Key functions of the Federal Government are now funded through user fees rather than general revenue, often shielding them from congressional control and oversight.

(F) The Credit Reform Act of 1990 placed Federal loans and loan guarantees on an accrual basis.

(G) Increasing shares of the economy are directed towards compliance with Federal regulations, which are not subject to the limitations applicable to Federal spending.

(b) **POLICY ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that legislation should be enacted that establishes a Commission on Budget Concepts to review and revise budget concepts and make recommendations to create a more transparent Federal budget process.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should—

(1) adopt an annual budget resolution before spending and tax legislation is considered in either House of Congress;

(2) assess measures for timely compliance with budget rules in the House;

(3) pass legislation to strengthen enforcement of the budget resolution;

(4) comply with the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(5) prevent the use of accounting gimmicks to offset higher spending;

(6) modify scoring conventions to encourage the commercialization of Federal Government activities that can best be provided by the private sector; and

(7) discourage the use of savings identified in the budget resolution as offsets for spending or tax legislation.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Government Accountability Office defines improper payments as any reported payment that should not have been made or was made in an incorrect amount.

(2) Improper payments totaled \$1.2 trillion between fiscal years 2003 and 2016 with a reported Federal Government-wide error rate of 5.1 percent in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Improper payments increased from \$107 billion in 2012 to \$144 billion in 2016.

(4) The Earned Income Tax Credit, Medicare, and Medicaid account for 78 percent of total improper payments, with error rates of 24 percent, 11 percent, and 10.5 percent, respectively.

(5) Eight agencies did not report payment estimates for 18 programs that the Comptroller General deems susceptible to significant improper payments.

(b) **POLICY ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that an independent commission should be established with the goal of finding tangible solutions to reduce total improper payments by 50 percent within the next 5 years. The commission should also develop a more-stringent system of agency oversight to achieve this goal.

SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Many Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect

and spend fees and other offsetting collections.

(2) The Office of Management and Budget estimates the total amount of offsetting fees and collections to be \$513 billion in fiscal year 2017.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable Government.

(b) **POLICY ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should reassert its constitutional prerogative to control Federal spending and exercise rigorous oversight over Federal agencies. Congress should subject all fees paid by the public to Federal agencies to annual appropriations or authorizing legislation and a share of these proceeds should be reserved for taxpayers in the form of deficit reduction.

SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) Patient-centered health care increases access to quality care for all Americans, regardless of age, income, or health status.

(2) States are best equipped to respond to the needs of their unique communities.

(3) The current legal framework encourages frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits that increase health care costs.

(b) **POLICY ON HEALTH CARE REGULATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the American health care system should encourage research, development, and innovation in the medical sector, rather than stymie growth through over-regulation;

(2) States should determine the parameters of acceptable private insurance plans based on the needs of their populations and retain control over other health care coverage standards;

(3) reforms should protect patients with pre-existing conditions, reward those who maintain continuous health coverage, and create greater parity between benefits offered through employers and those offered independently;

(4) States should have greater flexibility in designing their Medicaid program and State Children's Health Insurance Program;

(5) medical malpractice reform should emphasize compliance with best practice guidelines, while continuing to protect patients' interests; and

(6) States should have the flexibility to implement medical liability policies to best suit their needs.

SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 57 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

(2) The Medicare Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Congress address Medicare's long-term financial challenges. Each year without reform, the financial condition of Medicare becomes more precarious and the threat to those in or near retirement more pronounced. The current challenges that Congress will need to address include—

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2029 and unable to pay the scheduled benefits;

(B) Medicare enrollment is expected to increase more than 50 percent in the next two decades, as 10,000 baby boomers reach retirement age each day;

(C) due to extended life spans, enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program five decades ago;

(D) notwithstanding the program's trust fund arrangement, current workers' payroll tax contributions pay for current Medicare beneficiaries instead of being set aside for their own future use;

(E) the number of workers supporting each beneficiary continues to fall; in 1965, the ratio was 4.5 workers per beneficiary, and by 2030, the ratio will be only 2.4 workers per beneficiary;

(F) the average Medicare beneficiary receives about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every dollar paid into the program;

(G) Medicare is growing faster than the economy, with a projected growth rate of 7.2 percent per year on average through 2026, peaking in 2026 at 9.2 percent; and

(H) by 2027, Medicare spending will reach more than \$1.4 trillion, more than double the 2016 spending level of \$692 billion.

(3) Failing to address the impending insolvency of Medicare will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with having to pay for these unsustainable spending levels.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to save Medicare for those in or near retirement and to strengthen the program's solvency for future beneficiaries.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This concurrent resolution assumes transition to an improved Medicare program that ensures—

(1) Medicare is preserved for current and future beneficiaries;

(2) future Medicare beneficiaries may select from competing guaranteed health coverage options a plan that best suits their needs;

(3) traditional fee-for-service Medicare remains a plan option;

(4) Medicare provides additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

(5) Medicare spending is put on a sustainable path and becomes solvent over the long term.

SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMBATING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 91 Americans die each day from an opioid overdose.

(2) Nearly half of all opioid overdose deaths involve a prescription opioid.

(3) Since 1999, the number of prescription opioids sold in the U.S. has nearly quadrupled.

(4) Since 1999, the number of deaths from prescription opioids has more than quadrupled.

(5) The CDC asserts that improving opioid prescribing practices will reduce exposure to opioids, prevent abuse, and stop addiction.

(6) The CDC has found that individuals in rural counties are almost twice as likely to overdose on prescription painkillers as those in urban areas.

(7) According to the CDC, nearly 7,000 people are treated in emergency rooms every day for using opioids in a non-approved manner.

(8) The 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act were signed into law in the 114th Congress in an overwhelming display of congressional and executive branch support in the fight against the opioid epidemic.

(9) Bipartisan efforts to eliminate opioid abuse and provide relief from addiction for all Americans should continue.

(b) **POLICY ON OPIOID ABUSE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) combating opioid abuse using available budgetary resources remains a high priority;

(2) the House, in a bipartisan manner, should continue to examine the Federal response to the opioid abuse epidemic and support essential activities to reduce and prevent substance abuse;

(3) the House should continue to support initiatives included in the 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act;

(4) the House should continue its oversight efforts, particularly ongoing investigations conducted by the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, to ensure that taxpayer dollars intended to combat opioid abuse are spent appropriately and efficiently; and

(5) the House should collaborate with State, local, and tribal entities to develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the opioid addiction crisis.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) is a means-tested program that provides health insurance coverage to low-income children and pregnant women who do not qualify for Medicaid based on income.

(2) SCHIP eligibility varies by State, as States decide the income upper limit for beneficiaries; the current upper limit varies from 175 percent of the Federal poverty level to 405 percent of the Federal poverty level.

(3) SCHIP covered on average 6.3 million people monthly in fiscal year 2017.

(4) The average cost of a child enrolled in SCHIP to the Federal Government was approximately \$2,300 in fiscal year 2017, compared to approximately \$1,910 for a child enrolled in Medicaid.

(5) The Federal spending allotment for SCHIP will expire at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(6) The Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission recommends an extension of Federal SCHIP funding, and warns that all States are projected to exhaust their Federal SCHIP funds during fiscal year 2018.

(7) SCHIP should be preserved to assist the Nation's vulnerable children.

(b) **POLICY ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should work in a bipartisan manner to reauthorize SCHIP funding;

(2) the authorizing committees should consider establishing a Federal upper limit for SCHIP eligibility, rather than providing open-ended access to the program for those at higher income levels;

(3) the House should target resources designated for SCHIP toward those most in need of Federal assistance; and

(4) the House should require greater reporting by States of SCHIP data in order to better structure the program to meet beneficiaries' needs.

SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY, AND INNOVATION.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world for decades.

(2) The history of scientific discovery and medical breakthroughs in the United States is extensive, including the creation of the polio vaccine, the first genetic mapping, and the invention of the implantable cardiac pacemaker.

(3) Reuters ranks the United States Health and Human Services Laboratories as first in

the world for innovation on its 2017 list of the Top 25 Global Innovators.

(4) The United States leads the world in the production of medical devices, and the United States medical device market accounts for approximately 45 percent of the global market.

(5) The United States remains a global leader in pharmaceutical research and development investment, has produced more than half of the world's new molecules in the past decade, and represents the world's largest pharmaceutical market, which is triple the size of the nearest rival, China.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the Federal Government should foster investment in health care innovation and maintain the Nation's world leadership status in medical science by encouraging competition;

(2) the House should continue to support the critical work of medical innovators throughout the country through continued funding for agencies, including the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to conduct life-saving research and development; and

(3) the Federal Government should unleash the power of private-sector medical innovation by removing regulatory obstacles that impede the adoption of new medical technology and pharmaceuticals.

SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Constitution requires the Federal Government to provide for the common defense. As such, the Nation must prioritize its ability to respond rapidly and effectively to a public health crisis or bioterrorism threat.

(2) There is a persistent threat of bioterrorism against American lives.

(3) Naturally-occurring public health threats can spread through the transmission of communicable diseases during international trade and travel.

(4) As of April 3, 2016, the World Health Organization reported nearly 29,000 cases of the Ebola virus worldwide, including 4 instances in the U.S.

(5) As of July 12, 2017, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that the current Zika epidemic resulted in over 5,000 cases of the Zika virus within the United States, with nearly 37,000 more cases reported in U.S. territories.

(6) Preventing the spread of disease to Americans requires halting threats before they breach the U.S. border.

(7) The United States is a leader in global public health assistance and orchestrates international responses to health crises.

(b) **POLICY ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should continue to fund activities of the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority to develop and stockpile medical countermeasures to infectious diseases and chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents;

(2) the House should, within available budgetary resources, provide continued support for research, prevention, and public health preparedness programs;

(3) the Federal Government should encourage private-sector development of critical vaccines and other medical countermeasures to emerging public health threats; and

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State should collaborate on

global health preparedness initiatives to prevent overlap and promote responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources.

SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) More than 60 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg of the “three-legged stool” of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans’ retirement security.

(3) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. The financial condition of Social Security and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced each year without reform. For example—

(A) in 2028, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) with the exhaustion of both the Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Fund in 2035, benefits will be cut by as much as 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(4) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$1.3 trillion over the next 10 years.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to CBO, between 1970 and 2015 the number of disabled workers and their dependent family members receiving disability benefits has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. CBO also attributes program growth to changes in demographics and the composition of the labor force as well as Federal policies.

(6) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission”, which helped address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(7) Americans deserve action by the President and Congress to preserve and strengthen Social Security to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should work in a bipartisan manner to make Social Security solvent on a sustainable basis. This concurrent resolution assumes, under a reform trigger, that—

(1) if in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance

and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and any recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit its recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House should introduce the President’s legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction should report a bill, which the House or Senate should consider under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on and provide certainty for future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2028 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This concurrent resolution assumes reform that—

(1) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work;

(2) ensures benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(3) prevents a 7 percent across-the-board benefit cut; and

(4) improves the Disability Insurance program.

(d) POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that any legislation the House considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance Trust Fund must also improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Medicaid is a Federal-State program that provides health care coverage for impoverished Americans.

(2) Medicaid serves four major population categories: the elderly, the blind and disabled, children, and adults.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office projects the average monthly enrollment in Medicaid for fiscal year 2018 to be 78 million people.

(4) Of this 78 million people, 27 million – more than one third of the enrollees – are non-elderly, non-disabled adults.

(5) Medicaid continues to grow at an unsustainable rate, and will cost approximately one trillion dollars per year within the decade, between Federal and State spending.

(6) Congress has a responsibility to preserve limited Medicaid resources for America’s most vulnerable – those who cannot provide for themselves.

(7) Forbes reported last year on a first-of-its-kind study conducted by the Foundation for Government Accountability. It analyzed data from the State of Kansas, which dem-

onstrates that work requirements have led to greater employment, higher incomes, and less poverty.

(8) The State of Maine implemented work requirements in 2014, and saw incomes rise for able-bodied welfare recipients by an average of 114 percent within a year.

(9) Work is a valuable source of human dignity, and work requirements help lift Americans out of poverty by incentivizing self-reliance.

(b) POLICY ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that encourages able-bodied, non-elderly, non-pregnant adults without dependents to work, actively seek work, participate in a job-training program, or do community service, in order to receive Medicaid;

(2) Medicaid work requirements legislation could include 30 hours per week of work, of which 20 of those hours should be spent in the core activities of: public or private sector employment, work experience, on-the-job training, job-search or job-readiness assistance program participation, community service, or vocational training and education;

(3) States should be given flexibility to determine the parameters of qualifying program participation and work-equivalent experience;

(4) States should perform regular case checks to ensure taxpayer dollars are appropriately spent; and

(5) the Government Accountability Office or the Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General should conduct annual audits of State Medicaid programs to ensure proper reporting and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON WELFARE REFORM AND SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM WORK REQUIREMENTS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has grown from 17 million Americans in 2001 to 44 million in 2016.

(2) The work support role of SNAP has declined, and the program increasingly serves as a replacement to work.

(3) Work requirements were key to the success of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (Public Law 104-193), which led to a two-thirds reduction in welfare case-loads, a reduction in child poverty, and an increase in work participation. The successful 1996 welfare reform law provides a model for improving work requirements in other anti-poverty programs.

(b) POLICY ON WELFARE REFORM AND SNAP WORK REQUIREMENTS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should reward work, provide tools to escape poverty, and expect work-capable adults to work or prepare for work in exchange for welfare benefits; and

(2) SNAP should be reformed to improve work requirements to help more people escape poverty and move up the economic ladder.

SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) Spending on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has almost quadrupled since 2001.

(2) Various factors are driving this growth, but one major reason is that while States have the responsibility of administering the program, they have little incentive to ensure it is well run.

(3) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic President reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the 5 years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This bipartisan success offers a model for improving other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SNAP.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that SNAP should be reformed to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility for struggling Americans on the road to personal and financial independence. Based on the successful welfare reforms of the 1990s, these proposals would improve work requirements and provide flexible funding for States to help those most in need find gainful employment, escape poverty, and move up the economic ladder.

SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated, high-skilled workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Average published tuition and fees have increased consistently above the rate of inflation across all types of colleges and universities.

(3) With an outstanding student loan portfolio of \$1.3 trillion, the Federal Government is the largest education lender to undergraduate and graduate students, parents, and other guarantors.

(4) Students who do not complete their college degree are at a greater risk of defaulting on their loans than those who complete their degree.

(5) Participation in Federal income-driven repayment plans is rising, in terms of the percent of both borrowers and loan dollars, according to the Government Accountability Office. Because these plans offer loan balance forgiveness after a repayment period, this increased use portends higher projected costs to taxpayers.

(b) **POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to promote college affordability, access, and success by—

(1) reserving Federal financial aid for those most in need and streamlining grant and loan aid programs to help students and families more easily assess their options for financing postsecondary education; and

(2) removing regulatory barriers to reduce costs, increase access, and allow for innovative teaching models.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 7.5 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with skilled personnel.

(3) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce successfully consolidated 15 workforce development programs when Congress enacted the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to build on the success of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal workforce development programs; and

(2) empowering States with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce.

SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) In 1995, fire activities made up 16 percent of the United States Forest Service's (USFS) annual appropriated budget. Since 2015, more than 50 percent has now been dedicated to wildfire.

(2) Wildland fire suppression activities are currently funded entirely within the USFS budget, based on a 10-year rolling average. Using this model, the agency must average firefighting costs from the past 10 years to predict and request costs for the next year. When the average was stable, the agency was able to use this model to budget consistently for the annual costs associated with wildland fire suppression.

(3) Over the last few decades, wildland fire suppression costs have increased as fire seasons have grown longer and the frequency, size, and severity of wildland fires has increased.

(4) The six worst fire seasons since 1960 have all occurred since 2000. Since 2000, many western states have experienced the largest wildfires in their State's history. In 2016 alone, there were a recorded 67,595 fires and a total of over 5.5 million acres burned. The suppression costs to USFS and other Federal agencies for 2016 totaled over \$1.9 billion dollars.

(5) As wildfire costs continue to increase, funding levels for USFS wildfire suppression activities will also continue to constrict funding levels for other necessary USFS forest management activities focused on land management and wildfire prevention.

(b) **POLICY ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress, in coordination with the Administration, should develop both a long-term funding mechanism that would allow supplemental wildfire suppression funding and reforms on reducing hazardous fuel loads on Federal forests and lands that could decrease wildfires.

SEC. 522. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) For years there have been serious concerns regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs' (VA) bureaucratic mismanagement and continuous failure to provide veterans timely access to health care.

(2) Since 2003, VA disability compensation and health care have been added to the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) "high-risk" list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, lack of a "unified vision, strategy, or set of goals to guide their outcomes," and the inability to ensure allocated resources are used in a cost-effective and efficient way to improve veterans' health care access.

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to America's veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the agency has mismanaged these resources, resulting in proven adverse effects on veterans and their families.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should require the VA to conduct an audit of its programs named on GAO's "high-risk" list and report its findings to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON MOVING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE ON BUDGET.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The President's Commission on Budget Concepts recommends that the budget should, as a general rule, be comprehensive of the full range of Federal activity.

(2) The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-239) moved the United States Postal Service (USPS) off budget and exempted it from sequestration.

(3) The USPS has a direct effect on the fiscal posture of the Federal Government, through—

(A) the receipt of direct appropriations of \$35 million in fiscal year 2017;

(B) congressional mandates such as requirements for mail delivery service schedules;

(C) incurring \$15 billion in debt from the Treasury, the maximum permitted by law;

(D) continued operating deficits since 2007;

(E) defaulting on its statutory obligation to prefund health care benefits for future retirees; and

(F) carrying \$119 billion in total unfunded liabilities with no foreseeable pathway of funding these liabilities under current law.

(b) **POLICY ON MOVING THE USPS ON BUDGET.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that all receipts and disbursements of the USPS should be included in the congressional budget and the budget of the Federal Government.

SEC. 524. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE JUDGMENT FUND.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The House finds the following:

(1) The Judgment Fund (Fund), established in 1956, was created to pay judgments and settlements of lawsuits against the Federal Government.

(2) As a result of the Fund's design, it is ripe for executive branch exploitation. The Obama Administration used the Fund to make billions of dollars in payments to Federal agencies and foreign entities. For example—

(A) on January 17, 2016, the State Department announced the Federal Government agreed to pay the Iranian government \$1.7 billion to settle a case related to the sale of military equipment prior to the Iranian revolution, of which \$1.3 billion was sourced through the Fund, without prior congressional notification; the Obama Administration's use of the Fund to make this and other payments raises serious concerns by sidestepping Congress; and

(B) in 2016, the Department of Health and Human Services announced its intentions to use the Fund for settlements with health insurers who sued the Federal Government over the loss of funds for risk corridors under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(3) Failing to address the lack of oversight over the Fund annually costs taxpayers billions of dollars, as payments exceeded \$4.6 billion in 2016 and more than \$26 billion in the preceding 10 year period.

(b) **POLICY ON JUDGMENT FUND.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation that reclaims Congress's power of the purse over the Fund. Such legislation should—

(1) prohibit interest payments paid from the Fund for accounts or assets frozen by the Federal Government and listed on—

(A) the Sanctions Programs list of the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of Treasury; or

(B) Sponsors of Terrorism list of the Department of State;

(2) amend sections 2414 and 1304 of titles 28 and 31, United States Code, respectively, to—

(A) provide a clear definition and explanation of a “foreign court or tribunal”; and

(B) require congressional notification whenever the Fund makes a settlement or court ordered lump sum or aggregated payment exceeding \$500 million; and

(3) require legislative action to approve payments from the Fund in excess of a specified threshold, increase transparency, and require Federal agencies to reimburse the Fund over a fixed time period.

SEC. 525. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that significant savings were achieved by the House by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources, and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources, including printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent;

(2) the House should review policies and procedures for the acquisition of goods and services to eliminate unnecessary spending;

(3) the Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to services provided to Members and committees of the House, and identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room;

(4) no taxpayer funds should be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress; and

(5) retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 526. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds the following:

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all 3 counts: it is complex, unfair, and inefficient. The tax code’s complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Standard economic theory holds that high marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(3) Roughly half of United States active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a “pass-through” basis, meaning the income is taxed at individual rates rather than corporate rates. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the highest Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(4) The top United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) is slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages, discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(5) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains eco-

nomical growth and job creation. The United States tax rate differential fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate practices intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(6) The “world-wide” structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors that have more competitive international tax systems.

(7) Reforming the tax code would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and significantly reduce tax avoidance.

(8) The tax code imposes costs on American workers through lower wages, consumers in higher prices, and investors in diminished returns.

(9) Increasing taxes to raise revenue and meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans’ ability to save for their children’s education and retirement.

(10) Closing special preference carve outs in our tax code to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

(11) Tax reform should curb or eliminate tax breaks and use those savings to lower tax rates across the board, not to fund more wasteful Federal Government spending. Washington has a spending problem, not a revenue problem.

(12) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform, including a broader tax base and lower tax rates, would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which would have a positive impact on total national output.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider comprehensive tax reform legislation that promotes economic growth, creates American jobs, increases wages, and benefits American consumers, investors, and workers by—

(1) simplifying the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reducing the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowering tax rates for individuals and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repealing the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reducing the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitioning the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-339.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) to offer the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this concurrent resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 and 2019 through 2027.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 1. Direct spending.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance Appropriations.

Sec. 302. Point of order against funding for certain immigration enforcement efforts.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$2,566,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,231,053,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,754,112,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$3,852,015,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$4,011,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,197,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$4,405,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$4,617,110,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$4,840,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$5,069,484,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$0.

Fiscal year 2018: \$497,484,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$920,604,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$901,439,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$951,960,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$1,014,422,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$977,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$943,390,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$994,932,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,050,654,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$1,111,097,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,558,164,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,809,501,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$3,889,380,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$4,085,946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$4,242,299,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,524,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,667,232,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,840,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,123,649,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,359,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,604,559,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,411,968,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,801,027,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,859,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,031,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,190,238,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,474,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,610,999,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,770,214,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,057,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,301,376,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,545,750,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: -\$845,569,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$569,974,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$569,974,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$179,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$178,367,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$276,918,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$315,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$364,396,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$440,607,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$461,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$476,266,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$21,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,490,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$22,950,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,111,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$24,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$26,305,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$15,093,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,752,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,693,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,794,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$18,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$21,166,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$597,390,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$581,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,087,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$582,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$609,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$594,652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,521,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$611,949,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$637,690,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$620,850,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$655,897,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$632,247,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$670,145,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$651,864,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$680,394,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$663,759,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$690,786,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$674,679,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,918,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,533,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$55,508,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$50,831,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,425,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$55,384,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,369,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$59,870,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,575,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,106,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$73,547,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,255,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,986,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$73,094,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,697,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,618,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$84,476,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$80,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$88,702,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$83,952,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$92,835,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$87,887,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,853,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$35,239,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$33,151,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$37,743,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$35,678,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,747,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$37,880,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$42,204,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$40,117,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,567,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,522,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,123,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,442,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$47,766,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,120,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,490,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$47,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$51,349,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,597,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,198,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$51,390,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,003,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,581,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$54,382,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$59,900,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$56,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$58,813,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,511,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,073,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,314,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,918,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$62,631,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,290,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$63,142,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,119,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,100,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,437,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$67,375,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,575,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$68,547,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$40,851,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$41,010,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$122,495,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$122,147,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$125,237,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$124,382,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$128,313,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$127,136,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,915,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$68,294,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,613,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$70,715,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,531,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$72,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,400,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$74,852,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$78,455,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$76,818,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$80,604,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$78,839,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$82,820,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$81,015,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):

Fiscal year 2017:

(A) New budget authority, \$21,930,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,001,000,000.

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,023,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$22,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,735,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,240,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,298,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$19,431,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,832,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,437,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$17,941,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,610,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$18,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,068,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,180,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,105,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,938,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,328,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,274,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,131,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,724,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,516,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,781,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,608,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,099,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,576,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,836,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,416,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,772,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,478,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,628,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,730,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,107,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$199,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$201,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$196,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,143,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$203,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$205,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$171,562,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$179,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,132,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$173,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$183,231,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$185,116,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$175,633,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$187,060,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,569,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,830,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,242,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,662,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,888,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,353,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,428,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,242,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$298,769,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$295,251,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$168,879,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,656,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$172,182,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$188,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$182,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$192,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$204,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$210,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,028,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$216,669,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$212,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$218,112,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$228,312,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$224,320,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$548,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$548,998,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,564,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$585,289,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$613,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,402,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$659,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$646,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,765,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$726,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,843,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$765,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$761,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$807,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$802,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$852,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$846,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$897,043,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$891,673,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$943,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$938,235,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,289,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$599,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$599,092,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$650,772,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$676,942,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$676,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$723,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$723,163,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$817,925,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$817,695,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$840,589,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$840,371,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$861,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$861,049,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$963,021,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$962,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,016,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,016,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,091,254,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,091,006,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$522,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$512,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$574,926,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$554,174,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$641,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$624,323,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$691,701,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$675,708,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$737,828,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,824,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$785,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$775,704,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$819,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$807,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$855,396,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$837,727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$904,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$887,787,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$947,417,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$937,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$995,029,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$984,004,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,155,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,621,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,621,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,402,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,402,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,861,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$50,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$54,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$54,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$59,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$75,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,931,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$175,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$178,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$185,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$183,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$204,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$199,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$213,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$209,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$242,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$241,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$237,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$261,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$257,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$271,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$266,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$281,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,377,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$80,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$95,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,445,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,207,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$358,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$358,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$379,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$379,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$408,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$444,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$444,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$482,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$518,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$518,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$554,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$554,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$588,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$588,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$621,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$621,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$654,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$654,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$682,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$682,937,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$223,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,565,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 1. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 4.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget adopts former President Obama's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to expand eligibility, including for childless workers. Continues enhanced credits originally implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to target those most in need. This includes extending the Child and Dependent Care Credit and the American Opportunity Tax Credit through 2027.

(B) The People's Budget includes former President Obama's proposal to boost the Child Tax Credit maximum deduction to \$3,000. It makes key expansions permanent to protect 50 million Americans who would otherwise be at jeopardy for losing part or all of their EITC and CTC.

(C) The People's Budget creates a debt free college that provides Federal matching program to support state efforts to expand investment in higher education, bring down

costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt. The program would encourage innovation by states and colleges to improve efficiency and enable speedy and less-costly degree completion. By treating higher education as a public good worth investing in, we can once again make higher education accessible to all.

(D) The People's Budget allows students to refinance their student loans at low rates and allows private borrowers to shift to more affordable government loans. Allowing student borrowers to reduce the value of their debt will free up income for purchases and will create a job-creating ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

(E) The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are households with children, seniors and individuals with disabilities, but recent cuts lowered average benefits by \$216 in 2014. Providing families with basic food security through SNAP is one of the most effective ways the Federal Government can stimulate the economy.

(F) The People's Budget provides an additional \$10.8 billion for child nutrition programs including program expansion and improvements for summer meals; essential improvements and expansion funding for preschool nutrition including increases in meal reimbursements to fulfill the new meal pattern, an additional meal or snack for children in long-term care, and expanded program eligibility; and investments in school meals and school kitchens.

(G) The People's Budget replaces the 40 percent excise tax with a public option to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to offer a public insurance option within the health insurance marketplaces. This ensures choice, competition, and stability in coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the premium costs for Americans under the public option will be 7 to 8 percent lower than costs in private exchange plans. The repeal of the excise tax costs \$132 billion while savings from the public option are \$176 billion.

(H) The People's Budget continues funding for the entire CHIP program until 2020.

(I) The People's Budget protects States programs by fully retaining maintenance of effort requirements and eliminating any States ability to arbitrarily implement enrollment caps. Without action, Federal funding for CHIP will expire jeopardizing the health care coverage of more than 10 million children and pregnant women.

(J) The People's Budget permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Giving HHS the ability to negotiate prices, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, will save Medicare \$429 billion and will reduce costs for seniors.

(b) NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 4.8 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 5.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment

benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years.

(B) The People's Budget also adopts former President Obama's reforms to improve solvencies and incentivize job training.

(C) The People's Budget improves the Affordable Care Act by repealing the excise tax on high-priced health plans. Proponents of the provision hoped that this tax would slow the rate of growth of health costs, while raising revenue. However, in an effort to avoid the tax, employers who traditionally offer excellent benefits have started offering less generous plans. This is an ineffective tool to bend the cost curve. Since the tax is attached to premiums instead of coverage it has the potential to hit plans it wasn't intended to impact.

(D) The People's Budget establishes a representative democracy that truly reflects the diversity and values of our nation by providing funding for the public financing of campaigns. This gives a voice to small donors that have been drowned out by dark money. Public financing keeps politicians accountable to the voters that elect them instead of to special interest money. In the era of the devastating Citizens United decision, big money has taken the reins of our election process. It is now more important than ever to provide candidates with effective alternatives to finance their campaigns.

(E) The People's Budget uses the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for Federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement, current underpricing of costs amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

(G) The People's Budget makes a down payment of \$1.9 trillion to help close the nation's infrastructure deficit while protecting against climate change and creating millions of living wage jobs. The budget also helps boost private financing for critical state and local projects by creating a public-private infrastructure bank. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimates that the United States will need to invest upwards of \$2 trillion above current levels over the next decade just to make required repairs to roads, bridges, water, and energy systems.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report making a general appropriations or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.

It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment there- to or conference report thereon, that appro-

priates funds to implement Executive Order 13767, entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2017 and fiscal years 2018-2027".

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to replace the reckless Republican budget that is being considered before this House.

Instead of a doomsday budget that presents a future where everything is bleak and opportunity is nonexistent, the Progressive Caucus is offering a budget that can prove that the future can be bright and prosperous.

The Republican budget sacrifices everything from public education to Social Security to Medicare and Medicaid. It does this for one reason and one reason only: to give the wealthiest few and the corporations more tax breaks and increase their standing and concentration of power and wealth in this country more than it is already.

It has been said over and over that the budget that we are presenting we feel does deal with the values of this country. It deals very directly with something that is important to this Nation, and that is the American people, the greatest resource that we have as a nation, and we see it day in and day out.

This budget invests in the American people. It invests in jobs, it invests in solid education, and it invests in the greater good.

This budget is not narrow, tilted to a few: the wealthiest and the corporations in this country. It deals with the totality of who the American people are: those who are struggling and need opportunity, those who are elderly and need the continued support of this Nation through Medicare and Social Security, those who are poor who need Medicaid and a good education system so their opportunity will be better in the future.

Our budget speaks to the values of the American people. Our budget speaks to the needs of the American people. Our budget speaks to a future that returns the values, to the American people, of opportunity, of hope, and of chance.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from California is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, even though I disagree heartily with the budgets advanced by

the Progressive Caucus, they do us an invaluable service in the budget debate by bringing into sharp relief the two very different visions of governance advanced by the two parties.

The Progressive budget is a sincere and bold document. Unfortunately, it is also wrong. It would hike taxes by \$10.1 trillion over the next 10 years relative to the Republican budget.

Now, think of every trillion dollars that we throw around here as \$8,000 from an average family, because that is what it comes to. So \$10.1 trillion in new taxes ultimately translates as \$81,000 from an average family over the next decade taken either as direct taxes or as tax-driven price increases or as lower wages or as lower earnings as businesses pass on their burdens to consumers or employers or investors. Remember, investors are largely your 401(k) or your pension plan.

It also runs up \$2.6 trillion more in debt than the Republican budget over the next 10 years. That means another \$21,000 of debt added to that family's obligations that they will have to pay as future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on their credit card statement this month. And they have got to pay that back before they pay back their credit card statement. The IRS can get very insistent that they do.

And don't believe for a moment that only the rich will pay these taxes. It turns out that the so-called rich people aren't rich and they aren't even people. Many are struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S, small businesses that create two-thirds of the jobs in our economy.

We are told: "Don't worry. We are using that money to create wealth and jobs." Well, the problem is government does not create jobs because it cannot create wealth. Government cannot inject a dollar into the economy until it has first taken that dollar out of the same economy.

As Bastiat warned, we see the job that government creates when it puts the dollar back in the economy. What we don't see as clearly is the job that is lost when government first takes that dollar out of the economy. We see those lost jobs as stagnating wages and workers giving up and leaving the job market, or as it is also known, the Obama economy.

Here is what government can do and what the Progressive and Democratic budgets propose. It can transfer jobs from the private sector to the public sector by taxing one and expanding the other. It can transfer jobs from one sector of the private market to another by taxing one and subsidizing the other. That is precisely the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra. It is the difference between FedEx and the post office. It is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery.

Reagan, like Coolidge and Kennedy before him, reduced the tax and regulatory burdens on the economy and produced one of the longest economic

expansions in our country's history. It truly felt like morning again in America. That is the Republican approach, and it works.

Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I thank Mr. POCAN and his office staff for the fine work and time that they put into working on this budget that we are proposing today.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, also, for his leadership within the caucus.

I am proud to rise in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget alternative. This is a practical, progressive vision for our country by providing solutions to counter the Republican cuts to vital programs and tax breaks for the wealthy.

Let me contrast the House GOP budget with the Progressive Caucus budget.

First, in healthcare, the Republican budget embraces TrumpCare by incorporating the House-passed American Health Care Act, which cuts at least 20 million people from their care. This includes up to \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, threatening care for seniors in nursing homes, children, and struggling families. It makes \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare, ending the Medicare guarantee and shifting cost risk on to seniors.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act. It lowers prescription drug costs and expands access to mental healthcare and addiction treatment.

We invest in workers. The GOP plan slashes investments in workers and programs to help more Americans get back to work, programs like apprenticeships and job training. And yet the people's budget would create 2.4 million jobs over its first 3 years and raise wages for American workers.

The Republican budget, their \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts means less funding for roads and bridges and schools. Our budget puts a \$2 trillion investment into strengthening our Nation's infrastructure.

The Republican budget drastically cuts Federal funding, which could undermine our ability to respond to disasters. The people's budget provides \$200 billion in emergency disaster funds to rebuild communities devastated by hurricanes.

The Republican budget guts our public education system with cuts that could devastate schools and further disinvest in public universities. The Progressive Caucus budget makes debt-free college a reality and provides for the refinancing of student loans. It expands access to pre-K education and provides childcare for all families.

Let's get real. The reason we are debating the budget this week: Repub-

licans can't wait to get started on their tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican tax plan should be called the Trump Family Tax Plan because it enriches the wealthy on the backs of the middle class.

The Progressive Caucus gets it right. Not one more penny in tax breaks for corporations and the wealthiest Americans. The Progressive Caucus budget ensures that the top 1 percent pay their fair share in taxes, we close corporate loopholes, and we expand the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for working families.

We must reject the Trump Family tax cut and invest in our roads and bridges, our schools, our healthcare, and our workers. Progressives are proposing bold policy solutions as clear alternatives to the cruel budget cuts Republicans are proposing.

The people's budget is an investment in the American people, and I urge you to support the Progressive Caucus people's budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my friend reminds me of a story when Ronald Reagan was pushing his tax reductions a generation ago that produced the biggest expansion in our Nation's history. He was approached one day by a working class fellow on a stop that the President was making, and the man looks at him and says: Mr. President, the Democrats say that you Republicans want to cut taxes on the rich. Is that right?

Reagan says: Well, that is what they say.

And the man says: Well, you go ahead and do that, Mr. President, because a poor person never gave me a job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

□ 1815

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding to me. As you know, Mr. Chairman, he is not just down here as the ranking member on the House Budget Committee. He is also the leader of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force. The leadership he has provided in all those areas means a lot to the entire institution. I am grateful to him for it.

I also want to say I am grateful to my friends in the Progressive Caucus. I disagree with their budget, and I plan to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, how often do we come down here and folks want to complain about what is not going right, but they don't want to do anything about it?

To my friends' credit in the Progressive Caucus, they laid out a vision, and that is exactly what I came here to Congress to be a part of. Let's lay out our visions. Let's have some votes. Let's count those votes and see where we go from there.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, absolutely any group could offer a budget today, yet we only have four alternatives being considered. That tells

you something about how hard it is to put your ideas forward. So I want to thank my friends on the Progressive Caucus for doing that.

I want to run through a couple of things that their budget includes, Mr. Chairman. It includes a 4 percent pay increase for Federal workers across the board. It includes \$500 billion in green energy incentives. It imposes a carbon tax to deal with greenhouse gases. It cuts \$70 billion from the Defense Department and, in fact, eliminates altogether the spending on the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, these are all legitimate policy disagreements.

Their budget also increases revenues, taxes, by \$10 trillion, but spends so much more on American priorities that we continue to end up with almost a \$1 trillion annual deficit in year 10.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of debate that we have to have. I want to understand the priorities of my friends. I want to understand where they want to see more investments. And then I want to understand how it is we are going to balance this budget together. Because what is lacking in this plan, Mr. Chairman, what frustrates me the most about the Progressive Caucus plan is not the investment in green energy, it is not the investment in the Federal workforce, it is not the investment in healthcare; it is the fact that they don't believe we can do these things while raising taxes by \$10 trillion on the American people and balance the budget at all.

Mr. Chairman, if folks want to raise taxes in this institution—I think our problem is a spending problem. I don't think it is a taxing problem, but I am willing to have that discussion with them to understand their point of view.

But the reason I will ask my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget is not because it raises taxes \$10 trillion; it is because it raises taxes \$10 trillion, yet continues to borrow from our children and our grandchildren in the form of annual debt and deficits.

I think we can do better. But we cannot do better without an honest discussion of the issues, Mr. Chairman. Say what you want to about the budgets you are going to see on the floor here, these alternatives that we are going to discuss.

There are a lot of talking heads on TV who just want to talk about it and don't want to do anything about it. If you are looking for a ray of hope today, look at the Progressive Caucus, which I disagree with about almost everything as it comes to how to peg the numbers, but they put their vision forward tonight. They said: Let's take a stand tonight.

If we can work together across that aisle, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing that we cannot do on behalf of the American people.

Vote "no" on this budget, but applaud the effort that has gone into it such that we can try to find common ground going forward.

If we have but one thing to agree on in this institution, let it be to agree to pay for those things that we think are important. Whether it is wars or whether it is green energy, whether it is troops or whether it is Federal employees, let us agree that we should pay for those things today with our dollars, and the borrowing from our children and grandchildren should be ended forever.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, what the Progressive Caucus budget does, and does very clearly, is that we end the special treatment for Wall Street buddies of the majority of this Congress.

Meanwhile, their budget has no problem hitting low- and middle-income families with their tax plan. Under their plan, corporations get a \$2 trillion cut, \$2.4 trillion, and the richest 1 percent will get a tax cut worth \$130,000 next year; and many middle class families will have to pay more.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a valued member of the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his tremendous leadership as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus; and our other co-chair, MARK POCAN, for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, the People's Budget. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that there are two different visions being presented here. Let's be very clear about what those two different visions are.

The Republican budget says we should invest millions of dollars into tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and the largest corporations.

Our budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, says we want to invest in people. We believe in working families across this country who are working hard, want to have a decent life, and want to build a better future. I choose investing in the people. That is what this budget does. It invests in education, in jobs, infrastructure, research, and science, and diplomacy.

Let me just focus for a minute on education as the gateway to opportunity. The People's Budget commits \$1 trillion to help families afford childcare, provides universal access to pre-K, and upholds our Nation's commitment to our public schools, which are the bedrocks of our communities nationwide, through adequate funding and supporting educators with resources that they need to reach every student.

It makes debt-free college a reality by investing in college as a public good. It creates apprenticeship opportunities for all of our districts across the country—red and blue, urban and rural.

Our country's success, Mr. Chairman, lies in that of our children and young people, not in the Republican plan to

give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this vision, this budget, and to invest in the people.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), a former director of the State Policy Network.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Progressive Caucus' budget.

In his farewell address, President Eisenhower said: "We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without asking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow."

Instead of trying to put America on a sustainable financial path, the progressive budget seeks to mortgage even more of our grandchildren's and great grandchildren's future, frankly, by spending over \$57 trillion over the next 10 years. With the national debt surpassing \$20 trillion just last month, now is the time to rein in reckless government spending, not explode it.

In addition to these spending increases, the Progressive Caucus is proposing nearly \$9 trillion in tax increases over the next decade. These enormous tax increases do not come close to covering the cost of the irresponsible policies proposed. I want to repeat that. Enormous tax increases that don't come close to covering the cost of what they have proposed.

As a result, the Progressive Caucus' budget raises the debt to over \$27 trillion by 2027. In fact, by fiscal year 2027, our deficits would be near \$1 trillion.

Higher taxes and higher spending would stifle the American economy and put our debt on an expedited upward trajectory. It is time for us to make tough decisions when it comes to this country's budget. The decision to oppose the Progressive Caucus budget is not one of those tough decisions.

This budget also makes no effort to curb waste, fraud, and abuse. Instead, it would expand bureaucratic programs by trillions of dollars without proposing any oversight measures. For example, it would spend \$41 billion on "free college" promises, and \$1 trillion on childcare and universal pre-K.

Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of the shovel-ready programs that were part of the Obama package just a few years ago. We all had this expectation that this money would go to rebuild our infrastructure, and it turns out just a little over 3 percent of that money actually made it to infrastructure projects; somewhere in the range of \$30 billion out of over \$800 billion.

That is what I see in the progressive budget. It continues the failed ObamaCare experiment, and even goes so far as to allow States to experiment with socialized medicine.

It continues to encourage able-bodied adults without children not to seek work by providing them a government paycheck.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. It increases the pressure on Americans' pocketbooks by increasing the price at the pump and, really, at every level.

It proposes Washington-centric solutions to problems that the States are better equipped to determine, such as the whole college issue. And it spends \$500 billion on green energy and imposes a carbon tax.

Mr. Chairman, we have a moral responsibility to spend taxpayer dollars wisely, and the Progressive Caucus fails to do this in its budget. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus budget invests in the American people, invests in America, and still reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), my friend and a member of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative GRIJALVA for his leadership.

Our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates we have a \$4.6 trillion infrastructure deficit. That is why the People's Budget wisely invests \$2 trillion to fix our infrastructure.

Not only will this budget help repair roads, highways, and bridges, but it will also put broadband all over America, including rural areas, and create millions of good-paying jobs, over 2.5 million in its first year.

We are presenting this plan. We are asking for support. Donald Trump talks a big game on infrastructure, but he has yet to put out a plan. So we urge the President to support our plan. If he doesn't want to, then put out his plan so we can have a discussion on how to move forward on fixing our infrastructure and creating high-paying jobs for Americans.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for giving me an opportunity to address the Progressive Caucus, their budget. I think the budget is unacceptable. It is something the American people ought to pay attention to because the day may come in which a budget similar to the Progressive Budget passes this floor.

The first thing to look at is we are increasing maybe by an average of about a little under—well, around \$1 trillion increase in taxes over the next 10 years. So you are taking a lot more money away from Americans. And despite this huge increase in taxes, you are looking at about a \$70 billion cut in defense.

I suggest that the public and the people who are supporting the Progressive

Caucus take some time talking to their people in the current military, talk about the planes that can't fly, talk about the shortage of parts, and ask: How is it possible you could take this much more money from the American people and still feel we have to have significant cuts in our military budget?

But then you look at what we have to spend more on: a 4 percent raise for Federal workers. Look, we wish everybody had a raise, but, really, at a time when we are approaching \$20 trillion in debt, is it a priority to give Federal workers a raise?

We put more and more people dependent on government; a large expansion of the program providing free college to people. At a time when, quite frankly, many people who already have college degrees can't get jobs, we are expanding that program. And, of course, by making it free, people will respect it less. And not only will they respect it less, but by making it free, many people will go to college who perhaps otherwise don't feel it is for them.

They won't make adjustments to the food stamp program, which is a problem.

We greatly extend the time that you are on unemployment, and this is kind of bizarre because it is a time when our employment is near historic lows. But despite the fact that until now we haven't had such unemployment for a long period of time, we want to extend unemployment, thereby encouraging more people to stay on unemployment.

□ 1830

I would like to thank my friends from the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing students to refinance their student loans, which shows something or another that there is a heart there, a little bit anyway. I wish I could get my own Conference to put that in. But in any event, I urge rejection of the Progressive budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, Americans in this Congress do have a choice. Our budget is a contrast to what the Republicans are proposing. We can either cut Medicare to pay for more tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires as our Republican budget does, or we can close tax loopholes to protect essential programs that invest in jobs. We chose investment.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a moral contract between elected officials—the government—and the people we were elected to represent. That is why I am proud to rise in support of the people's budget, presented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This budget serves as a Progressive alternative to the GPO's cruel budget plan, a plan that prioritizes tax breaks for billionaires over the need to fund care for seniors in nursing homes and children and struggling families in places like Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I was proud to help draft the people's budget, which invests \$200 billion to ensure that families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida, and the U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need right now.

The people's budget would also reduce the deficit by \$700 billion over the next 20 years by investing in human capital. We would do this while enacting comprehensive immigration reform, protecting DREAMers, and ending funding for family detention centers.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the people's budget and reject H. Con. Res. 71. Let's stand with the working class, the middle class, and the immigrants in our country. This is the right thing to do for our people and for our economy.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Arizona is finished, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time each side has.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 4¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader in our caucus and a leader here in Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to thank the gentleman and Congressman POCAN for their really great leadership of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and for crafting a budget which creates economic growth, a decent standard of living for everyone, and a strong yet rational national security budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget. Today, millions of Americans are struggling to make ends meet and millions more are working hard trying to find a job. Paychecks for everyday Americans are shrinking, while corporations are reaping record profits. Yet, instead of developing a budget to create jobs and to help American families, the House Republicans "balance" their budget once again on the backs of struggling families. And for what? To protect tax cuts for billionaires and millionaires and corporations. Again, this is totally disgraceful.

The CPC's people's budget stands in stark contrast to the House Republican budget. It creates 2 million good-paying jobs and invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure. It includes a plan to lift more Americans out of poverty, and it invests in communities of color, like expanding computer science education.

It ends the Pentagon's slush fund, known as the overseas contingency account, that for far too long has padded the pockets and the wallets of defense

contractors at the taxpayers' expense. It also tackles waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon by demanding audit readiness. It is hard to believe that the Republican budget goes \$10 billion over what the Pentagon even requested.

Make no mistake, the people's budget does what the House Republican budget does not. It works for the American people, not special interests, nor defense contractors, or the 1 percent.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for all American families, and that is support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for his leadership. It has been more than a pleasure to serve as the vice chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the number of years that we have had to put forward the people's budget.

I simply want to say what a budget is, Mr. Chairman. A budget is a roadmap for the American people. It is a question of whether America cares about the most vulnerable and whether or not, in our caring, we are prepared to do deeds to insist upon their success.

The Republican budget takes \$2 trillion and provides a big, wealthy tax cut for the rich, and it creates, in essence, a deep hole in affordable care for healthcare. It does not provide justice and fair elections. It takes away educational opportunity from students, and, of course, it does not bring the most vulnerable out of poverty and enhance the lives of the middle class.

The people's budget provides for supporting the Affordable Care Act. It provides for giving fair working tax cuts for others, and it provides fairness and justice.

I rise to support the people's budget. It invests in the American people. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the top ten reasons to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

TOP TEN REASONS TO SUPPORT THE PEOPLE'S BUDGET

(Supported by over 60 organizations including: AFT, NEA, Planned Parenthood, Communications Workers of America, Sierra Club, AFSCME, AFGE, Vote Vets, Social Security Works, NARAL)

(1) The People's Budget invests \$2 trillion in America's crumbling infrastructure while promoting job growth and strengthening our commitment to sustainability. This is an investment in America which will transform our fossil-fuel energy system, overburdened mass transit, deteriorating schools, lead-contaminated water systems, and crumbling roads and bridges through local hiring and livable wages.

(2) The People's Budget enacts comprehensive immigration reform which permanently protects Dreamers and their families and opposes immigration bans on Muslims and refugees. Our country needs an immigration system that honors our values of inclusion, diversity, and equality. Our Budget prohibits funding to Customs and Border Protection to implement President Trump's discriminatory Muslim and refugee bans.

(3) Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change and rebuild our local communities recently devastated by hurricanes. The People's Budget requires polluters to pay for their reckless behavior while eliminating tax breaks that incentivize fossil fuel energy over cleaner energy. It invests \$200 billion to ensure families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida and U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need to begin the stable road to recovery. It also provides funding for climate change research, mitigation and adaptation to protect those most at risk from future environmental disasters.

(4) The CPC budget delivers on the promise of child care for all and Pre-K for all. It ensures that families will not have to pay more than 10 percent of their income for child care, whether that care is at home or at a child care center. Our budget also expands pre-k for children across the country.

(5) We make debt free college a reality for all students by overhauling the student loan system which currently leaves college students saddled with unmanageable levels of debt. The People's Budget creates a federal matching program that supports state efforts to expand investments in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt.

(6) The People's Budget strengthens the Affordable Care Act, while pushing towards a single payer system. It prioritizes reforms to increase access, equity, and affordability. Maintaining the positive reforms from the ACA are critical as Republicans attempt to gut the health care system and leave millions of Americans stranded without access to critical insurance coverage. The People's Budget protects Medicare's integrity and improves its long-term solvency. It protects children and low-income Americans and gives states the freedom to transition to a single payer system. It also makes two significant policy changes to reduce the costs of prescription drugs: allows Medicare Part D to negotiate drug prices and ends "Pay for Delay" practice which keeps generics out of the market.

(7) The CPC Budget creates a fair tax system for working Americans. In order to make these bold, necessary investments in working families, we must rewrite the rules of a rigged economy that favors billionaires and big corporations. The People's Budget closes tax loopholes that corporations use to ship jobs overseas, and stops CEOs from receiving millions in tax-free bonuses. Our budget tackles inequality through fair tax rates for all Americans, leveling the playing field for working people.

(8) Our budget protects the right to vote and supports criminal justice reforms which strengthen public safety and avoid over-criminalization. Our budget calls for rebuilding trust in the justice system by funding community oriented policing reforms. It also strengthens Department of Justice voter protection programs, protects voting rights by increasing funding to voter protection agencies, and funds public financing of campaigns to curb the influence of special interests in politics. Additionally, the budget makes key investments in America's electoral integrity by upgrading our voting systems.

(9) The People's Budget creates pathways out of poverty by expanding proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives and restoring vital programs to our nation to provide prosperity for all. These include a national strategy to reduce poverty in half in ten years and \$12.8 billion investment to end family homelessness. The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition As-

sistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It also provides an additional \$10 billion for child nutrition programs and allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits for up to two years.

(10) We make veterans a priority by increasing funding for veterans supportive housing to eliminate veterans homelessness and expanding access to mental health care for all veteran and service members. Our budget also invests in job training opportunities for transitioning service members and veterans.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In the debate on the Republican budget and how it contrasts with the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, we heard a lot about needing to control mandatory spending, that that was the real issue here, runaway mandatory spending.

Make no mistake, when my Republican colleagues talk about cutting mandatory spending, they mean they want to cut Medicare and Social Security to pay for the trillion-dollar tax scam and creative numbers that are part of their budget for the wealthy and for the corporations in America.

The other issue that we heard a lot about is that, by making these major cuts for the wealthiest and the rich, that somehow their net gain and their profit and their break on taxes is going to trickle down to the rest of us. Well, we have seen that movie before in this country. That trickle-down theory doesn't work. The money doesn't trickle down, and the American people won't be fooled about that again.

Our budget invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure and jobs immediately. Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change, and our budget delivers on the promise for our children, their inheritance of this country, the inheritance of the children that everybody is worried about a deficit. We are worried about their future as well.

Our budget delivers on the promise of childcare for all, pre-K for all, and a robust public education system to provide all kids with an opportunity to succeed in this Nation.

Our budget is about the future, our budget is about emphasizing the values that make this country special and great, and our budget is a contrast. It offers a contrast about what this country can be if it invests in its people.

The road that we have been on for far too long in which we have disinvested in people, shifted wealth and burden onto the middle class and the working class in this country, that time has ended. Our budget represents that end.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on the people's budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, have my friends on the left learned absolutely nothing over these past 8 years? If massive government spending, higher and higher

taxes, and deeper and deeper debt produced economic growth, the Obama years should have been the golden age of our economy. Instead, we suffered prolonged stagnation. We averaged 1.5 percent annual growth, only half the average economic growth that our Nation has enjoyed in the postwar era. The Progressive and Democratic budgets promise more of the same.

We choose a different path, the Reagan path that produced an average of 3.5 percent growth year after year, higher wages, better jobs. Not just a Republican policy, John F. Kennedy did the same thing. He reminded us that a rising tide lifts all boats. These are the policies that create prosperity.

The government cannot create jobs because it cannot create wealth, but what it can do is create the conditions where jobs multiply and prosper or where they stagnate and disappear. That it can do very well. We have very consistent experience with the policies that create these conditions.

If you increase the burdens on the economy as the Democrats again propose, the economy contracts. If you lighten the burdens on the economy, it grows and prospers. No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

We know what works and we know what doesn't work because we have tried both paths many times before. The House Budget Committee's budget follows principles that have, time and again, consistently and rapidly produced economic expansion and prosperity.

The House Democrats' budget and the Progressive budget before us now double down on policies that have impoverished and bankrupted nations wherever they have been employed down through history.

That is the choice before us today. Let us choose wisely. Our future depends on it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the yeas appeared to have it.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,089,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,274,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,420,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,596,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,749,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,965,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,166,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,361,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,619,387,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$211,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$256,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$324,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$361,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$414,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$432,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$503,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$544,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$572,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$661,000,000,000.

(2) **NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,875,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,829,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,845,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,920,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,149,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,282,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,411,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,653,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,865,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,058,527,000,000.

(3) **BUDGET OUTLAYS.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,538,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,808,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,890,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,963,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,167,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,267,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,373,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,615,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,833,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,032,183,000,000.

(4) **DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$593,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -\$719,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -\$615,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -\$542,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -\$570,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -\$517,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -\$408,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -\$449,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: -\$472,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: -\$412,796,000,000.

(5) **DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.**—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,175,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$22,085,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,866,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,578,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$24,291,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,985,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$25,599,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$26,248,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$26,981,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$27,552,527,000,000.

(6) **DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.**—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,515,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$16,336,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$17,080,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,782,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,543,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$19,291,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,972,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$20,739,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$21,579,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$22,413,681,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) **National Defense (050):**

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$611,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$583,502,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$624,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$605,816,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$638,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$620,966,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$651,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$634,689,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$664,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$652,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$678,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$661,612,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$692,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$670,504,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$707,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$689,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$722,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$703,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$737,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$718,554,000,000.

(2) **International Affairs (150):**

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,815,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,945,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,812,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,970,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,271,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$47,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,039,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,725,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,596,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,234,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,128,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,653,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,557,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,539,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,036,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,337,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,793,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,498,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,138,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,555,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,703,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,864,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,169,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,926,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,746,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,216,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,054,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,248,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,939,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,710,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,911,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,068,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,647,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,620,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,280,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,866,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,965,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,664,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,211,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,231,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,737,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,490,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,549,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,232,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,867,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,755,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,075,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,377,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,435,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,949,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,167,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,317,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,204,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,315,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,499,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,195,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,346,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$412,246,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,199,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,432,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$162,071,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,557,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$110,947,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,441,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,855,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$114,823,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,517,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,726,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,338,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,297,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,806,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,354,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,080,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,384,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,071,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$165,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$165,987,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,570,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$163,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,826,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,277,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$157,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$156,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$157,914,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$151,875,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$573,434,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,568,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$604,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$637,447,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$669,270,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$666,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$702,953,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$696,993,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$735,459,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$728,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$772,591,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$763,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$810,799,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$801,662,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$849,471,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$839,223,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$890,688,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$879,028,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$601,682,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$601,303,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$672,626,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$672,318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$720,653,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$720,416,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$775,853,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$775,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$871,247,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$871,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$896,829,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$896,611,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$920,920,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$920,693,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,028,532,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,028,285,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,093,424,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,093,171,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$1,176,028,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$1,175,780,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$528,718,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$508,933,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$541,318,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$538,787,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$554,195,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$554,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$567,182,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$569,833,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$583,720,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$594,084,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$592,625,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$598,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$601,577,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$602,988,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$621,241,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$625,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$636,800,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$648,216,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$653,208,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$664,923,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$183,573,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$181,049,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$198,367,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$195,432,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$203,192,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$201,863,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$209,704,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$207,846,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$225,035,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$223,431,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$222,849,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$220,873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$217,808,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$216,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$235,899,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$234,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$243,591,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$241,380,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$252,030,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$249,835,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$63,596,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$62,328,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$64,092,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$63,865,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,733,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,272,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$69,336,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$65,880,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,965,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$67,534,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$69,220,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$68,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$70,963,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$70,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$78,798,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$78,991,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$81,299,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$80,655,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,065,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$25,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$27,477,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$26,458,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,418,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$28,777,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$29,473,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$28,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,156,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$30,693,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,129,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$31,492,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$30,848,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$32,309,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$31,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$33,111,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$32,437,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$377,635,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$377,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$413,674,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$413,674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$461,176,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$461,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$512,434,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$512,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$560,400,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$560,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

- (A) New budget authority, \$605,893,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$605,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

- (A) New budget authority, \$644,696,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$644,696,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

- (A) New budget authority, \$679,742,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$679,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$714,720,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$714,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

- (A) New budget authority, \$743,060,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$743,185,000,000.

(19) Non-Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2018:

- (A) New budget authority, \$134,164,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$70,964,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,428,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$66,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,748,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$41,212,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

- (A) New budget authority, \$20,859,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$29,359,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

- (A) New budget authority, \$18,656,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$27,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,971,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,372,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,860,000,000.
 (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.
 (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$0.
 (B) Outlays, \$0.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

The Nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the Republican budget continues to highlight the wrong prior-

ities. It fast-tracks tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and claims that unrealistic economic growth will pay for these cuts when, in reality, those tax cuts will ultimately be paid for by children, seniors, and those in need.

It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare and also cuts programs that support basic living standards, including nutritional assistance, and undermines national security by cutting diplomatic programs and foreign aid.

The Republican budget also cuts education, job training, research and development, and infrastructure. Their budget leaves hardworking American families out in the cold and would devastate our economic recovery after years of consistent job growth.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget. It is compassionate. The numbers add up. It addresses the needs of the most vulnerable and improves our economy. Unlike the Republican budget, the CBC budget uses real numbers, not overly optimistic growth projections and assumptions of things that won't happen.

The CBC budget proposes \$3.9 trillion in revenue enhancements, and unlike the Republican budget, we show exactly how Congress can realistically reach this revenue target by outlining almost \$11 trillion in revenue options from which Congress could pick and choose \$3.9 trillion.

With the additional revenue, the CBC budget protects and strengthens the social safety net and commits the Federal Government to eradicating poverty in America.

Our budget includes a comprehensive infrastructure and jobs program, totaling over \$1 trillion over 5 years, and according to the Economic Policy Institute, it will create 2 million jobs next year.

In addition, the CBC budget eliminates any further threat of sequestration, eliminating the arbitrary budget caps and across-the-board budget cuts that are scheduled for next year.

It allocates \$200 billion for hurricane relief, \$100 billion to address the looming pension crisis, and additional funding for our veterans.

Even with the elimination of the sequestration and strong investment in programs that we know will create jobs and economic opportunity, the CBC budget is still estimated to reduce the deficit, when compared to the baseline, by approximately \$2.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1845

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion today because it is an important one. I know that the gentleman from Virginia and I both want to address the challenges facing our Nation and our fellow Americans.

We agree that the status quo is insufficient to meet the needs of the future, and we share a passion for protecting the vulnerable, breaking the cycles of poverty, and lifting Americans up.

But I must oppose this budget because it will not accomplish those things. This budget raises taxes by \$4 trillion, increases spending by \$1.4 trillion, and it never balances.

It proposes more Washington-mandated answers to problems that States and communities are better equipped to solve. It makes no effort to control Federal deficits and debt, and it will leave our country bankrupt.

I want to be clear what this means. This budget will double down on generational theft—spending more and more money that we don't have today and leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill tomorrow.

In contrast, the Republican budget confronts our Nation's fiscal challenges head on by requiring mandatory spending reductions of at least \$203 billion and balancing within 10 years.

While this budget measures success on how much the Federal Government spends, the Republican House budget proposes to measure success by outcomes. If we have learned nothing from decades of spending on Federal welfare programs, it is that more money cannot resolve the complex issues underlying systemic poverty.

We must change our approach, and this starts with changing how we measure results.

This budget also fails to address a critical piece of the upward mobility agenda: reforming our broken Tax Code. Instead, it calls for tax increases that would stifle economic growth that the country so desperately needs.

America should be the most competitive place in the world to do business, but everything in our Tax Code today tells companies to take their jobs and their investments overseas and to leave them there.

Higher taxes on job creators and small businesses is the exact opposite of what we need to bring workers back into the labor force and get our economy growing again. Now is the time for comprehensive tax reform that unleashes the entrepreneurial spirit of America, increases business and personal investment, and promotes job creation. By failing to move the ball forward on tax reform, this budget leaves the American workers and families behind.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I want to note what this proposal does make cuts in, and that is in our national defense. In a time when we face increasingly complex and evolving international threats from places like North Korea, Russia, and Iran, this budget would cut overall

defense spending and compromise the readiness and safety of our servicemembers and our national freedoms.

The first job of the Federal Government is to provide for our national security. We need to reinvest in our military to deter global threats and protect our homeland. That is why the Republican budget fulfills Congress' commitment to ensure robust funding for our country's national defense.

Mr. Chairman, we will have a lot of conversations today about priorities, because that is what budgets are: clear illustrations of our priorities.

We want to leave our Nation better for our children and grandchildren. We all want every person, regardless of their socioeconomic status or ZIP Code, to have the opportunity to realize the American Dream.

I oppose this budget proposal because it will not help us achieve these goals. It avoids the tough questions and substitutes more spending for better results.

It does nothing to promote vibrant economic growth, and it doubles down on bad ideas that stifle ingenuity and the spirit of entrepreneurship that we need. We have a responsibility to secure our Nation's fiscal future and improve the lives of our citizens, but this budget is not the way forward.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), who is the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, BOBBY SCOTT, for his hard work, and the rest of the CBC in putting this budget together.

Mr. Chairman, I think that what I am having a hard time doing is wrapping my mind around the same failed arguments that we hear over and over again that we are going to cut trillions of dollars in taxes so that we can help the upper middle class and the top 1 percent really, and that is somehow going to benefit the poorest people in the country; we are going to exacerbate the deficit saying that we are going to create jobs.

We know it never happens, and then all of a sudden we find ourselves with an increasing debt and deficit, and then we go to the poorest people in this country and we ask them to pay for it. We cut the programs that are vital to lifting them out of poverty.

I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. My mother is a perfect example that a great education will lift you out of poverty and that having a Historically Black College and University that you can go to will prepare you for your future. But the problem is we don't talk about the fact that the Republican budget cuts education.

So how can we say with a straight face that we propose to lift people out

of poverty, help people achieve the American Dream, help our children dream the impossible dream, and then give them the power so that they can go achieve it while we are cutting their education and we are cutting all the programs that help them to achieve it?

Look, we always hide behind protecting our country and the national defense. The biggest threat to our national defense resides on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is a shame when most people in this country and my colleagues wake up in the morning and say: Are we going to war with North Korea? That is not good for the economy, and that is not good for the mental health of the country. But I think that the Secretary of State has a great disposition and strategy when it comes to the national defense and diplomacy.

I think the key with what we have to do with budgets is understand that they are moral documents and they express our values, and cutting the disabled and others is not a true statement of American values.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget if for no other reason that there is a price on work, savings, and investment. When you raise that price too high, guess what you get? You get less work, savings, and investment, and you get less economic growth.

Look at the growth rates we have had over the last 10 years under astronomical debt and deficits. If spending could create an economic juggernaut, we would have one now. But instead, we have got 1.5 percent growth, 1.9 percent growth, and 2 percent growth—nowhere near what the prospending lobby would suggest.

Yet, if you look at the 1920s, if you look at the 1960s, and if you look at the 1980s—remember JFK in that famous Economic Club of New York speech said that the surest way to raise revenues is to cut tax rates now.

It worked then, it worked in the 1920s, and it will work right now as it did in the 1980s as well.

The reason is simple. The reason is very simple. Once you lower the price of work, savings, and investment, you not only get more of that, but you leave more capital in the private sector where it is put to use.

When you have capital put to use in the private sector, workers become more productive, and they earn more. I have always said the truck driver is much more productive with the truck, and the people who have the capital that can buy the truck is what makes the economy go.

We don't have a revenue problem in this country. Last year, we had record tax revenues: \$3.26 trillion, yet a deficit of \$587 billion. We have a spending

problem, and the CBC budget increases spending above the CBO baseline over 10 years, while our budget is underneath the CBO baseline for 10 years. Our budget cuts taxes across the board including eliminating the bottom rate that we suggest in our tax reform plan.

This is a question of American vision and the American Dream. Our vision is for more capital in the private sector, more incentives to work, savings, and investment, and more people with rising incomes. Their vision is to protect the government budget.

Mr. Chairman, so I stand in opposition to this particular substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. Also I want to thank him for his tremendous leadership in continuing to craft the Congressional Black Caucus' budget which really does reflect our Nation's priorities and our values, so I rise in strong support of this budget.

As a member of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees and as chair of our Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I am really proud that the Congressional Black Caucus budget includes \$300 billion in investments into initiatives that have proven to lift millions out of poverty.

For example, it restores the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, it extends emergency unemployment insurance, it expands access to affordable housing, and it also increases funding for job training and trade assistance programs.

The CBC budget creates a fair Tax Code that provides investments in communities. It boosts GDP by \$329 billion and helps create 2 million jobs. This budget addresses poverty head on by investing \$120 billion in creating jobs, \$25 billion to restore our Nation's public housing, and \$80 billion to modernize our schools.

Also, our budget employs the 10-20-30 formula championed by our assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), by directing at least 10 percent of Federal spending into areas with poverty rates of more than 20 percent over the last 30 years. We will make progress toward ending entrenched and generational poverty that hurts families and communities.

With regard to the Pentagon, yes, we require that we audit the Pentagon and encourage DOD to implement remaining GAO recommendations that would likely lead to tens of billions in costs savings.

This is a budget that stands with the American people. It is a message to the American people that we stand with those who are working hard to find a job, and we stand with those working hard at a job with low wages. It is a message to the country that balancing

the budget on the backs of struggling families to provide giveaways to billionaires and corporations is unacceptable. That is not the American way.

The CBC budget provides for the national security and the economic security of our Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, as one of the youngest Members of Congress, I feel an obligation not only to my district but to my generation. Right now in America, we are midway through the greatest wave of generational theft in all of human history.

The budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus takes the problems of Washington and makes all of them worse by doubling down on deficit spending and irresponsible financial decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I tell my constituents I am on two of the scariest committees in Congress—Armed Services and Budget—because on the Armed Services Committee, I see every day that our adversaries are closing the capability gap. They are able to do more while, after 8 years of the Obama administration, our military has been left in shambles. This budget does nothing to rebuild the military. It leaves our troops on the battlefield without the tools they need to win, and it is absolutely shameful.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the budget today, we absolutely have to get back on a path of fiscal discipline. This budget, however, doesn't do that. It punishes American workers and American businesses with new taxes and more taxes.

It pours billions into the failed experiment of ObamaCare. To take things a step further, it would promote a healthcare system that is a single-payer system. Not only will this bankrupt our Nation, it will bankrupt hard-working Americans.

How much would premiums go up under a State-run single-payer system? \$1,000 a month? \$2,000? Of course, taxes would increase, too. The same families in this system would see enormous challenges meeting their needs because they would be funding irresponsible spending in Washington.

So beyond making our citizens sick and poor, this budget would gut our defense, weaken our military, and put more Americans in danger. Everyone here knows that the threats we face are serious: ISIS, Hezbollah, North Korea, and regional instability and volatility across the Middle East. Yet, bizarrely, this budget cuts funding for the global war on terror.

Under President Obama, readiness fell to the lowest levels in a century, GDP growth sputtered, the quality of healthcare for the middle class got worse, and our debt skyrocketed. These are not policies we should repeat, and certainly not policies we should expand.

Instead, let's vote for the Republican budget that has the greatest reduction

in entitlement spending since Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House and can actually restore the great promise of the American Dream.

□ 1900

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus' Budget Task Force.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC alternative budget, and I commend Representative SCOTT and his staff for the tremendous work that they have done.

The CBC budget provides for all of the essentials, including defense and infrastructure, but what I like most about it is that it is focused on job creation, rebuilding our veterans' hospitals, rebuilding infrastructure in our communities, and putting people to work.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents need jobs and opportunities to work. The CBC budget focuses on jobs. I strongly support it, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this proposed amendment to the budget resolution.

I think it is very important, when discussing spending such as suggested before us, to remember that we do not live in a fantasy world. We live in a world where resources are limited. We have to make difficult choices. These are the same choices every family makes with their budget every day of the year.

Currently, our national debt rests at over \$20 trillion. The entire U.S. GDP in 2016 was only \$18.57 trillion.

Should we continue to spend money that we don't have without restraint?

This proposal never balances. It does raise taxes, though. With the tax increases in this proposal totaling \$3.9 trillion, one would expect this budget to balance.

What this does do is add over \$1 trillion in new spending. What is another trillion when you are only \$20 trillion in debt?

I challenge the supporters of this proposed budget to research the potentially catastrophic impacts of defaulting on our national debt. We are saddling future generations with an unsurmountable burden.

When our grandchildren and children look back on what we have done here, do we want this work to be that we left our country broke?

I don't think so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not kick the can down the road and to not pass this proposed amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, can you advise how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remain-

ing. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to point out that the healthcare plan in the budget is a public option, which CBO scores as a savings of over \$100 billion. We have \$1 trillion in spending for infrastructure, the same as the President has promised, but at least we pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Budget Committee, I find the CBC budget to be a principled and thoughtful budget.

It ends the threat of sequestration, it will accelerate our economic recovery, it will help eradicate poverty in America, and it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

On the other hand, the tax cut that our Republican friends are proposing will cause a deficit by giving a whopping \$2.4-plus trillion in tax cuts, most to the top 1 percent of the American people.

It will not help the young child as he grows to seek opportunities and jobs. This will be a bill that is at a price that is not right. If you work hard, you get less.

Our budget, on the other hand, gives \$665 billion in immediate investments to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. It is crumbling even more so after the devastating hurricanes. It gives \$120 billion to fund a national direct job creation program and full employment trust fund program.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It provides \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools, \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program, \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services, \$25 billion for recapitalization, \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding VA hospitals, \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods program, and \$5 billion for summer jobs for young people.

I can attest to the fact that, in discussions with the Federal Communications Commission, the connectivity in vulnerable neighborhoods and communities is at an all-time low. Expanding broadband services is a vital need.

It is a vital need to expand the educational services for this young man in order for him to be capable of taking a job in the 21st century. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs that go unapplied for because the skill set of our young people have been deprived because of inadequate education.

This budget of the Congressional Black Caucus is a people investor. It invests in people. For that reason, I believe it is the right way to go. It balances our needs for the military and it provides for the American people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It, in fact, provides that roadmap to ensure that the American people are taken care.

I want to make mention that it provides for \$300 billion for programs that are proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

Shouldn't this be what we are doing?

Right now, in my district, thousands are online for the disaster Food Stamp program. That program needs to be extended.

This is what we do. We do not make people dependent. We give them a hand up, not a handout. That is what the budget is supposed to be: a roadmap for opportunity.

I support the Congressional Black Caucus budget, for that is what it is: a roadmap for opportunity.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Black Caucus to H. Con. Res. 71, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018."

I support the CBC Budget for four principal reasons:

1. It ends the threat of sequestration;
2. It will accelerate our economic recovery;
3. It will help eradicate poverty in America; and
4. It will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" and "Work Harder to Get Less" Budget with its discredited economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CBC Budget, we will get instead a comprehensive jobs program that would rebuild our nation's infrastructure and reinvest in our communities totaling \$1 trillion over the next decade.

The jobs created will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches every community in America, while also making the necessary investments to ensure America's long-term economic competitiveness.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will create jobs by providing:

1. \$665 billion in immediate investment to rebuild our nation's crumbling infrastructure;
2. \$120 billion to fund a National Direct Job Creation Program and Full Employment Trust Fund Program;
3. \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools;
4. \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program;
5. \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services;
6. \$25 billion for public housing recapitalization;
7. \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding V.A. hospitals and extended care facilities;
8. \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods Program and for communities that desperately need revitalization; and
9. \$5 billion for summer jobs so young persons can save money to attend college and plan for their futures.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to addressing the poverty that is still too prevalent in our coun-

try, the CBC Budget is clearly superior to the Republican's "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget.

The CBC Budget provides for \$300 billion for programs that have proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

The funding provided will be used to restore cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, extend emergency unemployment insurance, expand access to affordable housing, increase access to quality and affordable education, and increase funding for job training and trade adjustment assistance programs.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, to ensure that federal resources are targeted more efficiently towards eradicating poverty and are actually reaching communities most in need, the CBC budget proposes the codification of the "10-20-30" policy for federal spending.

Under the "10-20-30" policy at least 10 percent of the federal funds in certain accounts are to be directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent for the last 30 years.

Finally, I support the CBC Budget because it puts an end to the draconian sequester burdening the economy and our people for the last several years.

In addition, according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, it is said often, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

The Republican budget resolution fails this moral test; the CBC Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CBC Budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I certainly understand our colleagues' desire to fight poverty. I would like to share a little bit of my experience and what we have done to fight poverty at the local level.

For generations now, we have continued to throw more and more money towards eliminating poverty, with fewer and fewer results.

Yes, we have succeeded in alleviating the effects of poverty, but we have made very little progress in actually lifting people out of poverty. Instead of giving people a hand up, we are giving them a handout and essentially telling them life can't get any better than where they are. That is morally wrong, and I think that we can do better.

The key to solving poverty isn't just simply throwing more money at the problem. It is to try something different and find innovative ways to fix our welfare entitlement system, improve our education system, and return

the dignity of work to our fellow citizens.

The proposed amendment does none of these things. It simply perpetuates the cycle of generational poverty that has been passed down from parent to child.

I saw the same situation in my hometown of West Point, Georgia. In fact, it is what motivated me to enter public service and run for mayor.

We had a community that was dying. Folks were trapped in generational poverty and had been stripped of the dignity of work.

Instead of continuing the current system, we made changes. We worked to get the government out of the way and allow the job creators to innovate and grow their businesses to hire more workers. We invested in our infrastructure and we were able to create over 15,000 advanced manufacturing jobs.

For the first time in a generation, we saw more people moving into the middle class than moving into poverty.

We made changes to our education system, working to break through the generational cycle of poverty and prepare today's students to work in a 21st century workforce.

With all of these changes, we saw our community come back to life. People had jobs and opportunity. They took advantage of it. They had the advanced manufacturing sector spring back to life, and we saw a revitalization of not only our community, but of our people.

These lessons are from the folks in the Third District. They sent me here to push those same type of ideas here in Congress.

The Republican budget puts us on a path to this type of reform, and I believe my colleagues and I share the desire to fight poverty in this country. However, I do not believe that the CBC budget proposal does us that justice.

I look forward to passing the House budget.

Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more responsible alternative than the GOP budget.

A nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the GOP budget continues to push the wrong ones, catering to the wealthy and the special interests.

The GOP likes to say that a rising tide lifts every boat, but that is only if every vessel is seaworthy. The GOP budget leaves too many Americans in dinghies, rubber rafts, and rowboats, subject to being capsized.

It includes trillions of dollars in irresponsible cuts, such as \$5.4 trillion slashed from job-creating programs; \$2 trillion cut from Medicaid and Medicare; \$5 billion eliminated from investments in education, research, and infrastructure that will prevent us from competing globally.

The GOP budget would devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities in Maryland and across our country.

And for what?

To provide tax cuts to the top 1 percent—people who make at least \$900,000 every year.

In stark contrast, the CBC would create a fairer Tax Code and provide for much-needed investments in our communities. Our budget would boost our GDP by \$329 billion.

I, too, Mr. Chairman, served on the House Armed Services Committee, and I stand here to say that the CBC's budget would end sequestration for our military so that we can improve military readiness and, at the same time, restore critical domestic programs that support working families and revitalize our neighborhoods.

Rather than giving the top 1 percent a \$6 trillion tax cut, our budget would call for major investments here at home. We invest \$665 billion to modernize highways and infrastructure, \$120 billion in job-creating programs, \$80 billion so that every child learns in a modern classroom, and \$15 billion to rebuild our VA.

Perhaps, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, we invest \$300 billion over the next decade to eradicate poverty and provide basic standard of living to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, our budget responsibly pays for all of our investments. Our budget is a credible alternative and a real plan for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I stand here to talk a little bit about the Republican budget first. It is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear in America.

Once again, Americans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era. The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and larger corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle- and low-income Americans. This has never helped, and it won't help now.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our community while cutting other important social safety network programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion. Nondefense discretionary spending across the government would also be

cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand tonight with my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget to propose an alternative to this budget we are facing.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear as Americans.

Once again, Republicans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era.

The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle and lower income Americans.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our population while cutting other important social safety programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion.

Non-defense discretionary spending across the government would also be cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to propose an alternative budget amendment that serves the interests of the greater good, and not just a select few.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

Our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Our budget looks to bring \$20 billion in new investment to extend broadband internet to rural areas, so that everyone—not just the wealthy few—can have access to high-speed internet and access to information.

Our budget delivers \$300 billion over the next decade for social programs that help provide millions of Americans a basic standard of living.

This is a reflection of the values and priorities of the American people, not what is embodied in the Republican budget.

I, for one, do not believe that our nation does well by cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans while increasing taxes for the poor.

I do not believe that our nation does well by making massive cuts to social programs while allowing corporations to hide trillions of dollars overseas.

I do not believe that our nation does well by destroying Medicare and Medicaid for our elderly and poor while pushing tax cuts for the top one percent.

This is not the future that I envision for our country and neither do the American people—at least not 99 percent of them.

Mr. Chair, the Republican Budget is not a true; reflection of the priorities of the American people.

This budget serves the interest of a select few at the heavy cost of exploiting millions of others.

We need to oppose the Republican budget in favor of a viable alternative such as the CBC Budget Alternative, which is more reflective of the values that we treasure in our society.

□ 1915

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus is a more compassionate, fiscally responsible alternative to the underlying Republican budget and does not rely on unrealistic growth projections or bizarre suggestions that massive tax cuts can pay for themselves. It makes our Tax Code fairer, protects and strengthens the Affordable Care Act, makes college more affordable, and ensures more Americans are lifted out of poverty. It also improves retirement security for our seniors.

With these targeted investments, our budget creates 2 million jobs next year and reduces our Nation's deficit by \$2.5 trillion over the next decade and puts us on a more sustainable path compared to the CBO projections of our budget. I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the budget presented by the gentleman from Virginia. This budget does nothing to address our mandatory spending challenges. It never balanced. It raises taxes, it increases spending, it cuts funding to our military. We can do better, we must do better, and the House budget is the way forward.

The American people sent us here to get our fiscal house in order. This budget does not accomplish that goal. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

HOOR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 553 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution, H. Con. Res. 71.

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) kindly take the chair.

□ 2046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with Mr. MITCHELL (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-339 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 314, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—108

Adams
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Blumenauer
Boyle, Brendan
F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Butterfield
Capuano
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)
Chu, Judy
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Conyers
Crowley
Cummings
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
Demings
DeSaulnier
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Español
Evans
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

Gabbard
Gallego
Gomez
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hastings
Higgins (NY)
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Lawrence
Lee
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Nadler
Nolan

Norcross
Pallone
Panetta
Dent
Pascrell
Payne
Pingree
Pocan
Price (NC)
Raskin
Richmond
Roybal-Allard
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Takano
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Vargas
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—314

Abraham
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei

Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr

Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)

Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bonamici
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carbajal
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cicilline
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Rodney
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Eshoo
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Fox
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garamendi
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene

Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Hanabusa
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Heck
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hoyer
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Keating
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawson (FL)
Levin
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebbeck
Loudermilk
Love
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham,
M.
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes

O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Quigley
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schiff
Schneider
Schradler
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Veasey
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack

Woodall	Yoho	Young (IA)
Yoder	Young (AK)	Zeldin

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt Rochester	Long	Rooney, Thomas
Bridenstine	Murphy (PA)	J.
Doyle, Michael	Napolitano	Rosen
F.	Pelosi	Titus
Kihuen		

□ 2110

Mr. MCNERNEY and Mrs. COMSTOCK changed their vote from “aye” to “no.”

Ms. ADAMS and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia changed their vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 130, noes 292, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 554]

AYES—130

Adams	Gabbard	Meeks
Barragán	Gallego	Meng
Bass	Gomez	Moore
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)	Moulton
Beyer	Green, Al	Nadler
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene	Neal
Blumenauer	Grijalva	Nolan
Boyle, Brendan	Gutiérrez	Norcross
F.	Hastings	Pallone
Brady (PA)	Heck	Panetta
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)	Pascrell
Butterfield	Hoyer	Payne
Capuano	Huffman	Pingree
Cardenas	Jackson Lee	Pocan
Carson (IN)	Jayapal	Price (NC)
Cartwright	Jeffries	Raskin
Castor (FL)	Johnson (GA)	Richmond
Castro (TX)	Johnson, E. B.	Roybal-Allard
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Ryan (OH)
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)	Sánchez
Clark (MA)	Kennedy	Sarbanes
Clarke (NY)	Khanna	Schakowsky
Clay	Kildee	Schiff
Cleaver	Krishnamoorthi	Scott (VA)
Clyburn	Larsen (WA)	Scott, David
Cohen	Larson (CT)	Serrano
Connolly	Lawrence	Sewell (AL)
Conyers	Lawson (FL)	Sherman
Crowley	Lee	Sires
Cummings	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Davis, Danny	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
DeFazio	Lofgren	Speier
DeLauro	Lowenthal	Takano
Demings	Lujan Grisham,	Thompson (MS)
DeSaulnier	M.	
Dingell	Luján, Ben Ray	Tonko
Doggett	Lynch	Tsongas
Ellison	Maloney,	Vargas
Engel	Carolyn B.	Veasey
Espallat	Matsui	Vela
Evans	McCollum	Velázquez
Frankel (FL)	McEachin	Walz
Fudge	McGovern	

Wasserman	Watson Coleman	Yarmuth
Schultz	Welch	
Waters, Maxine	Wilson (FL)	

NOES—292

Abraham	Gallagher	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Garamendi	Mullin
Aguiar	Garrett	Murphy (FL)
Allen	Gianforte	Newhouse
Amash	Gibbs	Noem
Amodei	Gohmert	Norman
Arrington	Goodlatte	Nunes
Babin	Gosar	O'Halleran
Bacon	Gottheimer	O'Rourke
Banks (IN)	Gowdy	Olson
Barletta	Granger	Palazzo
Barr	Graves (GA)	Palmer
Barton	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Bera	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Bergman	Griffith	Perlmutter
Biggs	Grothman	Perry
Bilirakis	Guthrie	Peters
Bishop (MI)	Hanabusa	Peterson
Bishop (UT)	Handel	Pittenger
Black	Harper	Poe (TX)
Blackburn	Harris	Poliquin
Blum	Hartzler	Polis
Bonamici	Hensarling	Posey
Bost	Herrera Beutler	Quigley
Brady (TX)	Hice, Jody B.	Ratcliffe
Brat	Higgins (LA)	Reed
Brooks (AL)	Hill	Reichert
Brooks (IN)	Himes	Renacci
Brownley (CA)	Holding	Rice (NY)
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rice (SC)
Buck	Hudson	Roby
Bucshon	Huizenga	Roe (TN)
Budd	Hultgren	Rogers (AL)
Burgess	Hunter	Rogers (KY)
Bustos	Hurd	Rohrabacher
Byrne	Issa	Rokita
Calvert	Jenkins (KS)	Rooney, Francis
Carbajal	Jenkins (WV)	Ros-Lehtinen
Carter (GA)	Johnson (LA)	Roskam
Carter (TX)	Johnson (OH)	Ross
Chabot	Johnson, Sam	Rothfus
Cheney	Jones	Rouzer
Coffman	Jordan	Royce (CA)
Cole	Joyce (OH)	Ruiz
Collins (GA)	Katko	Ruppersberger
Collins (NY)	Keating	Rush
Comer	Kelly (MS)	Russell
Comstock	Kelly (PA)	Rutherford
Conaway	Kilmer	Sanford
Cook	Kind	Scalise
Cooper	King (IA)	Schneider
Correa	King (NY)	Schrader
Costa	Kinzinger	Schweikert
Costello (PA)	Knight	Scott, Austin
Courtney	Kuster (NH)	Sensenbrenner
Cramer	Kustoff (TN)	Sessions
Crawford	Labrador	Shea-Porter
Crist	LaHood	Shimkus
Cuellar	LaMalfa	Shuster
Culberson	Lamborn	Simpson
Curbelo (FL)	Lance	Sinema
Davidson	Langevin	Smith (MO)
Davis (CA)	Latta	Smith (NE)
Davis, Rodney	Levin	Smith (NJ)
DeGette	Lewis (MN)	Smith (TX)
Delaney	Lipinski	Smucker
DelBondo	LoBiondo	Soto
Denham	Loebsock	Stefanik
Dent	Loudermilk	Stewart
DeSantis	Love	Stivers
DesJarlais	Lowey	Suozzi
Deutsch	Lucas	Swalwell (CA)
Diaz-Balart	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
Donovan	MacArthur	Tenney
Duffy	Maloney, Sean	Thompson (CA)
Duncan (SC)	Marchant	Thompson (PA)
Duncan (TN)	Marino	Thornberry
Dunn	Marshall	Tiberi
Emmer	Massie	Tipton
Eshoo	Mast	Torres
Estes (KS)	McCarthy	Trott
Esty (CT)	McCaul	Turner
Farenthold	McClintock	Upton
Faso	McHenry	Valadao
Ferguson	McKinley	Visclosky
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Wagner
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Walberg
Flores	McNerney	Walden
Fortenberry	McSally	Walker
Forster	Meadows	Walorski
Fox	Meehan	Walters, Mimi
Franks (AZ)	Messer	Weber (TX)
Frelinghuysen	Mitchell	Webster (FL)
Gaetz	Moolenaar	Wenstrup

NOT VOTING—11

Blunt Rochester	Long	Rooney, Thomas
Bridenstine	Murphy (PA)	J.
Doyle, Michael	Napolitano	Rosen
F.	Pelosi	Titus
Kihuen		

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 2117

Mr. GARAMENDI changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Mr. MACARTHUR. Mr. Chair, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL) having assumed the chair, Mr. MITCHELL, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

MONTANANS DEALING WITH
FEDERAL OVERREACH

(Mr. GIANFORTE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I met last week with a couple of small business owners in Butte, Montana, who have been the target of an out-of-control Federal bureaucrat in the Food Safety and Inspection Service.

One of the bureaucrat's targets is Riley's Meats. Over a period of 12 years, Dr. Jeffrey Legg with the FSIS ordered Bart Riley to comply with what he told Riley were Federal regulations.

Mr. Riley spent over \$10,000 in compliance costs and suffered years of harassment, but these weren't real Federal regulations. They were costly measures dreamed up by this bureaucrat.

I saw the toll that dealing with this government harassment has taken on the Riley family over the last decade.

No one should have to endure such a nightmare. Stories like these are why the American people demand that Washington is cleaned up.

For the Riley family and other Montanans dealing with Federal overreach, I will continue to focus on this issue until it is resolved.

MASS SHOOTING IN LAS VEGAS

(Mr. SWALWELL of California asked and was given permission to address

the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SWALWELL of California. Mr. Speaker, America has again been rocked by a mass shooting, and our hearts ache and our hands pray for the victims and those who are recovering. You can't help but watch the countless scores of video accounts and not feel an urge to act.

My constituents ask: Are we helpless to stop the next mass shooting?

We are only helpless once the trigger is squeezed and you are in the pathway of a bullet, but we are not helpless in this House. In fact, if we come together, we are more powerful than any weapon.

Aren't the dead owed a dialogue, a conversation about whether we should have background checks, a talk about whether people who have weapons of war should only be warriors, and what about talking about restrictions on ammunition purchases?

I refuse to accept the tradeoff that we must allow and accept that a mass shooting is going to happen in this country for an unfettered access to firearms.

If the police officers who went into that building so blindly and were so brave could do that and show that courage, we can come into this building and have the courage to have a dialogue for those victims.

RECOGNIZING THE WORK AND ACHIEVEMENT OF STEVE HILDRETH

(Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work and the achievement of Steve Hildreth, an exemplary employee and member of our community. Steve celebrated his retirement last month after working for 30 years at the Georgia Pacific Paper Mill in Camas, Washington.

Steve started at the mill in 1987, as sleeter helper in the print department. By the time he retired, he held the position of the shift team leader for the shift instrumentation technicians. He was well respected by the operators and crews of the machines, and he knew the job was to make their job easier.

He was also a member of the Association of Western Pulp and Paper Workers union throughout his career and held office in Local 5 for several years.

Fortunately, Steve has options in retirement. According to his wife, Shari, he is a true Renaissance man, in that he can build, troubleshoot, and fix just about anything. He is spending his time remodeling their Washougal home, setting up his new shop, and making his way through Shari's extensive honey-do list.

Mr. Speaker, southwest Washington has been fortunate to have someone like Steve Hildreth as an employee, father, husband, grandfather, and resi-

dent for the past 30 years. I would like to congratulate Steve on his retirement and wish him all the best in the years to come.

TRADE AND JOBS HEARING IN BROOK PARK, OHIO

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, as the NAFTA negotiations continue, it is important for us to listen to our constituents on how we can make NAFTA better for them.

To that end, I convened important stakeholders for a hearing in Ohio on how NAFTA has hurt American workers and what we can do to help them.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the testimony of Ms. Lee Geisse of the BlueGreen Alliance, Cheryl Johncox of the Sierra Club, and Mark Milko of Workers United.

BLUEGREEN ALLIANCE TESTIMONY, LEE GEISSE, REGIONAL PROGRAM MANAGER

We know that it is possible to have trade agreements that don't engage the U.S. in a race to the bottom, but instead lift up our own workers and workers throughout the world. We applaud Congresswoman Kaptur's work on this issue and so many others that are vital to the future of Ohio's workers, economy and the environment! Thank you for bringing these folks together and inviting the BlueGreen Alliance to participate!

In 2006, the United Steelworkers and the Sierra Club formed this unique Alliance—founded with the belief that we no longer have to choose between good jobs and a clean environment; we can and must have both. In these 11 years, we've convened workers, environmentalists, and industry leaders to forge partnerships that help us find solutions to address historic problems like climate change in ways that create and secure quality jobs. Together, we are a powerful voice for good jobs, a clean environment, and a fair and thriving economy.

The North American Free Trade Agreement, also known as NAFTA, has been in effect since 1994. The current Administration has announced plans for its renegotiation, but without much detail. That renegotiation begins this month. For far too many, NAFTA has meant the loss of good, quality paying jobs and increased pollution, as the deal exacerbated offshoring and profiteering off the backs of workers and the environment. It's time for a trade agreement that levels the playing field and makes deep reforms to strengthen workers' rights and environmental standards. American workers should expect agreements that ensure that other countries have to play by the same worker safety and environmental rules that we do. Anything short of [this] would be a failure.

NAFTA's replacement must support good union jobs, livable wages, healthy communities, clean air and water, and a more stable climate. Through an open, public process, the U.S. can partner with other nations in mutually beneficial trade and climate agreements that are fair, protect workers' rights and jobs, safeguard the environment; ensure the democratic processes of sovereign nations are not overturned by unelected bodies; and raise the bar for consumer and public protections in all nations that are signatories. The BlueGreen Alliance recommends a new approach to trade that lifts up workers

and communities. This requires fundamental changes to NAFTA, including:

1. Creating a transparent and inclusive renegotiation process. NAFTA renegotiations should not be done in secret but should be transparent and allow for public participation. This means inviting and incorporating public input on U.S. proposals for the agreement, and making negotiating texts available for public comment after each negotiating round. Workers, environmentalists, and other key stakeholders should be part of the process to make sure negotiators understand the impact of the deal on jobs and the environment. It is critical that all stakeholders and the general public be involved in a transparent, fair, and participatory negotiating process.

2. Eliminating corporate courts that incentivize offshoring and undermine environmental protections. NAFTA's Investor-State Dispute Settlement (ISDS) provision has created private courts in which foreign corporations can demand compensation for environmental protections and other democratically enacted laws before unelected, unaccountable, panels of corporate lawyers. By creating unique privileges for foreign investors, ISDS can incentivize offshoring and threaten the very safeguards we have democratically enacted. NAFTA's broad rights for foreign corporations, including ISDS, must be eliminated—mere tweaks will not be sufficient. NAFTA's replacement must eliminate ISDS so as to safeguard workers and environmental and health protections.

3. Including strong and binding labor and environmental protections—including wage and climate standards—in the core text of the agreement. NAFTA has enabled corporations to offshore production to take advantage of lower environmental and labor standards abroad. This has significantly impacted workers in both the manufacturing and service sectors. It has spurred the loss of good paying jobs, carbon leakage, and the export of pollution, while undermining domestic labor and environmental protections. To fix this, NAFTA's replacement should establish a binding floor of labor and environmental protections across North America. It should require signatory countries to adopt living wages for workers and to implement policies to fulfill important international labor and environmental agreements, including the Paris Climate Agreement and the International Labor Organization's conventions. These commitments should be included in the core text of the agreement and trade sanctions should be used to penalize violations. NAFTA must make a commitment to prioritize workers and the environment.

4. Creating a stronger, independent enforcement mechanism. Rules mean nothing if they aren't enforced. In the history of the U.S. trade agreements, labor and environmental provisions have consistently been ignored. Even post-2007 trade agreements with labor and environmental provisions in the core text have failed to produce disputes over widely documented labor and environmental violations. To fix this, the agreement that replaces NAFTA must create a new, independent dispute settlement mechanism for enforcing labor and environmental provisions rather than replicating the failed system of the past. Stronger enforcement is critical to ensure that the agreement is upheld and that it creates a fair playing field among all parties.

5. Protecting and promoting Buy American and green procurement policies. Currently NAFTA requires that the federal government treat foreign bidders as if they were American bidders when deciding how to spend U.S. taxpayer money. It also includes rules that

limit governments' ability to use "green purchasing" requirements that ensure government contracts support environmental protection. To protect and grow America's manufacturing and service sector employment, create taxpayer funded jobs in the U.S., and safeguard our air and water, NAFTA's replacement should support domestic job creation and responsible bidding standards.

6. Strengthening rules of origin. Rules of origin should benefit producers and workers across North America. For example, NAFTA's replacement needs to adopt more robust rules of origin that require automotive manufacturers to make a higher percentage of new vehicles and their parts in the originating country in order to qualify for tariff free trade. The agreement should ensure the signatory countries receive manufacturing, investment, and production benefits of the agreement. Under the current agreement, many countries that are not part of the agreement take advantage of loopholes to gain market access. The rules of origin and regional value content need to be updated so that they can incentivize manufacturing and production domestically.

We know exactly what causes outsourcing: low wages, exploited workers in unsafe working conditions, and weak, or non-existent, environmental, protections in other countries.

Americans, Ohioans, and working people everywhere need fair trade deals that put workers and the environment first and don't put corporate interests above our health, our rights, and our safety.

The promise of NAFTA being a job creator was hollow, and thousands of Ohio workers watched helplessly as this flawed trade agreement led to the outsourcing of middle-class jobs. While Donald Trump has promised to renegotiate NAFTA, the skepticism is that his billionaire, climate-denying cabinet, could actually make it worse!

All of our partners and allies must commit to helping champions like Congresswoman Kaptur watch closely and ensure that the voices of working people are heard throughout this process to support—not undermine—good jobs, efforts to address climate change, and safe worksites and healthy communities!

CHERYL JOHNCOX, ORGANIZING
REPRESENTATIVE, SIERRA CLUB

Thank you, Congresswoman Marcy Kaptur, for this very important hearing associated with the North American Free Trade Agreement Renegotiation. My name is Cheryl Johncox and I am a member of the national field team of Sierra Club.

For more than two decades, the North American Free Trade Agreement (NAFTA) has harmed communities across Canada, Mexico, and the U.S.—particularly people of color and lower income families—by undermining environmental protections, eliminating jobs, increasing air and water pollution, eroding wages, and fueling climate change.

To transform NAFTA from a polluter-friendly deal into one that supports environmental protection, any renegotiation must include, at a minimum,

1. Eliminate rules that empower corporations to attack environmental and public health protections in unaccountable tribunals. NAFTA's investor-state dispute settlement (ISDS) system has empowered multinational corporations to bypass our courts, go to private tribunals, and demand money from taxpayers for policies that affect corporate bottom lines. Corporations have used NAFTA to challenge bans on toxic chemicals, the decisions of environmental review panels, and protections for our climate. They have extracted more than \$370 million from

governments in these cases, while pending NAFTA claims total more than \$35 billion. The cases are heard not by judges, but by corporate lawyers outside the normal court system. Broad corporate rights, including ISDS, must be eliminated from NAFTA to safeguard our right to democratically determine our own public interest protections.

2. Add strong, enforceable environmental and labor standards to the core text of agreement. NAFTA's weak and unenforceable environmental and labor side agreements facilitated a race to the bottom in which corporations could offshore jobs to exploit lower environmental and labor standards in another country. Any deal that replaces NAFTA must create a fair playing field by requiring each participating country to adopt, maintain, and implement policies to ensure compliance with domestic environmental laws and important international environmental and labor agreements, including the Paris climate agreement, and treaties protecting Indigenous rights. In addition, each country must make commitments to tackle critical conservation challenges related to illegal timber trade, illegal wildlife trade, and fisheries management. These commitments must be included in the core text of the agreement and made enforceable via an independent dispute settlement process in which trade sanctions are used to correct labor and environmental abuses.

3. Safeguard energy sector regulation by overhauling overreaching rules. NAFTA's energy chapter, written before awareness of climate change was widespread, must be eliminated. Other NAFTA rules allow renewable portfolio standards, low-carbon fuel standards, and other climate-friendly energy regulations to be challenged for impeding business and hurting corporate bottom lines. Such rules must be narrowed to protect climate policies in each country.

4. Restrict pollution from cross-border motor carriers. NAFTA encouraged a rise in cross-border motor traffic without doing anything to mitigate the resulting increase in harmful vehicle emissions. Any deal that replaces NAFTA must require cross-border motor carriers to reduce emissions in order for their goods to benefit from reduced tariffs. In addition, all cross-border commercial vehicles must be required to comply with all state and federal standards to limit pollution.

5. Require green government purchasing instead of restricting it. NAFTA's procurement rules limit governments' ability to use "green purchasing" requirements that ensure government contracts support renewable energy, energy efficiency, and sustainable goods. NAFTA's replacement must require signatory governments to include a preference for goods and services with low environmental impacts and fair labor practices in procurement decisions.

6. Bolster climate protections by penalizing imported goods made with high climate emissions and lax labor standards. NAFTA allows firms to shift production to a country with lower climate standards, which can spur "carbon leakage" and job offshoring. To prevent this, and encourage greater climate action from high-emissions trading partners, each country must be required to impose a border tax on imported goods made with significant climate pollution, and unfair labor practices.

7. Add a broad protection for environmental, labor and other public interest policies. NAFTA's many overreaching rules restrict the policy tools that governments can use to protect the environment and other broadly-shared priorities. NAFTA includes no provision that effectively shields public interest policies from such rules—only a weak "exception" that has consistently

failed to protect challenged policies. Instead, any deal that replaces NAFTA must include a broad "carve-out" that exempts public interest policies from all of the deal's rules.

Any NAFTA renegotiation must be conducted through an open process that invites the public to help formulate U.S. positions and to comment on negotiated texts after each negotiating round. Bolstered by resurgent support for a new trade model, we commit to push for this environmental overhaul of NAFTA, and against any polluter-friendly deal that masquerades as change.

WORKERS UNITED,

August 11, 2017.

Re NAFTA field hearing.

Congresswoman KAPTUR,
Cleveland Office, Cleveland, OH.

DEAR CONGRESSWOMAN KAPTUR: I just wanted to respond in writing on a couple of facts on how NAFTA can affect workers indirectly impacted by NAFTA in manufacturing.

1. Workers that supply the food service in factories that are moved to Mexico.

2. Workers that work in the hospitality industry are impacted because of the loss of good paying jobs, those manufacturing workers no longer have the disposable income to go to a racetrack, ball game or other sporting events at all or as often.

3. The workers that still produce goods like our garment workers are put in a bad bargaining position at contract time because of trade agreements like NAFTA.

Please keep me in the loop on anything we can do to help in this process to get this trade agreement amended.

Sincerely,

MARK A. MILKO,
Area Director Workers United.

Ms. KAPTUR. Lee and Cheryl underlined the adverse environmental effects of NAFTA and the need to strengthen environmental standards in any renegotiated agreement.

I was proud to note their statements that Ohio has become number one in solar manufacturing. Just as Mark said, it is important that we ensure that these valuable manufacturing skills are passed along to our youth, and not outsourced.

I am grateful for their contributions and welcome their continued engagement as the negotiations proceed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for allowing me to include their remarks in the RECORD. They are important for all Americans to read, especially those negotiating the new NAFTA.

RECOGNIZING CARE NET PREGNANCY CENTER OF CENTRAL NEW YORK

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Care Net Pregnancy Center of Central New York.

Founded in 1989, Care Net provides free, confidential services for women facing an unplanned pregnancy across our region. Nationwide, Care Net has a network of over 1,100 pregnancy centers.

Through its work, Care Net of Central New York has provided guidance and compassionate care to over 24,000

individuals, equipping women with the resources they need to make an informed decision about their pregnancy.

From pregnancy counseling to post-abortion recovery services, Care Net offers a wide range of support and assistance to women considering this life-changing, difficult decision.

During an emotional and challenging time, Care Net staff provides an unparalleled level of compassion, support, and dedication to the women and men they serve.

Care Net continues to lead the way in the mission to protect the sanctity of life, helping to save the lives of thousands of unborn children each year.

It is an honor to stand here today to recognize Care Net's service to our community and its unwavering commitment to future generations.

COMMENDING THE OFFICE OF MANAGEMENT AND BUDGET FOR THEIR ATTENTION TO WILDFIRES IN THE WEST

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I wish to commend this evening the Office of Management and Budget and Mr. Mulvaney for the special attention they are taking to the wildfire situation we have in this country, especially in the West.

They have put forward a request for \$576 million additional funding for fire suppression, but even more importantly is to get at the root of the problem with better forest management that will make sense and make a difference over the coming years of getting rid of the fuel, getting the fuel out of the forest that is so much of the problem, with millions and millions of dead trees, brush, and all the other hazards that cause wildfires, that are going to happen anyway, to become catastrophic fires.

So OMB calling for these reforms that we have been talking about, me and my colleagues, for a long time is really a good sign that this administration wants to get serious about cutting way back on the wildfires and the severe damage to air quality, habitat, wildlife, and the asset the American people own, that they are serious about it.

□ 2130

YOU HAVE EARNED YOUR REST CORPORAL MICHAEL PAUL MIDDLEBROOK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for half the remaining time until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. HIGGINS), my friend.

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

On October 1 of this year, less than one week ago, my brother of the thin blue line, Corporal Michael Paul Middlebrook, a nine-year veteran of the Lafayette Police Department, was killed in the line of duty while responding to a "shots fired" call at a local convenience store.

Corporal Middlebrook is survived by his wife, three daughters, and his parents. During his tenure at the Lafayette Police Department, Corporal Middlebrook accumulated seven letters of commendation for acts of bravery and outstanding police work.

Michael understood that his job as a cop began with an oath. And that oath was not to a chief or a sheriff or a marshal. It was an oath of allegiance to the constitutional principles that his badge represents. Corporal Michael Middlebrook recognized unwaveringly the civil constitutional rights of the citizens he had sworn to protect and defend and serve.

In March of this year, Michael was awarded the highly prestigious Heart of Law Enforcement Award by the national nonprofit group Beyond the Badge. During the ceremony, Corporal Middlebrook was recognized by Louisiana's Governor and was presented a commemorative State flag. This award was given to recognize Corporal Middlebrook's ongoing contributions to the low-income community that he patrolled.

Michael regularly took donated food items from local convenience stores and distributed the food to the homeless and less fortunate. Michael also collected clothing on his off time and delivered the clothing to poor souls he encountered during his shift deep in the night while the world slept.

In the last 6 months alone, Corporal Michael Middlebrook was recognized for having saved a person's life by placing himself between the victim and the knife-wielding suspect, and for single-handedly apprehending an armed robbery suspect seconds after the 911 call was placed.

Corporal Middlebrook's chief, my friend and brother, Chief Toby Aguillard, provided this quote: "For many in our community, Corporal Middlebrook was a spearhead that brought them to justice. For many others, Corporal Middlebrook was a cradle of compassion. He was an officer's officer, loved and respected by his peers. The void he leaves in our department, in our community, in our hearts will be felt for generations. He will never be forgotten."

That quote was from Michael's chief. Brother Michael, you have earned your rest. Your watch has ended. We have got it from here. The thin blue line will never forget your service. We shall always honor your memory, and we shall watch over your family.

May our Saviour bless your ascension, and may He hold your loved ones close to His own heart.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague for yielding to me.

HOW DID WE GET HERE?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, when someone with the service of my friend from Louisiana, Mr. HIGGINS, pays tribute, you know it is somebody worthy, because my friend from Louisiana served with distinction in the United States Army, wearing the uniform of this country. He served as a law enforcement officer. He knows about serving, protecting others, and a willingness to lay down his life for others.

It has been deeply touching to have seen accounts of what is going on in Las Vegas. To understand what I have seen in my years as a prosecutor, judge, and chief justice, when everyone is running away from the sound of a gun, first responders and law officers are running into harm's way to help and protect others.

It was Jesus who said, "Greater love has no one than this, that a man lay down his life for his friends."

Those who wear the uniform, as my friend has, of law officer and in the military, they know what that means. My 4 years in Active Duty in the Army, we were not in combat, but Jesus was right.

There were so many there in Las Vegas that put their own lives on the line for the sake of the lives of others.

There are others that couldn't wait to rush to a microphone to demand: Gun control, gun control.

I am waiting for them to rush to the mic and scream: Knife control, knife control.

Or after a van is used as the weapon: Van control, van control.

What is clear is we need to look at the real causation, whether it is machetes being used to torture and kill 800,000 precious humans in Africa, whether it is knives, whether it is ammonium nitrate. People with evil in their hearts are going to find a way to wreak havoc.

We know that without a gun being used, the biggest—worst tragedy and loss of life attack was on 9/11 in 2001. I don't believe there was a gun used in the whole process, yet it was a worse loss of American life than at Pearl Harbor.

You have got to look at what is in the heart, what's causing it. If they are going to use knives, if they are going to use planes, if they are going to use vehicles, yeah, we need to protect ourselves, but we need to look at what is in the heart.

I know the sheriff said the shooter may have been radicalized. We don't know yet. We know there was a trip to the Philippines.

I am very proud to have met out in the jungles of the southern Philippines with some of our special forces. Amazing. Some of the best America has to offer, and they were out in the jungles teaching the Filipino soldiers, the best that the Philippines had, how to go after the radicalized Islamists in the southern Philippines.

But we don't know if this man with evil in his heart had been radicalized.

Others say there were no indications. But one thing was certain, he looked down on that crowd of people enjoying life, enjoying their families, enjoying their loved ones, and all he could see was worthless people that needed to be eliminated.

Why did he have that in his heart? Where do people get those ideas?

I mean, we argue and disagree here on the House floor. When I was a judge, I watched argument. At times it seemed like they wanted to come to blows, but it was part of a civil process in a bastion where we come and we disagree and we don't use physical violence, but we are still supposed to have respect for each other and each other's position.

To hear some comedian say, "Just do something," would have been viewed by those who gave us the documents that have allowed us to be the greatest Nation—I think greater than Solomon's Israel, more assets per person, the only country in the history that I'm aware of where the number one health problem for the Nation's poor is obesity, and it is a serious issue.

But how did we get here?

Obviously, for the Japanese at Pearl Harbor, it was easier for them because they weren't looking in the eyes of people.

It was easier for this guy 32 floors up because he was not looking at the eyes of these people, his people he wanted to kill that he didn't think were worth allowing to live, despite the love they were sharing with each other and the joy.

Where do people get those ideas that somebody is that worthless? Is it from hearing people with whom someone disagrees is deplorable, that they simply cannot be made worthy of living?

Here is a statement from this October 2 article. Some CBS executive said she was not even sympathetic for the victims of the shooting at a country music festival. She said: "I am actually not even sympathetic because country music fans often are Republican gun toters."

□ 2145

Scott Pelley has questioned whether the shooting was "foreseeable, predictable and, to some degree, self-inflicted."

But for someone who appears to know right from wrong, not suffering from mental disease or defect, to inflict that kind of death on people who are just innocent, just having a good time, there has to be so much evil and hate in his heart.

So we have a Supreme Court that has been saying for years: You have got to get prayer out of schools. Never mind the fact that prayer got this country started, that prayer and worship and honoring God have been behind the greatest developments in this country's history that got us to this place, to this plateau, as a nation.

Although some would argue we have hit the height of freedom, some surveys

don't have us anywhere near the top of being one of the freest countries in the world anymore.

It is continuing to be, after tragedies, after people with evil in their heart do evil things, that more cry out: We need to lose more freedom. We need to lose more freedom.

That is not the answer. Let's look at what is in people's hearts and what would be good to have in their hearts.

I know where we came from, but even I was surprised when my pastor, David Dykes, and I and his wife, Cindy, my wife, Kathy, we were going through the State Department. I had not done a tour of the State Department before because it is mostly boring, but we came to a glass case that had a document in it, and it said it was a duplicate.

We know that many of our most important documents, including the Declaration of Independence, were made in duplicate, so I don't know if this was one that was actually signed or it was a duplicate. It appeared to be of the era.

I said to Dr. Dykes: Did you know the Treaty of Paris began like that?

I didn't know. I study history most every day.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I did know that rule.

But this was the Treaty of Paris, 1783, and John Adams was there. But this is where we were negotiating with England, the most powerful country in the world, imploring them to recognize this little upstart country of 13 States as an independent country, independent and free of the shackles that were there as Colonies by England.

Here they have got the biggest navy. They have an impressive military, most powerful nation, and we are asking them to swear on a document that we in the United States have the right to be free and independent.

So as I contemplated that, well, these first words that are in much bigger letters than the rest of the document, began to make sense.

What would you have asked somebody swear under, at the beginning of our Nation, asking the most powerful nation in the world to swear that they recognize, something important enough they would not want to break that oath, even with the anger and the despising attitude that many in England had at that time?

Well, the words they chose for those big, tall letters, were these, and this is a copy of the copy. "In the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity."

Well, some say we were started with the Declaration of Independence, recognizing that we are free and, of right, ought to be free because we are endowed by our Creator with these unalienable rights.

And then we have this document where England swears in the name of the Most Holy and Undivided Trinity that they recognize our independence. That came after the Great Awakening, in the 1700s, where pulpits were on fire with the glory of God and the recognition of what God had given us and of the importance of the Bible.

No, everybody wasn't a Christian back then, but of the signers of the Declaration, you had over a third of them were—may have been over half were actually ordained Christian ministers.

There were secularists that supported the end of slavery, but the churches drove that. The churches provided the Underground Railroad, most often, to try to help Africans to be free Americans.

It was an ordained Christian minister who went on to help bring about the full meaning of the Constitution, that this should mean what it said, an ordained Christian minister named Martin Luther King, Jr.

So, Mr. Speaker, Abraham Lincoln, he started life early as, bragging to his law partner, he was an infidel. Going from that, as Steve Mansfield discusses, I believe the book is entitled "Lincoln's Struggle With God." By the time he became President, he knew there was a God. And just like Benjamin Franklin said: "I have lived, sir, a long time. The longer I live, the more convincing proofs I see of this truth—God governs in the affairs of men. And if a sparrow cannot fall to the ground without His notice, is it probable that an empire can rise without His aid? We have been assured, sir, in the sacred writings that, 'except the Lord build the house, they labor in vain that build it.'"

He said: "I firmly believe this. I also firmly believe that without His concurring aid, we shall succeed in our political building no better than the builders of Babel."

So this man, kind of homely looking—I thought Daniel Day-Lewis captured his essence so well. When I met Doris Kearns Goodwin over at the Library of Congress, I said: You've got to tell me, you do such fabulous research—and, yes, she is a more liberal Democrat, I know, but she does fabulous research. And in her book, "Team of Rivals," she has well documented he didn't have a pleasant voice, kind of high, raspy. Daniel Day-Lewis nailed it.

But Lincoln came to know what Ben Franklin testified to in 1787 at the Constitutional Convention. He lost a son. He and his wife lost a son in 1861. There are indications he totally blamed himself because he thought he hadn't done quickly enough what God meant for him to do: end slavery. I don't know if that is true or not.

But in March of 1863, this was Abraham Lincoln's declaration, and I will finish with this, Mr. Speaker. Abraham Lincoln's words were: "But we have forgotten God. We have forgotten the

gracious hand which preserved us in peace, and multiplied and enriched and strengthened us; and we have vainly imagined, in the deceitfulness of our hearts, that all the blessings were produced by some superior wisdom and virtue of our own."

Lincoln goes on and says: "Intoxicated with unbroken success, we have become too self-sufficient to feel the necessity of redeeming and preserving grace, too proud to pray to the God that made us. It behooves us then, to humble ourselves before the offended Power, to confess our national sins, and to pray for clemency and forgiveness"—Abraham Lincoln.

Mr. Speaker, I believe this was not the act of God punishing Americans for being country music fans or being conservatives. This was not the act of God punishing Americans for turning away. This was from a man with evil in his heart in a country where God has been driven out of the schoolhouse, driven out of government buildings by a majority of Supreme Court Justices who have no clue how far from the original intent of the Constitution they have wandered.

It is the result of years of teaching people that there are those among our what we deem innocent in society who just should not be allowed to live. That is not the teaching of Jesus. It is not the teaching in the Bible, and it is not what this country grew so great believing.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of a death in the family.

Mr. KIHUEN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of work in district relating to tragic shooting in Las Vegas.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 5 p.m. and the balance of the week on account of husband's health.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on September 29, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills.

H.R. 3823. To amend title 49, United States Code, to extend authorizations for the airport improvement program, to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to extend the funding and expenditure authority of the Airport and Airway Trust Fund, to provide disaster tax relief, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2519. To require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint commemorative coins in recognition of the 100th anniversary of The American Legion.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 57 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9 a.m.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. RASKIN, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY):

H.R. 3937. A bill to require the Federal prudential banking agencies to determine whether certain institutions they regulate engage in a pattern or practice of violations of Federal banking and consumer protection laws and regulations, to provide for the revocation of banking charters and Federal deposit insurance for such institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. LYNCH (for himself, Mr. SUOZZI, Ms. NORTON, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. POLIS, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. PANETTA, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. PETERS, and Mr. LOWENTHAL):

H.R. 3938. A bill to direct the Administrator of the Federal Aviation Administration to enter into appropriate arrangements with the National Academies of Sciences, Engineering, and Medicine to provide for a report on the health impacts of air traffic noise and pollution, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mrs. NOEM (for herself and Mr. WALZ):

H.R. 3939. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. POE of Texas (for himself, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. VELA, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. BRADY of Texas, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. BABIN, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRADER, Mr. WALDEN, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. SESSIONS, Mr. MCCAUL, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 3940. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for housing stipends and supply fee payments under Post-9/11 Educational Assistance Program for individuals affected by extended school closures due to natural disasters; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Ms. PINGREE (for herself, Mr. FORTENBERRY, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 3941. A bill to improve food safety, to encourage greater production of agricultural commodities for use in the locality in which produced, to reauthorize and expand Department of Agriculture support of these efforts, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, and in addition to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration

of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. HARTZLER (for herself, Ms. BORDALLO, and Mrs. NOEM):

H.R. 3942. A bill to amend the Violence Against Women Act of 1994 to include sex trafficking victims in the transitional housing assistance grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Financial Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'ROURKE (for himself, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. VELA, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PETERS, and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico):

H.R. 3943. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act to prohibit the Secretary of Homeland Security and the Attorney General from using eminent domain to acquire land for the purpose of constructing a wall, or other physical barrier, along the international border between the United States and Mexico, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. COHEN (for himself, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. HASTINGS, and Mr. POLIS):

H.R. 3944. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras and securely storing and maintaining recorded data for law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JEFFRIES (for himself, Mr. MARINO, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. SMITH of Texas, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. TED LIEU of California):

H.R. 3945. A bill to amend title 17, United States Code, to establish an alternative dispute resolution program for copyright small claims, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ALLEN (for himself, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CARTER of Georgia, Mr. COLLINS of Georgia, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. WOODALL):

H.R. 3946. A bill to name the Department of Veterans Affairs community-based outpatient clinic in Statesboro, Georgia, the "Ray Hendrix Veterans Clinic"; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CICILLINE (for himself, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. BASS, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. BEYER, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr.

CLEAVER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CRIST, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. DELAUNO, Ms. DELBENE, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. EVANS, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. HECK, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. HIMES, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. JEFFRIES, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. KEATING, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. KILDEE, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. LEE, Mr. LEVIN, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mrs. LOWEY, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. LYNCH, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MOORE, Mr. MOULTON, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. NADLER, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. PINGREE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. RASKIN, Miss RICE of New York, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SARBANES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SIRES, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Ms. TITUS, Mr. TONKO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. TSONGAS, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. WALZ, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. MENG, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. RUSH, Mr. SCHRADER, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 3947. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia):

H.R. 3948. A bill to prohibit the Securities and Exchange Commission from compelling a person to produce or furnish algorithmic trading source code or similar intellectual property to the Commission unless the Commission first issues a subpoena, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. KHANNA (for himself, Mr. ARRINGTON, and Mr. O'ROURKE):

H.R. 3949. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to provide for the designation of State approving agencies for multi-State apprenticeship programs for purposes of the educational assistance programs of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. LOVE (for herself, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. WALKER, Mr. GOWDY, Mr. LABRADOR, Ms. TENNEY, Mr. HILL, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER):

H.R. 3950. A bill to specify the scope of judicial review of certain agency actions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3951. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Transportation to declare that an aviation humanitarian crisis exists for airports impacted by a major disaster or emergency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3952. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to clarify the treatment of coordinated expenditures as contributions to candidates, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3953. A bill to amend the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971 to replace the Federal Election Commission with the Federal Election Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3954. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to reform the system of public financing for Presidential elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3955. A bill to reform public financing for Presidential elections and provide for public financing for Congressional elections; to the Committee on House Administration, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. RENACCI (for himself, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. COSTA, Mr. BARLETTA, and Mr. JOYCE of Ohio):

H.R. 3956. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to simplify the treatment of seasonal positions for purposes of the employer shared responsibility requirement; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida (for himself, Mr. GARRETT, Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. BRAT, Mrs. HANDEL, and Mr. SMUCKER):

H.R. 3957. A bill to repeal title VIII of the Higher Education Opportunity Act and title VIII of the Higher Education Act of 1965; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER (for himself and Mr. CARTER of Texas):

H.R. 3958. A bill to establish a pilot program on securing energy infrastructure, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT (for himself, Mr. CÁRDENAS, and Mr. AGUILAR):

H.R. 3959. A bill to amend the Clean Air Act to give States the option of monitoring covered criteria air pollutants in designated areas by greatly increasing the number of air quality sensors in exchange for greater regulatory flexibility in the methods of monitoring, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Ms. PELOSI):

H.R. 3960. A bill to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Liu Xiaobo, and collectively to all advocates of democracy and human rights in China, in recognition of their extraordinary advocacy for liberty and human rights despite repression and their impact on world peace and global understanding of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition

to the Committees on House Administration, and Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3961. A bill to amend the Wild and Scenic Rivers Act to designate segments of the Kissimmee River and its tributaries in the State of Florida for study for potential addition to the National Wild and Scenic Rivers System, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. HIMES, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. LOFGREN, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. MCNERNEY, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SIRES, Mr. SMITH of Washington, and Ms. SPEIER):

H.R. 3962. A bill to require face to face purchases of ammunition, to require licensing of ammunition dealers, and to require reporting regarding bulk purchases of ammunition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. REED (for himself, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. MEEHAN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. LOBIONDO, Mr. JOYCE of Ohio, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. HULTGREN, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. CICILLINE, Ms. KAPTUR, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. TONKO, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. BOST, Mr. NADLER, Mr. LOEBESACK, Mrs. RADEWAGEN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. COURTNEY, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RENACCI, Ms. DELBENE, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. BARLETTA, Mr. COSTA, Mrs. WALORSKI, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. LAHOOD, Mrs. TORRES, Mrs. BUSTOS, Ms. NORTON, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BLUM, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. EMMER, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. JENKINS of West Virginia, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LATTI, Mr. FERGUSON, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MARSHALL, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mr. EVANS):

H. Con. Res. 84. Concurrent resolution expressing support for designation of the first Friday of October as "Manufacturing Day"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. GRIJALVA (for himself, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. POLIS, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. GALLEGO, and Mr. BEYER):

H. Res. 555. A resolution of inquiry requesting the President and directing the Secretary of the Interior to transmit, respectively, certain documents and other information to the House of Representatives relating to the executive order on the review of designations under the Antiquities Act; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 556. A resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. JONES (for himself, Mr. ROHR-ABACHER, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GAETZ, and Mr. CONNOLLY):

H. Res. 557. A resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 3937.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. LYNCH:

H.R. 3938.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. NOEM:

H.R. 3939.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 3940.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Line 18 of the Constitution: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Ms. PINGREE:

H.R. 3941.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 1 of Section 8 of the US Constitution

By Mrs. HARTZLER:

H.R. 3942.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 Section 8 of Article I of the United States Constitution

By Mr. O'ROURKE:

H.R. 3943.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Clause 18 of Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution:

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the

foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by the Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Office thereof.

By Mr. COHEN:

H.R. 3944.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. JEFFRIES:

H.R. 3945.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper . . .

By Mr. ALLEN:

H.R. 3946.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Consistent with the original understanding of the general welfare clause, the authority to enact this legislation is found in Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution.

By Mr. CICILLINE:

H.R. 3947.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 3948.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States); and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. KHANNA:

H.R. 3949.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 18 (necessary and proper clause)

By Mrs. LOVE:

H.R. 3950.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, and Article III, Sections 1 and 2, of the Constitution.

By Mr. PAYNE:

H.R. 3951.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 Clause 3—Congress has the ability to regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3952.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3953.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3954.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina:

H.R. 3955.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution and Article I, Section 4 of the Constitution, which give Congress power to make laws governing the time, place, and manner of Federal elections.

By Mr. RENACCI:

H.R. 3956.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18. To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida:

H.R. 3957.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1 Section 8

By Mr. RUPPERSBERGER:

H.R. 3958.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 1 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. SCHWEIKERT:

H.R. 3959.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey:

H.R. 3960.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8 of the Constitution

By Mr. SOTO:

H.R. 3961.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN:

H.R. 3962.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 37: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 147: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 246: Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 299: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 436: Ms. SINEMA.

H.R. 445: Ms. DEGETTE.

H.R. 535: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. BRAT.

H.R. 598: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 613: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 619: Mrs. BEATTY.

H.R. 620: Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. AMODEI, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 632: Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 638: Ms. BASS and Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 669: Mr. CUMMINGS and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 686: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 750: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 807: Mr. MCCAUL and Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 820: Mr. MACARTHUR, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Mr. AL GREEN of Texas.

H.R. 821: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DEMINGS, and Ms. VELÁZQUEZ.

H.R. 846: Mr. RATCLIFFE, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. SCHRADER, and Mr. SIMPSON.

H.R. 850: Mr. WITTMAN.

H.R. 866: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 927: Mr. KNIGHT and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1002: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. BRADY of Texas.

H.R. 1017: Mr. HUIZENGA, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. CONAWAY, and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 1046: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1057: Mrs. HARTZLER and Mr. MCHENRY.

H.R. 1078: Mr. KIND, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. MOORE, Mr. DEUTCH, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 1094: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 1111: Ms. JACKSON LEE.

H.R. 1133: Mr. ZELDIN.

H.R. 1136: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1148: Mr. KHANNA and Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1150: Mr. FORTENBERRY, Mr. KATKO, and Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1164: Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. MAST, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GRAVES of Georgia, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1167: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 1241: Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 1273: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1274: Mr. STEWART.

H.R. 1276: Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 1279: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 1298: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 1374: Mr. CONNOLLY.

H.R. 1406: Mr. VARGAS, Mr. PAULSEN, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. DELANEY.

H.R. 1444: Mr. AMODEI.

H.R. 1459: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 1552: Mr. MARCHANT and Mr. HILL.

H.R. 1566: Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 1568: Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 1587: Mr. POLIS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. TONKO.

H.R. 1639: Mr. COLLINS of Georgia.

H.R. 1661: Ms. STEFANIK and Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 1676: Mr. MACARTHUR and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 1729: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 1762: Mr. RATCLIFFE and Mr. GOWDY.

H.R. 1825: Mr. SMITH of Missouri and Ms. TSONGAS.

H.R. 1896: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 1953: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. CONAWAY.

H.R. 2133: Mr. RUTHERFORD, Mr. COLE, and Mr. FLEISCHMANN.

H.R. 2193: Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2267: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 2285: Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. OLSON.

H.R. 2318: Mr. KIHUEN.

H.R. 2321: Mrs. NOEM.

H.R. 2401: Mr. WALZ, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Ms. ADAMS.

H.R. 2436: Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. COHEN, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. ELLISON, and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 2465: Mr. BURGESS.

H.R. 2481: Ms. SLAUGHTER and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2625: Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. CLEAVER, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. NEAL, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. TITUS, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, and Mr. SCHIFF.

H.R. 2633: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. NADLER.

H.R. 2644: Mr. CARTWRIGHT and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 2651: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 2705: Mr. STIVERS.

H.R. 2740: Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, and Mrs. DAVIS of California.

H.R. 2782: Ms. BORDALLO.

H.R. 2821: Mr. REICHERT.

H.R. 2862: Mr. RYAN of Ohio.

H.R. 2890: Mr. KINZINGER and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2901: Mr. GOTTHEIMER.

H.R. 2908: Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER.

H.R. 2936: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 2999: Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 3034: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. LEE, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Mr. REICHERT, and Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 3040: Mr. SMITH of Washington, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. MENG, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. TED LIEU of California, and Mr. LEVIN.

H.R. 3117: Mr. PERRY.

H.R. 3222: Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. PASCRELL, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, and Ms. CLARKE of New York.

H.R. 3303: Mr. GOTTHEIMER and Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3320: Mr. SENSENBRENNER.

H.R. 3324: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 3329: Mr. BUDD, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BUCHANAN, and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 3345: Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 3352: Mr. CORREA and Miss RICE of New York.

H.R. 3363: Ms. MOORE.

H.R. 3380: Mr. RUSH, Ms. PINGREE, and Mr. SMITH of Washington.

H.R. 3394: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 3402: Mr. GALLAGHER.

H.R. 3464: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. RUPPERSBERGER.

H.R. 3479: Mr. YOUNG of Iowa.

H.R. 3497: Mr. HIMES and Mr. SWALWELL of California.

H.R. 3512: Mr. VALADAO and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 3528: Mr. KENNEDY.

H.R. 3548: Mr. ROTHFUS and Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 3554: Mr. CLEAVER and Mr. SCHRADER.

H.R. 3576: Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia.

H.R. 3632: Ms. STEFANIK, Ms. SINEMA, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 3639: Mr. POLIS.

H.R. 3711: Mrs. Handel.

H.R. 3727: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 3730: Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3733: Mr. BEYER.

H.R. 3738: Ms. LEE, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, and Mr. WELCH.

H.R. 3755: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. POCAN, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. CLAY, and Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD.

H.R. 3761: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H.R. 3767: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 3775: Mr. HUDSON.

H.R. 3808: Ms. STEFANIK.

H.R. 3826: Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. DEUTCH, Mr. DIAZ-BALART, Mr. CRIST, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 3832: Mr. GIBBS, Mr. JONES, and Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota.

H.R. 3847: Mr. COOK.

H.R. 3849: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 3862: Ms. MATSUI.

H.R. 3866: Mr. TAKANO.

H.R. 3875: Mr. CARSON of Indiana.

H.R. 3877: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 3896: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. RUSH.

H.R. 3923: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. KHANNA, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 3925: Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.J. Res. 48: Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.

H. Con. Res. 63: Mr. DESAULNIER and Ms. BARRAGÁN.

H. Con. Res. 72: Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, and Miss RICE of New York.

H. Con. Res. 81: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. NORTON, and Mrs. DINGELL.

H. Res. 142: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H. Res. 213: Mr. ELLISON.

H. Res. 283: Mr. BEYER, Mr. CARBAJAL, and Mr. MOULTON.

H. Res. 367: Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. KILMER, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H. Res. 370: Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. GOMEZ, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H. Res. 401: Mr. CARSON of Indiana and Mr. TIPTON.

H. Res. 458: Mr. KELLY of Mississippi.

H. Res. 495: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, and Mr. CLEAVER.

H. Res. 517: Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 535: Ms. MENG.

H. Res. 544: Mr. COLLINS of New York and Mrs. LOVE.

DELETION OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 367: Mr. DEFAZIO.



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, OCTOBER 4, 2017

No. 159

Senate

The Senate met at 9:30 a.m. and was called to order by the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, Dr. Barry C. Black, offered the following prayer:

Let us pray.

Almighty God, we are grateful that Your will prevails when reliance on humanity is futile.

Give our Senators the wisdom to understand that without Your help, they cannot succeed. Today, use them to work and act to accomplish Your purposes on Earth. Help them not to repay evil with evil but plant seeds of goodness that will bring a harvest of joy.

Arise, O Lord. Lift Yourself up in these dangerous times to bring Your peace to our hearts. Help us to remember that You save the upright in heart, and Your justice will sustain us. Keep us from conceiving troubles and embracing falsehoods, as we focus on loving and serving You.

We pray in Your loving Name. Amen.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The Presiding Officer 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.

APPOINTMENT OF ACTING PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will please read a communication to the Senate from the President pro tempore (Mr. HATCH).

The bill clerk read the following letter:

U.S. SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, DC, October 4, 2017.

To the Senate:

Under the provisions of rule I, paragraph 3, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, I hereby

appoint the Honorable RAND PAUL, a Senator from the Commonwealth of Kentucky, to perform the duties of the Chair.

ORRIN G. HATCH,
President pro tempore.

Mr. PAUL thereupon assumed the Chair as Acting President pro tempore.

RECOGNITION OF THE MAJORITY LEADER

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The majority leader is recognized.

TAX REFORM AND THE BUDGET

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, yesterday, Chairman HATCH held another hearing on a subject that is incredibly important to the economic future of our country: tax reform.

For too long, our economy has failed to live up to its full potential. For too long, Americans have suffered through stagnant paychecks, a lack of steady work, and retirement that can seem to slip further away by the day. These are the forgotten men, women, and families of the last decade. For many Americans living on the coasts, working in Silicon Valley, or in finance, the recession of 2008 to 2009 may seem like just a moment in history, but for too many Americans, the last 10 years have been a lost decade where our economy has stumbled along and opportunities have declined for American workers and their families.

Tax reform represents the single most important thing we can do today to get our economy back on track and give American workers a leg up. It is our once-in-a-generation opportunity to replace an outdated tax code that holds us back with one that works for American families and small businesses. We want to lower taxes and simplify rates. We want to expand job creation and grow paychecks. Put another way, we want to take more money out of Washington's pocket and

put it in yours. That is the essential goal of tax reform. That is our message to the American people. It is what I believe. It is what Chairman HATCH believes. It is what Chairman ENZI believes as well.

Chairman ENZI has an important role to play in this process, too, because later today he will lead his committee in marking up a comprehensive budget for fiscal year 2018 that will help our country achieve balance by reining in Federal spending. It will also help our economy grow, and one of the ways it will do so is by providing legislative tools to advance tax reform. I thank the Budget Committee for all its good work so far, and I look forward to its continued efforts to get our fiscal house in order and our economy back on a path to solid growth after the lost decade of disappointment I just spoke about.

NOMINATIONS

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, earlier this week, I filed cloture motions on four qualified nominees for various agencies throughout the Federal Government. I shouldn't have had to. In different times, we may have even considered them on voice votes. But this is where we are, and now it is time to advance and confirm them as soon as possible.

Later this morning, the Senate will consider Eric Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. As the people of Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands continue to recover from a series of devastating hurricanes, Mr. Hargan's expertise in disaster response and public health will help the Department respond to these crises. I look forward to confirming Mr. Hargan soon so he can help coordinate multiple agencies under his supervision to respond to the hurricanes, deliver relief, and help save lives.

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

S6293

After that, this afternoon we will take up the nomination of Randal Quarles, the President's nominee to help oversee the Federal Reserve System. Mr. Quarles brings with him both domestic and international financial experience from multiple administrations, and he will be a strong guide for our Nation's monetary policy. We also intend to confirm Mr. Quarles to the position of Vice Chair for Supervision. This is an essential role created by Dodd-Frank, and it is critical that Mr. Quarles begin this work over at the Fed.

Tomorrow, the Senate will confirm Lee Francis Cissna to be Director of U.S. Citizenship and Immigration Services. Mr. Cissna has a wealth of experience in immigration policy, serving in senior policy positions in both the Bush and Obama administrations and then working for the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee. He was voted out of committee with bipartisan support. I look forward to his confirmation to this important role.

Then we will consider Callista Gingrich, whom the President has nominated to be our Nation's Ambassador to the Holy See. Ms. Gingrich's work will continue the strong relationship between our Nation and the Vatican, building upon shared values, goals, and global responsibilities.

I thank each of these nominees for their willingness to serve our Nation. They are each well qualified and suited for their role. I look forward to the Senate confirming them very soon.

TRIBUTE TO DR. TOM APPLETON

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to congratulate Dr. Tom Appleton of Lexington, KY, on his retirement from the History Department at Eastern Kentucky University. One of Kentucky's premier historians, Tom has spent his career writing about the Commonwealth's rich heritage. He joined ECU's faculty in the fall of 2000, and over the years, he has left a positive imprint on his students, his field, and his State.

He has also proved to be an invaluable resource for me. A number of years ago, I began a series of talks focused on former U.S. Senators from Kentucky. In each speech, I have tried to convey a bit of political history through the lives of these distinguished individuals. Tom's counsel has been invaluable in my work to prepare these speeches and pay tribute to some of Kentucky's prominent political leaders.

Before joining ECU's faculty nearly 20 years ago, Tom spent more than two decades at the Kentucky Historical Society. It certainly shows. Even the TV show "Jeopardy" has used him as a historical resource. Tom has been the co-editor of six books on the history of the American South, including a groundbreaking look into the lives of Kentucky women, and he is currently working on a biography of Kentucky's

own A.B. "Happy" Chandler, who served as Governor, Senator, and baseball's second commissioner. Tom's passion for Kentucky's rich history is obvious.

He has been a wonderful friend and resource for me, a real champion and advocate for our Commonwealth, and has made a lasting impact on the next generation through his teaching. As one former student recalled, "Dr. Appleton's mission in teaching Kentucky history was less about imparting facts and dates and more about ensuring that students departed the class with an enhanced understanding of the rich cultural tapestry of Kentucky. He admonished students to be worthy of the proud legacy of our Commonwealth's great statesmen, military leaders, writers, and sports legends." That is a legacy to be proud of.

After his final semester of teaching, Tom could be forgiven for wanting to retire from his work as a historian altogether, but that is not Tom. He plans to continue his research and writing about the lives and events that shaped our home State, and I plan to continue reading his fascinating take on our shared Kentucky heritage.

I wish Tom well, and I urge all of my colleagues to join me in congratulating Dr. Tom Appleton on a truly remarkable career.

RESERVATION OF LEADER TIME

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the leadership time is reserved.

CONCLUSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Morning business is closed.

EXECUTIVE SESSION

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Hargan nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Under the previous order, the time until 11 a.m. will be equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

Mr. MCCONNELL. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

RECOGNITION OF THE MINORITY LEADER

The Democratic leader is recognized.

PUERTO RICO AND U.S. VIRGIN ISLANDS RECOVERY EFFORT

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I understand the administration intends to submit its first request for disaster aid for Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands today. It is a good first step, but it is just the start of the financial aid we will need to provide to the American citizens in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

I urge my colleagues to work quickly to add additional and urgent funding for recovery, like community development block grant dollars, just as we did for Texas after Hurricane Harvey, with the understanding that an additional and more comprehensive request for Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, Florida, Texas, and the western wildfires will be coming from the administration once the damage assessments are complete.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. President, returning to the events in Las Vegas on Sunday, we cannot let this American tragedy, another in a long line of American tragedies, fall out of our hearts and minds too quickly.

Let us pledge to be there for the families of the 59 Americans who were killed and the over 500 Americans who are still injured and recovering. Seeing the pictures of so many of these beautiful, young people in the prime of life—young, excited about the world, some of them newly married, some of them a little older with young children—breaks your heart. So not just today or this week, but in the weeks and months to come, let us pledge to continue to show our gratitude to those firefighters and cops, the emergency and medical personnel, and all the other first responders who rushed to the scene. Let us pledge to remember the acts of everyday heroism that are a beacon of light in this moment of darkness: the lines to give blood that stretched around the block at 6 a.m., the teachers who went to school the day after the shooting to try and give their students a sense of normalcy. I hope these are the things President Trump highlights in his visit to Las Vegas today.

And one more thing: President Trump has an opportunity to wrench his party out of the grasp of the NRA and get our country and our Congress to start talking about commonsense gun safety reforms. Before President Trump ran for office, he repeatedly supported several sane, rational gun safety measures, including the assault weapons ban and longer waiting periods to purchase a gun. As recently as 2012, President Trump supported President Obama's response to Sandy Hook. In the wake of Sandy Hook, President Obama called for action. In the wake of

Las Vegas, President Trump should do the same.

We have heard it over and over again: Now is not the time to talk about gun safety because it would politicize the tragedy. My friend the majority leader said no less than three times at his press conference yesterday that it is premature and inappropriate to talk about any legislative solutions to the epidemic of gun violence.

As Martin Luther King said in his letter at the Birmingham Jail, “not now” means never. “Wait” means never. That is what he said: Wait means never.

The Republicans don’t want to talk about it today, tomorrow, next week, next month, or next year. We know why they don’t want to talk about it. They know the country is totally against their view. It is not political out in the country. Over 90 percent of Americans support universal background checks. A significant majority of Republicans support them. That is not political, I would say to my friend the majority leader.

It is political for him because he is afraid of the NRA, a powerful lobby that is off to the extreme. It is not political for American people or for Republicans. They are for it. Over 70 percent of gun owners support background checks for private sales and at gun shows. The only place where this is political is here, and that is because the NRA, the gun manufacturers, and their powerful lobby make these folks afraid—afraid to do the right thing. They know it is the right thing.

The NRA and these lobbies are the swamp the President is talking about. President Trump talks about the swamp, groups of lobbyists who thwart the will of the American people. That is what the NRA does.

So I say to the President, Mr. President, you have an opportunity to buck the NRA, buck the gun lobbyists, buck the swamp, and lead this country in an adult conversation about gun violence. The President can and should bring the parties together—the leaders of this Congress—and let both sides know he is ready to address this issue head-on and talk about sensible, moderate measures of gun safety and, above all, background checks.

The President’s visit is an important one today. He should be going. He should seek to provide comfort to the families and express gratitude to our first responders. But he should take it one step further. Call us together, lead this Nation in a debate about rational, moderate gun safety laws. Get us started on the work that so many Americans are desperate for us to do.

TAX REFORM

Mr. President, on one final matter, the Republican tax plan, we Democrats have long said that we are willing to work with our Republican colleagues on tax reform, and we laid out our principles early on so that there would be no mistake about them. We wanted tax reform to be deficit neutral. It

shouldn’t increase the deficit. For every reduction in rate, they ought to close a loophole. We wanted it to go through regular order, not the way healthcare did, not reconciliation, but work with us. You would get a much more sensible product. Most importantly, we didn’t want to give a tax cut to the top 1 percent. They are doing great already. God bless them. They don’t need any more tax relief. It is the middle class that does. But the framework the GOP released last week violates all three of these commonsense principles, vastly favoring the wealthy over working Americans.

I have spoken several times about tax breaks for the rich included in this package—lowering the top rate from 39 to 36 percent, repealing the estate tax, opening up a gaping tax loophole for hedge fund managers, wealthy Wall Street firms, lobbyists, and law firms by lowering the rate on passthroughs so that these rich people would pay only 25 percent on their personal income tax while other people pay a lot more.

This morning, I want to highlight not only how the Republican plan favors the rich but also sticks it to the middle class. This is something that the Acting President pro tempore has brought up.

Just this week we found a bombshell contained within the GOP resolution they are using to pass tax reform. The Republicans plan to cut Medicare by \$473 billion and Medicaid by more than \$1 trillion. It can be a little hard to find, but it is right there in the GOP budget—\$473 billion for Medicare, \$1 trillion for Medicaid.

If you are an older American, if you have a family in a nursing home or someone in treatment for opioid addiction and you think the GOP plan doesn’t affect you, think again. The AARP—not a political organization, it simply represents the interests of the elderly—sent a letter yesterday opposing this Republican plan, the one in the House, and I think we have one in the Senate as well. It is the same group that represented senior citizens and fought the debacle on healthcare that the Republicans proposed.

The Republicans are proposing to pay for their giant tax cut to the rich by gutting Medicare and Medicaid. That is the bombshell this week. That is the nugget that will destroy their whole plan. Americans are so against those kinds of cuts.

Amazingly, it is just like the inverse of the Republican plan on healthcare. In each case, they gut healthcare for Americans who need it most to pay for taxes for Americans who need it the least.

The healthcare plan focused on cuts to Medicaid but snuck in tax cuts for the rich. This plan focuses on tax cuts to the rich and sneaks in cuts to Medicare and Medicaid.

The GOP budget is another page out of the same playbook. The GOP plan contains another punch to the gut of the middle class.

This is what the Acting President pro tempore, I believe, spoke about yesterday.

In the form of the repeal of the State and local deduction—44 million Americans take the State and local deduction. That is one-third of all taxpayers. This is not just a small, rarified group in California or New York. It is across the country. They get an average of several thousand dollars off their taxes each year. That includes 40 percent of taxpayers making between \$50,000 and \$75,000 per year and 70 percent of taxpayers earning from \$100,000 to \$200,000.

This is a middle-class tax deduction worth several thousand dollars a year, and the GOP tax plan yanks it away. Taking it away means double taxation on middle-class families.

For many families, this will not be offset by a larger standard deduction in the GOP plan. Largely due to the elimination of State and local, the Tax Policy Center estimates that 30 percent of those making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 and 60 percent of those making between \$150,000 and \$300,000 will see a tax increase with the GOP plan, and that is after doubling the standard deduction. By the way, don’t think that it is just a few States; the numbers are astounding across the country, as folks in every State claim this deduction. I say to my dear friend the chairman of the Finance Committee that 35 percent of Utahns take this deduction, 33 percent of Georgians, and 32 percent of Coloradans.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a list of how many taxpayers are affected in every State by removing State and local deductibility and how much it will cost them on average.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FIGURE 7.—PERCENTAGE OF TAX UNITS THAT USE THE SALT DEDUCTION AND THE AVERAGE DEDUCTION BY STATE

State	% with SALT Deductions	Average SALT Deduction*
MD	46	\$12,931
CT	41	19,664
NY	41	17,850
DC	40	16,442
VA	37	11,288
MA	37	15,571
OR	36	12,616
UT	35	8,291
MN	35	12,954
NY	35	22,169
CA	34	18,437
GA	33	9,158
RI	33	12,434
CO	32	9,017
DE	32	9,194
IL	31	12,523
WI	31	11,653
NH	31	10,121
WA	30	7,402
IA	29	10,163
HI	29	9,905
NC	29	9,587
PA	29	11,248
AZ	28	7,403
MT	28	9,357
ID	28	8,862
ME	28	11,431
NE	28	11,088
SC	27	8,765
VT	27	12,407
MI	27	9,648
MO	26	9,886
OH	26	10,444
KY	26	9,955
AL	26	5,918

FIGURE 7.—PERCENTAGE OF TAX UNITS THAT USE THE SALT DEDUCTION AND THE AVERAGE DEDUCTION BY STATE—Continued

State	% with SALT Deductions	Average SALT Deduction*
KS	25	9,425
NV	25	5,989
OK	24	8,201
MS	23	6,302
LA	23	6,742
TX	23	7,823
IN	23	8,756
FL	22	7,373
NM	22	7,091
AR	22	9,116
WY	22	6,306
AK	21	4,931
TN	19	5,611
ND	18	6,864
WV	17	9,462
SD	17	6,098

* Calculated as SALT deduction amount divided by number of SALT deductions.

Mr. SCHUMER. I urge my colleagues to look in the RECORD and see how it affects them. You are fooling yourself if you think that you are not affected by the State and local deductibility.

Of course, if you are a family of four in one of those States, the repeal of State and local could be a killer because, again, you would lose the personal exemption. The larger the family, the greater the loss of exemption.

I want to make one final point on tax reform. This is related to two people whom I know, and I knew one of them before he ever arrived in Washington. I have to make this point because what I heard them say over the weekend just turned my stomach. It was astounding. It was awful.

Over the weekend, we heard some pretty extraordinary claims from Republican legislators and Cabinet officials about what the GOP tax plan was all about, but Gary Cohn and Secretary of the Treasury Steve Mnuchin deserve a special admonition.

Chief White House economic adviser Gary Cohn actually said: “The wealthy are not getting a tax cut under our plan.” That is not a surmising of what he said; that is a direct quote. “The wealthy are not getting a tax cut under our plan.” Comments like that should make everyone’s head spin. According to the Tax Policy Center, the top 1 percent would reap 80 percent of the benefits of the GOP plan. The top 0.1 percent—the folks who make more than \$5 million a year—would get a break of more than \$1 million a year.

Some might argue, of course, that it will cause economic growth. I do not think that it will, but at least make your real argument. Do not hide it. You know that the American people do not agree with you. That is why you hide it.

Only in Wonderland, where down is up and up is down, could Gary Cohn’s comments be believed. It is something like out of the Ministry of Truth from George Orwell’s “1984,” which would be to cut the top rate by 4 percent and repeal the estate tax—yes, no tax cuts for the wealthy. Bunk. It is why the Washington Post gave Gary Cohn four Pinocchios for his statement. If they had allowed more Pinocchios on the scale, I am sure he would have gotten them. He earned them, unfortunately.

What about Secretary Mnuchin? His lack of credibility resembles Gary Cohn’s. He said that he believes the GOP plan would reduce deficits by \$1 trillion. “We think there will be \$2 trillion of growth. So we think this tax plan will cut the deficits by a trillion dollars.” Mnuchin’s claim is fake math at its worst. As was written in the Washington Post, no serious economist, liberal or conservative, believes that a tax cut boosts economic growth so much that the tax cut pays for itself, let alone adds \$1 trillion in revenue as Mnuchin claims. Four Pinocchios were given by the Washington Post. I am sure that he too—Steve Mnuchin—would have earned more Pinocchios.

Gary Cohn and Steve Mnuchin claim to be economic experts, and they both used to work at Goldman Sachs. If they had used this kind of math at Goldman Sachs, they would have been shown the door a long time ago. As I said before, they should know better, and they do know better. They ought to stop deliberately misleading the American people. It demeans them. It demeans the administration. It demeans the debate in this country.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the time during the quorum calls be divided equally between both sides.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. COTTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. SCHUMER. Mr. President, I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. WYDEN. Mr. President, I did not get a chance to hear the distinguished Democratic leader’s remarks, for Chairman HATCH and I were in the Senate Finance Committee. We managed to pass, by an overwhelming bipartisan vote, the Children’s Health Insurance Program—a vital program for 9 million kids. So that is a bit of good news in that this important piece of legislation is advancing. I do know that the Democratic leader touched on a number of very important issues, particularly some of these comments that have been made by top advisers to the President with respect to taxes.

I am struck by the fact that Mr. Gary Cohn, the President’s top economic adviser, said last week that middle-class folks were going to get \$1,000 in tax relief—set aside the fact that that does not look to be true for a number of middle-class folks who have kids. I am also struck by the comment that followed. Mr. Cohn said that not only are middle-class families going to get \$1,000 worth of tax relief but that they would be able to go buy cars or remodel their kitchens. You just think to your-

self, with that kind of tax cut, that you would be buying a very small car or remodeling a very small kitchen. The fact is, that is not, in my view, a comment that reflects a real understanding of what middle-class folks in America are going through. I don’t see very many of them buying cars for \$1,000 or remodeling their kitchens for \$1,000.

That comment was accompanied by the comments of Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin, who not only said a couple of days ago that tax cuts would pay for themselves—a statement that was contradicted by Republican economists yesterday in the Senate Finance Committee—but that there would be something like \$1 trillion left over. Mr. Mnuchin continues to make the case that there is somehow a magical growth fairy here in the American economy that nobody else knows about, including Republican economists.

I am one who believes that behavior does matter, and I am going to talk about a bipartisan approach to taxes in a minute—a responsible, bipartisan approach to taxes, not one that helps the 1 percent or creates a huge new deficit or that kind of thing. I think that you will generate some revenue, and Doug Elmendorf said that when he was the head of the Budget Office, but it is not going to generate hundreds and hundreds of billions of dollars, as in the case of what Mr. Mnuchin is talking about, which is something like \$2 trillion. There is no economic support for that.

You have the President’s economic team and his top advisers trying to defend the indefensible, and I will go into that more a little bit later today.

Right now, I think it is important that we have a response that I am going to deliver to the distinguished majority whip, who is a member of the Finance Committee, who made some comparisons between the Republican plan and the bipartisan legislation that I wrote—after months and months of hard work—with two of our former Republican colleagues, Senator Gregg and Senator Coats. Senator Coats is now a member of President Trump’s Cabinet.

The comparison that somehow the Republican plan is like the bipartisan approach that I wrote—these extreme ideas in the Republican plan—is not just a bit of a stretch or a little off base; there is absolutely no comparison—none—between the bipartisan proposal and the extreme Republican plan. The distinguished majority whip, in my view, offered a complete and total misrepresentation of what the two proposals are all about, and I am going to illustrate this in two ways—first, with respect to the policy.

The Republican tax cut framework green-lights the entire wish list for major multinational corporations and the wealthy. There is a massive corporate tax cut that overwhelmingly benefits shareholders. When it comes to international taxes, there is a pure territorial system with barely a nod to

the kind of tough rules that are needed to protect workers and the middle-class folks in the center of our tax base.

There is, in the Republican plan, a brand-new passthrough loophole. It is as big as the Grand Canyon. It is the Grand Canyon of loopholes in the Republican tax proposal, which invites tax cheats to skip out from paying their fair share to Social Security and Medicare.

The Republican plan eliminates the estate tax, which today only touches estates worth more than \$11 million or \$5.5 million for a single individual. The top rate goes down, and the bottom income tax rate goes up. When doing the math on what the Republicans have on offer, we are looking at upwards of \$4, \$5, \$6, or \$7 trillion in tax giveaways to the most fortunate.

It is a different story under the Republican proposal if you are middle class. You probably have a lot of unanswered questions. All you know right now is that it virtually guarantees that, in order to pay for the giveaways to the wealthy and corporations, current middle-class tax breaks are going to be on the chopping block—the personal exemption, incentives for retirement savings, education, and home ownership, to name just a few. From everything we know, when you set up these kinds of extreme approaches, when you raise the parts of the Tax Code that are a giveaway to those at the top, what you see is the middle class getting hurt.

Instead of tripling the standard deduction, which is what we did in our bipartisan bill, the Trump people double it, but then they take away the personal exemptions for working-class folks. So unlike our proposal, where the middle class can count on hundreds and hundreds of dollars in their paycheck when you triple the standard deduction, under the Republican proposal, they give it with one hand by doubling the standard deduction and take it away with the other hand by eliminating the personal exemption. So you have a very stark difference between the bipartisan proposal that I offered with Senator Coats, a member of the President's Cabinet, and what the Republican extreme plan is all about.

The bottom line is that the Republican plan seeks to raise those parts of our Tax Code that are all about the middle class, and they are doing it to pay for the giveaways for those folks at the top. That is not what we did in the bipartisan plan at all. Any middle-class person can sit at their kitchen table and look at the bipartisan plan that I was involved with and see how the middle class wins. They get hundreds and hundreds of dollars more in every paycheck by tripling the standard deduction, and they can see how they as middle-class folks—say, who make \$70,000 and have a couple of children—lose under the Trump proposal.

Now there are other differences between our bipartisan plan and what the

Big 6 and the Trump administration want. The bipartisan plan was scored as revenue neutral by authoritative independent tax experts. It made the Tax Code more progressive. The fact is, what we offered—Senator Coats, Senator Gregg, and I—was an actual bill. It was the product of weeks and months of work.

Senator Gregg and I—and I think it is fair to say that all Senators may not be aware of this, but Senator Gregg was a top economic thinker with whom the majority leader consulted—sat next to each other for months in order to put together what is still the first and only comprehensive Federal bipartisan tax reform plan since 1986. It was an actual bill. It wasn't four pages of rhetoric.

In the spring we got one page. It was shorter than your typical drugstore receipt. Now I guess we are up to four pages, when you take out all this kind of white space. Our bill was an actual bill and was designed to give everybody in America a chance to get ahead, not just those in the 1 percent, not just those who have real clout and power.

I have always said that this is the heart of the difference. We have two Tax Codes in America. We have one for the cops and the nurses. It is compulsory. Their taxes come right out of their paychecks—no Cayman Islands deal for them. Then we have another Tax Code for the high flyers—the fortunate and well-connected. They can pretty much pay what they want when they want to. The bipartisan proposal that I wrote with Senator Gregg and Senator Coats helps the first group, the cops and nurses, but it was also fair to everybody. It gave everybody a chance to get ahead. The Republican plan is another big gift to that second group, the group that can decide what they are going to pay in taxes and when they are going to pay it. So we really couldn't have two proposals that are more different.

The fact is, the Republican framework looks less like a real effort at tax reform than a shameless attempt, in effect, to accommodate the President's boast about the biggest tax cut ever. The bottom line is that it is a giveaway to those at the top, and it robs from the middle class.

The differences don't just end with these specifics that I have described here. We took a fundamentally different approach. With Senator Gregg and Senator Coats, we were digging into the cobwebs of every dark corner of the Tax Code. We brought together principles on which both sides had to find common ground with a lot of sweat equity.

If you are going to write a partisan bill, you can go off on your own and do your thing. The fact is, if Senators Gregg, Coats, and I had written separate bills on our own, they would have looked very different, but the bill we wrote together, starting with Senator Gregg and I, was the first comprehensive bipartisan tax proposal in a quar-

ter century. Senator Coats, to his credit, did yeoman's work in updating it. There is no comparison from a process standpoint between that bipartisan work that was done to update the system of more than a quarter century ago and the Republican tax cut framework.

The majority leader said from day one, at the beginning of the year, that he didn't want Democratic input on tax reform. He said: We are just going to do it on the "our way or the highway" approach with reconciliation. Reconciliation is a rejection of bipartisanship through and through.

I note that the Presiding Officer is the tallest Member of the Senate, along with Senator STRANGE, and I talked fairly frequently with our former colleague Senator Bradley, who was another tall Democrat on the Finance Committee with a much better jump shot than me. He has described the bipartisan efforts of 1986, with key officials in President Reagan's administration, Jim Baker and Don Regan, who spent months talking to Democrats—months and months—before anything happened. That is not what happened here. The specifics are very different, and the process is very different.

Recently, my Democratic colleagues and I came forward with our principles for reform, and it was just a matter of a few hours before Leader MCCONNELL rejected them in the media. One administration official actually said that tax reform would be worse if it included Democratic ideas, and the "go it alone" mentality is pretty obvious when you look at the framework that came out last week.

The tough questions haven't been answered. For those at the top, it is all sweet and no sour. There was not a single shred of Democratic input in the framework—not one Democratic fingerprint anywhere to be found. The administration officials in charge of selling it to the public are, in my view, executing a con job on the middle class.

So I wanted to come here today to highlight some of the recent comments that the Senate Democratic leader has made with respect to some of these out-of-touch comments we have heard recently from key administration officials, like Gary Cohn and Steve Mnuchin, and I wanted to make sure that Senators heard—after the comments of the Senate Republican whip—that they now know that there is no comparison, none, between the bipartisan proposal that I had the honor to write with Senators Coats and Gregg, which brought the two parties together, and the framework that came out last week that forced even more polarization between the parties. The reality is that this Republican proposal, this tax cut framework, is so radically skewed toward the wealthy and the big corporations, that it makes Ronald Reagan's landmark reform look like the work of rabid socialists.

So I appreciate the chance to set the record straight by outlining the differences between a recent bipartisan bill with two influential Republican Senators with whom I had the honor to work and the extreme Republican framework that came out last week. These plans are not just trillions of dollars apart based on the numbers. It is clear they are written with entirely different goals in mind.

Our view is that tax reform ought to be about giving everybody in America the opportunity to get ahead. What we have said is that, instead of it being an “our way or the highway” partisan approach, we ought to be doing—particularly in the area of tax reform—what has a storied history. The key to a successful tax reform, based on that history, is working in a bipartisan way.

I will close with the comments about the Democratic principles, which is that we are not going to give relief to the people at the 1 percent, we are not going to break the bank, and we are going to focus on the middle class. Those principles don’t even go as far as ideas advanced by President Reagan, where he said that we are going to treat income from a wage and income from investment in the same way.

I close by way of saying this. No. 1, the distinguished Republican whip is wrong when he compares the bipartisan bill I have been a part of to what the administration’s tax framework is all about. No. 2, the right way to do this is to focus in a bipartisan way, not through partisanship only. The principles that we have outlined on our side, when you compare them, do not even go as far as some of the ideas embraced by the late President Reagan.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. BURR. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that we start the scheduled 11 a.m. vote now.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

CLOTURE MOTION

Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The senior assistant legislative clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services.

Mitch McConnell, Lamar Alexander, John Cornyn, John Barrasso, Mike Rounds, Chuck Grassley, Thad Cochran, Steve Daines, Roger F. Wicker, John Boozman, Thom Tillis, John

Hoeven, John Thune, Mike Crapo, Bill Cassidy, James M. Inhofe, Tom Cotton.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. SULLIVAN). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 57, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 210 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Gardner	Perdue
Burr	Graham	Portman
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Collins	Hoeven	Rubio
Coons	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	King	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Leahy	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Franken	Nelson	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Heller	Menendez
Cortez Masto	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 57, the nays are 38.

The motion is agreed to.

The majority whip.

TAX REFORM

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, beginning today, the Senate Budget Committee will take the next step in our effort to enact pro-growth tax reform, this time by marking up a budget resolution.

The committee’s work follows the release last week of our unified framework—the tax blueprint on how to cre-

ate jobs and how to put more money back in the pockets of the hard-working Americans who earn it.

Even though the framework is just 1 week old, there are some who are imagining the worst-case scenario. Rumors are spreading like wildfire. Last week, the Tax Policy Center fanned the flames when it published a report analyzing the plan—which, I want to emphasize, hasn’t been written yet. Let me say that again. The Tax Policy Center published a report criticizing a plan which hasn’t been written yet.

This alleged or so-called nonpartisan think tank has looked into its crystal ball and now claims to be able to see the future, and it said the future doesn’t look very good. The tax plan, it says, will be a resounding flop. Well, give me a break. I, for one, am sick and tired of this sort of pessimism parading as expertise—people talking about things they know nothing about and claiming to be the experts. It is pretty common here, in Washington, DC, you might have noticed.

It is not helpful to assume the worst prematurely and to condemn this important exercise before we are even starting, and it is irresponsible to masquerade biased, partisan analysis as somehow objective.

As the Wall Street Journal wrote a couple of days ago, in response to the Tax Policy Center’s economists, they made at least two baseless claims: first, that our proposal would “reduce federal revenues by \$2.4 trillion over the first ten years and \$3.2 trillion over the subsequent decade”; second, the top 1 percent of taxpayers would “receive about 50 percent of the total tax benefit.”

These statistics were pretty quotable and indeed raged like a prairie fire across the news media in our country, especially when the media is predisposed to believe the worst, without any question or semblance of skepticism. After all, the Tax Policy Center’s report made for easy headlines, reciting the same tired refrains we have all heard before that are all too predictable; that, somehow, our tax plan is only designed to help the rich.

Apparently, the temptation was just too great to resist, even though the report didn’t have a real author since no self-respecting economist wanted his or her name attached to it. As the Wall Street Journal pointed out, however, last week’s tax blueprint was just that—a starting place, a plan, a framework, and nothing more. It excluded many important data points which would be important to a real analysis.

For example, the income ranges for the three consolidated tax brackets, those weren’t in the blueprint. The value of the expanded child tax credit and when it would be phased out, that wasn’t in the blueprint either, and you would need to know that information in order to make a reasoned, logical analysis. The blueprint also doesn’t mention tax rates for small businesses and what deductions will be eliminated as part of the base broadening.

As we all know, an army of lobbyists, lawyers, and other folks have, since 1986, larded the Tax Code with a wide variety of deductions, credits, and other special preferences. What we need to do is clear out some of that thicket so we can lower the rates for everybody, so everybody gets a tax cut, and I mean everybody.

It is not going to be easy because we can imagine that army of lobbyists descending upon Capitol Hill trying to protect the special deals they were able to carve out of the Tax Code since 1986, but we have to do it.

None of these facts that would be important in order to conduct a reasoned and objective analysis was included in the framework, but all of them would have great potential to greatly move the final numbers. These, and many other details, are essential for any honest fiscal assessment of changes in our Tax Code.

When will we begin to see some of those numbers? We need to pass the budget resolution out of the Budget Committee this week—which we will. Then, after Columbus Day, we will come back and have a debate and a vote-arama to pass the budget resolution, which will equip us with the technical tools we need in order to pass a reconciliation bill.

Then the real work is going to be occurring in the Finance Committee on this side of the Capitol, where we will take the chairman's mark—the original bill which Senator HATCH will introduce at the committee—which will fill in a lot of these details. I predict that will be sometime around the third or maybe fourth week of this month.

Then we are going to have an amendment process. The real question in my mind is, Will our Democratic colleagues participate and make this a bipartisan bill? I hope they will.

I also want to mention two other related points that deserve mention but which were left out of the Tax Policy's report. One is, the committees in Congress will actually have the ability to come up with the details I mentioned. That will happen in the Ways and Means Committee in the House and in the Finance Committee in the Senate. There will be, as there should be, discussion, deliberation, and compromise as the normal legislative process works out.

There have been many around Capitol Hill who have said we don't have enough "regular order." What that means is, we need to conduct the normal legislative process and have the committees actually do what they are designed to do—which is to have hearings and vote on amendments and pass the bill out so it is available to be heard on the floor of the Senate. Then the Senate has a chance to amend it, vote on it, and debate it.

The second point I want to make is, any analysis of tax reform must consider what will be the impact on economic growth that will result from it. As the Journal stated, if the rate of

GDP growth speeds up from the Obama administration's pace of 2 percent a year to 3 percent, incomes would rise and revenues would increase to the Treasury by some \$2.5 trillion. That is what is most often overlooked, including by some of the people who score these bills.

If we are successful in passing pro-growth tax reform and tax cuts and we can get this sleeping giant of an economy awake and roaring again just to get it to 3 percent—which is below the average growth of the economy over the last three decades—just at 3 percent, it would put \$2.5 trillion more in the Treasury. That would be great because it would help us not only pay our bills, it would help us pay down the deficit and the debt.

Obviously, these are important factors to acknowledge. The best way to accomplish meaningful tax reform is to lower rates and simplify provisions across the board, to give Americans more take-home pay and have to spend less time hiring somebody just to complete their tax return. We can't simply throw up our hands, do nothing, and accept the status quo because American workers and job creators can't afford the status quo.

I am optimistic about the framework that has been released and look forward to working with my colleagues on the Finance Committee in the days and weeks ahead. What we have now is a useful starting point, and we need to fill in the blanks—and we will—so then we can have a debate based on the facts, not based on somebody's wild, fevered imagination about what the tax bill might look like.

One last point on that. We have the highest tax rate in the world for corporations and businesses. This used to be something that even the President of the United States, Barack Obama, back in 2011 acknowledged and said we need to reduce that in order to be competitive globally. We know too many of our jobs are moving overseas.

I mentioned yesterday that IBM, one of the largest businesses in the world, has more employees in India than they have in the United States. Now, there are probably varied reasons for that, including our Tax Code. Some of it is access to highly trained workers, lower costs of operation, and the like, but our Tax Code is a self-inflicted economic wound for our country, and the people who pay the price are the people whose wages are stagnant or people who are looking for a job and can't find one. We need to put more money back in their pocket, let them keep more of what they earn, and get this economy growing again.

PROTECT OUR CHILDREN ACT

Finally, just yesterday, the House passed a bill I introduced with Senators BLUMENTHAL, KLOBUCHAR, and HELLER called the PROTECT Our Children Act. This bill helps to stop the exploitation of children across the country and over the internet by reauthorizing the Internet Crimes Against Children, or ICAC, Task Force Program.

The Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force is a national network of 61 coordinated entities that represent 3,500 Federal, State, and local law enforcement agencies that investigate and prosecute child predators. They develop victim support programs, provide training and technical assistance, and advance forensic methods.

They also help facilitate community education to make parents more aware of this threat against all of our children so we can prevent internet crimes against children before they even happen. This is an issue I have cared about for a long time, starting with my service as attorney general of Texas. I saw firsthand how vulnerable children can quickly become victimized at the hands of some truly despicable individuals. I also learned about the resources it takes to stop and prosecute these predators. Like the Presiding Officer, who also served as attorney general, we know that not all of our jurisdictions have access to the same sort of expertise and resources so it is important to have this resource in order to help them investigate and prosecute these crimes.

Back in 2000, when I started it in Texas, we called it the Internet Bureau. It is kind of a quaint title these days. Now I think they call it the Cyber Crime Unit, but we call it the Internet Bureau to fight internet crimes like child pornography. Tragically, in this day and age, the internet provides a safe harbor for too many people who want to use it for their own nefarious purposes. It can be a difficult arena for our law enforcement to navigate, but this bill ensures that they will have the resources to fight cyber crimes and keep our communities safe by reauthorizing programs until 2022.

I am happy the House has now acted, and I am thankful for the work of my colleagues from Connecticut, Minnesota, and Nevada for joining me in this effort. I look forward to working expeditiously to ensure that we repass this legislation in the Senate as soon as possible.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

HEALTHCARE

Mr. KING. Mr. President, I rise today to talk about a subject that has been on our minds in recent weeks and months and, in fact, years; that is, healthcare—one of the most complex and confusing but important topics that we have to consider.

Before I get into the bulk of what I want to address, I want to make the point once again that as we are debating healthcare and debating who pays, how much they pay, whether it is the ACA or Medicare or Medicaid or private insurance or private pay, we also

have to begin a serious discussion about the underlying cost of healthcare.

Regardless of who is paying, it is going to break us. If healthcare continues to grow in cost as it has over the last 20 years, it is going to eat the Federal budget, family budgets, individual budgets, and it is going to be something we absolutely have to address. Usually around here we don't address something until it is a crisis.

I would argue, as we are approaching 20 percent of GDP, with \$1 out of every \$5 in the country being committed to healthcare costs—more than twice as much as most other countries in the world, far more than any other country in the world—we have to address this issue.

Arguing about who pays is not going to solve the problem. That is important because in the interim, that is what is going to protect our citizens' coverage and what is going to protect our citizens from a healthcare disaster, a healthcare crisis.

I want to preface my remarks with—I think this is something we all need to be thinking about—how do we move beyond the discussion we are having now, not that it is unimportant, but we also need to move beyond the discussion and start talking about the underlying cost and why is it that Americans are paying virtually twice as much as anyone in the world for healthcare per capita—or as a percent of GDP or however you want to calculate it—without noticeably better results? In fact, most worldwide studies indicate the results of our healthcare system are not as good as those in many other countries.

It would be one thing if we were paying a lot of money and getting absolutely superior care across the board in our country, but that is not the case. In measurements such as infant mortality, longevity—standard basic healthcare indicators—we are not doing very well. Yet we are paying twice as much. There is something wrong with that, and we have to address it.

I want to talk about the Affordable Care Act. I want to start with the point that it is the law of the land. It is the law of the land.

I am rising today in sadness but also in anger because there is a lot of talk about the Affordable Care Act collapsing, imploding. It is not collapsing. It is being mugged. It is being stabbed in the back. It is being sabotaged deliberately and consciously by the actions of the administration.

I want to emphasize that this isn't about ideology. It is not about politics. It is not about who wins and who loses or which party is up or who voted or who didn't. This is about people. It is about people in Maine. It is about people, many of whom got care for the first time under the Affordable Care Act; lobstermen, small farmers, small businesspeople, individuals finally had a shot at reasonably priced healthcare.

It is not perfect by any means. I would never argue that. In fact, I have

been working on proposals since the day I got here on how to improve it, how to fix some of the problems, how to make it better, how to have the effects be less intense on some parts of our economy. It is the law of the land. The impacts of what we do here or don't do here fall on real people—real people, in my case, in my home State of Maine.

The Affordable Care Act is not collapsing; it is being sabotaged. Here is a partial list.

In January, during the period of the last open enrollment, one of the first acts of the new administration was to cut the advertising on television, advising people that they had this healthcare option. Cut the ads, that is No. 1. That was in January.

Then they announced they were going to minimize the enforcement of the personal mandate. If you tell somebody you are not going to enforce something, that is an invitation to not abide by it, to not pay any attention to it. People can argue about whether that is desirable, but that is the law. To announce that administratively you are not going to enforce it, again, what does that do? It reduces the number of people who are going to get healthcare. That, in turn, undermines the individual market, and that, in turn, makes it less financially viable. That is a deliberate act that will undermine the viability of this law.

In April, there began a series of what turned into seven different threats from various people in the administration to not make the legally mandated CSR payments—the cost-sharing reduction payments—which are not bailouts to insurance companies but which were designed as part of the law to hold the rates down and to hold the deductibles down for those people buying coverage under the Affordable Care Act. Continuously threatening the reduction or the elimination of these payments has created an uncertainty in the marketplace that is now coming home to roost.

Just last week, Anthem announced they are leaving the Maine marketplace. They cited a number of reasons, but one of the chief reasons was the uncertainty created by whether these payments are going to be made.

Recently, the HELP committee had a series of hearings on this subject. They had a bipartisan group of Governors. They had a bipartisan group of insurance commissioners, health experts from across the country. I was at all but one of those hearings. I believe I am right in saying it was unanimous that we must ensure the continuation of the CSR payments in order to stabilize the market and reduce premiums projected to increase this coming year.

The number nationally is estimated to be about 20 percent—a 20-percent increase attributable to the failure to ensure that the CSR payments will be made because an insurance company, if they are setting rates, has to factor into their rates the risk of these pay-

ments not being made. The testimony is—it depends somewhat on the State, but roughly a 20-percent increase is attributable to just this fact.

If we could pass legislation here—unfortunately, we missed the deadline, but we may be able to work on that because the deadline was just last week. But if we could simply ensure those payments are made, that in itself would lower rates by 20 percent next year on a silver plan.

By the way, if those CSRs aren't made and the rates go up, ironically, that means the mandatory payments of subsidies to individuals under the Affordable Care Act will also go up. So it will cost the Treasury money—additional money not accounted for, roughly \$200 billion over the next 10 years.

What else has gone on? In May, there was another one from the head of the Office of Management and Budget. The administration has not decided whether to pay the CSRs. That is a big red signal to the insurance companies: You can't count on this, so you better raise rates. In May, the budget was released. In the budget, there were drastic cuts in the call centers for the Affordable Care Act, in the in-person assistance, and in marketing. And just for good measure, they announced they were cutting the enrollment period in half, from 3 months to 6 weeks. What possible reason can there be to do that, except that you want fewer people to sign up? That is called sabotage—reducing from 3 months to 6 weeks.

Then, all along, the Health and Human Services Department has been monkeying around with the website, taking down explanatory material about the Affordable Care Act, taking down material indicating why this would be a good deal for people and, instead, putting up critical material.

On August 31, the administration announced reductions in outreach of 90 percent and cuts in assistance to people trying to navigate this system by 40 percent. This is complicated material. Any of us who have signed up for insurance—we all have the Affordable Care Act. Most people don't know that. But we had to go on the website and choose a policy for ourselves. It is hard, it is complicated, and to take away the people who are in the communities helping people work through these various decisions and weigh the different policies, the deductibles, and how to compare them is the same as taking away the coverage. It is an act of sabotage.

The most recent one I just learned about this morning. This is amazing. The Affordable Care Act is based on a website, healthcare.gov. We all know it had terrible problems when it started. There is no excuse for that. I was critical of it at the time. Those were problems that were not intentional.

Now intentional problems are being created. This is the one that really gets me. I just learned this morning that every Sunday during the bobtail enrollment period, the 6-week enrollment period, the website is going to be closed

for 12 hours for maintenance. Isn't that amazing? For 12 hours on the one day of the week when many working people are going to have an opportunity to try to understand this system and enroll, they are going to be down from midnight Saturday night until noon on Sunday, the middle of the day on Sunday.

I want to go back to the beginning. This isn't about ideology. This is about seeing that the laws are faithfully executed. That is why they call it the administration. The administration is supposed to administer the laws, not unadminister them.

We are talking about people. Why does anyone want to have fewer people with insurance? I am at a loss to understand the motivation. I can understand if you don't like the ACA. If you don't like the ACA, let's work together and find ways to improve it and change it, but figure out how to keep people with health insurance.

The uninsured rate in America has fallen 50 percent because of the Affordable Care Act. That is an enormous achievement. It is one that should be celebrated, not sabotaged. That is what is so puzzling to me about this: fewer people with coverage and higher costs to the Treasury.

We can do better than this. These are all things the administration in good faith can say: OK, we don't like the ACA, but we are going to move beyond the politics of this and try to help people get the coverage they desperately need.

This is about real people's lives. This is about lifting the threat, the cloud of a healthcare disaster, both physically and financially, from families across America. We are talking about millions of families—not tens of thousands but millions of families. I don't get why we are deliberately trying to undermine and sabotage something that is so meaningful to so many people. As one can tell, it makes me angry. Mostly, it makes me sad because I know people in Maine who have benefited, who have gotten coverage, who did not have it before and who will not have it if this is taken away—people who need those navigators to help them, people who need to be able to use the website on a Sunday morning, people who need to have rates that are lower because the CSRs have been funded, and we are not continuously raising the uncertainty of that piece of this law.

We can do better. This is about the health of our people. I cannot think of anything more important. We can have different ways of getting there, but right now we have a law that is in place, and until we change it—and we should change it; we should fix it—we should administer it straight up, straightforwardly, as it was written and as it was intended. This is too important for politics, and it is too important for ideology. This is all about people and their health.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mrs. ERNST). The Senator from Utah.

TAX REFORM

Mr. HATCH. Madam President, last week I joined with the Secretary of the Treasury, the Director of the National Economic Council, our Senate majority leader, the Speaker of the House, and the chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee in releasing a unified framework for tax reform.

This is a big step in the ongoing effort to overhaul our Nation's miserable Tax Code. I have been in the Senate awhile, and I can only remember a few times when the White House and the House and Senate leadership were in agreement on an issue as complicated as tax reform so the current state of affairs is pretty remarkable. Still, as we made clear in the framework document, this is only a step; it is not a final product.

The House and the Senate tax-writing committees will be tasked with putting together legislation that is aimed at meeting the goals and principles that are outlined in the framework. Therefore, as the chairman of the Senate Finance Committee, my top goal at the moment is to produce a comprehensive tax reform bill that can get at least 14 votes in the committee because, without that, there likely will not be any tax reform. Yet, before we can get to that point, we have to pass the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution.

Make no mistake, the budget resolution is critical to our tax reform efforts. If we are going to move a tax reform vehicle in the current environment, we need a resolution in place with a workable reconciliation instruction that will allow us to produce a bill of sufficient size and scope to give middle-class taxpayers a pay raise, grow our economy, and create more American jobs.

As we all know, the Budget Committee will begin marking up its resolution later today, and it will include the type of instruction we need in order to produce a bill that will fix our broken tax system, boost economic growth, and give a pay raise to middle-class Americans.

I am grateful for the leadership of Chairman ENZI and all of our colleagues on the Budget Committee for their work in crafting the resolution, and I urge everyone who supports tax reform, whether he is in Congress or elsewhere, to support the budget resolution.

Once again, that is the next big step in this process, and it is an absolutely essential step. Once that is done, the Finance Committee will be able to move forward on crafting and marking up a tax reform bill.

Some have said tax reform is a do-or-die moment for the GOP. I wholeheartedly believe that to be true, not just because we might lose an election or that our poll numbers might go down, it is that Republicans have promised, for some time now, that we will deliver meaningful, comprehensive

tax reform that will spur economic growth, increase wages and well-paying jobs, and simplify our existing system. We need to deliver on that promise and not just because we will suffer politically if we do not. We need to deliver because the cost of doing nothing—the cost of maintaining the status quo for the foreseeable future—will be too much for the American people and our economy to bear.

The last major overhaul of our Tax Code was 31 years ago, and in many respects, our current tax system was built for the economy of 1986 and is ill-suited for the needs of today. In the last 31 years, we have seen a dramatic increase in international trade and expanded globalization. We have seen the fall of the Soviet Union and the collapse of most centrally run economies, and of course we have seen the development and rapid expansion of the internet, which has, in many respects, remade the entire world several times over.

America no longer has a competitive Tax Code. Instead, we have a Byzantine system with exceptionally high rates and an array of overlapping and often less-than-effective deductions, exclusions, and credits. This is not just a parade of horrors trotted out by Republicans, these problems have been acknowledged by a number of prominent Democrats, like Presidents Clinton and Obama, not to mention our current Senate minority leader and the ranking member of the Finance Committee, Senator WYDEN.

We all know the system is not working. Still, in many respects, we have politics as usual around here when we talk about tax reform. While both parties have supported reforms in the recent past, including a number of reforms that are included in the framework, we are already hearing the same, tired arguments that come up every time Republicans want to talk about tax reform.

According to the opponents of reform, our "plan" will cut taxes on the superrich. Our "plan" will raise taxes on the poor. Our "plan" will harm the middle class. Our "plan" is a giveaway to greedy corporations. These are some pretty odd claims given that as of right now, no completed "plan" exists. We have a framework, and we are not calling it that simply for PR reasons. We have some basic principles and targets that the leaders have agreed upon, but as the framework makes clear, the Finance and Ways and Means Committees have been tasked with filling in the details and writing legislation.

Here are just some of the details that are not included in the framework:

Income thresholds for individual tax brackets. The framework includes rate targets for three brackets, but the breakdown of those brackets is still to be determined.

The size of the enhanced Child Tax Credit. The framework anticipates an increase, but it does not specify an amount.

The existence and rate of the highest bracket. Our document leaves room for the creation of a fourth bracket at the high end, but it does not include any rate target.

Safeguards to prevent abuse of the separate passthrough rates.

These are just some of the key details that need to be filled in.

My point is, no one can make any definitive statements or make any credible estimates about the fiscal impact of the plan until the committees do more work. Still, that has not stopped people from trying.

Last week, the left-leaning Tax Policy Center released an unattributed “analysis” of the framework that appeared to confirm a number of blanket claims that critics have made about our “plan.” As we all know, left-leaning pundits, liberal media outlets, and many of our friends on the other side seem to love the TPC, apparently because the TPC is willing to provide estimates and analysis about tax plans without waiting for all of the boring details.

We all remember well when the TPC wrote Mitt Romney’s tax plan for him and claimed that he wanted to raise taxes on the middle class to finance a tax cut for the top 1 percent. Their analysis of the Romney plan—a plan that was not yet in existence beyond a broad set of principles—became the gospel for our friends on the other side, and their estimates were repeated time and again; never mind the fact that they did not have nearly enough evidence to support their assertions.

The TPC appears to be on the same track with regard to the unified framework. I guess they think they can get away with it again. Maybe they can. I don’t know. The TPC’s document from last week included a relatively precise estimate of lost revenue that they claim would result from the framework. It also estimated how much of the tax benefit of the framework would go to the top 1 percent of earners, again with a fair amount of precision. How they got to these results is, certainly, to me, a mystery.

There is simply no way for the TPC or anyone to deliver these kinds of specific estimates with the information that is provided in the framework. To get their estimates, they filled in blanks with numbers from other proposals, added a pile of exceptionally pessimistic and biased economic assumptions, and came up with a tax plan that, for all intents and purposes, is their own. Just because they say this analysis was performed on the unified framework and was not just a plan they made up themselves does not suddenly make their estimates credible.

Still, I expect to hear a lot about the TPC’s “analysis” in the coming weeks. Some will treat their estimates as fact, and I expect we will see them cited in a few campaign commercials before too long. Breaking from any notion of professional accountability, the TPC’s “analysis” was, according to the TPC’s

report, authored by the TPC’s staff. Evidently, no one in an organization that describes itself as “nonpartisan” wanted to put their name on a document that would be used in such a partisan manner, but let’s be clear. We cannot separate this kind of speculative “analysis” from the way it is being used by our friends on the other side. It has become fodder for more of the same partisan attacks.

In going forward, I hope the TPC and other think tanks will acknowledge the still undefined features of the framework, including the commitment to maintaining the current progressivity of the Tax Code, which will require adjustments in order to achieve. I think groups like the TPC can be helpful if they avoid the partisan criticisms and focus on shedding light and providing accurate assessments of various proposals. Everyone who has an interest in these issues should wait and let the tax-writing committees do their work.

In the Finance Committee, we are going to write a committee bill. Any Member who is sincerely interested in working with us will get a chance to contribute, whether he is a Republican or Democrat. We are going to have a markup during which the bill will be debated and amended in the light of the day. Thereafter, I expect that we will have a fair and open amendment process on the floor. Despite some odd claims to the contrary, the Joint Committee on Taxation will score the bill.

At the end of the day, people will be free to disagree with the final bill and to vote against it, but no one will be able to credibly claim that the legislation was written behind closed doors or that the American people did not get a chance to see what was in the bill and read accurate accounts of its fiscal and economic impacts.

I want to work with anyone who is willing to come to the table in good faith. I think the framework puts forward a number of general proposals that both parties can support. There is fertile ground for bipartisanship here if my Democratic colleagues are willing to set aside some of the unreasonable preconditions that they have put on their involvement in tax reform. The last time I checked, both Republicans and Democrats supported tax relief for low- and middle-income families. The last time I checked, reducing our uncompetitive corporate tax rate was a bipartisan objective. The last time I checked, both Republican and Democratic voters were in need of higher wages, more jobs, and a more competitive economy.

This is going to be a difficult process, whether it is bipartisan or partisan. There is a long list of sacred cows in our Tax Code, each of them with a constituency that will fight to keep them in place. We are going to have to eliminate a number of tax deductions and credits if we are going to be fiscally responsible, including a number of provisions that are, under the current system, pretty popular in certain seg-

ments of the country. The framework specifies two deductions that should stay in place because they benefit many in the middle class and they are designed to achieve important policy goals. Everything else is currently on the table, including items that I have personally championed in the past.

We have already seen stories about how Republicans are already divided on the fate of the State and local tax deduction. Make no mistake—that is a pretty popular deduction, particularly among Democrats, but it has some Republican supporters as well. I would remind my colleagues who are adamant about preserving the State and local tax deduction that the benefits of that particular provision skew heavily toward higher income earners, especially those living in high-tax cities and States. So if our main goal is to help the middle class, I would hope that there won’t be many Senators who will fall on their swords in order to keep this particular deduction in place.

Still, nothing is set in stone, and most items are currently still up for negotiation. The State and local tax deduction is, like virtually every other tax provision, currently on the table, and we may very well have to pare it back one way or the other. We need to see how the numbers work out before we can speak definitively on this or any other tax policy item.

Before I conclude, let me just say that this is a once-in-a-generation opportunity. There is currently more momentum in favor of tax reform than at any other time in the past three decades. All of us should be willing to take advantage of this opportunity. All of us should be able to give in order to get a final bill done that will make sense and will get us back on track. I am hopeful that we can have a bipartisan effort here, but whether we do or don’t, I intend to see that we get tax reform done and that we get it done in the best interest of our country, the best interest of our people, and above all, the best interest of the middle class.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.
The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LAS VEGAS MASS SHOOTING

Mr. CASEY. Madam President, I come to the floor today for the second time this week to highlight the tragic human cost of gun violence. I will speak today about just one victim, but of course we are thinking as well about the 58 victims in Las Vegas. Not counting the killer in that total, the last count was 58 victims and well over 500 injured.

We have some sense of the gravity of the violence that played out in Las Vegas. I am not sure any of us can fully understand it, and some of us will

never quite understand what happened there, but I think we have to dedicate ourselves to taking action. I will get to that in a moment.

REMEMBERING GERARD GRANDZOL

Madam President, today I am here to honor the memory of Gerard Grandzol, a resident of Philadelphia who lost his life to gun violence last month as he protected his 2-year-old daughter from carjackers. This was truly a senseless tragedy, one that took a father from his wife and two young daughters, one that robbed the Spring Garden neighborhood in Philadelphia of a man who was a beloved member of the community, and I think that is an understatement.

Gerard was known as Gerry. His wife Kristin and their 2-year-old daughter had welcomed a second baby girl into their family this past July.

In addition to raising his family and working at a legal recruiting firm, Gerry dedicated his time and energy to making his community a better place. As a member of the Spring Garden Civic Association, he was the go-to guy in his community, in the words of Philadelphia City Council president Darrell Clarke. Gerry was an avid hockey player, the neighborhood handyman, and the person who would man the grill at block parties and repair bikes for kids in the neighborhood. His neighbors and friends have spoken of his happy, magnetic personality and his willingness to help others.

You can tell how important Gerry was to his family, friends, and community. You can tell what an impact he had on the people he met because thousands of people lined up at the Cathedral Basilica of Saints Peter and Paul a few weeks ago to pay their respects to Gerry and to celebrate his life. The people who knew him are keeping his memory alive on his Facebook page, where they shared pictures of Gerry hiking, painting, playing hockey, full of life and surrounded by friends and family.

This is a man who became yet another victim of gun violence last month after he refused to give a pair of robbers his car keys because his 2-year-old daughter was in the back seat. This was a truly senseless act of violence that has shaken his family, friends, and his community. Two suspects in this terrible crime are now in custody, and I hope that proceedings in the justice system in Philadelphia can provide some measure of relief, some measure of comfort, and, we pray, even closure to the Grandzol family. Whatever relief it might provide, justice can't heal every wound. It can't bring Gerry back to Kristin, their daughters, and their family, friends, and neighbors. But we can make sure his memory lives on in the way we treat each other, and I hope we can honor Gerry's life by dedicating ourselves to improving the lives of our neighbors and working together to solve problems.

One thing I hope we can do here on the specific issue of gun violence is to

work on legislation and policy that will at least—at least—reduce the likelihood that someone like Gerry will lose his life. It is part of a longer conversation. I won't get into the list of issues we should be working on—some of those I have outlined already—but we can't simply, as we often do, express condolence and pay tribute that is appropriate to those whose lives have been lost and those who may have been injured in Las Vegas and so many other places around the country. We have to do more than that. We can't stop with those expressions—those appropriate and essential expressions of sympathy and solidarity and commendation for the great work of law enforcement and emergency personnel. We have to do more than that.

Today, as we remember Gerry, we offer not only condolences but we offer prayers to his wife Kristin, to their daughters, and to the family and friends of the Spring Garden neighborhood in Philadelphia.

Once again, stopping there is not enough. There are plenty of examples of people who have lost their lives in a city like Philadelphia or in cities around the country that may not add up to the 58 deaths, may not add up to 500-plus injured, but when you take just one life—in this case, the life that we highlight today, Gerry's life—it is reason enough to come together to work on new approaches, commonsense approaches to, as I said before, reduce the likelihood. No one is suggesting that we can pass something that will be a magic wand to take away all of these acts of violence, but we shouldn't throw up our hands and say there is absolutely nothing we can do to reduce the likelihood that people will lose their lives due to an act of gun violence. I refuse to accept that as an American, that there is nothing we can do legislatively to reduce that likelihood or even, God willing, to substantially reduce the likelihood.

So when we are thinking about Gerry today, I hope we can commit ourselves to action and debate and maybe even reach consensus on legislation and policy to move forward in the right direction.

Madam President, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oklahoma.

TAX REFORM

Mr. LANKFORD. Madam President, I would recommend to this body something that is obvious to all of us. Our economy is stuck. We are in a bad spot of just treading water. Over the last 11 years, our gross domestic product—that is how much our economy is growing—has been 1.9 percent, and 1.9 percent is a tiny change.

Just to give you a perspective, over the last 100 years, there has not been a single decade when we have not had a year without at least 3 percent growth, until the last decade. Literally, our economy, is typically growing; that is, more jobs are being added, people are making more money, there is more

happening, and we are selling more internationally. In America, over the last 100 years, it has just slowly grown and grown and grown until the last 10 years, and, then, it has flattened out. We are stuck.

Now, when I was younger, we had a record player in the house. Now, for all of you under 40, I would explain that a record player is kind of like a CD player, only it was larger and made of vinyl. But if I say that, then, all the under-20 crowd will say: What is a CD player?

Let me just say this. The big black pieces of vinyl that played music at my house occasionally would get stuck. The record needle would land in the same groove and play the same part of the song over and over. It was my job, as the youngest one in the house, to go over to the record and bump it and get it out of that. Our economy needs that.

We need to be able to get over to our economy, which is stuck in the same groove at 1.9 percent in this incredibly low-growth rate, and give it a bump. Now, that bump can come in a lot of ways: increasing international trade would be a great help, engaging more internationally, keeping our regulations common sense and as nonintrusive as possible so that small businesses and medium-sized businesses aren't panicked all the time of what the Federal Government is going to do to them with a new regulation. Just keep them common sense and simple.

How about making sure that there are fewer Federal forms and that the Federal forms that people have to fill out not only are simple to do but they don't duplicate over multiple different agencies. It would be good if people who worked in small, medium, and large businesses spent more time selling products than they did filling out a form for some Federal bureaucracy that is never going to read that form anyway.

The obvious way to be able to bump the record needle in our economy right now is tax reform. It is not the main thing that is going to do everything, but it is a pretty big element. If we can get tax reform done, it actually gives our economy a little bit of a boost. Now, I have folks that will say: How does that make a difference? When you do tax reform, why does that actually increase economic activity?

Well, quite frankly, people around the country and in my State of Oklahoma are struggling to be able to save money because their wages aren't growing at the same speed that everything else is going up in price. So people need to be able to save more money and to be able to have more money to be able to spend.

Also, we need to create more jobs and we need to get companies going again and actually developing more jobs. If people can actually get a job, if people can make more money at that job, and if people actually have more take-home pay, they spend a little more, they save a little more, and the company expands a little more. If each

place does that a little bit, it dramatically increases our economy around the country, and we know it because we feel it.

Making the Tax Code simpler for every person in every business means people don't have to pay as much to have their taxes done. Maybe you can do your own taxes because it would be simple enough to do it, and it wouldn't cost so much. Accountants who work for businesses could go back to working for their businesses to see how they can make their businesses more efficient rather than spending all of their time just on tax policy.

I think we should follow the lead of the President on this. The President made a very clear statement. He said: Let's help our companies compete, but to do that we have to also knock down barriers that stand in the way of their success. For example, the President said:

Over the years, a parade of lobbyists have rigged the tax code to benefit particular companies and industries. Those with accountants or lawyers to work the system can end up paying no taxes at all. But all the rest are hit with one of the highest corporate tax rates in the world. It makes no sense, and it has to change.

So tonight, I'm asking Democrats and Republicans to simplify the system. Get rid of the loopholes. Level the playing field. And use the savings to lower the corporate tax rate for the first time in 25 years.

Did I fail to mention that the President who said that is President Obama? President Obama did, right down the hallway, in 2011, in his State of the Union address. That is what he said we should do: simplify the system, lower the corporate tax rate, and be able to deal with all of the loopholes that are in the system.

This shouldn't be a partisan issue. Everyone sees this, Republicans and Democrats alike.

So my focus is this. How do we actually get this done and not make it into a partisan food fight here but actually do what is right for the American people and help bump the economy to be able to help get us going again?

In my State—whether you live in Valliant, Gotebo, Heaton, Sayre, Muskogee, Tulsa, Oklahoma City, or Lawton—this matters because everyone unfortunately pays taxes. Everyone knows it is a necessary thing, but we want to have it as simple as possible and to have it as low as possible, and we want to make sure it is as fair as possible.

So the framework has been presented this past week. It is a simple framework for how we deal with tax policy. It talks about consolidating our rates. We have seven rates now. We would drop that down to four rates. There would be a 0-percent rate, a 12-percent, a 25-percent, and a 35-percent rate.

Now, some folks have asked me about the 0-percent rate, because a lot of Americans say one simple thing: Every American is an American, and every American should pay a little bit in taxes. I would agree, by the way. But

every American is paying some taxes. For those folks at the lowest end of the scale, I would propose dropping the rate to zero for them on income taxes, but they are paying their fair share in property tax, in gas tax, and in sales tax. They are helping their local fire department and their local police department. They are paying for the roads that are federally subsidized, based on their gas tax. They are paying taxes, but if they are not at a rate and at an income high enough to be able to survive at that rate, then let's drop theirs to 0 percent for income tax. They will keep some of the other taxes so they can still contribute to society and still be a part of this great Nation.

Dropping those rates down to the lowest bracket being 0 percent for income tax, then 12 percent, 25 percent, and 35 percent is a pretty standard rate. Quite frankly, this is something that was proposed in the Simpson-Bowles proposal before, which was a bipartisan proposal, for it to be able to come out, on how we can reform the system.

Eliminating the alternative minimum tax—do you want to talk about a complicated tax code? Basically, we have two Tax Codes. We have the standard Tax Code, and then we have the alternative minimum tax. Everyone who does their taxes has to do them twice to be able to evaluate which one of the codes they actually fit into. Now, if are using an electronic system, you lose track of it because the electronic system on the computer is doing that for you. But the AMT dramatically increases the complexity of the code. We should do away with that.

If we want to be able to protect the folks who are in the lowest bracket, then let's double what is the standard deduction. Right now the standard deduction is about \$12,000. Let's double that to about \$24,000. That \$24,000 amount for families would mean that the first \$24,000 of income that you would make as a family would fall into that 0-percent bracket. So you are paying zero income tax to the Federal Government until you make more than \$24,000. That protects a lot of families in the lowest end of the bracket to make sure they are not falling into this.

Quite frankly, in Oklahoma, most Oklahomans just use the standard deduction. They don't itemize. Doubling the standard deduction would mean that for a lot of those specialized deductions that everyone else gets, it actually flattens that out. It makes it fair. The No. 1 thing I hear from people when they fill out their taxes is not only that they filled them out and turned them in, but they say: I have no idea whether I did them right. It was so complicated, and I don't know if it is right. Then, the second thing they say, though, right behind that, is this: Why is it that, when I read through the hundred pages of instructions on the 1040 form, every deduction seems to be for someone else?

So let's increase the standard deduction so everybody gets a flatter, simpler, and fairer system, and let's keep the biggest of the deductions that most Americans use, like the charitable deduction or the mortgage interest deduction. If there are any two deductions that most people use, it is those two. So let's protect those two in the system.

As for reducing the corporate tax rate, I have folks say that it only benefits the biggest businesses. I always smile and say: Those are actually people who employ people. If you reduce the corporate rate, that means they are more competitive internationally and that means they are not having to move their corporate headquarters overseas.

For years, as a nation we have used the carrot-and-stick approach on trying to keep businesses here in the United States; that is, if they go overseas, beat them with a stick and try to punish them for trying to move. Why don't we use the carrot approach? Why don't we find out why they are moving overseas and fix that? Many of these companies are moving overseas because of the very high corporate tax rate here in the United States. Let's fix that. Over the decades, many of our competing nations have done that. We should fix that. That increases the number of jobs, that increases economic activity, and that keeps American jobs in America.

We should deal with the child tax credit and continue to be able to protect that for families.

We can deal with how we do expensing. Now, if you don't run a business, that doesn't matter much to you. But if you are the one who owns the small business, you understand how expensing works. If you have a cost to your business this year and if you can't write it off in this year, you have to expand that out, and you know that slows you down.

Here are the basics. If you are running a small business and you need to buy a new pickup for your business, if it takes you years to be able to depreciate that out, you are slower to do it. But if you know you can depreciate it out this year in your business, you are more likely to buy that. So that business buys a new truck this year. Well, that not only benefits that business in having new equipment, but it also benefits the Ford dealership down the street that actually sold them the truck, and it benefits all of the people in the area who helped supply that vehicle. So it trickles down through the rest of the economy.

There are ways to be able to accomplish all of these things and to be able to be as simple as we possibly can be.

There has been a lot of conversation about worldwide taxation as well. People seem to get confused on that area because most people don't live in that world. Here are the basics of it: Right now, if you are an American company and you are selling things overseas and

doing business overseas, when you make a profit overseas and you try to bring that money back, you get taxed overseas at their tax rate, which you should, in that country you are making the product and selling it, but you get taxed again when you bring it back to the United States. We are the only country that does it that way.

If we will just simplify the system, it will actually encourage companies to be able to stay in America and then do business all over the world rather than moving their company out of America. It is a simple way to be able to do it, and it is a way that we can do and should do. You will hear the term “repatriation,” and that is really what it is about. It is Americans being able to move their money from overseas accounts back to the United States and get that money moving.

There was a lot of conversation about the stimulus plan back in 2009 trying to get almost a trillion dollars of government money—that is money from you and me—and to be able to move that around in a stimulus package. Let me give you the figure. Right now, it is estimated that American companies have about \$2.5 trillion of private money parked overseas that they are not going to bring back to our economy because of the high cost of the tax coming back. If we were able to change that system, \$2.5 trillion of private money would move from overseas back into the United States. What effect would that have on our economy? I would stipulate that it would be a pretty dramatic effect that it would have on our economy.

We can fix this. We can resolve this. This shouldn't be as hard as we are making it, and it can be a bipartisan approach to be able to address some basic things—taking care of our families, making sure we are watching out for those who are in poverty, simplifying the code, making sure deductions aren't for a few but that they are spread out across the way that we handle it, protecting things like charitable giving and the mortgage interest deduction and things that most Americans use. These are the parameters we are trying to be able to work through over the next couple of weeks.

Hopefully in the coming months, as we work through all the details in the committee process with amendments and coming to the floor and being able to fight our way through the process, we will be able to actually get to a decision that will help us long term as a nation. This is something that can and should be resolved. It is one of the issues I have to raise to this body again.

This body has had a hard time actually moving on the biggest issues we face as a nation because the rules of this body prohibit us from debating them. The rules haven't changed over the past multiple decades, but the way we operate has. The American people are ticked about it, and rightfully so. The Senators in this body are frus-

trated with it. May I remind us that the rules of the Senate are set by the Senate? So if we are frustrated with the rules, we should address them.

Many of you have heard me speak about this in the past.

There are three basic rule changes that I think will change dramatically how business gets done in the Senate. The biggest one is the filibuster rule. We have two filibusters for every single bill that comes up. There is one at the beginning. You have to get 60 votes to start debate; you have to get 60 votes to stop debate; then the bill passes with 51. That needs to change. We should take away the first 60 votes at the beginning. We should be able to get onto a bill. Regardless of whether it is Republicans or Democrats in the majority, the majority party should be able to bring up a bill and debate it without being stopped. Let's bring up any issue and actually debate it. Let's not inhibit debate in this body. If we can't find agreement, keep the 60 votes at the end of it so we can keep the debate going until it gets resolved, but we should be able to debate the issues.

The second big issue is that we have to deal with nominations in an appropriate time period. Currently, my Democratic colleagues are forcing the long periods of time in debate for every single nominee who comes up. I had folks say that is what Republicans did in the past. That is actually not true. This is the first time it has happened like this.

This week, we are going to move four nominees for the President in 1 week—four. Under the current structure, it will take 11 years for President Trump to get his staff. Let me give you a barometer of where things have been in the past. As of yesterday, President Trump had 153 confirmations. At this same point, President Obama had 337 total. President Bush had 358 total at this same point. President Trump is not getting his nominees heard, and they are being slow-walked through the process.

We have to fix that. A simple way to fix it is to allow only 2, 4, or 8 hours of debate, not this protracted 30 hours of debate per nominee. It is already a resolved issue. Everybody knows it. These individuals have already gone through committee. They were already voted on in committee. By the time they get to the floor, it is resolved. The 30 hours of debate time is purely delay tactics. We should be able to resolve that within 2, 4, or 8 hours total.

Here is a radical idea: If we want to get the Senate going again, we can agree to a rule change that would allow for what is called dual-tracking. We would do nominations in the morning and legislation in the afternoon. Right now, we can only do one thing at a time in the Senate, so while we are waiting on a nomination vote, everything waits until that is done. It slows down the process. Why can't we do nominations in the morning and legislation in the afternoon?

There are basic rule changes that will help that are not partisan issues. They are designed to get the Senate moving regardless of who is in the majority. We have to resolve this long term. If we don't, the American people will continue to be frustrated, and we as Senators will continue to be frustrated.

DETENTION OF DR. ANDREW BRUNSON

Madam President, this weekend is an anniversary I don't like bringing up. One year ago this weekend, a gentleman named Dr. Andrew Brunson was detained in Turkey. He has been a pastor in Turkey for more than 20 years, and he is a U.S. citizen. He has faithfully served the people of Turkey for two decades. A year ago this weekend, he was picked up by local authorities and was detained for months and months without charges. He was just swept up and held.

Things are changing rapidly in Turkey right now. Turkey is not the same NATO ally and friend of the United States that they have been. The leadership of Turkey is radically changing the nature of that very open democracy and is shutting it down to become more and more of an authoritarian government. American citizens who do business there, who do mission work there, who have friends and family there, need to be aware that Americans are being swept up and detained without charges and held. In the case of Dr. Brunson, he has been held for a year. I have to warn fellow Americans that Turkey is not necessarily a safe place to do business in and travel to anymore.

Right now, Turkey has the authority to release Dr. Brunson. He is an American citizen and a pastor. They have the ability to do that.

Recently, the Appropriations Committee passed an amendment in an appropriations bill giving additional authorities to our State Department to take action against Turkish officials who hold American citizens like this and to put specific sanctions on those individuals. I hope that in the days ahead, our State Department will use that tool in their toolbox to apply pressure on the Turkish people to not impose arbitrary detention on U.S. citizens. We can push back on the Turks.

I hope that in the days ahead, the Turkish Government turns back around to more of an open democracy. They have been a nation in the past that was historic for their stand for religious liberty and democracy in that region. We would like to see a Turkish ally that still stands for religious liberty and the protection of all citizens in the days ahead.

With that, I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Oregon.

TAX REFORM

Mr. WYDEN. Madam President, as the ranking Democrat on the Senate Finance Committee, I followed the Senator's comments with respect to taxes and the debate over tax reform

with considerable interest. I will just tell you, my goodness, how I wish we could have what the Senator called an uninhibited process with respect to the debate over tax reform. I have written an actual bipartisan tax reform bill with our colleague who is now part of the Trump administration, Senator Coats.

Unfortunately, what our colleague laudably called for is not on offer. The Senate majority leader has said that he intends to use reconciliation—the most partisan process for considering tax reform. When we were talking about healthcare, which is one-sixth of the economy, we had the same process—reconciliation, all partisan. Now we are talking about taxes that involve the whole economy, and we are seeing the Senate majority leader say once again that it is his intent, his preference, and his plan to use that same process. I sure wish the world was like my colleague has called for because I have written a bipartisan plan.

What is so striking is that the Senate majority leader has called for 20 hours of discussion, which is essentially what you get with reconciliation, as opposed to what happened when Ronald Reagan and a big group of Democrats got together in 1986 and spent a whole month on tax reform.

So before the Senator leaves—and it is a pleasure to serve with him on the Senate Select Committee on Intelligence as well—I sure wish the world was along the lines of what my colleague has called for. Perhaps he can use his intellect and energy to persuade the Senate majority leader to use that process on taxes because that is what some Democrats have called for.

I can just tell my friend, given my interest in the subject, which goes back well over a decade—we have a bipartisan proposal written, coauthored by a member of the President's Cabinet, so we would very much like to have what the Senator is talking about.

Madam President, I rise now to oppose the nomination of Eric Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of the Department of Health and Human Services. This is the No. 2 position at HHS, the chief operating officer. Of course, with Secretary Price's departure, Mr. Hargan would fill the top spot if he is confirmed.

My concern is that I don't have any confidence that Mr. Hargan is going to lead the Department in a different direction than it took under Dr. Price. Last week, the country watched as more and more details emerged about Secretary Price's travel. In my view, the flights were an abuse of office.

In my view, from the very outset, there was reason to be concerned about Secretary Price and how he would handle the public trust. Ever since our committee received the Price nomination, it was clear that he had a little trouble following the rules when it served his own personal interests rather than taxpayers. He used insider in-

formation from a fellow Congressman to get a sweetheart stock deal that made him hundreds of thousands of dollars. He frequently bought stocks in industries that he was overseeing as a Member of Congress. He pushed healthcare legislation that benefited industry insiders rather than patients.

He was confirmed on a party-line vote, and it wasn't very shortly after that that he proceeded to go forward with what I and others consider a sabotage campaign that, in effect, has been executed since day one. He was a top salesman for TrumpCare. He came before our committee and made countless other public appearances in which he willfully misrepresented the massive scale of the harm TrumpCare would have done to American healthcare. He also appeared on national television and argued, in effect, that healthcare funding cuts aren't actually cuts. He denied that individuals would lose health coverage or see increases as a result of TrumpCare, even after there were independent analysis showing that was wrong. Then, of course, he flew about the country scaring folks who just wanted affordable healthcare.

As far as the President's promise to bring down the high prices of prescription medicine—that was a promise the American people heard stop after stop on the campaign trail in 2016. That promise is nowhere to be seen or heard from at this point. It is my hope that the President's next pick to lead Health and Human Services will follow through on what the American people were told in the campaign they were going to get—lower the cost of healthcare and get our citizens covered—but that nominee hasn't been put forward.

In the meantime, Mr. Hargan's nomination has him in line to serve as Acting Secretary. I will tell you, having examined the record as closely as I could, I don't think there is any reason to believe Mr. Hargan would deviate from Secretary Price's ideological agenda that included a constant effort to undermine and in my view sabotage the implementation of the Affordable Care Act. This campaign is driving up premiums and confusing Americans who just want to be able to see a doctor and get affordable healthcare services.

I am going to tick through some of the actions the administration has taken that would undermine the upcoming open enrollment period and the effect that is going to have on our people's healthcare costs.

First, just a few weeks into his tenure, Secretary Price cut the enrollment period. This is the period during which Americans sign up for health insurance. We are talking about a private marketplace. I am really struck by this debate about the role of government. We are talking about a private marketplace where private healthcare plans offer coverage. Secretary Price cut the enrollment period for private healthcare in the private marketplace

in half. People across the country used to be able to sign up for healthcare from the beginning of November until the end of January, and now they have literally half that time. That is going to cause a whole lot of disruption for people who are working hard and living their lives rather than trying to follow every little press account from Washington, DC.

Let's imagine for a moment a 29-year-old who just got locked out of the healthcare system because he has had a 3-year routine of signing up for health insurance around the new year. That is exactly the kind of individual the private insurance market needs to attract in order to hold costs down—a young person who is probably signing up right toward the deadline.

Then think of the single mom with two kids who marked January 30, probably with a big, bright pen on her calendar because she cut it close to the end of enrollment last year. Her life is busy enough. She doesn't read trade publications from health industry sources to see what is happening with open enrollment. Because of the early enrollment cutoff, this mom and her family, who just want affordable, private healthcare from the private marketplace, are going to be locked out.

The Department of Health and Human Services is taking the healthcare.gov website offline for maintenance on all but one Sunday during the open enrollment period. The fact is, Sunday has been one of the most popular times for well-meaning assistance groups to help folks get signed up at community centers. It is like the State Department of Transportation blocking the highways and digging up the blacktop with construction crews every Monday morning during the peak commute time. It is just the opposite of common sense.

The Department is kneecapping the programs that are designed to get highly trained people. These are folks called navigators, and what they do is get out into the communities and go to various places where they know a lot of folks aren't signed up, and they help them get signed up.

The Department of Health and Human Services has slashed the budget for getting the word out, including zeroing out the budget for TV ads. That has been a big factor in getting enrollment up in the past.

Let's be clear about what the Department has done under Secretary Price's leadership. They have been working overtime to make it harder for people to get healthcare, plain and simple.

The sabotage doesn't really end with just making enrollment a headache. The administration continues to dangle the threat of cutting off cost-sharing payments as if it were a political gain without consequences in the real world. In State after State after State, insurers have made it clear that this gamesmanship is causing premiums to go up. If the payments are cut off, families will face premium increases of

hundreds of dollars or more, and it is all because they are searching for a political trophy.

I want to talk about what this means for private sector healthcare. When you have the President and the previous Secretary of Health and Human Services pouring gasoline on the fires of uncertainty in the private health insurance marketplace, it makes it very hard for insurers to make the calculations that are involved in spreading risk and getting people signed up and pricing products.

The reality is, an administration that says they really care about the private sector—the President continually says that he is from the business community and he wants to be sensitive to private sector economic forces. The last thing you would do is pour all this uncertainty into the private healthcare landscape, which is what they have been doing with the gamesmanship in terms of whether they are going to pay these cost-sharing payments so that folks who face big deductibles and extra prices for medicine and the like would know there is going to be help in their health plan for those costs.

The Secretary was out jetting all about, spreading falsehoods about the private healthcare landscape. Sometimes he would say that it would be collapsing, and I would say: We know a lot of people who are trying to stabilize it, but you are making it harder by pouring all this gas on the fires of uncertainty.

While this was going on, they were also neglecting to work with States. For example, Oklahoma designed a reinsurance system intended to stabilize the private insurance market and control costs, and they sought a waiver application to the Department of Health and Human Services. But the Department of Health and Human Services didn't get around to approving it in time to help Oklahomans in 2018, so the State just pulled their application.

I have been a strong supporter of these waivers. I authored a provision in the Affordable Care Act, the innovation waiver, 1332. For the Secretary to not work with Oklahoma in a timely way and in a way that would stabilize the private insurance market is not what those of us on this side are in favor of.

There is no reason to believe Mr. Hargan would come in and clean up the mess. In my view, many States want to see stable or reduced premiums this coming year, but so far the Department is just marching in lockstep with the status quo. The President apparently is committed to continuing this kind of mismanagement and willful wrongdoing. Mr. Hargan has made clear what his stance is on the Affordable Care Act in plenty of public statements.

Beyond this question of undermining the Affordable Care Act, we were also particularly troubled that Secretary Tom Price shared the Trump adminis-

tration's abysmal record of responding to oversight letters from Congress, especially the Democrats. As far as I can tell, some of this is shared on both sides.

I think this is profoundly undemocratic, and our obligation to perform oversight as Members of Congress is derived from the powers laid out in the Constitution, in article I. The issues we raise in oversight inquiries to the Department of Health and Human Services relate directly to the well-being of people in North Carolina, in Oregon, and everywhere in between. I don't think Senators on either side, Democrats or Republicans, do it for sport. But the administration's behavior is not that of a government that sees itself as answerable to the public—either that or it just doesn't have good answers as to why it constantly, constantly is out there undermining private health insurance markets to make it harder for people to get affordable healthcare. Either way, they aren't doing their jobs, and they aren't putting the interests of the American people first.

Members on both sides of the aisle have expressed concern about the Department of Health and Human Services stonewalling important oversight issues presented by Members on both sides. Chairman HATCH and Senator GRASSLEY are two very senior Republicans. Chairman GRASSLEY and Chairman HATCH deserve a lot of credit for calling out the Trump administration on this lack of responsiveness to basic oversight.

The fact is, what our committee has heard is basically a lot of sweet talk from nominees about how, of course, they are going to be responsive, and then they go out, and it is business as usual. We see them for that confirmation hearing, and there is not much of any kind of response when we ask the questions.

I will not support Mr. Hargan's nomination today. In my view, under Tom Price and this administration, the Department of Health and Human Services has done a miserable job of working to improve the health and well-being of the American people. The irony is, it seems that one of the objectives from day one was to set out and try to accomplish that, to make it appear that there were problems when the Affordable Care Act was being implemented. Instead of rolling up their sleeves and tackling it, the idea was to try and get an ideological trophy: Let's tell the American people that everything about the Affordable Care Act is horrible so we can get it repealed.

The Affordable Care Act is far from perfect. In fact, when we were debating it, I had an alternative plan. We had seven Senators on both sides of the aisle. It was a bipartisan plan, but that is history.

The Affordable Care Act has made an enormous difference for millions of Americans. What we ought to be doing is working together to improve it.

There are plenty of ways in which this Senate and an administration that really want to accomplish that can work together in a bipartisan way.

What I have been more interested in than any other aspect of public service is to work in a bipartisan way on healthcare. That has been my No. 1 interest. So nothing would please me more than to be able to say: OK. We have an official who is going to break with the past and, instead of trying to make the implementation of the Act as bad as possible, is prepared to roll up his or her sleeves and make it as good as possible. Unfortunately, that person is not Mr. Hargan. I urge a no vote.

I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TILLIS). The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

NOMINATION OF RANDAL QUARLES

Mr. BROWN. Mr. President, today we are considering the nomination of Randal Quarles to be a member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors.

Since 1984, Mr. Quarles has revolved between the public and private sectors. He was most recently the director of the Carlyle Group from 2007 to 2013, and then founded Cynosure Group, an investment management company.

I appreciate Mr. Quarles' willingness to serve the public once again, but I don't think he is the person we want in this important role at the Federal Reserve.

The financial crisis devastated communities in my State and across the country—devastated in terms of lost jobs, foreclosed homes, and evaporated savings. We have made a lot of progress in the 7 years since we passed Wall Street reform. The Vice Chair of Supervision at the Federal Reserve, a position created in Dodd-Frank, is supposed to look out for our financial system and make sure that our financial system is sound.

Mr. Quarles served as Treasury's Under Secretary for Domestic Finance in the years leading up to the 2008 financial crisis. It was his job to coordinate oversight of the financial industry. Many of his statements, however, leading up to the crisis were far too credulous. He seemed to believe whatever the banks were telling him. They were far too credulous when it came to industry claims that we simply need not worry; the economy is in good shape and we don't have to worry about a credit bubble.

In the early 2000s, while at the Treasury Department, Mr. Quarles espoused the following view of the role of regulators in financial markets. It is a long quote, and I will quote him directly:

Markets are always ahead of the regulators, and frankly that's how it should be. It's analogous to the advice that my father

provided me that “if you don’t miss at least two or three planes a year, you’re spending too much time in airports.” If the regulators aren’t a little behind the market in a few areas at any given time, they would be stifling innovation and evolution. The regulators’ task is to promote investor protection, while ensuring that prudential and supervisory activities do not stifle efficiency gains. For effective regulation, the regulators must work with the markets.

I am not sure where to start on picking that apart. More importantly, it is showing that someone who says that shouldn’t be in charge of financial regulation at the Federal Reserve.

He said at his Senate nomination hearing: “That is probably the most unfortunate use of language that I ever made, and I do not stand behind that statement.” That is what he said when presented with these words at his confirmation hearing. He made other similarly unfortunate statements in the years leading up to the financial crisis.

In 2006, as Under Secretary for Domestic Finance, he discussed the prospects for an impending financial crisis. This was before things looked really, really bad. He said:

How would our current financial system stand up to this sort of canonical crisis? On the whole, I would say that the U.S. economy is well positioned to weather such a retrenchment in risk-taking.

This was about a year and a half before the economy began to implode. He was in a high position in the Treasury Department, and he had access to all of the information he might possibly want, and he said that the “economy is well positioned to weather such a retrenchment.”

In the same speech, on the potential harm posed by increases in mortgage payments for families with exotic mortgages he said:

While that is certainly a large number, it represents only a small hit to aggregate personal income. Moreover, market reports indicate that borrowers using such non-traditional mortgages tend to be upper income individuals that can manage a sizable increase in their mortgage payment.

He concluded by saying, again, in 2006:

Fundamentally, the economy is strong, the financial sector is healthy, and our future looks bright. We will surely face challenges in the future, but we can take comfort in the knowledge that our economy and financial system have proven remarkably resilient to all manner of adverse shocks in the past.

That was a lot of comfort to the millions of Americans afflicted by the financial crisis.

My wife and I live in Cleveland, in ZIP Code 44105. The year after Mr. Quarles made that statement and the economy started to really tank, my ZIP Code had more foreclosures than any other ZIP Code in the United States. I know what that does to a neighborhood.

I am not confident Mr. Quarles took to heart the costly lessons of the financial crisis. He seems far too ready to relax the rules for Wall Street and those who protect consumers. He is another example that this administra-

tion, which said it wants to drain the swamp, instead looks like a retreat for Goldman Sachs executives. The number of people on Wall Street who have influence on our government is just far and away worse than we have ever seen it.

Putting Mr. Quarles—who should know better but apparently doesn’t, from his statements—at the Federal Reserve, in charge of financial regulation, is just the wrong thing. In 2015, when asked about Dodd-Frank, he said:

The macro issue is that the government should not be a player in the financial sector. It should be a referee. And the practice, and the policy, and the legislation that resulted from the financial crisis tended to make the government a player. They put it on the field as opposed to simply reffing the game.

How could he think that, when he was part of the government when it didn’t do its job and didn’t do the job that regulators are supposed to do? In response to questions for the record at his nomination hearing, he stated: “My approach to policy making, and particularly to regulation, has been that the discretion of policy makers, and particularly of regulators, should be as constrained as possible.”

He is really saying: Let Wall Street do what it wants to do; let Wall Street run the financial sector of our economy, and government regulators should sort of step aside.

As vice chair for supervision and as a Member of the Federal Reserve Board of Governors, Mr. Quarles will be making decisions about risk-based capital, leverage and liquidity requirements, resolution plans, concentration limits, risk committees, stress tests, and other important safeguards put into place after the crisis for the Nation’s largest banks. The crisis showed we need strong financial watchdogs, not, as he said, “constrained” ones. If confirmed, I am not sure who Mr. Quarles will be working for, taxpayers and working families or Wall Street.

Let me close by reminding my colleagues that, last Congress, the Banking Committee refused to consider President Obama’s nominees to the Federal Reserve Board. Mr. Quarles is the first nominee President Trump has chosen. There are currently three other vacancies. The term for Chair of the Federal Reserve expires early next year. Because of that, President Trump will likely fill at least five of the seven Federal Reserve Board seats, which are 14-year terms.

Again, if the first one is someone who is so close to Wall Street, what does that tell you about who is in the White House? What does it tell you about the advisers in the White House? What does it tell you about that executive retreat for Goldman Sachs I talked about in the White House?

If all the nominees to the Federal Reserve are like Mr. Quarles, average Americans may once again pay the price. We can’t return to a time when financial watchdogs are asleep on the job.

There seems to be a collective amnesia in this body, in the White House, and in the Banking Committee about what people in our country went through in 2008, 2009, 2010, 2011, and 2012, which was, in large part, because of the influence of Wall Street in our government. We can’t let that happen. That is why I urge my colleagues to oppose the nomination of Mr. Quarles to the Federal Reserve.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. CORTON). Without objection, it is so ordered.

TAX REFORM

Mr. BLUNT. Mr. President, I am not aware of any Missouri constituents, for whom I work, who wouldn’t like to see a tax code that was simpler, fairer, that did more to create jobs, that was better for individuals, and one that they understood. I don’t have anybody come up to me and say: What can we do to complicate the Tax Code further, or what can we do to make us less competitive, or how much more of my money would you like to have to do what you think the government ought to do? I don’t have anybody say that to me.

We are now at a time when we have the tools available. We have the focus available that will allow us to move in the right direction. For almost a decade now, hard-working families and hard-working individuals have had to deal with a below-average economy and with below-average wage growth in that below-average economy. Surely, we don’t want that to be the new normal.

I kept hearing the last 3 or 4 years that 2 percent growth is what we should expect now. The growth since World War II has averaged 3.4 percent for over 70 years. Suddenly, we were told: No, 2 percent is the best we can do.

I understand that, even counting the Great Depression, growth in the entire 20th century was over 3 percent. What do we need to do to get our economy growing in a way that creates better opportunities and better jobs?

Why would it create better jobs? Because you have people who are looking for workers who are more eager to pay and keep a workforce in a growing economy than you do in an economy that is not growing. You have people who understand they can compete better if they have a workforce that is the workforce they want rather than the workforce they just happen to get and that there is competition for that workforce. So our goal here in tax reduction and tax reform should be to help families and individuals keep more of their hard-earned money, to empower people to invest in their own

future in ways that we currently are not encouraging or just simply not allowing because we don't let them take enough of their money home from work that they make at work, and to make it easier for families to see a pathway toward success and not to penalize people when they make the right decisions.

The tradition has always been this: If you want more of something, you don't tax it. You don't regulate it. You encourage it.

We need a tax code that encourages more success, that encourages higher take-home pay and better jobs. Most people don't realize that the individual income tax is still the biggest source of Federal money. More than half of all Federal taxes collected come from the income tax.

One of our goals should be how do we get more taxpayers and not how do we make more from the taxpayers we have. Perhaps the greatest voluntary compliance in the history of the world is how Americans have complied with the income tax system.

The more Americans think the system is fair and understandable and everybody else is being treated the same way they are being treated, they are much more likely to comply with that system than a system where they hear: Well, some company made a lot of profit, but because of the complexity of the Tax Code, they paid zero taxes, or this neighbor has figured out that and that neighbor has figured out that, and because of the Tax Code, you work just as hard as they did, but the Federal Government somehow got a lot of your money because you hadn't set up your tax planning in the right way.

Tax planning doesn't need to be that difficult. Right now the Tax Code has seven individual rates. We are proposing three individual rates, which maybe could go to four, but that would still be barely half the number we have, even if it got to four. There are seven individual rates, and there are more than 100 deductions, credits, and exclusions that people use when they fill out their tax form. American people collectively pay billions and billions of dollars just to figure out how much of their money the Federal Government is going to get.

Most people would like to have the certainty of a postcard form that you fill out, but instead they see this system that has gotten increasingly complex, often not indexed for inflation. So you start with something that you think is only going to apply to a few people, and, before you know it, it applies to a whole lot of people.

I think that when the alternative minimum tax was added to the Tax Code, there had been 155 wealthy individuals who hadn't paid any income tax. So the Federal Government decided, and Congress decided, that we are going to put the alternative minimal tax in to be sure those 155 people, who are clearly wealthy people, are going to pay income tax. No matter

how much they have gamed the tax system, they are still going to pay an alternative minimum tax. This was just a few years ago.

By 2015, the 155 had gone to 4.4 million people who paid the alternative minimum tax. It is unbelievably successful if you are trying to collect people's money in a way they don't understand. It is not very successful if all you were trying to do was to prevent 155 wealthy people a couple of decades ago from being able to not pay any tax at all. They took a shot at 155 people and wound up hitting 5 million.

That is unacceptable. That is not what the Tax Code is supposed to do. We need to work hard to simplify that. There are 14 pages of instructions that tell you or, more likely, your tax preparer how to comply with the alternative minimum tax guidelines.

I don't have the one page with me, but I was handed the one page of instructions for the Tax Code from 1913. By the way, the estimate was that not only not many people would pay it, but nobody would ever pay it because you didn't pay anything unless you made at least \$3,000, which in 1913 was a lot of money. But it was one page of instructions. Now we have 1 page of index to the 100 pages of instructions, and 14 of those pages are just for the alternative minimum tax. When you fill the form out, there are 64 different lines that you use to calculate now how almost 5 million people are impacted by a part of the Tax Code that was designed for 155 people.

We can do a better job. We can do a better job of being sure that hard-working families get to take home more of the money they have earned with that hard work. We can also do a better job with the rest of the Tax Code to make sure we are creating the kind of opportunity for us to compete as a country, for us to compete as a nation, for us to be more fairly aligned with the other countries in the world that we compete with, and to make sure those hard-working families have better jobs with more take-home pay to start with.

If you are working hard for a living—and Americans do; we are a working country—the best of all circumstances is that you have a better job than you used to have and less money comes out of every dollar you make than used to come out of every dollar you make, and that needs to be our goal. Whatever we do on the individual side needs to be focused on that. Whatever we do on the job-creating side needs to be focused on that. If we do that, we will not have the people we work for come in complaining: What have you done? The Tax Code is too simple now. It is too easy to fill out my tax form. I am walking out on Friday with more money than I used to walk away with, and, oh, by the way, they tell me there is a better job about to develop that I can apply for.

That is what we ought to do. I hope we keep focused on that and get this tax bill passed this year.

I think the Senator from Georgia has come to talk about this same topic, along with Senator BARRASSO from Wyoming.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Georgia.

Mr. ISAKSON. Mr. President, I thank the Senator from Missouri. I make the point that I have enjoyed the last 19 years serving with him in the Congress of the United States. He was elected 2 years before me to the House of Representatives. I came a little bit later, but I preceded him in the Senate in 2004. He has been great to work with.

The Show Me State of Missouri is an awful lot like my State of Georgia. They are proud of their country. They are proud to be Americans. They are proud of the chance to have an opportunity to make an honest living and want to be a part of a country that continues to grow and have prosperity for the future.

We had a hearing in the Finance Committee yesterday where there was an interesting study I had not seen before. It had been done by a Harvard student, who I assume was correct. Ninety percent of the people born in the 1940s ended up making more than their parents did when they went to work. But only about 40 percent of the people born in the 1980s will end up making more than their parents did, meaning that as we have gone along the way since World War II, we have taken more and more away from the opportunity in the earning level and more money has gone to different places, like taxation.

Personally, I think the Finance Committee and the leadership of the Big 6, so to speak, have done us a great favor to open the debate on tax reform in America. Unlike some of the debates we have had recently, this debate is open-ended. We are starting with a framework, not an absolute dictate but a framework. We are talking about an opportunity we have to see if we can lower the burden of taxes on the American people, while incentivizing the American people to work more, to make more, and to earn more.

There are two ways to increase revenue to the government. First, you can increase the rate of taxation. But then you are not necessarily taking in any more money. You might incentivize somebody to go somewhere else. The other way is to improve the opportunity to make money and the atmosphere in which people make money so they invest their time and effort and they grow their revenue, which grows the revenue of the United States of America.

The proposal in the framework before us has any number of outlines and any number of targets. The four things I want to focus on are these. One is the middle class. I have gotten tired of hearing this reference to dividing us as Americans by class. We are all Americans. Regardless of our station in life, we are all important. The code ought

to be important to every single person who is an American and, if they can come to this country, to improve their life, raise their children, and live a good life.

I am not into a class society. I am into an opportunity society. If you take a look at this proposal, for those people you put in the middle class today, it proposes lower rates, less brackets, and more opportunity to gain wealth in the future through work, through investment, and through earnings.

Second, this framework encourages job creation. I know that people are always demonizing the rich. Most people who are rich are people providing people who aren't rich with jobs. I don't think it is bad to provide people with jobs. I think it is good to provide them with jobs. We need a Tax Code that incentivizes the creation of jobs.

The focus on the passthrough rate, which is talked about by the Big 6, may lower the passthrough rate to 25 percent. It is a job-creating proposal that works.

I have run a sub-S corporation. I have been a partner in limited partnerships. I have known people who have had sole proprietorships. I have known people who have had independent operations. They all pay their taxes at the regular, ordinary tax rate on the individual. They don't pay at the corporate rate. They pay at what is called the passthrough rate, where the profits at the end of the year of the partnership or the LLC or the sub-S corporation flow in a K-1 to the individual and are taxed at the ordinary income tax rate; whereas, corporations in C-corps, or stock-held companies, pay a top rate of 35 percent.

That rate is being proposed to go to 25 percent conceptually. If that goes to 20 percent and the 25 percent rate is applied to passthroughs, we will have a good environment in which companies can form investments, form new companies, make investments of those companies, build opportunity, and, in turn, build jobs. So it motivates America to create more jobs. With jobs come income. With income comes money. With money comes investment. At the end of that comes profit, which ends up being taxed, which is revenue to our country, and it increases.

We also need to recognize that we are not as competitive as we used to be, in large measure because of the code we have, not because we are not competitive people. America is the most competitive environment in the world in which to do business. Americans by themselves were explorers to get here. Americans by themselves are investors and inventors. Americans by themselves are risk-takers. We want to improve in every competitive opportunity we have, but the current code we have suppresses competitiveness.

This proposal by the Big 6 takes us to a territorial tax system. We are one of the few countries in the world that taxes the old-fashioned way. The terri-

torial system is the way in which most of the world competes, and we are the biggest competitor within the rest of the world. It is time we put an end to a company making a dollar in Delhi, India, on a product they made there and sold there, pays the Indian tax, and then brings it back into America and has to pay the differential on the American tax as well. It is time we did what the territorial tax does, which is to tax the money where it is earned; therefore, you will never have to do repatriation again, and you will never have to talk about offshore tax havens again because the Tax Code will not induce those things to happen. Instead, people will pay the tax where it is earned, bring the money back here to hire people, invest, build new products, and then take them overseas and sell them. There is nothing more important than going to the territorial tax system. I am excited about this.

Have you ever thought about this?

If you were the president of a major American corporation and it was coming to the end of the year and you were getting ready to have your stockholders' meeting for the year and you were looking at ways to show how the stock could grow and how, next year, you were going to improve the profits of the company and, in turn, the net of the company and, in turn, the dividends to the stockholders—right now, if you have a home office in America, that is your principal office, and you are taxed at 35 percent in America. If you have a competitive company that is in Ireland and it is taxed at 12½, it just might cross your mind: If I move my headquarters from America to Ireland, I could take my stockholders and put 18 percent or 20 percent—or whatever the differential is—on the bottom line for them. When your Tax Code causes people to think about things like that, you are predicting a future for a country that is not as bright, as rich, or as important as it should be.

Lastly, everybody thinks I am a city slicker because I am from Atlanta, but I did grow up working on a farm in Fitzgerald, GA, and Ocilla, GA. I love farmers and I love farms. I know one of the proposals of the Big 6 is to do away with the remainder of the estate tax that is still with us. A few years ago, we exempted all estates at \$5 million or less from the estate tax. Now it is \$5.49 million because the index has been used on inflation. The tax rate used to be 55 percent, and it is now 40. Yet, in my State of Georgia, with the effective application of the income tax, the tax is about 46 percent. So, for round figures and argumentative figures, for someone who dies in our State, after the first \$5 million, he pays a tax closer to 50 percent.

A lot of people say that is rich people taking a benefit of the Tax Code. I don't call being dead in order to collect a tax benefit a good idea. I do not think that that is a benefit to me at all because the estate tax is on somebody's estate who passes away, who pays that

tax for the people who would inherit the assets. Those are normally the children or the spouses or maybe the employees with whom they work in their companies.

Have you ever thought about this?

If somebody were taxing you at 50 percent or close thereto and you file your first estate tax return after you are dead, then if this were the value of your estate, you would be telling the government: OK, you get this half, while my children, my wife, my family get the other half. A year later, when you go back to the well—or a generation later—those kids who inherited the business will have to go back and pay taxes, and a quarter of it will be gone. So, in two generations, you took an asset that was worth a lot and reduced it to 25 percent of what it was worth. You are incentivizing people to liquidate something that was paying taxes on an ongoing basis and pay a onetime exit in terms of an estate tax. That is backward thinking.

What we should do is take those things people have worked for and striven for and tried their best to build and have an incentive for them to take that and leave it to their heirs and leave that company in a tax-paying mode or that farm in a tax-paying mode so America benefits and they benefit as well. Just because you are not taxing something does not mean you are not taking advantage of your company or the benefit of that item. By abolishing the estate tax, you will actually put more money, over time, in the Treasury of the United States of America in taxes than you ever will by taxing the one-time 50 percent.

So as we enter this debate—and I have been joined on the floor by a number of my colleagues who, I know, want to talk—let's talk about what benefits the American people, what incentivizes innovation and competition, what puts more money in the pockets of middle-class Americans today but also creates more people in the middle and upper classes in the future, not because we gave them anything except an opportunity, a fair place to compete, and that competitive drive that only people in the United States of America have, possess, and will always use to the benefit of our country.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Wyoming.

Mr. BARRASSO. Mr. President, it is always such a privilege to come to the floor and hear Senator ISAKSON, of Georgia, speak, as he speaks so eloquently. He comes here and makes perfect points. He was talking about the tax system looking to the future. What we have is a tax system that looks backward, regrettably. A number of years ago, we had a Treasury Secretary named Bill Simon, who said: "The Nation should have a tax code that looks like someone designed it on purpose." That is what we are trying to do now—have a Tax Code that looks like it was designed on purpose.

The person who really understood this was Ronald Reagan. As we take a look at tax proposals, it is not about taxes; it is about much more—about a better life for the American people. Ronald Reagan said that tax reform is the door to a bigger future and, I would add, to a brighter future. He said it was the door to a future as big and hopeful and full of heart as the American dream. That is what we are talking about here today, a bright, big future, as big and bright as the American dream. That is what we are aiming at with this plan, a big and hopeful future for all Americans.

It all starts with increasing the amount of money Americans get to keep in their pockets as a result of their hard-earned paycheck dollars. That is the most important thing. That is what families are concerned about. That is what I hear about every weekend in Wyoming. Under the outline the Republicans have proposed, every working man and woman in this country will be better off. That is our goal, to make everyone better off and to make the country better off, more prosperous, with a strong, healthy economy. That is what we are hearing about today on the floor and what we heard about from the Senator from Georgia.

When we cut the amount of money people have to pay in taxes, it is essentially like giving them a raise. That is what this is about, giving people a raise. We want working people to keep more of their hard-earned money. One of the ways you can do that, which is very popular, is by doubling the standard deduction. It is easy math to do. The current standard deduction is around \$12,000 for a couple who files jointly. The Republican proposal doubles it to \$24,000. That means the first \$24,000 of a couple's income will not be taxed at all.

Beyond that, we are going to reduce the number of tax brackets. People will like that. It is so complicated, the system we have now. We will move people into lower brackets. Isn't that what we are trying to do? Yes, it is. If you used to be in a bracket and paid 25 percent, there is a pretty good chance that a significant amount of your income is going to be moved down to the 12-percent range. For most people, that is like getting a big raise when they take a look at their paychecks at the end of the week. That is what Republican tax relief looks like.

The second thing we want to do is to actually make it a lot simpler. We talked about lowering the number of brackets, making it simpler for everyone who does their taxes. The instructions you get now from the IRS for the 1040 tax form are 106-pages long, and that is if you just limit yourself to the instructions. Remember that there are 15 different worksheets to fill out just so you can fill out your 1040 form. When more people take the standard deduction, they can save a lot of time and not have to go to the 15 worksheets

and the 106 pages of instructions. They get that standard deduction, which has now doubled, making it a lot easier, with a lot less time having to be spent on taxes.

What else are we going to do?

We want to cut out a lot of the loopholes and complicated rules so most people will be able to just fill out a form on a single page. Think of the hours that is going to save families—the millions and millions of hours—when you multiply it across the country. Plus, think of the stress people will not have to be living under in their wondering if they actually followed the instructions properly. When you call the IRS help line, you get different answers from different people with whom you talk. It is hard to get a single answer because the complicated system makes it hard to get the answer right. So you end up with the expense of hiring lawyers, tax accountants, and people who can help you navigate a complicated system.

People are looking for simpler lives, more free time, and more money of their own they can keep, not complicated government forms so the government takes more of their money. There is a lot of room for us to improve the simplicity of the tax system and the actual challenges that come from filling out the forms.

The third thing we want to do with the plan, of course, is to get the economy growing faster so it is a strong and healthy economy, with more prosperity and higher take-home pay in the paychecks. With that, you will actually get an economy that creates more jobs and has more people working, which is a big part of tax reform. It is a direct benefit for American families. When you cut taxes on small businesses, they can afford to hire more people or they can use the extra money to pay their workers more. There is a lot that can be done to reach that level of prosperity—in individual paychecks as well as in having more people in the workforce.

Under the outline the Republicans released last week, the top rate for most small businesses is going to drop from almost 40 percent down to 25 percent, allowing the businesses to pass on those savings to their customers and the savings to their employees. Larger businesses are going to get a tax break too. The idea is to lower taxes for everyone.

When you take a look at it from a business owner's standpoint, 70 percent of the cost of corporate taxes actually does not get paid by a corporation; it gets paid by the people who work for those businesses. If we cut taxes, more of that money is going to go to the workers. You will have higher wages, better benefits, and more jobs, and businesses will actually be able to lower their prices. Every time there is a tax increase, a business has to raise the cost of a product to be able to collect that tax and send it to the government. I would rather have that money

go into the pockets of the people who are shopping in the store or using that business rather than into the pocket of the Federal Government.

Senator ISAKSON was talking about something called repatriation and the amount of money businesses are taxed that do some business overseas. If we can cut the taxes they pay on the money they earn overseas, it means those businesses can bring back that money to the United States and spend it here. How much is it? Right now, about \$2.6 trillion is sitting overseas because those businesses get taxed twice—once on the business done overseas and then once on the business done when they bring those profits back to the United States. When we get that money back, that is going to help grow the economy here as well. It makes sure the American Tax Code ought to be helping American businesses and the American economy, not helping foreign countries. We need to get that money back and put it to work in the United States.

Those are all of the things the Republicans are proposing. It means more money in the pockets of American workers, and it means simpler taxes and more jobs for American workers. Isn't that what we are looking for? Isn't that what prosperity means for America? Isn't that what a healthy economy means—job growth and the sort of things that happen when we get the kind of tax reform we have proposed?

I want to address one other thing I have heard over the past couple of days as our plan has come out. I have heard some Members on the other side of the aisle say that under the Republican plan, certain people will win more than others. Under the Republican plan, the goal is for everyone to win. The American economy will win. When we have a growing economy, people keep more of their hard-earned money. That is the goal. That is why the President and the Republicans in Congress wanted to take up tax relief right now in the first place. We need to do this to help all American families.

This gets back to Ronald Reagan, in that tax reform—tax reductions, tax relief—means a big and hopeful future for all Americans. That should be the goal. It should be the goal of every Member of the U.S. Senate. It should be the goal of every American. We want to make taxes fairer and simpler and lower for everyone.

There are too many people in Washington right now who want to use America's tax laws to punish or reward one group of Americans or another. Too many people in Washington want to use this debate over tax reform to stir up conflict and resentment. We hear it already in the Democrats' talking points. There are some Democrats in this Senate who think that is good politics. Well, it is terrible policy and terrible for the direction of our country and economy.

The tax plan the Republicans have released this last week does nothing to

change who bears the burden of taxes in the country. People who are fortunate and have high incomes will pay their fair share; people who make less will pay less. That is how the Tax Code is spread today. Nothing in this plan changes that.

We have a lot of work ahead of us. We have to figure out the exact income levels for each of the tax brackets and the size of some of the tax credits families get. These are all important details. That is the kind of debate we are going to be having—the markup on the budget and the mathematics of the tax bill coming through committee.

I am so grateful to Senator HATCH and members of the Finance Committee for all of the hard work they will be putting into this over the next several weeks.

I will refer back to the quote of the Treasury Secretary, Bill Simon, who said: “The nation should have a tax code that looks like someone designed it on purpose.” This is our chance. We need to make sure we take full advantage of it.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from South Dakota.

Mr. ROUNDS. Mr. President, today I rise to speak about our country's need for tax reform. As our previous speakers have indicated, this is a critical time in our country, and we have an opportunity to make some good decisions that will impact our Nation for literally generations to come.

Reforming our Tax Code is a top priority not only for myself but for many of my colleagues and the President. We are committed to delivering tax reform that will provide more jobs, bigger paychecks, and a fairer tax system for the American people.

Over the 8 years of the previous administration, economic growth averaged a paltry 1.5 percent annually, which is about half of the post-World War II average. This anemic growth has led to stagnant wages and, according to the Joint Economic Committee, has cost families an average of \$8,600 in income on an annual basis. It is no wonder that half of the American public says they are living paycheck to paycheck. This is simply not acceptable.

Even more concerning, the Congressional Budget Office is projecting economic growth to remain under 2 percent over the next 10 years if we do not act. If that happens, let me just share with you the real concern. If we allow economic growth to stay under 2 percent, then we will literally bring in revenue based upon the size of our economy. If we allow economic growth to move at a paltry 2 percent or less, then we won't have the revenue to pay our bills.

Today, right now, we are looking at trillion-dollar deficits. Yet, if we take a look at where the dollars are going, they go basically—looking at our entire budget, about 28 percent of the

money that we spend today is found within the 12 appropriations bills that make up the defense and the non-defense discretionary side of the budget. All of the remaining items, making up 72 percent, are in areas of mandatory payments—Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt. If we don't do anything and if we continue on this same path, with the type of growth we have, then we can expect that within 9 years now, by the year 2026, our country's 250th birthday, 99 percent of all of the revenue we take in will go into Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, and interest on the debt. That means there will be only 1 percent remaining for defense of our country, roads, bridges, research, education, and all of those other items that many people really want to see and that help us to move ahead as a country.

We have to make changes now that will allow our country's economy to grow and prosper the way it used to. The way we believe we do that is by changing our Tax Code, changing the regulatory environment in the United States, and sending the message back to the businesses that this is the place where they want to do business. They don't have to leave our shores in order to actually make a profit and be able to keep that profit.

It is our intention to deliver policies that will jolt our economy, allow hard-working families to keep more of their paychecks, and provide financial opportunities to lower and middle-class families. Tax reform is a vital component of this.

Our current overly complicated Tax Code is more than 70,000 pages in length. It takes Americans more than 8.1 billion hours each year to file their taxes. A fairer, simpler Tax Code will grow the economy, increase wages for American families, improve American competitiveness overseas, and provide much needed certainty for our business community.

It has been 30 years since our Tax Code was last reformed. The rest of the industrialized world has learned from America what it takes to be competitive. They have seen what our tax rates have become. They have lowered their tax rates. They are now inviting businesses to their shores rather than to ours. Businesses that can go anywhere in the world they want to are not choosing America as their location anymore. We have to change that because when they come back, they bring good-paying jobs with them. They keep the profits here, which are reinvested within our borders rather than overseas, and that adds to a growing economy here, which allows us more revenue through even lower tax rates.

The average corporate rate in the United States today is 39 percent, compared to 25 percent by our foreign competitors. This puts American businesses at a disadvantage right out of the gate. We must reform the tax rate to one that incentivizes businesses to remain here in America and keep good-

paying jobs from going overseas. Doing so will unleash the full potential of this American economy.

One thing we can all agree on is that taxes are too high and that the tax rate, no matter who you are, should be lowered. Allowing all American families to keep more of their hard-earned dollars by taking them out of the hands of Washington and putting them back into their pocketbooks will result in a more prosperous America. That means more people investing in America long term. When our economy is healthy, every American will feel the positive effects.

I am encouraged by the ongoing discussions and progress being made to alleviate the tax burden on American businesses and American families, and I will continue to work with anyone serious about lowering taxes and reforming the code to provide a much needed boost to our sluggish economy. The American people deserve better than the uncertain growth and burdens still lingering from the previous administration.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from North Carolina.

Mr. TILLIS. Thank you, Mr. President.

I appreciate the opportunity to speak today. Like last week, I didn't plan on speaking on this subject, so my staff is probably wondering once again what their boss is going to say. But I was thinking that maybe we could translate a little bit of what we are trying to do with tax reform, because we talk about tax rates, exemptions, exceptions, and simplification—all this stuff that is important because it gets baked into the bill—but we don't spend a lot of time explaining why we are trying to do what we are doing.

The last time we had real, meaningful, impactful tax reform was back in 1986. That is when Republicans and Democrats came together and decided that the stagnant economy that I grew up in—I graduated from high school in 1978. I didn't immediately go to college. I moved away from home when I was 17 years old, and I was working. It was an economy that was not unlike today's. In many respects, it may have been a little bit worse. The environment was the same. Iran was behaving badly, and Russia was behaving badly. We had sort of the same sort of global environment that we have today. We had the threats that we have to confront every single day, and we had the threat to the future of a generation. I mean, literally, people had no earthly idea, if they were getting an education, whether they would be able to get a job because the job-creation numbers when I was 26 years old were terrible. People were worried about whether they could pay for college.

So why are we doing tax reform? We are doing tax reform because it is time for the American economy to grow back to what it is capable of doing, what it has done in the past.

We need tax reform so we can create economic expansion that lets us pay down our debt, which many people in the military say is the single greatest threat to our national security.

We need tax reform and we need to grow the economy because we owe it to this generation to have the same opportunities that I did.

It can be done, but we have to do it probably through reconciliation because right now, even though many of the proposals that we are putting forward—the tax rate and the kinds of policies we are putting forward have been supported by our colleagues and many of my friends on the other side of the aisle. For some reason, they don't make sense anymore. They made sense back in 1986 when Democrats and Republicans joined together to do tax reform. If you were in your midtwenties then, you saw prosperity unlike anything we have seen right up to today. That was the last time we saw great growth in our economy. We need to get back to providing those same sorts of opportunities.

People will tell you that we are not giving a cut to the little guy or the working man. Well, one thing you don't see when you see the percentage rates that we are talking about on individual tax rates that we are targeting is that there will be tens of thousands of people who will pay zero taxes. There is a actually a zero tax bracket. There are people who, because of the exceptions and exemptions that we are proposing, will actually fall below having a Federal tax liability. We need to talk about that.

We need to recognize that we have to provide relief to the entire spectrum, from the businesses that hire people and create jobs to the working families and the people who don't make enough where we can take any more away from them because they need it to pay their bills. They need to pay their electric bills, their utility bills, their school tuition, and all the other things that working families are struggling to do today, just as I was struggling to do back in 1986.

So I hope this Congress will deliver on the promise we made last year to cut taxes, to get this economy moving again, and to provide the same opportunities for the generation going to school and the people who aren't in school, who are struggling to make a living—the same opportunities that I got when I was that 26-year-old back in 1986. We can do it. I know we can do it because we have done it before. It is a promise we made and a promise we need to keep.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Pennsylvania.

NATIONAL HISPANIC HERITAGE MONTH

Mr. CASEY. Mr. President, I want to speak today with regard to a month we set aside—or I should say the equivalent of a month that spans two different months—as National Hispanic Heritage Month.

As many know, the United States is home to more than 56 million people of Hispanic or Latino ethnicity, comprising over 17 percent of the Nation's total population. We set aside September 15 to October 15 to mark National Hispanic Heritage Month. This month is a reminder of the vibrant culture and substantial contributions that people of the Hispanic community have made to our Nation. Although we have only a 30-day time period as a designation, we recognize the contributions made by Latinos in this country every day, not just between September 15 and October 15.

I have held a number of meetings with Latinos and Latino leaders this past year in Pennsylvania and here in Washington and recently just a couple weeks ago, as well, to discuss issues of concern to Hispanic Americans and Latinos. The resounding theme I heard from Pennsylvanians is the strong economic drive that Latinos and Hispanic Americans share.

As the second fastest growing minority in the United States, the Hispanic community's economic power continues to grow. Small businesses are the backbone of our economy both in Pennsylvania and across the Nation. Latinos are 1.4 times more likely than the general population to become entrepreneurs. In fact, Latinos own some 3.3 million businesses in the United States, accounting for more than 40 percent of all minority-owned businesses. Together, these businesses generate almost \$500 billion in economic activity. Overall, the Latino community accounts for a combined \$1.3 trillion in economic activity. Their contributions are projected to top \$1.7 trillion by 2020—from \$1.3 to \$1.7 trillion in just a few years.

Last month, I was proud to join many of my Senate colleagues in designating the week beginning September 18 as National Hispanic-Serving Institutions Week. This resolution recognizes the achievements and goals of the 472 Hispanic-serving institutions, known by the acronym HSI. These HSIs are throughout the Nation, and they improve their local communities and play a vital role in expanding access to college for students across the country. These HSIs represent 13 percent of nonprofit colleges and universities. Yet they enroll 63 percent of all Latino students. These Hispanic-serving institutions are located in 18 States and Puerto Rico. I am proud to be a co-sponsor of the resolution which recognizes the important work these institutions play in expanding access to higher education for everyone.

This year, Hispanic Heritage Month has become a month of advocacy and action. I would be remiss if I didn't mention the Dream Act. This issue has been on the forefront in recent discussions, not only among the Latino community, the Hispanic-American community but with many of my constituents across the board, and I am sure that is true in every Senate office.

Dreamers shared with me the hard work and struggles they have endured to be successful in this country. Ending DACA, in my judgment, is wrong. First of all, it is wrong to break a sacred promise to hundreds of thousands of people living in our country, young people who were promised by their government, if they came forward, they would be protected. Ending DACA would be breaking that sacred promise.

In Pennsylvania alone, estimates say that ending DACA would cost the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania nearly \$357 million per year in GDP losses to our State, and that is according to the Center for American Progress. Ending DACA would result in the loss of \$460.3 billion—not million but billion—from the Nation's GDP over the next decade, again according to the Center for American Progress.

So it would be a betrayal to violate this covenant with hundreds of thousands of young people, and it is really a bad move for the economy of my State of Pennsylvania and the economy of our Nation.

I was proud to vote for the DREAM Act in both 2007 and 2010, and I hope the Senate will have a clean vote on the Dream Act soon. We should be focused on humane and commonsense solutions that keep our Nation safe as well as allowing it to thrive. Hispanic Americans are a vital part of the fabric of American society.

With that, I yield the floor.

I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will call the roll.

The senior assistant legislative clerk proceeded to call the roll.

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the order for the quorum call be rescinded.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, The most powerful words in our Constitution are the first three words: "We the People." It sets out the mission statement for our Nation, or, as President Lincoln put it, a nation "of the people, by the people, and for the people." Our Founders did not start out our Constitution with "we the powerful" or "we the powerful and privileged." They didn't proceed to say that our form of government is all about the powerful and privileged ruling for themselves to make themselves richer at the expense of everyone else.

Thus, going back to the foundation, the vision of our Nation is appropriate because our Republican colleagues have put forward a document—a budget—with a tax plan that is all about government for the powerful. It is all about self-serving government for the privileged. There is nothing about fighting for a foundation for ordinary people to be able to thrive here in the United States of America.

Indeed, the plan put forward by my Republican colleagues is a plan fit for a king living in a gilded castle—maybe

fit for King Trump living in Trump Tower, but certainly not for working Americans living and striving to build the wealth of America. No, this is not a plan for them. This is a plan for the King Trumps of our Nation, who believe they can deceive the country again and again by putting forward an argument that they are going to do something to help the people while writing it for themselves.

We can take a look at this and realize that the President himself leads that effort to do the sales pitch when he unveiled his tax plan at the National Association of Manufacturers last week. President Trump said: "My plan is for the working people." He said: "There's very little benefit for people of wealth." And he went on to say: "I don't benefit. I don't benefit." He repeated it twice.

Well, as soon as you look at the tax plan, you see that this is wrong. He sent out his other Secretaries to reinforce his message. Secretary Mnuchin showed up on the shows and said: "The objective of the President is that rich people don't get tax cuts." Well, that is a little bit of lawyerly work there. He didn't want to confront the reality that this plan is all about tax cuts for the wealthy. So he said the objective wasn't to do that.

Well, let's talk about the reality. The bottom third economically here in America get zero help from the tax provisions in this plan—none whatsoever. Plus, the broader budget slashes Medicaid by about \$473 billion—you know, the one thing that has improved for working people. It has been tougher in a blue-collar communities to get a full-time job. It has been tougher to get a living wage. It has been tougher to save for retirement, with pensions disappearing and employer-supported retirement and savings plans disappearing.

One thing got better, and that is access to healthcare, thanks to ObamaCare. In my State, over half a million Oregonians gained access to healthcare. It didn't just help them; it helped everyone. The uncompensated care rate went way down in hospitals and way down in clinics, which meant stronger clinics and stronger hospital services for everybody in the State. Everyone benefited.

So the one thing that has improved for working America the Republicans in this Chamber wanted to rip it away—stomp on it, destroy it, shred it. They couldn't bear the thought that working Americans might finally have affordable, quality healthcare. They couldn't stand the vision of healthcare as a right. They wanted to return it to healthcare being only for the wealthy and the healthy, but not for ordinary working people.

Well, the bottom third is totally unhelped—in fact, hurt by this plan. How about the middle third? For the middle third—25 percent of the middle third—taxes go up, not down. The tax bracket goes from 10 percent to 12 per-

cent. For the seniors in middle America, this plan takes a trillion dollars away from Medicare. Not only do my Republican friends hate having healthcare for working people, but they want to destroy healthcare for older Americans at the same time.

So if the bottom third doesn't benefit and the middle third has taxes going up, who benefits here? Simple answer: It is the billionaires. The millionaires and billionaires of America are those whom this plan is written for.

Well, let's just look at the provisions that cost so much money to the Treasury. The alternative minimum tax is wiped out. Remember how the rich and powerful rigged the system so they were paying no taxes at all? We here in America established an alternative minimum tax, saying that, if you are wealthy, with a ton of money coming in the door, you should pay at least a little. The one tax return we have for President Trump shows he paid taxes because of the alternative minimum tax. That is the only reason he paid taxes.

So when President Trump says he doesn't benefit, clearly that is wrong. If he knows it is wrong, it is a lie. Let's just say he is either incredibly ignorant or trying to be incredibly misleading about the fact that this would benefit him enormously to get rid of the alternative minimum tax.

What is the second thing it does? Where it raised the tax rate at the lowest bracket for working Americans, it lowers the tax rate for the wealthiest Americans, from 39.6 percent to 35 percent. That is a huge reduction that benefits people at the very top, wealthy enough to be paying in the top bracket. Certainly, President Trump, by his own description of his own affluence, would be in that category. So clearly, he benefits enormously from that.

The third huge provision is getting a special rate for passthrough entities. Let's say you own a big development, like a shopping complex or a Trump Tower, and it generates a lot of money and you pass it through to pay your personal taxes from your limited liability corporation. Well, instead of being charged 39.6 percent, the current rate, or 35 percent, at the lower rate or at the corporate rate, no, you get this special deal on this passthrough of 25 percent. So you paid an enormous amount less.

Who benefits from this? Well, the people who own LLCs and pass through huge amounts of money are the ones who benefit from this. Who has a lot of LLCs? Who has, by various estimates, hundreds and hundreds? I heard an estimate that the President has over 500 LLCs. So if the President has hundreds and hundreds of LLCs, passing through income that is lowered from a 39.6-percent rate to a 25-percent rate—basically, a 15-percent reduction—he benefits enormously from this, as do all of his millionaire and billionaire friends.

Finally, there is the estate tax. This one, I have to admit, President Trump

doesn't benefit from today because he hasn't died. But when he dies, his estate would benefit massively. If he is taking out insurance to be able to pay his tax bill when he dies, then he has to take out less insurance. In that case, it does benefit him today. Most wealthy individuals do have that kind of insurance investment to pay the estate tax. A very small number of Americans fall into this category, and that very small number have a whole team of financial planners. That means that, yes, even though, technically, he wouldn't pay the tax benefit until he dies, he pays less for the preparation of paying that. As for the AMT, the lower tax bracket, the passthroughs, and the estate tax, the President benefits enormously from every single one.

There you have it. There is nothing for the bottom third. The middle third get hit with Medicare being slashed, and also with an increase in taxes for a good share of them, but the billionaires at the top benefit enormously. Let's be fair. The President understands this. His advisers understand it. His Cabinet is full of the types of individuals at the very top—the 1 percent, the 0.1 percent—full of the richest Americans. They wrote this plan for themselves and to hurt the rest of America. That is shameful.

There is another provision that the President has put in that probably helps himself, and that is cutting the corporate tax rate to 20 percent. It is keeping with the President's demonstrably false statement that the United States is the most taxed nation in the world. That is simply not true, as a percentage of GDP. We have seen the share of tax revenue that companies pay decline.

Here we have the argument that somehow there will be prosperity because we reduce the tax rate. Let's look at those companies that already pay less than 20 percent in corporate taxes because of the big difference between the nominal rate—the stated rate of corporations—and the reality of what they actually paid. A report from the Institute for Policy Studies analyzed 92 U.S. corporations that paid less than 20 percent in corporate taxes. Did they find that these firms have medium job growth of 20 percent? No. Ten percent? No. Five percent? No. Zero? No. It is negative 1 percent. There is negative job growth even though these companies paid less than 20 percent in corporate taxes, while the private sector job growth over those years as a whole was 6 percent positive. So those paying less than 20 percent had negative 1 percent growth, while the entire private sector grew with job growth at 6 percent. In fact, during that period, these 92 firms that were studied—in fact, just a fraction of them, or 48 of them together—eliminated basically about half a million jobs. They had very low taxes.

The argument is that they will do more because they don't have to pay as much taxes. They will expand the number of people they hire. But instead,

they slashed half a million jobs—just 48 of these firms that pay less than 20 percent.

What happened to the CEOs of those firms? Their salaries went through the roof. Part of the plan here is that you cut as many people as you can, and you have a net profit increase. Sometimes, even when you don't, you get a big increase.

So if we take this as a model of what the President wants to achieve, he wants to empower other companies to follow this track of having this model of slashing hundreds of thousands of jobs and jacking up the salaries of the already richest CEOs in the country. Who were these companies?

AT&T had an effective tax rate of 8 percent. Wouldn't that be nice for middle-class Americans, to have an effective tax rate of 8 percent? While they had that beneficial 8 percent tax rate, they slashed 80,000 jobs and doubled their CEO's pay to \$28.4 million. Think of how many ordinary working people would have a better life if they raised their pay by one dollar an hour. But no, the CEO slashes 80,000 jobs and raises to pay himself \$28.4 million.

How about GE, which boosted its CEO's pay nearly \$18 million in 2016, while cutting 14,700 jobs over 9 years and achieving a negative tax rate? A negative tax rate—get that. They didn't pay a dollar to the National Treasury—not a dollar. They had a negative tax rate. The company got more money back from the government than it paid in taxes.

How about ExxonMobil? Between 2008 and 2015, they had an effective tax rate of 13.6 percent. That is way below 20 percent. In that time period, did we see a significant growth in the number of people they employed because they got this hugely beneficial 13.6 percent tax rate? No, we did not. In fact, they cut their global workforce by a third. At the same time, the CEO of that company, who just happens to be our Secretary of State at the moment, saw his compensation grow to \$27.4 million.

The record shows that these companies that are getting these low tax rates are slashing their employees and boosting their CEO salaries. Is that the model that makes for a prosperous middle-class America, slash jobs and a dramatic increase of inequality in this country?

That is why this entire tax plan and the budget are so diabolical. It is everything contrary to "we the people." It is a vision of basically hijacking the National Treasury to inflate the wealth of the wealthiest in America, while doing as much harm as possible to working Americans, laying down a model on the corporate side of rewarding companies for slashing hundreds of thousands of jobs and inflating the salaries of their CEOs.

Here is the question every Member of this Chamber should ask: Is your priority adding more zeros to the bank balances of millionaires and billionaires? Is that your mission? Are you at

work here not representing the people of your State but just millionaires and billionaires? If you are, then you should be full-throated supporting the Republican tax plan and the Republican budget on the floor of this Senate. But if you believe in the mission of the United States of America, the "we the people" mission of providing a foundation for families to thrive across this land, then there is no choice but to take this budget and this tax plan and shred it, destroy it, burn it, put a stake through its heart in every way possible.

I, for one, believe in this mission of "we the people."

Thank you.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. TOOMEY). The Senator from Illinois.

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak as in morning business.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

DACA

Mr. DURBIN. Mr. President, there are many lobbyists around Capitol Hill. They perform the important task of informing Members and their staff about issues that are going to come before us. Some of them are volunteers, and some of them are paid very handsomely.

There is a special group of lobbyists who are roaming the corridors of Capitol Hill in the House and Senate today and tomorrow. They are young people from across the United States. Many of them are college students, and all of them have one thing in common: They are Dreamers. They are young people who came to the United States under the age of 18, many of them 2 years old, 4 years old, brought here by their parents. They grew up in this country. They went to our schools. Some of them were excellent students. Many of them have gone on to college—at their own expense many times. Some have even enlisted in our military. They have a nagging problem. The problem is that they are not legally citizens of the United States. They don't have legal status in the United States, and so the uncertainty about that status has led many of them to wonder what their future will be.

About 5 years ago, President Obama, at my urging, issued an Executive order that changed their lives. It was called DACA. It gave them a chance to come forward and register with the government, submit themselves to a criminal background check, get fingerprinted, pay a \$500 fee, have their background looked at in detail, and gave them a chance to stay in the United States for 2 years at a time, and in that 2-year period not be subjected to deportation and be able to work.

Four weeks ago, President Trump announced that the DACA Program was going to be rescinded. Many of these young people don't know what their future will be from this point forward. A number of them came out to the steps of the Capitol this afternoon to talk about their lives. Two in particular I wanted to mention.

Nathali Bertran from Columbus, OH, is a student who graduated from college after great sacrifice and has gone on to become an engineer. She is currently working in the Columbus area for a global automotive company. She has a bright future if she is allowed to stay in the United States. She doesn't know the answer to that because we haven't come up with a replacement for DACA, which was rescinded by President Trump.

Jesus Perez is from Tulsa, OK. He had given up on a college education and a future, and then DACA came along, and he decided he wanted to be a doctor. He is on his way. He has finished community college. He is now about to complete his studies at Oklahoma State, and he wants to go to medical school. He works as a transporter and a surgical orderly in a hospital to make enough money to stay in school. His future is completely in doubt because of the uncertainty around what is going to happen to those who were protected by DACA.

I have said many times that these young people were brought here by their parents. They didn't make the decision. I don't want to look negatively on their parents. If I were given a choice of skirting the law or even breaking the law to save my child's life or to give them security and safety, I know what I would do. I also know what these parents did. But the kids themselves were not in on that decision process.

Now, all they are asking for is a chance to be a part of the only country they have ever known. They got up in the classroom every day at school and pledged allegiance to the only flag they ever knew, and most of them can sing only one national anthem, the anthem of the country they believe is their own, the United States. That is an important part of this conversation.

If we believe in fairness and justice in America—and I think we do—we want to be fair and just to these young people. If they have not done something in their lives that is dangerous, such as commit a crime, for example, that is serious, they ought to be given a chance. If they are willing to go to school or to work or to enlist in our military, why wouldn't we welcome them in so that they can be a part of our future, as they should be. The alternative, in many cases, is to ship them back to a country they cannot remember or never really knew, to a language they don't speak. That is not the right outcome.

I want to thank LINDSEY GRAHAM of South Carolina. He is my Republican cosponsor of the Dream Act. Senator GRAHAM has been a stalwart. He and I may disagree on an issue every other day, but on this issue, we agree. We agree that America should step forward and do the right thing for these young people.

I hope these lobbyists—I will use that term—who are Dreamers, who are roaming the Halls of Congress, will

make the same impression on my colleagues that they made on me—that their special lives and their special future will make this Nation a better Nation in the years to come.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the Hargan nomination?

Mr. JOHNSON. Mr. President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The result was announced—yeas 57, nays 38, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 211 Ex.]

YEAS—57

Alexander	Ernst	Moran
Barrasso	Fischer	Murkowski
Blunt	Flake	Paul
Boozman	Gardner	Perdue
Burr	Graham	Portman
Capito	Grassley	Risch
Carper	Hatch	Roberts
Cassidy	Heitkamp	Rounds
Collins	Hoeven	Rubio
Coons	Inhofe	Sasse
Corker	Isakson	Scott
Cornyn	Johnson	Shelby
Cotton	Kennedy	Strange
Crapo	King	Sullivan
Cruz	Lankford	Thune
Daines	Lee	Tillis
Donnelly	Manchin	Toomey
Durbin	McCaskill	Wicker
Enzi	McConnell	Young

NAYS—38

Baldwin	Hassan	Sanders
Bennet	Heinrich	Schatz
Blumenthal	Hirono	Schumer
Booker	Kaine	Shaheen
Brown	Klobuchar	Stabenow
Cantwell	Leahy	Tester
Cardin	Markey	Udall
Casey	Merkley	Van Hollen
Duckworth	Murphy	Warner
Feinstein	Murray	Warren
Franken	Nelson	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wyden
Harris	Reed	

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Heller	Menendez
Cortez Masto	McCain	

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.

CLOTURE MOTION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Pursuant to rule XXII, the Chair lays before the

Senate the pending cloture motion, which the clerk will state.

The bill clerk read as follows:

CLOTURE MOTION

We, the undersigned Senators, in accordance with the provisions of rule XXII of the Standing Rules of the Senate, do hereby move to bring to a close debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

Mitch McConnell, Orrin G. Hatch, James Lankford, Jerry Moran, Johnny Isakson, John Thune, Thom Tillis, Shelley Moore Capito, Mike Crapo, James E. Risch, Mike Rounds, John Barrasso, John Cornyn, Chuck Grassley, John Boozman, John Hoeven, Rob Portman.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. By unanimous consent, the mandatory quorum call has been waived.

The question is, Is it the sense of the Senate that debate on the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, shall be brought to a close?

The yeas and nays are mandatory under the rule.

The clerk will call the roll.

The assistant bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. CORNYN. The following Senators are necessarily absent: the Senator from Mississippi (Mr. COCHRAN), the Senator from Nevada (Mr. HELLER), and the Senator from Arizona (Mr. MCCAIN).

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Nevada (Ms. CORTEZ MASTO) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. GARDNER). Are there any other Senators in the Chamber desiring to vote?

The yeas and nays resulted—yeas 62, nays 33, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 212 Ex.]

YEAS—62

Alexander	Flake	Perdue
Barrasso	Gardner	Peters
Bennet	Graham	Portman
Blunt	Grassley	Risch
Boozman	Hatch	Roberts
Burr	Heitkamp	Rounds
Capito	Hoeven	Rubio
Carper	Inhofe	Sasse
Cassidy	Isakson	Scott
Collins	Johnson	Shaheen
Coons	Kennedy	Shelby
Corker	King	Strange
Cornyn	Lankford	Sullivan
Cotton	Lee	Tester
Crapo	Manchin	Thune
Cruz	McCaskill	Tillis
Daines	McConnell	Toomey
Donnelly	Moran	Warner
Enzi	Murkowski	Wicker
Ernst	Nelson	Young
Fischer	Paul	

NAYS—33

Baldwin	Gillibrand	Murray
Blumenthal	Harris	Reed
Booker	Hassan	Sanders
Brown	Heinrich	Schatz
Cantwell	Hirono	Schumer
Cardin	Kaine	Stabenow
Casey	Klobuchar	Udall
Duckworth	Leahy	Van Hollen
Durbin	Markey	Warren
Feinstein	Merkley	Whitehouse
Franken	Murphy	Wyden

NOT VOTING—5

Cochran	Heller	Menendez
Cortez Masto	McCain	

The PRESIDING OFFICER. On this vote, the yeas are 62, the nays are 33.

The motion is agreed to.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the nomination.

The legislative clerk read the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System for the unexpired term of fourteen years from February 1, 2004.

LEGISLATIVE SESSION

MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to legislative session and be in a period of morning business, with Senators permitted to speak therein for up to 10 minutes each.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

INDONESIA

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I want to speak briefly about a recent report by the Secretary of State concerning, among other things, impunity within Indonesia's military. This has been a concern of mine, and of many others, for decades. Senate Report 114-290, which accompanies division J of the fiscal year 2017 Consolidated Appropriations Act, requires the Secretary of State to submit a report on steps taken by the Indonesian military to, No. 1, deny promotion, suspend from active service, and/or prosecute and punish military officers who have violated human rights, and to refine further the military's mission and develop an appropriate defense budget to carry out that mission; No. 2, cooperate with civilian judicial authorities to resolve cases of violations of human rights; No. 3, implement reforms that increase the transparency and accountability of the military's budget and operations, and achieve divestment of military businesses; and No. 4, allow unimpeded access to Papua; respect due process and freedom of expression, association, and assembly in Papua; and release Papuans and Moluccans imprisoned for peaceful political activity.

The Secretary submitted this report on September 12, 2017, and the information it contains is both disturbing and disappointing.

Indonesia became a democracy after many years of brutal, corrupt dictatorship under President Suharto. He had the unwavering support of the Indonesian military, which was responsible for widespread atrocities not only against Indonesian citizens who opposed Suharto but later against the

people of East Timor and Papua. He was also a Cold War ally of the United States.

Suharto is gone, and Indonesia has changed for the better. It remains an important ally of the United States, but no democracy can achieve its potential without an independent judiciary and security forces that are professional and accountable or that fails to defend such fundamental rights as freedom of expression and association.

While the Indonesian military is no longer the criminal enterprise it was during the Suharto period, impunity for past crimes remains the norm. As the Secretary of State's report notes, the Government of Indonesia continues to take inadequate steps to hold members of the Indonesian military accountable for human rights violations. One stark example includes the reemergence on active duty and promotions of several former members of the Special Forces' Rose Team, who were convicted in 1999 of kidnapping pro-democracy activists. In another deplorable incident, the Government of Indonesia appointed as the head of the Armed Forces Strategic Intelligence Agency a military officer who was convicted in 2003 for the murder of prominent Papuan civil society leader Theys Eluay.

Furthermore, military-related entities, such as foundations and cooperatives, continue to hold large amounts of land and other properties and businesses, despite the government's claim that the military has largely divested itself of private enterprises.

Military personnel are still not subject to civilian judicial authorities. Instead, they are tried by military tribunals which lack transparency and often grant much shorter prison sentences than any credible judicial authority would deem appropriate. Although four district courts are authorized to adjudicate cases involving human rights violations, none of them have heard or ruled on any human rights cases since 2005.

Simply authorizing changes or espousing rhetoric without following up with tangible action makes a mockery of the concept of reform.

Other findings in the report are also illustrative of a resistance to reform. For example, the report states, "Indonesian law provides that military prosecutors are accountable to the Supreme Court. In practice, however, they are responsible to the Indonesian Armed Forces for the application of laws."

With respect to the Moluccas and Papua, the report states that "according to international NGO reports, approximately 10 Moluccan independence activists, who were arrested in 2007, remain in custody. . . . In January 2015, a court sentenced Simon Siya, a leader in the Moluccan independence movement, to five years in prison on treason charges. He remains in prison. The court also sentenced seven others to two-to-three years for displaying a

banned separatist flag during a peaceful pro-independence demonstration in 2014. . . . NGOs in Papua continued to report widespread monitoring of their activities by intelligence officials as well as indirect threats and intimidation."

Accusing people of being traitors and imprisoning them for peacefully supporting self-determination is itself a violation of human rights.

Indonesia has come a long way since the dark days of President Suharto, but when it comes to military reform, it has fallen far short. In January 2018, it will be 10 years since Suharto's death; yet the military remains a largely opaque, unaccountable institution that has not even acknowledged the extent of its responsibility for past crimes. That needs to change.

REMEMBERING AUGUST "GUS" SCHUMACHER, JR.

Mr. LEAHY. Mr. President, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute to August "Gus" Schumacher, Jr., who passed away on September 24. Gus was an altruist who dedicated his life to discovering ways to help both farmers and those who are hungry, both here in the United States and abroad. His integrity, creativity, and his great courage over decades to sustain a passionate commitment to assisting the poor and hungry, as well as our farmers and rural communities, leaves an immeasurable legacy that will not soon be forgotten.

I have known Gus since his days in Massachusetts. From the first time I met him, it was clear his passion was infectious. He brought that passion and his creative ideas to us here in Congress when he was the Massachusetts secretary of agriculture. It was that passion that propelled Senator Kerry and me to craft the first legislation—which became law—to create a farmers' market coupon demonstration project in 10 States. In 1988, the first year of the demonstration program, we secured \$2 million in the Agriculture appropriations bill for the Women, Infants and Children, WIC, Farmers Market Demonstration Project. I was—and remain—proud that Vermont was one of those 10 States chosen for the initial WIC Farmers Market Demonstration Project. Now, nearly 30 years later, the program helps over 7 million nutritionally at risk women, infants, and children across the United States. None of this would have been possible without Gus's brilliant innovation, determination, and leadership.

Gus put into action his innovative ideas first in Massachusetts and then across the country and around the world with his work at the Foreign Agricultural Service and as Under Secretary of Farm and Foreign Agricultural Service. His work led to a greater emphasis on organizing direct marketing, farmers' co-ops, farmers' markets, crop diversifications, and expanding opportunities for farmer-owned packaging, distributing, and processing

facilities. More recently, his leadership and endless resourcefulness was on display through his work at Wholesome Wave. For Gus, the only things that mattered were that there were struggling farmers and hungry people who needed help. It did not matter where because Gus understood that hunger transcends all languages and cultures.

We were fortunate to have Gus come to Vermont several times, both during his work at the USDA and Wholesome Wave. During his visits with the USDA's Foreign Agriculture Service, Gus's unflinching public service was always on display. He came to meet with the farmers, the food processors, and the dairy co-ops. He came to help Vermonters improve their lives, and I will always be grateful for that.

His recent passing reminds all of us of the need to continue his fight. The fight for the hungry, for our farmers, and for the constant work of more fully realizing America's potential as both a great and a good nation. Gus believed, as should we all, that hunger should not exist in this country. We have the food and know-how to end it. Gus offered creative solutions to fight it. Now we need the political will to do it.

I ask unanimous consent that the September 27 Washington Post obituary that describes Gus's life and career be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the material was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From The Washington Post, Sept. 27, 2017]

GUS SCHUMACHER, A FORCE IN THE FARM-TO-TABLE MOVEMENT, DIES AT 77

(By Bert Barnes)

Gus Schumacher, a fourth-generation farmer and third-ranking official at the Agriculture Department, told the story of his epiphany about food hundreds of times.

It was the end of a summer afternoon in 1980 at a farmers market in Boston, and he was helping his brother load up his truck with unsold produce grown on their family property in Lexington, Mass. The bottom fell out of a box of pears, scattering the fruit into the gutter.

There, a young mother with two little boys eagerly gathered them into the folds of her unhemmed shirt. She was a single mom, she explained, dependent on food stamps, which back then made fresh fruit and vegetables prohibitively expensive for her. The pear spill was a bonanza.

For Mr. Schumacher, he would say later, it was a seminal moment in his life. He grew up on a farm, and it had never occurred to him that parents would find it hard to provide their children with fresh fruit and vegetables.

He would change it, he told himself.

Mr. Schumacher—who in a 50-year career also served as the Massachusetts commissioner of food and agriculture, a food project manager and agriculture development officer for the World Bank and finally a co-founder of a nonprofit group that tries to improve affordable access to fresh, locally grown food—died Sept. 24 at his home in Washington. The cause was an apparent heart attack, said his wife, Susan Holaday Schumacher. He was 77.

Since that farmers-market epiphany, Mr. Schumacher helped make food assistance programs more generous in allowances for fresh fruit and vegetables. He also became a force in the farm-to-table movement, encouraging restaurants and retail stores to buy produce locally.

In 2013, Mr. Schumacher received the James Beard Foundation's Leadership Award for "his lifelong efforts to improve access to fresh local food in underserved communities."

In Boston, the *Globe* wrote about a time several years ago when Mr. Schumacher, dining out at tony Hamersley's Bistro, sat down at a table, reached into a brown paper bag and pulled out a shiny, ripe red tomato. He asked for a serrated knife, olive oil and a plate, then proceeded to make himself a salad.

"Who's this guy who's making his own salad?" chef-owner Gordon Hamersley wanted to know. His own tomatoes came from California. Where had Mr. Schumacher's come from? "Twenty minutes from your doorstep," Mr. Schumacher said.

That scene, or a version of it, would play over and over again between 1984 and 1990 when Mr. Schumacher was agriculture chief for Massachusetts. He was always asking chefs whether they knew any farmers who could supply them food directly. He created market coupon programs for seniors and low-income families with children. He chastised breakfast diners for serving English jellies instead of American ones.

"Gus was instrumental in bringing two seemingly obvious groups together who never talked to each other—chefs and farmers," Hamersley told the *Globe*. "He's basically the architect of chefs featuring locally grown produce. As always, there was a team of people with him, but he was sitting in the chair."

The Washington Post reported on Mr. Schumacher's work with refugee and immigrant farmers all over the United States. He encouraged them to grow and market their native vegetables, such as amaranth. From New England, the New York Times reported, Mr. Schumacher made personal deliveries of Asian greens that included pea tendrils, Chinese chive blossoms and Cambodian spear-mint to the Washington restaurant TenPenh.

August Schumacher Jr. was born in Lincoln, Mass., on Dec. 4, 1939. He grew up on a farm in Lexington, and his father was one of the largest parsnip growers in Massachusetts. His grandfather and great-grandfather were farmers in New York City. They grew winter vegetables in glass-enclosed hot-houses.

Mr. Schumacher graduated from Harvard University in 1961 and attended the London School of Economics.

Over his career, he had a variety of consultancies, served as Massachusetts agriculture chief from 1984 to 1990 and was the USDA undersecretary of agriculture for farm and foreign agricultural services from 1997 to 2001.

Since 2008 he had served as founding board chairman of Wholesome Wave in Bridgeport, Conn., which seeks to increase access to affordable, locally grown fruits and vegetables.

His first marriage, to Barbara Kerstetter, ended in divorce. Survivors include his wife of 25 years, Susan Holaday Schumacher of Washington; a stepdaughter, Valarie Karasz of Brooklyn; and two grandchildren. A stepson, Andrew Karasz, died earlier this month.

(At the request of Mr. SCHUMER, the following statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD.)

VOTE EXPLANATION

• Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 210, the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 211, on the nomination of Eric D. Hargan to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.

Mr. President, I was unavailable for rollcall vote No. 212, on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Randal Quarles to be a member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. Had I been present, I would have voted nay.●

CONFIRMATION OF HALSEY FRANK

Ms. COLLINS. Mr. President, I wish to express my strong support for the confirmation of Halsey Frank to serve as the U.S. Attorney for the District of Maine. Mr. Frank has 30 years of experience working for the U.S. Department of Justice in Washington, DC, and in Maine, and he is highly qualified to assume this crucial law enforcement position. I thank the Senate for swiftly confirming him.

Mr. Frank is an intelligent, highly competent, experienced law enforcement professional. Mr. Frank has served as an Assistant U.S. Attorney for Maine for the past 17 years, during which he has shown an in-depth knowledge of our country's criminal justice system and significant experience in both criminal and civil law. In this role, he has prosecuted Federal crimes related to fraud, drugs, white-collar offense, violence, civil rights, and environmental violations. He has defended the United States in civil cases and handled numerous appeals. Prior to his current post, Mr. Frank was an Assistant U.S. Attorney for the District of Columbia, one of the country's largest offices, where he worked on a wide range of civil and criminal matters. He is presently a resident of Portland, ME, and a graduate of Wesleyan University and Boston University School of Law.

Based on his demonstrated proficiency and character, I have every confidence that Mr. Frank will successfully lead and coordinate local and Federal law enforcement activities in Maine to faithfully uphold our Nation's laws and ensure public safety and order. Throughout his long and distinguished career, Mr. Frank has shown a strong commitment to public service, and I am confident that he will serve the State of Maine and our Nation very well.

CONFIRMATION OF RALPH R. ERICKSON

Mr. VAN HOLLEN. Mr. President, I wish to support the confirmation of U.S. district judge Ralph Erickson to serve on the U.S. Court of Appeals for the Eighth Circuit.

Mr. Erickson received the support of both of his home State Senators, Democrat HEIDI HEITKAMP and Republican JOHN HOEVEN. Both HOEVEN and HEITKAMP submitted their blue slips for

Mr. Erickson, and the Senate Judiciary Committee unanimously voted to advance his nomination to the full Senate.

I hope Mr. Erickson's confirmation reinforces the importance of bipartisanship and the importance of maintaining the blue slip process. The Judiciary Committee has used the blue slip process since at least 1917, and the process is integral to maintaining the bipartisan nature of the Senate. Under both Presidents Obama and George W. Bush, even when a party had unified control of the Presidency and the Senate, if a home State Senator objected to a nominee, the nomination did not proceed. There have been recent discussions to suspend the blue slip tradition in order to force nominations through the Judiciary Committee. I encourage my colleagues to reject any such measures and to continue in the blue slip tradition.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE

At 10:22 a.m., a message from the House of Representatives, delivered by Mrs. Cole, one of its reading clerks, announced that the House has passed the following bills, without amendment:

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. An 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.

The message further announced that the House has passed the following bills, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1624. An act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as no lower than level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes.

H.R. 1918. An act to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2408. An act to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes.

The message also announced that the House passed the following bill, with an amendment, in which it requests the concurrence of the Senate:

S. 782. An act to reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Task Force Program, and for other purposes.

MEASURES REFERRED

The following bills were read the first and the second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

H.R. 36. An act to amend title 18, United States Code, to protect pain-capable unborn children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H.R. 1624. An act to require the appropriate Federal banking agencies to treat certain municipal obligations as no lower than level 2B liquid assets, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

H.R. 1918. An act to oppose loans at international financial institutions for the Government of Nicaragua unless the Government of Nicaragua is taking effective steps to hold free, fair, and transparent elections, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

H.R. 2408. An act to enhance the transparency, improve the coordination, and intensify the impact of assistance to support access to primary and secondary education for displaced children and persons, including women and girls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

EXECUTIVE AND OTHER COMMUNICATIONS

The following communications were laid before the Senate, together with accompanying papers, reports, and documents, and were referred as indicated:

EC-2970. A communication from the Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Equal Credit Opportunity Act (Regulation B) Ethnicity and Race Information Collection" ((RIN3170-AA65) (Docket No. CFPB-2017-0009)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2971. A communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, a six-month periodic report on the national emergency that was declared in Executive Order 13694 of April 1, 2015, with respect to significant malicious cyber-enabled activities; to the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs.

EC-2972. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Emergency Planning for Research and Test Reactors and Other Non-Power Production and Utilization Facilities" ((Regulatory Guide 2.6, Revision 2) (NUREG-1537 and NUREG-0849)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2973. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Regulatory Guides: 'Conduct of Nuclear Material Physical Inventories' and 'Statistical Evaluation of Material Unaccounted For'" (NRC-2017-0196) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2974. A communication from the Director of Congressional Affairs, Office of Research, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Physical Inventories and Material Balances at Fuel Cycle Facilities" (Regulatory Guide 5.88, Revision 0) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

EC-2975. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Treatment Under Section 956(c) of Certain Property Tempo-

rarily Stored in the United States Following Hurricane Irma or Hurricane Maria" (Notice 2017-55) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2976. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017-2018 Special Per Diem Rates" (Notice 2017-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2977. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Revised Guidance Related to Obtaining and Reporting Taxpayer Identification Numbers and Dates of Birth by Financial Institutions" (Notice 2017-46) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2978. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Replacement Period for Livestock Sold on Account of Drought" (Notice 2017-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2979. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Extension of Replacement Period for Livestock Sold on Account of Drought" (Notice 2017-53) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2980. A communication from the Chief of the Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, Department of the Treasury, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "2017-2018 Special Per Diem Rates" (Notice 2017-54) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on October 2, 2017; to the Committee on Finance.

EC-2981. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2982. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2983. A communication from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report relative to a vacancy in the position of General Counsel, Department of Health and Human Services, received during adjournment of the Senate in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 29, 2017; to the Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions.

EC-2984. A communication from the Librarian of Congress, transmitting, pursuant to law, the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for fiscal year 2016; to the Committee on Rules and Administration.

EC-2985. A communication from the Program Analyst, National Highway Traffic Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards; Electric-Powered Vehicles; Electrolyte Spillage and Electrical Shock Protection" (RIN2127-AL68) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2986. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Damascus (OSTT) Flight Information Region (FIR)" (RIN2120-AL07) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2987. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Falls City, NE" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9593)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2988. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Arkadelphia, AR" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0182)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2989. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Mason, MI" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0722)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2990. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; Pauls Valley, OK" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0184)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2991. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Amendment of Class E Airspace; West Plains, MO" ((RIN2120-AA66) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0165)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2992. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (12); Amdt. No. 3764" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on

September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2993. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (82); Amdt. No. 3763" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2994. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (106); Amdt. No. 3761" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2995. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Take-off Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments (99); Amdt. No. 3762" (RIN2120-AA65) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2996. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0339)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2997. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0809)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2998. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0560)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-2999. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-0451)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3000. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0533)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3001. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0808)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3002. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0308)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3003. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Ameri-King Corporation Emergency Locator Transmitters" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-6673)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3004. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; B/E Aerospace Protective Breathing Equipment Part Number 119003-11 and Part Number 119003-21" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0439)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3005. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-9184)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3006. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Bombardier, Inc., Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2016-8177)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3007. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0524)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3008. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0525)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3009. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0529)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3010. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Rolls-Royce Corporation Turboshaft Engines" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2011-0961)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EC-3011. A communication from the Management and Program Analyst, Federal Aviation Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting, pursuant to law, the report of a rule entitled "Airworthiness Directives; Textron Aviation Inc. Airplanes" ((RIN2120-AA64) (Docket No. FAA-2017-0608)) received in the Office of the President of the Senate on September 28, 2017; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following executive reports of nominations were submitted:

By Mr. THUNE for the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

*David J. Redl, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Communications and Information.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission for a term of seven years from October 27, 2018.

*Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission.

*Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary of Commerce for Oceans and Atmosphere.

*Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation.

*Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary of Commerce for Standards and Technology.

By Ms. MURKOWSKI for the Committee on Energy and Natural Resources.

*Bruce J. Walker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability).

*Steven E. Winberg, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary of Energy (Fossil Energy).

By Mr. JOHNSON for the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

*John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

*Nomination was reported with recommendation that it be confirmed subject to the nominee's commitment to respond to requests to appear and testify before any duly constituted committee of the Senate.

INTRODUCTION OF BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTIONS

The following bills and joint resolutions were introduced, read the first

and second times by unanimous consent, and referred as indicated:

By Mr. THUNE (for himself, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. ROUNDS, and Mr. BENNET):

S. 1913. A bill to amend the Federal Crop Insurance Act and the Federal Agriculture Improvement and Reform Act of 1996 to make the native sod provisions applicable to the United States and to modify those provisions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry.

By Mr. WARNER (for himself and Mr. SCOTT):

S. 1914. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act in order to strengthen rules in case of competition for diabetic testing strips, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. MARKEY (for himself, Ms. WARREN, and Mr. VAN HOLLEN):

S. 1915. A bill to provide for the development and use of technology for personalized handguns, to require that all handguns manufactured or sold in, or imported into, the United States incorporate such technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation.

By Mrs. FEINSTEIN (for herself, Mr. VAN HOLLEN, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, Ms. KLOBUCHAR, Mr. MARKEY, Mr. MURPHY, Mr. BLUMENTHAL, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. CASEY, Mr. REED, Ms. HASSAN, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. CARPER, Mr. CARDIN, Mr. COONS, Mr. FRANKEN, Mr. BOOKER, Ms. HARRIS, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Ms. HIRONO, Mr. SANDERS, Mr. LEAHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. SCHUMER, Ms. CANTWELL, Mrs. MCCASKILL, Mr. NELSON, Mrs. MURRAY, Mr. UDALL, and Mr. KAINE):

S. 1916. A bill to prohibit the possession or transfer of certain firearm accessories, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Mr. DURBIN, Mr. LEE, Mr. WHITEHOUSE, Mr. GRAHAM, Mr. LEAHY, Mr. FLAKE, Mr. BOOKER, Mr. SCOTT, Mrs. FEINSTEIN, and Mr. BLUNT):

S. 1917. A bill to reform sentencing laws and correctional institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SCHATZ (for himself, Mr. PAUL, Mrs. GILLIBRAND, and Mr. MERKLEY):

S. 1918. A bill to amend the Omnibus Crime Control and Safe Streets Act of 1968 to authorize a grant program to assist State and local law enforcement agencies in purchasing body-worn cameras and securely storing and maintaining recording data for law enforcement officers; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOOKER (for himself, Mr. MERKLEY, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. MURRAY, and Mr. CASEY):

S. 1919. A bill to end the use of body-gripping traps in the National Wildlife Refuge System; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

By Mr. BOOKER:

S. 1920. A bill to amend title 40, United States Code, to direct the Administrator of General Services to incorporate bird-safe building materials and design features into public buildings, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Environment and Public Works.

SUBMISSION OF CONCURRENT AND SENATE RESOLUTIONS

The following concurrent resolutions and Senate resolutions were read, and referred (or acted upon), as indicated:

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 281. A resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY):

S. Res. 282. A resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017; to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs.

By Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COCHRAN):

S. Res. 283. A resolution designating the week beginning October 15, 2017, as "National Character Counts Week"; considered and agreed to.

By Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, and Mr. BOOZMAN):

S. Res. 284. A resolution calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2017 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month"; considered and agreed to.

ADDITIONAL COSPONSORS

S. 251

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Pennsylvania (Mr. CASEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 251, a bill to repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board in order to ensure that it cannot be used to undermine the Medicare entitlement for beneficiaries.

S. 298

At the request of Mr. TESTER, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mrs. ERNST) was added as a cosponsor of S. 298, a bill to require Senate candidates to file designations, statements, and reports in electronic form.

S. 479

At the request of Mr. BROWN, the name of the Senator from Nebraska (Mrs. FISCHER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 479, a bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to waive co-insurance under Medicare for colorectal cancer screening tests, regardless of whether therapeutic intervention is required during the screening.

S. 832

At the request of Mr. CARDIN, the name of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) was added as a cosponsor of S. 832, a bill to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, and for other purposes.

S. 946

At the request of Mr. FLAKE, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 946, a bill to require the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to hire additional Veterans Justice Outreach Specialists to provide treatment court services to justice-involved veterans, and for other purposes.

S. 1015

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Hawaii (Mr. SCHATZ) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1015, a bill to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system.

S. 1498

At the request of Ms. COLLINS, the names of the Senator from Illinois (Ms. DUCKWORTH) and the Senator from Oregon (Mr. WYDEN) were added as cosponsors of S. 1498, a bill to establish in the Smithsonian Institution a comprehensive American women's history museum, and for other purposes.

S. 1632

At the request of Mr. MORAN, the names of the Senator from North Dakota (Mr. HOEVEN) and the Senator from Indiana (Mr. DONNELLY) were added as cosponsors of S. 1632, a bill to establish an additional fund in the Treasury to meet existing statutory obligations to reimburse costs reasonably incurred as a result of the reorganization of broadcast television spectrum, and for other purposes.

S. 1706

At the request of Mr. BOOKER, his name was added as a cosponsor of S. 1706, a bill to prevent human health threats posed by the consumption of equines raised in the United States.

S. 1718

At the request of Mr. KENNEDY, the name of the Senator from Missouri (Mr. BLUNT) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1718, a bill to authorize the minting of a coin in honor of the 75th anniversary of the end of World War II, and for other purposes.

S. 1724

At the request of Mr. WARNER, the name of the Senator from Michigan (Ms. STABENOW) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1724, a bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to establish a new tax credit and grant program to stimulate investment and healthy nutrition options in food deserts, and for other purposes.

S. 1757

At the request of Mr. CORNYN, the name of the Senator from Oklahoma (Mr. LANKFORD) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1757, a bill to strengthen border security, increase resources for enforcement of immigration laws, and for other purposes.

S. 1774

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Alabama

(Mr. STRANGE) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1774, a bill to provide protections for workers with respect to their right to select or refrain from selecting representation by a labor organization.

S. 1823

At the request of Mr. BLUNT, the name of the Senator from Louisiana (Mr. KENNEDY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1823, a bill to amend the Robert T. Stafford Disaster Relief and Emergency Assistance Act to clarify that houses of worship are eligible for certain disaster relief and emergency assistance on terms equal to other eligible private nonprofit facilities, and for other purposes.

S. 1827

At the request of Mr. HATCH, the name of the Senator from Iowa (Mr. GRASSLEY) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1827, a bill to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program, and for other purposes.

S. 1859

At the request of Mr. GARDNER, the name of the Senator from Georgia (Mr. ISAKSON) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1859, a bill to extend the moratorium on the annual fee on health insurance providers.

S. 1869

At the request of Mr. GRASSLEY, the name of the Senator from New Hampshire (Ms. HASSAN) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1869, a bill to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator.

S. 1874

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1874, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish certain demonstration grant programs relating to the demonstration of advanced distribution systems, smart water heaters, vehicle-to-grid integration, and granular retail electricity pricing, and for other purposes.

S. 1875

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1875, a bill to move the United States toward greater energy independence and security, to increase the flexibility, efficiency, and reliability of the electric grid, to increase the competitiveness of the United States economy, to protect consumers, and to improve the energy performance of the Federal Government, and for other purposes.

S. 1876

At the request of Mr. WYDEN, the name of the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) was added as a cosponsor of S. 1876, a bill to direct the Secretary of Energy to establish a program to advance energy storage deployment by reducing the cost of energy storage through research, development, and demonstration, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 211

At the request of Mr. TOOMEY, the name of the Senator from Arizona (Mr.

MCCAIN) was added as a cosponsor of S. Res. 211, a resolution condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya.

S. RES. 245

At the request of Mr. CRUZ, the names of the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. BOOKER) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 245, a resolution calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and for other purposes.

S. RES. 280

At the request of Ms. STABENOW, the names of the Senator from Maine (Mr. KING) and the Senator from Minnesota (Ms. KLOBUCHAR) were added as cosponsors of S. Res. 280, a resolution designating the week of October 2 through October 6, 2017, as "National Health Information Technology Week" to recognize the value of health information technology in transforming and improving the healthcare system for all people in the United States.

SUBMITTED RESOLUTIONS

SENATE RESOLUTION 281—URGING THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES TO ALLOW FOR THE FULL PUBLIC RELEASE OF ALL REMAINING RECORDS PERTAINING TO THE ASSASSINATION OF PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY THAT ARE HELD BY THE NATIONAL ARCHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINISTRATION AND TO REJECT ANY CLAIMS FOR THE CONTINUED POSTPONEMENT OF THE FULL PUBLIC RELEASE OF THOSE RECORDS

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the resolution urging the President of the United States to allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration and to reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 281

Whereas May 29, 2017, marked the 100th anniversary of the birth of President John F. Kennedy;

Whereas nearly 54 years have passed since the tragic assassination of President Kennedy on November 22, 1963;

Whereas the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 U.S.C. 2107 note; Public Law 102-526) (referred to in this preamble as the "Records Collection Act"), directed all Federal agencies to transmit to the National Archives

and Records Administration all records in their custody related to the assassination of President Kennedy;

Whereas former President and ninth Director of Central Intelligence George H.W. Bush declared in his signing statement for the Records Collection Act that "[b]ecause of legitimate historical interest in this tragic event, all documents about the assassination should now be disclosed";

Whereas the Records Collection Act established the Assassination Records Review Board to ensure that Federal agencies complied with the law;

Whereas the Records Collection Act established a deadline 25 years after enactment for the full public disclosure of all assassination records whose disclosure was postponed or that were subject to redaction;

Whereas the 25-year deadline for the full public disclosure of all remaining assassination records is October 26, 2017;

Whereas the Assassination Records Review Board uncovered records that were withheld from the staff of the President's Commission on the Assassination of President John F. Kennedy, the House Select Committee on Assassinations, and other Government entities;

Whereas the former Chairman of the Assassination Records Review Board has publicly commented that records held by the National Archives and Records Administration should be made public;

Whereas the National Archives and Records Administration holds approximately 3,100 fully redacted records and approximately 31,000 partially redacted records concerning the assassination of President Kennedy;

Whereas Congress declared in the Records Collection Act that all Government records related to the assassination should be preserved for historical and governmental purposes and eventually disclosed to enable the public to become fully informed about the history surrounding the assassination;

Whereas Congress declared in the Records Collection Act that legislation was necessary because the implementation of the Freedom of Information Act (section 552 of title 5, United States Code) by the executive branch prevented the timely public disclosure of records relating to the assassination of President Kennedy;

Whereas public opinion surveys suggest that a large majority of the American public supports the full release of all remaining assassination records;

Whereas Congress recently reaffirmed its commitment to transparency, accountability, and the public disclosure of Government records by enacting the FOIA Improvement Act of 2016 (Public Law 114-185; 130 Stat. 538), which codifies a presumption of openness;

Whereas there is legitimate interest from the academic community, historical researchers, and the general public in having access to withheld records for research purposes and general knowledge; and

Whereas the National Archives and Records Administration was formed to preserve and document Government and historical records and to increase public access to those documents: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate urges the President of the United States to—

(1) allow for the full public release of all remaining records pertaining to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy that are held by the National Archives and Records Administration; and

(2) reject any claims for the continued postponement of the full public release of those records.

SENATE RESOLUTION 282—COM-
MENDING THE NATIONAL AR-
CHIVES AND RECORDS ADMINIS-
TRATION AND ITS STAFF FOR
WORKING TO COMPLY WITH THE
PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY
ASSASSINATION RECORDS COL-
LECTION ACT OF 1992 AND RE-
LEASE ALL RECORDS RELATED
TO THE ASSASSINATION OF
PRESIDENT JOHN F. KENNEDY
BY OCTOBER 26, 2017

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself and Mr. LEAHY) submitted the following resolution; which was referred to the Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs:

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I request unanimous consent that the text of the resolution commending the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017, be printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the text of the resolution was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

S. RES. 282

Whereas the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 (44 U.S.C. 2107 note; Public Law 102-526) directed the National Archives and Records Administration (commonly known as “NARA”) to establish a collection of records to be known as the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection (referred to in this preamble as the “Collection”);

Whereas the Collection includes all Federal Government records relating to the 1963 assassination of President John F. Kennedy, including records of Presidential commissions, congressional committees and investigations, executive branch agencies, and the judiciary, in addition to a variety of donated historical materials;

Whereas NARA has compiled a JFK Master System database of 319,106 documents comprising 5,000,000 pages of assassination-related records, photographs, motion pictures and recordings, and artifacts; and

Whereas the processing team at NARA, including archivists and technicians from the Special Access and Freedom of Information Act staff, staff from the Office of Innovation, and Public Affairs staff, have worked diligently to fully release records related to the assassination of President Kennedy: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate commends the National Archives and Records Administration and its staff for working to comply with the President John F. Kennedy Assassination Records Collection Act of 1992 and release all records related to the assassination of President John F. Kennedy by October 26, 2017.

SENATE RESOLUTION 283—DESIGNATING THE WEEK BEGINNING OCTOBER 15, 2017, AS “NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS WEEK”

Mr. GRASSLEY (for himself, Ms. STABENOW, Mr. ALEXANDER, Mr. ENZI, Mr. DONNELLY, and Mr. COCHRAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 283

Whereas the well-being of the United States requires that the young people of the United States become an involved, caring citizenry of good character;

Whereas the character education of children has become more urgent, as violence by and against youth increasingly threatens the physical and psychological well-being of the people of the United States;

Whereas, more than ever, children need strong and constructive guidance from their families and their communities, including schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, and civic groups;

Whereas the character of a nation is only as strong as the character of its individual citizens;

Whereas the public good is advanced when young people are taught the importance of good character and the positive effects that good character can have in personal relationships, in school, and in the workplace;

Whereas scholars and educators agree that people do not automatically develop good character and that, therefore, conscientious efforts must be made by institutions and individuals that influence youth to help young people develop the essential traits and characteristics that comprise good character;

Whereas, although character development is, first and foremost, an obligation of families, the efforts of faith communities, schools, and youth, civic, and human service organizations also play an important role in fostering and promoting good character;

Whereas Congress encourages students, teachers, parents, youth, and community leaders to recognize the importance of character education in preparing young people to play a role in determining the future of the United States;

Whereas effective character education is based on core ethical values, which form the foundation of a democratic society;

Whereas examples of character are trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, citizenship, and honesty;

Whereas elements of character transcend cultural, religious, and socioeconomic differences;

Whereas the character and conduct of youth reflect the character and conduct of society, and, therefore, every adult has the responsibility to teach and model ethical values and every social institution has the responsibility to promote the development of good character;

Whereas Congress encourages individuals and organizations, especially those that have an interest in the education and training of the young people of the United States, to adopt the elements of character as intrinsic to the well-being of individuals, communities, and society;

Whereas many schools in the United States recognize the need, and have taken steps, to integrate the values of their communities into teaching activities; and

Whereas the establishment of “National Character Counts Week”, during which individuals, families, schools, youth organizations, religious institutions, civic groups, and other organizations focus on character education, is of great benefit to the United States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) designates the week beginning October 15, 2017, as “National Character Counts Week”; and

(2) calls upon the people of the United States and interested groups—

(A) to embrace the elements of character identified by local schools and communities, such as trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and citizenship; and

(B) to observe the week with appropriate ceremonies, programs, and activities.

SENATE RESOLUTION 284—CALLING ON CONGRESS, SCHOOLS, AND STATE AND LOCAL EDUCATIONAL AGENCIES TO RECOGNIZE THE SIGNIFICANT EDUCATIONAL IMPLICATIONS OF DYSLEXIA THAT MUST BE ADDRESSED, AND DESIGNATING OCTOBER 2017 AS “NATIONAL DYSLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH”

Mr. CASSIDY (for himself, Mr. MURPHY, Ms. WARREN, Mr. GRAHAM, Mrs. CAPITO, Mr. KING, and Mr. BOOZMAN) submitted the following resolution; which was considered and agreed to:

S. RES. 284

Whereas dyslexia is—

(1) defined as an unexpected difficulty in reading for an individual who has the intelligence to be a much better reader; and

(2) most commonly caused by a difficulty in phonological processing (the appreciation of the individual sounds of spoken language), which affects the ability of an individual to speak, read, and spell, and often, the ability to learn a second language;

Whereas dyslexia is the most common learning disability and affects 80 percent to 90 percent of all individuals with a learning disability;

Whereas dyslexia is persistent and highly prevalent, affecting as many as 1 out of 5 individuals;

Whereas dyslexia is a paradox, in that an individual with dyslexia may have both—

(1) weaknesses in decoding that result in difficulties in accurate or fluent word recognition; and

(2) strengths in higher-level cognitive functions, such as reasoning, critical thinking, concept formation, or problem solving;

Whereas great progress has been made in understanding dyslexia on a scientific level, including the epidemiology and cognitive and neurobiological bases of dyslexia; and

Whereas early screening for and early diagnosis of dyslexia are critical for ensuring individuals with dyslexia receive focused, evidence-based intervention that leads to fluent reading, promotion of self-awareness and self-empowerment, and the provision of necessary accommodations that ensure success in school and in life: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Senate—

(1) calls on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize that dyslexia has significant educational implications that must be addressed; and

(2) designates October 2017 as “National Dyslexia Awareness Month”.

AUTHORITY FOR COMMITTEES TO MEET

Mr. CORNYN. Mr. President, I have 17 requests for committees to meet during today's session of the Senate. They have the approval of the Majority and Minority leaders.

Pursuant to rule XXVI, paragraph 5(a), of the Standing Rules of the Senate, the following committees are authorized to meet during today's session of the Senate:

COMMITTEE ON BANKING, HOUSING AND URBAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Banking, Housing and Urban Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. to conduct a hearing entitled, “An Examination of the Equifax cybersecurity breach.”

COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE, SCIENCE AND
TRANSPORTATION

The Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation is authorized to hold an Executive Session during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. in room Hart 216.

COMMITTEE ON ENVIRONMENT AND PUBLIC
WORKS

The Committee on Environment and Public Works is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room Dirksen 406, to conduct a hearing on the following nominations: Michael Dourson, Matthew Leopold, David Ross, and William Wehrum to be Assistant Administrators of the Environmental Protection Agency; and Jeffery Baran to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL
RESOURCES

The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, after the first vote scheduled at 11 a.m., in room S-216, to hold a business meeting to consider the following nominations: Bruce J. Walker and Steven E. Winberg, to be Assistant Secretaries of Energy.

COMMITTEE ON FINANCE

The Committee on Finance is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9:30 a.m., in room Dirksen 215, to consider favorably reporting the Keep Kids' Insurance Dependable and Secure (KIDS) Act of 2017.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9:15 a.m., to hold a briefing "Ordered Departure of Personnel from the U.S. Embassy in Havana, Cuba."

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The Committee on Foreign Relations is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10:30 a.m., to hold a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON HEALTH, EDUCATION, LABOR AND
PENSIONS

The Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions is authorized to meet, during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 3 p.m., in room Dirksen 406 to conduct a hearing entitled "Department of Labor and National Labor Relations Board Nominations."

COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY AND
GOVERNMENTAL AFFAIRS

The Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m. for a business meeting.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4,

2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room Hart 216, to conduct a business meeting considering the following: S. 943, Johnson-O'Malley Supplemental Indian Education Program Modernization Act.

COMMITTEE ON INDIAN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Indian Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room Hart 216, to conduct an oversight hearing entitled "Doubling Down on Indian Gaming: Examining New Issues and Opportunities for Success in the Next 30 years."

COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY

The Committee on Judiciary is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate, on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 10 a.m., in room Dirksen 226 to conduct a hearing on nominations.

COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS

The Committee on Veterans' Affairs is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m. to conduct a hearing on pending nominations.

SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON AGING

The Special Committee on Aging is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 9 a.m. in room Dirksen 562, to conduct a hearing "Still Ringing off the Hook: An Update on Efforts to Combat Robocalls."

SELECT COMMITTEE ON INTELLIGENCE

The Select Committee on Intelligence is authorized to meet during the session of the Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017 at 2:30 p.m. in room Hart 219 to hold a closed briefing.

SUBCOMMITTEE ON WESTERN HEMISPHERE

The Committee on Foreign Relations Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere is authorized to meet during the session of Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 11 a.m., to hold a hearing "The Future of Iraq's Minorities: What's Next after ISIS."

SUBCOMMITTEE ON PRIVACY, TECHNOLOGY AND
THE LAW

The Committee on Judiciary Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law is authorized to meet during the session of Senate on Wednesday, October 4, 2017, at 2:30 p.m., in room Dirksen 226, to conduct a hearing "Equifax: Continuing to Monitor Data-Broker Cybersecurity."

PRIVILEGES OF THE FLOOR

Mr. MERKLEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that my intern Nissa Koerner be granted floor privileges for the remainder of the day.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

REQUIRING THE ADMINISTRATOR
OF THE FEDERAL EMERGENCY
MANAGEMENT AGENCY TO SUBMIT A REPORT

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the immediate consideration of Calendar No. 222, H.R. 1117.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the bill by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A bill (H.R. 1117) 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.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the bill.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered read a third time and passed and the motion to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The bill (H.R. 1117) was ordered to a third reading, was read the third time, and passed.

COMMEMORATING THE 25TH ANNI-
VERSARY OF THE 1992 LOS AN-
GELES CIVIL UNREST

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 147 and the Senate proceed to its immediate consideration.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 147) commemorating the 25th anniversary of the 1992 Los Angeles civil unrest.

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 147) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in the RECORD of April 27, 2017, under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL CHARACTER COUNTS
WEEK

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to the consideration of S. Res. 283, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 283) designating the week beginning October 15, 2017, as "National Character Counts Week."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution

be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 283) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

NATIONAL DYSLEXIA AWARENESS MONTH

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the Senate proceed to consideration of S. Res. 284, submitted earlier today.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The clerk will report the resolution by title.

The assistant bill clerk read as follows:

A resolution (S. Res. 284) calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2017 as "National Dyslexia Awareness Month."

There being no objection, the Senate proceeded to consider the resolution.

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be agreed to, the preamble be agreed to, and the motions to reconsider be considered made and laid upon the table with no intervening action or debate.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

The resolution (S. Res. 284) was agreed to.

The preamble was agreed to.

(The resolution, with its preamble, is printed in today's RECORD under "Submitted Resolutions.")

ORDERS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2017

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that when the Senate completes its business today, it adjourn until 9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 5; further, that following the prayer and pledge, the morning hour be deemed expired, the Journal of proceedings be approved to date, the time for the two leaders be reserved for their use later in the day, and morning busi-

ness be closed; finally, that following leader remarks, the Senate proceed to executive session and resume consideration of the Quarles nomination, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided between the two leaders or their designees.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

ADJOURNMENT UNTIL 9:30 A.M. TOMORROW

Mr. CRAPO. Mr. President, if there is no further business to come before the Senate, I ask unanimous consent that it stand adjourned under the previous order.

There being no objection, the Senate, at 4:29 p.m., adjourned until Thursday, October 5, 2017, at 9:30 a.m.

CONFIRMATION

Executive nomination confirmed by the Senate October 4, 2017:

DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES

ERIC D. HARGAN, OF ILLINOIS, TO BE DEPUTY SECRETARY OF HEALTH AND HUMAN SERVICES.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

TAIWAN'S NATIONAL DAY

HON. DENNIS A. ROSS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. ROSS. Mr. Speaker, in addition to congratulating the people of Taiwan on the occasion of their National Day this coming October 10, I would like to reiterate my strong support for both the Taiwan Relations Act (also known as the TRA) and the bilateral trade agreement between Taiwan and the United States.

Economic bonds between Taiwan and the United States have continued to grow due to various bilateral mechanisms and exchanges including: the Trade and Investment Framework Agreement, the Digital Economy Forum, the SelectUSA Investment Summit, the United States Business Day, and the Agricultural Trade Goodwill Mission. In 2016, two-way trade of goods between Taiwan and the United States exceeded \$65 billion, making Taiwan the United States' 10th largest trading partner.

Since 1993, Taiwan has maintained its spot on the list of the top seven countries importing U.S. agricultural products. Altogether, Taiwanese importers have purchased nearly \$30 billion in U.S. grain products. In 2016, Taiwan imported \$3.4 billion worth of U.S. agricultural products, roughly one-quarter of Taiwan's annual agricultural imports.

Taiwan is not only a valuable trade partner, but our nations have a strong relationship based on shared values of freedom, democracy, and human rights, as well as interests in enhancing peace, security and prosperity in the Asia Pacific region. I look forward to continue working with my colleagues to address the global challenges that face Taiwan and continue our prosperous relationship.

RECOGNIZING THE 106TH NATIONAL DAY OF TAIWAN

HON. SCOTT DESJARLAIS

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. DESJARLAIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to acknowledge the 106th National Day of the Republic of China, which falls on October 10th, and to extend my best wishes to the people of Taiwan.

The U.S. and Taiwan have maintained a close and mutually-beneficial relationship based on our shared values of freedom, democracy and free enterprise. The passage of the Taiwan Relations Act in 1979 has contributed to the peace and stability of the Asia Pacific region, and enabled the people of Taiwan to build a prosperous and democratic society. Since then, Congress has continued to play a strong role in bolstering our bilateral security, economic and cultural ties.

This close relationship was exemplified recently in the wake of Hurricane Harvey, when

the government of Taiwan not only offered their support but also donated \$800,000 to the disaster relief efforts. I would like to join my colleagues in recognizing this generous donation and offer my sincere thanks.

I extend my best wishes to the people of Taiwan as they celebrate their National Day and I look forward to continuing our strong relationship for many decades to come.

JILL BORSTELMAN KLAUSING

HON. FRANCIS ROONEY

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of an outstanding teacher in my district.

I stand today to celebrate Dunbar High School teacher Jill Borstelman Klausing of Cape Coral. She returned to the classroom after a 16-month hiatus due to stage 3 breast cancer. After months of extensive treatment, she is blessed to continue her passion of teaching.

Jill has devoted almost two decades to teaching intensive reading at Dunbar High School and has had a lasting impression to countless students. Her high energy and determination is unmatched and enhances the learning environment every day.

I wish her and her family the best as she continues her recovery. The students and faculty of Dunbar are in a better place with Jill in the classroom. This has been a challenging start to the school year, and I wish all our local educators the best.

HONORING MR. CLINTON PARKER

HON. ELIZABETH H. ESTY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. ESTY of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Clinton Parker, who was recently named a 2017 Hero of the Year by the National Association of Letter Carriers. Mr. Parker has proudly served as a mail carrier in Waterbury, Connecticut, but he has gone above and beyond the call of duty to help others in his community.

Mr. Parker has a long history of service to our country, and is a 30-year Army veteran. He takes his commitment to protecting others seriously, and on December 6, 2014, Mr. Parker helped first responders during a dangerous situation. A fellow veteran experiencing post-traumatic stress was in a standoff with police; and, at the request of the man's father, the police contacted Mr. Parker to ask for his assistance in diffusing the situation. While on his mail route, Mr. Parker accepted the call and bravely assisted police in a seven-hour standoff, which ended peacefully.

His friends and coworkers know Mr. Parker as a humble man who quietly serves his community, but his brave actions in Watertown, along with his decades of military service, speak volumes about his character and deep care for others. He stays in contact with the veteran he helped in 2014 as much as possible to ensure that he is getting the treatment and attention that he deserves.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Clinton Parker has served our country throughout his career, and he willingly steps up to help others at moments of crisis. His leadership, bravery, and selflessness are inspiring, and it is therefore fitting and proper that we honor him here today.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. JOSEPH CROWLEY

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, on October 2 and 3, I was absent for recorded votes No. 544 through 547. Had I been present, on Roll Call No. 544 I would have voted YES; on Roll Call No. 545 I would have voted YES; on Roll Call No. 546 I would have voted NO; and on Roll Call No. 547 I would have voted NO.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LUIS V. GUTIÉRREZ

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent in the House chamber for Roll Call vote 546 on Tuesday, October 3, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted Nay.

HONORING THE LIFE OF FORMER TORRANCE MAYOR DELORES "DEE" HARDISON

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of former mayor of the City of Torrance Delores "Dee" Hardison—a beloved wife, mother, and grandmother—who passed away on September 30, 2017, at the age of 79.

Born Delores Grinton on January 22, 1938, in Bellingham, Washington, Dee was one of nine children born to Walter and June Grinton. She graduated from Western Washington University in 1960, where she met her future husband, Lowell Hardison, who worked for Boeing. Dee later received a master's degree from California State University, Long Beach. She

• This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

taught at Lincoln High School in Seattle and moved to Reno, Nevada with Lowell. Dee and Lowell moved to Torrance, near what is now Sur La Brea Park, in 1967.

Dee began mobilizing the local community to persuade the city to build Sur La Brea Park. This successful campaign led to her service for almost a decade on the Parks and Recreation and Planning Commissions, while she also worked as a physical education teacher and later a special-education instructor for the Torrance Unified School District.

She was then elected to the Torrance City Council in 1986 and became mayor in 1994. During her time as mayor, she was visible and accessible to her constituents. In the days immediately after 9/11, Dee was at Del Amo Fashion Center talking to community members and offering her support during that difficult time. She oversaw the expansion of the Civic Center library, establishment of the Madrona Marsh Nature Preserve and redevelopment of Old Torrance.

Her outstanding public service extended to other community organizations. For more than 25 years, Dee was an active member of the Torrance Education Foundation and board chair for LINC Housing, a nonprofit group that builds housing for seniors and families throughout the state. She was the 2011 recipient of the Jared Sidney Torrance Award, which recognizes an individual's sustained service to the community and is considered Torrance's highest honor. She was also recognized as Torrance YMCA Woman of the Year, Switzer Center South Bay Woman of the Year, and a Cal State Dominguez Hills Distinguished Alumni.

Dee is survived by her husband, Lowell, her two sons, Mark and Brad, and two grandchildren whom I hope take comfort in the way Dee lived her life serving Torrance, the city that she loved. Torrance loved her back. May her memory be a blessing to us all.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. LYNN JENKINS

OF KANSAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. JENKINS of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I was absent for Roll Call votes No. 544 and 545 on the evening of October 2, 2017. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 1547, sponsored by Rep. MARTHA MCSALLY; I would have voted in favor of H.R. 965, sponsored by Rep. ANN KUSTER.

RECOGNIZING LINDA OXBY

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Linda Oxby, a longtime educator, coach, and mentor.

Ms. Oxby first found her love for coaching volleyball at Coal City High School where she spent her first five years in education. Eventually she moved to Edwards County High School in Albion, IL, where she taught and was an administrator for 28 years as well as

coached their volleyball team for 19 years. During her coaching career at ECHS, she amassed 633 victories and 5 trips to the IHSA State Volleyball Tournament. And in 2012, Edwards County High School renamed their gym to the "Linda Oxby Gymnasium" in her honor.

In 2011, Ms. Oxby was diagnosed with cancer, but remained dedicated to her community, school, and team as she continued to coach volleyball through her treatments. On September 28th, Linda Oxby passed away after a 6-year battle with cancer, leaving behind a legacy of compassion, respect, and service. While Linda Oxby experienced phenomenal success on the court, her number of victories is unparalleled to the number of lives she impacted as a coach, teacher, colleague, and friend.

I send my most heartfelt condolences to Linda Oxby's family, friends, and to the entire Edwards County School District. She will be missed dearly by all of those she has touched.

IN RECOGNITION OF KENNETH BIANCHI, 2017 LACKAWANNA COLUMBUS DAY ASSOCIATION ITALIAN MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kenneth Bianchi, who will be recognized as the Italian Man of the Year by the Lackawanna Columbus Day Association as they celebrate the 525th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America.

Born and raised in West Scranton to Deno and Frances Ranakoski Bianchi, Ken received his Bachelor's Degree in Education from Mansfield University and continued post-graduate studies at Penn State University. While at Mansfield, Ken played varsity basketball and spent one year as team captain.

In 1967, Ken began his teaching career in the Line Mountain School District in Northumberland County, Pennsylvania. He returned to Scranton a year later to teach history and physical education at Cathedral High School, where he served as Athletic Director. Ken went on to teach for the Scranton School District, where he remained until his retirement in 2004.

Ken was head boys basketball coach at Scranton Technical High School from 1976 to 1991. In 1997, he became the head coach for boys basketball at Abington Heights High School. During his coaching career, Ken has led his teams to victory 747 times, and they made the ELITE 8 in the state three times, with last year's squad ending up one of the Final Four teams in Pennsylvania. Ken's teams have won 22 straight District II playoff games and have won the District II Championship the past six years.

In 1985, Ken received a citation from the Pennsylvania House of Representatives when his Scranton Tech team won the Lackawanna League Southern Division Championship for the first time in twenty years. In 2005, the Scranton Times-Tribune recognized Ken as one of Northeastern Pennsylvania's top twenty-five coaches of all time. In 2006, he was inducted into the Northeast Chapter of the

Pennsylvania Hall of Fame. The Times-Tribune also honored Ken by naming him Coach of the Year in 2011 and 2016. He also received The Joseph M. Butler Memorial Award in 2016 in recognition of his contribution to Scholastic athletics.

It is an honor to recognize Ken for his outstanding career as an educator and coach. I am grateful for all the work he's done to shape young minds throughout his lifetime.

TRIBUTE TO JOANN EACCARINO

HON. JOE COURTNEY

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to recognize Ms. JoAnn Eaccarino upon her retirement from the Child and Family Agency of Southeastern Connecticut.

For 23 years, JoAnn served the Child and Family Agency of Southeastern Connecticut's school-based health centers through skilled and compassionate care for children, steady support for the centers' medical and behavioral health professionals, and integration of these services with the agency's child care, after-school, and outpatient behavioral health services. Prior to her service in the health centers, JoAnn served her country with distinction as a nurse in the United States Air Force from 1974 to 1977, before being discharged with a Commendation Medal at the rank of Captain.

Through her distinguished career, JoAnn has dedicated herself to improving the health and well-being of individuals in a variety of hospital, outpatient primary care, military, and private, non-profit settings. JoAnn has been a passionate, statewide advocate for improved access to quality medical and behavioral health care through her years of leadership within the Connecticut Association of School-Based Health Centers.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing Ms. Eaccarino's career-long dedication to improving the health status of Connecticut's children and families through compassionate, direct care and tireless advocacy.

IN RECOGNITION OF THE 100TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE BOROUGH OF KEANSBURG, NEW JERSEY

HON. FRANK PALLONE, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Borough of Keansburg, New Jersey as it celebrates its centennial this year. It is my honor to join with its officials and residents in commemorating this significant milestone.

With its beautiful shoreline and proximity to New York City, the area attracted visitors from the north that helped transform Keansburg from a fishing community to a resort town dating back to 1917. Over the years, its location and affordability, as well as the Keansburg Amusement Park, helped the borough develop into a year-round residential town.

Today, Keansburg continues to grow, revitalizing its business district, improving its recreational resources and expanding its community activities. Although the town was devastated by Superstorm Sandy in 2012, the community remains resilient and continues to rebuild. In 2016, the borough celebrated the opening of the new Joseph Caruso Elementary School, a 122,000 square-foot state of the art facility for kindergarten through fourth grade students.

In its 100th year, the borough is governed by Mayor George Hoff, Deputy Mayor Thomas Foley and Council members Arthur Boden, James Cocuzza, Sr. and Sean Tonne, Sr.

Mr. Speaker, I sincerely hope that my colleagues will join me in marking the 100th anniversary of the Borough of Keansburg and celebrating its rich history.

HONORING THE CAPITOL HILL JAZZ FOUNDATION

HON. ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation as it celebrates its inaugural annual event, Hill Fest, during Capitol Hill Jazz Week in the District of Columbia.

The Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation was conceived after recognizing a need for jazz in the Washington, D.C.-area and the unique historical and educational opportunities it provides to musicians.

The mission of the Foundation is to serve the Washington, D.C. jazz community by providing a weekly jam session, an annual jazz festival and arts advocacy on behalf of D.C. jazz musicians. The Foundation seeks to assist Washington, D.C.-based jazz musicians, venues and jazz education programs.

This week, the Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation celebrates its Hill Fest, which brings together musicians, community leaders and policy professionals to address policy concerns that directly affect musicians at the local and national level. Hill Fest will also serve as an outlet for local music vendors to be introduced to a broader audience.

Therefore, I ask the House of Representatives to join me in recognizing the Capitol Hill Jazz Foundation during Capitol Hill Jazz Week in the District of Columbia.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. ALCEE L. HASTINGS

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on Tuesday, October 3, 2017, I mistakenly voted NAY on Roll Call Vote 550 for S. 782—To reauthorize the National Internet Crimes Against Children Taskforce Program, and for other purposes. I intended to vote YEA on the measure.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. KAY GRANGER

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, due to personal reasons, I unfortunately missed votes on September 27th and September 28th.

Had I been present, I would have voted YEA on Roll Call No. 538, YEA on Roll Call No. 539, YEA on Roll Call No. 540, NAY on Roll Call No. 541, YEA on Roll Call No. 542, and YEA on Roll Call No. 543.

IN RECOGNITION OF ROSS MACCIOCCO, 2017 LACKAWANNA COLUMBUS DAY ASSOCIATION ITALIAN MAN OF THE YEAR

HON. MATT CARTWRIGHT

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CARTWRIGHT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Ross Macciocco, who will be recognized as the Italian Man of the Year by the Lackawanna Columbus Day Association as they celebrate the 525th anniversary of Columbus' discovery of America.

Ross is the son of the late Joseph and Julia Paris Macciocco and grew up on Cabrini Avenue in West Scranton. Ross is a graduate of West Scranton High School, Keystone Junior College, and East Stroudsburg University. Ross received his Bachelor's Degree in Health and Physical Education in 1972. After graduating from East Stroudsburg, Ross was hired to coach basketball by the Dunmore School District.

Ross began his coaching career at Dunmore High School in the 1980–1981 season and spent 28 seasons as Head Girls Basketball Coach. Over his tenure, Ross compiled 528 wins, 12 league championships, 7 District II Titles, and was runner-up in the 1994 State Championship. He coached three All-State players, and 24 of his players went on to compete at the collegiate level.

Ross then went on to be head coach for Scranton Preparatory School girls basketball team, where he spent 6 seasons. While at Scranton Prep he amassed 132 wins, three League Championship, one District Title, two Lynett Tournament Titles, and two AAA Elite 8 appearances. His Scranton Prep teams have had two All-State players and 10 former players went on to play college basketball.

Ross coached the Keystone State Games, Pocono Region Team in 1985–1986 and is a member of the Russell/WBCA 400–500 Victory Club. He was inducted in the Chic Feldman Hall of Fame in 2000 and the Local Chapter of the Pennsylvania Hall of Fame in 2005. He spent the 2016–2017 season as an Assistant Men's Basketball Coach at Marywood University and is currently the Boys' Varsity Assistant to Joe Ferguson at Stroudsburg High School.

Ross has been married to his wife Terry for 42 years. They reside in Dunmore, Pennsylvania. They have two daughters Tara and Jenna and three grandchildren Lucas, Mollie, and Jaxon.

It is an honor to recognize Ross as he accepts the Italian Man of the Year award by the

Lackawanna Columbus Day Association. I am grateful for all the work he has done to help our young athletes strive for excellence.

HONORING PULASKI COUNTY DEPUTY BRANSON EBER

HON. JACKIE WALORSKI

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mrs. WALORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Deputy Branson Eber of Pulaski County on his recent outstanding actions. Earlier this year, the Pulaski County Sheriff's Department awarded Deputy Eber with the Medal of Valor for the integrity and commitment he showed during a cross-county pursuit.

Deputy Eber went above and beyond to ensure the safe rescue of a fellow Hoosier. His remarkable actions led to successful communication between multiple agencies and saved a life. Deputy Eber's bravery, instinct, and commitment to service are exemplary characteristics of the men and women in our nation's law enforcement who work to keep our communities safe every day.

I am grateful for the hard work and dedication Deputy Eber has shown in his career in local law enforcement as well as in the National Guard. His spirit and courage are positive reflections on northern Indiana, and our community is a safer place to live because of his service.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Indiana's 2nd District, I want to thank Deputy Eber for his leadership, determination, and conviction. I commend the hard work of all our nation's police officers, first responders, and emergency dispatchers, and I applaud Deputy Eber's embodiment of law enforcement at its finest.

IN RECOGNITION OF MR. CEDELL BROOKS' RETIREMENT FROM THE KING GEORGE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

HON. ROBERT J. WITTMAN

OF VIRGINIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. WITTMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Cedell Brooks, a citizen of King George County and Virginia's First District, on his retirement from the King George County Board of Supervisors. Mr. Brooks has served his community well for decades. Mr. Brooks began his career in public service as the youngest African American to be elected to a County Board of Supervisors in the Commonwealth. Mr. Brooks leadership and service continued throughout his career on the Board with many important community projects including: the establishment of Shiloh Park recreational facility, relocation of a landfill to Sealston, construction of Fire and Rescue Company #1 in Courthouse and Company #3 in Fairview Beach, in addition to overseeing the establishment of Sealston Elementary School, King George Elementary School, and King George High School. Mr. Brooks also helped the County Fire and Rescue Department transition to a full-time force to better serve the community.

During his tenure, Mr. Brooks served as the Chairman of the King George County Board of Supervisors five times, and as a member of the King George County's Social Services' Board for 20 years.

I would like to thank Mr. Brooks for his many contributions throughout his 26 year career. I wish him, his wife Carolyn, and daughter Cayla, the best of luck in their future endeavors.

HONORING THE PROJECT SELF-SUFFICIENCY 30TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Project Self-Sufficiency, based in Newton, New Jersey, serving Sussex and Warren counties, on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary.

Project Self-Sufficiency was founded in 1987 with the core mission of improving families' lives by providing childcare, educating and helping single parents find jobs. Since 1987, the organization continues to stay true to its mission by emphasizing the importance of community. Project Self-Sufficiency's staff members live in the community and many, were once themselves, beneficiaries of its services.

The first Founding Board President, Michael J. Holub, played a huge role in creating the essence of Project Self-Sufficiency. Michael was a supporter in the early stages and helped nurture the project into an organization that works to enhance the lives of local community members every day.

One amazing story that comes to mind is Matthew. Matthew was 17 years old when he found out he had a daughter on the way. He knew this would bring many changes and he needed to, in his words, "man-up". He went from being a teenager sitting on his couch to working a wide variety of jobs. Even though he was making money, at 22, he still did not have his high school diploma. When Matthew joined New Jersey Youth Corps of Sussex, which at the time was a new program, he found the missing puzzle piece in his life. Through this program he was able to gain experience at his community internships and earn his GED. He graduated from the Youth Corps and his daughter was able to witness her father get his diploma and understand the power of education.

Project Self-Sufficiency has grown tremendously in the past 30 years in both the hearts and homes of residents in Sussex and Warren counties. The organization began with two staff members, who within the first year, were able to help 343 single parents and their children. Project Self-Sufficiency began as a small and passionate organization, which surpassed public expectations.

More than 25,000 families have been helped by Project Self-Sufficiency, not including the 30,000 children whose quality of life has improved immensely from this organization. Project Self-Sufficiency has helped 12,000 adults in the surrounding area in career training, and out of that number, 9,000 adults have been granted employment. This organization has conducted over 38,000 home

visits and has helped families in need receive services from Project Self-Sufficiency.

Project Self-Sufficiency has always put their clients first, which is what makes them continue to be the successful organization it is today.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Project Self-Sufficiency on the occasion of its 30th Anniversary.

INTRODUCTION OF POLICE CAMERA ACT

HON. STEVE COHEN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Police Creating Accountability by Making Effective Recording Act, also known as the Police CAMERA Act, a bill I introduced earlier today with more than a dozen of my colleagues here in the House and in coordination with Senators BRIAN SCHATZ and RAND PAUL who introduced the bill today in the Senate. If enacted, this bill would establish a grant program to assist state and local law enforcement with the deployment of body-worn camera programs.

Safe communities require good police.

Good policing requires public trust.

Unfortunately, in far too many communities, that trust has become strained.

In the wake of recent police shootings, our nation is facing sobering questions about the basic fairness of our criminal justice system. We face sobering questions about race.

Over the past several years, the wider availability of video has shined a much-needed light on police use of deadly force. Without video of places like North Charleston, Staten Island, Chicago, Cleveland, Baton Rouge, Tulsa and Falcon Heights, Minnesota the world might never know what occurred.

The more we see of these types of videos, the more we are left to wonder about all the incidents that were not recorded.

Had there been better video of the shooting of Darrius Stewart in my home town of Memphis, it might have helped to better inform the grand jury that, sadly, refused to indict the police officer who was responsible.

Justice is supposed to be blind, but it is not supposed to be blind to the facts.

Police body cameras can help provide evidence and restore some much-needed trust.

They can protect both police and citizens alike.

The vast majority of police are well meaning, dedicated public servants, and we depend upon them to keep us safe from criminals. They have dangerous jobs, as we have seen all too frequently.

But the fact remains some officers go beyond the law in a callous disregard for due process. Their actions damage the public trust that is essential for good police to be able to serve and protect our communities.

Police body cameras, alone, won't solve this problem. But they are an important step in the right direction.

I would like to thank Senators SCHATZ and PAUL for their leadership on this issue and for partnering with me on this legislation.

I also thank my colleagues who have signed on as cosponsors of this legislation and I urge

all Members to help pass the Police CAMERA Act quickly.

HONORING TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY IN NASHVILLE, TENNESSEE

HON. JIM COOPER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. COOPER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Tennessee State University for its 45 years of participation in the Federal Depository Library Program. Tennessee State University and its renowned library are not only invaluable to the Middle Tennessee community, but to America.

Tennessee State University has been a staple of the community for more than a century. Its library is unique and filled with knowledge. In 1945, Ms. Lois H. Daniel was appointed the director. She led the library for 31 years, reaching new heights and creating the Library Service Program to train school librarians. She also ushered in a new partnership in 1972 when Tennessee State University joined the Federal Depository Library Program.

Through the Federal Depository Library Program, Tennessee State University helps maintain access to government documents for the entire nation. It preserves history by storing and providing public access to our laws, rules, research, and other documents. The Library Service Program has thrived at Tennessee State University, and now it is leading the way in transitioning to the digital age. It is fitting that a historic university with a bright future should be a caretaker for our government's documents.

I would also like to honor the countless people that have helped grow the Library Service Program, including Dr. Evelyn Fancher, Dr. Yildiz Binkley, Dr. Murle Kenerson, Ms. Laverne Walker, Ms. Jessie Hughes, Mr. Crayton Dudley, Ms. Sharon Johnson, Ms. Sandra Peterson, Ms. Anita Etheridge, and Ms. Angel Sloss.

I am proud to celebrate Tennessee State University's Martha M. Brown/Lois H. Daniel Library. It has served our nation well during its first 45 years of public service as a Federal Depository Library.

HONORING BRIDGETTE BEATTY JONES

HON. STEVEN M. PALAZZO

OF MISSISSIPPI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. PALAZZO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mrs. Bridgette Beatty Jones, former District Office Manager of Mississippi's "Fighting 4th" Congressional District.

I am blessed with a team of professionals who hit the ground running when I first came to Congress in 2011. The transition to a new office could have been overwhelming but for the energy and leadership of Bridgette Jones leading the way for my team in the district.

One important aspect of Bridgette's work was planning and executing public events, such as the Congressional Art Competition,

our Salute to the Military, our Youth Leadership Summit, and our Military Service Academy Day. Today, on the occasion of our annual Academy Day, I salute Bridgette in appreciation for her passionate leadership of this event.

Like the nominees and academy cadets Bridgette worked with over the years, she too represents the qualities of an excellent academy candidate. In addition to her sharp, professional, albeit pint-sized, appearance, Bridgette possesses amazing intelligence, a devotion to serving her community, a powerful work ethic, seemingly endless athleticism—especially on the tennis court—and a noble character.

On my staff, she best understood the process of Academy Day, from coordinating with academy representatives and service members, schools, and families involved in the event, right down to the smallest detail. Bridgette's contagious enthusiasm was greatly appreciated, as she facilitated the work of the selection board and the cadet nominees who would come to represent our district at the academies.

For these reasons, and so many more, I am proud and grateful for the opportunity to honor Bridgette Jones, my friend and former District Office Manager on the House floor today. I wish her and her husband, Bud Jones, as well as their children, Paige and A.J., all the best for the future, and thank her for her service to South Mississippi. Bridgette will always be a member of Team Palazzo.

2017 MERIT SCHOLARS

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize seven students from my district who have received 2017 National Merit Scholarships.

The criteria that must be met to receive one of these scholarships is quite difficult. In fact, of the 15,000 finalists selected, only half will actually receive scholarships.

The recipients of this prestigious scholarship are Connor Schmidt of Ham Lake, Benjamin Caswell of Shoreview, Raffi Toghramadjan of Blaine, Rachel Cho of Blaine, Piper Christenson of Spring Lake Park, Catherine Lewis of Blaine, and Kenneth Truong of Coon Rapids.

Each one of these students has big plans for their future, which include careers in medicine, science, and engineering—all fields that are critically important to the success of our nation.

I congratulate each of these students on receiving this scholarship, and I look forward to watching them achieve great success in their respective careers.

Good work and good luck.

HONORING JACOBY CREEK ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

HON. JARED HUFFMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Jacoby Creek Elementary School, which was selected as a 2017 National Blue Ribbon School, in the Exemplary High Performing Schools category, by the U.S. Department of Education. This highly competitive award reflects outstanding academic achievement and the highest caliber of professional service and family and community engagement.

With over 400 students from a variety of socioeconomic and ethnic backgrounds throughout rural Humboldt County, Jacoby Creek Elementary School offers a well-rounded educational program that challenges its students academically in a safe and inclusive climate while fostering a lifelong love of learning. In addition to a staff dedicated to helping students meet their fullest potential, Jacoby Creek Elementary School's educational success is uniquely supported by extremely high parent and community participation in all aspects of the school program. The school has earned a strong reputation for academic excellence and prides itself on developing students who are kind, productive, and considerate citizens.

Mr. Speaker, this hard-earned distinction reflects a true community success. From the amazing students and their families to the staff, administrators, and extended community, Jacoby Creek Elementary School has developed an effective education model for the state and nation, empowering students of today to be the problem-solvers, inventors, and pioneers of tomorrow. Please join me in congratulating Jacoby Creek Elementary School on this impressive achievement.

HONORING THE CALDWELL PUBLIC LIBRARY'S 100TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the Caldwell Public Library, located in the Borough of Caldwell, New Jersey, on the occasion of its 100th Anniversary.

The forerunner of the present Caldwell Public Library dates back to the post-Revolutionary War era. Pioneers purchased books and founded a library in 1804. The number of books increased relatively few to over five hundred volumes in the ensuing years. As a result of personal or home ownership of books, the interest in the library waned, resulting in its dissolution in 1835.

In early 1894, Caldwell High School held a faculty meeting to discuss reading material for students. At that time, nothing was available except books owned by the residents in the community. After several meetings concerning this matter, the committee concluded that a library was needed for the students as well as for the greater public.

On December 4, 1894, the library opened its doors and the circulation for that first day

was thirty-five books. Patrons paid a very small fee to borrow books. For several years, this was the sole source of library revenue.

By 1907, Professor Hedden, Superintendent of Schools, requested the Caldwell Borough Council to submit to the voters a referendum to establish a free library under the State Library Act. The measure was ultimately accepted and approved.

On June 8, 1908 a letter from the Carnegie Library Foundation offered a sum of seven thousand five hundred dollars to construct a library. For the next nine years, the library board was confronted with problems, which hindered the construction of a new edifice. Acquiring a suitable location was the principal issue, until Mr. George W. Canfield of West Caldwell, generously donated \$2,000.00 toward the purchase of a site for the library. With the contribution, and donations from other interested persons, a total of \$3,000.00 was accumulated to purchase a new location.

On October 12, 1917 the Caldwell Library was formally dedicated. Mayor Peck, who, at the time, was President of the Library Trustees, was delivered the key of the building.

During the First World War, the Council of National Defense made an appeal for magazines and books for soldiers on transport ships. Miss Hasler designated the library as a collection center for books from this area. The public responded enthusiastically by donating more than five hundred volumes.

On Armistice Day, November 12, 1919, two bronze tablets, installed on each side of the front entrance of the Caldwell Library, were dedicated and unveiled during auspicious ceremonies. On Memorial Day and Veterans Day, the James Caldwell Post 185 of the American Legion, and various local veterans organizations conduct joint exercises at this memorial.

This event served as a turning point for Caldwell, in that the library became a focal point for the community; generating civic volunteerism. The "Friends of the Library," continue to this day to promote its goals.

The purpose and aim of Caldwell library is to meet the cultural and intellectual needs of the people of the area. It is with this goal in mind that the library hopes to continue and expand its services to the community.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating the Caldwell Public Library on the occasion of its Centennial Anniversary.

RECOGNIZING DOUG McCUMBER

HON. JOHN SHIMKUS

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Speaker, I rise before you today to recognize Doug McCumber for his leadership and service to his community of Tuscola, IL.

Doug graduated from Tuscola High School in 1967 and then the University of Illinois in 1971. After graduating from the University of Illinois, Doug began his 40 year career in banking and a life dedicated to his community. Over time, Doug served in many capacities such as the President of Tuscola's Rotary Club, Chamber of Commerce, and Community Development Corporation. Doug was also active in Tuscola's United Methodist Church as a member of its Board of Trustees.

An avid sports fan, Doug enjoyed cheering on the Illini and St. Louis Cardinals, but that was nothing compared to his love for all things Tuscola Warriors. In fact, most knew Doug as the "Voice of the Warriors" as he was the play-by-play announcer for Tuscola High School's football team for 43 seasons.

Doug McCumber passed away September 26th, remembered as a beloved family man to his wife and children, a devoted Christian to his congregation, and a public servant to the entire Tuscola community.

Mr. Speaker, I wish to send my deepest sympathies to Doug McCumber's family, friends, and all of those he impacted in service to his town.

HONORING THE NEW SHARON AND OSKALOOSA FIRE DEPARTMENTS

HON. DAVID LOEBSACK

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. LOEBSACK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor a group of firefighters from my district. Millions across the country watched Hurricane Harvey hit parts of Texas in late August, causing tragic loss of life and devastating damage to areas such as Houston. A group of Iowa first responders with a history of helping out during national disasters knew they had to help.

On Thursday, September 14th, members of the New Sharon Fire and Oskaloosa Fire Departments loaded up materials and drove twenty-two hours to Rockport, Texas to help a community in need. Over the course of their time in Texas, these volunteers worked tirelessly to help their fellow first responders clean up and recover from this storm. In a time of disaster, Iowans step up to help out those in need. To the volunteers from the New Sharon and Oskaloosa Fire Departments, I am in awe of your selflessness, and you have undoubtedly made a significant impact on a community devastated by Hurricane Harvey.

A CHIEF HISTORIAN

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to celebrate the renowned historian Dennis E. Frye for his dedication to preserving our nation's history and for his passion on sharing our history with anyone lucky enough to meet him.

Dennis Frye serves as the Chief Historian at Harper's Ferry National Historical Park. Dennis has authored several books on the Civil War and has lectured on the topic throughout the nation.

Recently, my staff had the good fortune of taking a tour of Harper's Ferry, led by Dennis. He not only gave them great insight into the battle that took place at Harper's Ferry, but he also gave them a wider understanding of one of the most tumultuous times in our nation's history.

As Dennis so aptly pointed out on their tour, while our nation's history has not always been

pleasant, it is critical that we never try to forget or erase it. If we do, then we have not learned from our history and we are more likely to repeat mistakes of the past.

I thank Dennis for sharing his knowledge and wisdom with my staff. They will never forget him.

IN RECOGNITION OF MID-CITIES TEXAS CHAPTER OF THE LINKS, INC.

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the Mid-Cities Texas Chapter of The Links, Incorporated as they are awarded the 2017 Community Service Award from the Pro-Duffers Foundation for their work to promote programs that provide services to protect, enhance and enrich the educational, economic, cultural and social aspects of the Dallas-Fort Worth Metroplex.

The Links was chartered on April 20, 1985 and has since expanded its association to 280 chapters worldwide with more than 14,000 predominantly African-American members globally. Led by President Billie Hawkins, the Mid-Cities Texas Chapter of The Links boasts a coalition of 50 professional women focused on a commitment to community, comradery, and communication. To commemorate their 30th anniversary, the Mid-Cities Chapter donated \$30,000 to six local charities whose mission, vision and work in the community aligned with the service focus areas of the chapter: services to youth, the arts, health and human services, and removing barriers for national and international African American leadership development.

In years past, the Mid-Cities Texas Chapter collaborated with The University of Texas at Arlington and The University of Dallas to develop programs encouraging K-12 students to consider careers in Science, Technology, Engineering and Math (STEM). The organization is also responsible for organizing Project ALERT (Alzheimer's Link to Education, Research and Treatment) with The University of Texas Southwestern Medical Center's Alzheimer's Disease Research Center helping educating African-Americans about the disease and the importance of participating in clinical trials. Additionally, the Mid-Cities chapter established the Sallye Moore Scholarship Funding, awarding more than 30 four-year college scholarships to graduating seniors, and funded school construction in South Africa among other service projects aimed at empowering the African diasporic community.

I honor the Mid-Cities Chapter of The Links, a dedicated community service organization.

CONGRATULATIONS TO THE HAZELWOOD CEMETERY

HON. BILLY LONG

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. LONG. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 150th anniversary of the Hazel-

wood Cemetery, which is located in Springfield, Missouri.

The Hazelwood Cemetery was officially dedicated on October 26, 1867, and was originally located several miles outside of city limits. However, despite the original location outside of the city, over the years Springfield has grown around the Hazelwood Cemetery.

On the 14th of October this year, the Hazelwood Cemetery will celebrate its sesquicentennial anniversary. 150 years of both history and service to the Springfield community will be celebrated on this day. The Hazelwood Cemetery honors John Polk Campbell, the founder of Springfield, John T. Woodruff, the visionary of Route 66 and many other notable members of the local Springfield community.

On behalf of Missouri's 7th Congressional District, I ask my colleagues to join me in recognizing the significant role the Hazelwood Cemetery has played in honoring the lives of the Springfield community.

OPERA AT FLORHAM 35TH ANNIVERSARY

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Opera at Florham, located in Fairleigh Dickinson University, in the Borough of Madison, New Jersey, on the occasion of their 35th Anniversary. From humble beginnings, this organization's mission is to educate and provide affordable operatic and related musical performances.

In 1982 Violetta DuPont co-founded the organization as an extension of Fairleigh Dickinson University's Music Department. Since then Opera at Florham has been providing outstanding operatic and other vocal selections from the American Song Book. Each performance features three outstanding vocalists who have performed across the country. To this day, Opera at Florham is New Jersey's only long running opera recital series.

Part of Opera at Florham's mission is to provide stage and role opportunities to young and upcoming artists. The inaugural Violetta DuPont Vocal Competition was held in 1987. This annual competition provides young operatic talent an opportunity to compete for cash prizes in front of judges and a live audience. In 1995, Opera at Florham became a 501(c)(3) non-profit charitable organization and continues to be affiliated with Fairleigh Dickinson University.

Opera at Florham is most known for its staged opera. Each season four musicales are performed in Lenfell Hall at Fairleigh Dickinson University, in the former residence of the Vanderbilt's and Twombly's. These musicales are priced affordably, yet feature high artistic excellence. These events showcase the drama, passion, music, and story that good opera is known for.

Mr. Speaker, I ask that you and our colleagues join me in congratulating Opera at Florham on the occasion of their 35th Anniversary.

IN RECOGNITION OF UNITED
COURT OF THE LONE STAR EM-
PIRE'S DALLAS CHAPTER

HON. MARC A. VEASEY

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the United Court of the Lone Star Empire (UCLSE) in celebration of over 40 years of service to the Dallas LGBTQ community.

The UCLSE is a chapter of the International Court System, one of the largest LGBTQ organizations in the United States. In 1986, the UCLSE hosted its first coronation and has since worked tirelessly to serve those in the Dallas Community affected by HIV/AIDS.

Members of the UCLSE have fiercely served the LGBTQ community by addressing the needs of those suffering from HIV/AIDS. Due to the work of fearless LGBTQ advocacy groups, like the UCLSE, they have made a long lasting impact on the local community. UCLSE serves to ensure that Americans of any sexual orientation are treated fairly, are granted equal access to healthcare, and retain equal protection of their rights under the law.

The generosity of the UCLSE extends not only to those fighting HIV/AIDS in North Texas, but also includes a host of other organizations across the country. UCLSE beneficiaries include the Aids Interfaith Network, Aids Services of Dallas, the Greg Dollgener Memorial Aids Fund, the Sharon St. Cyr Fund, the Legacy Founders Cottage and Counseling Center, and the Resource Nutrition Program.

Over the past 40 years, the UCLSE has raised over \$500,000 for its charity partners in the Dallas area. In addition to its efforts, the UCLSE also supports other local organizations with similar missions and endeavors through collaborative community efforts.

The UCLSE will honor the work of its inspirational members in October 2017 at its XLIII annual coronation in Dallas, Texas.

I honor the United Court of the Lone Star Empire, an institution of the Dallas and Texas LGBTQ community.

RECOGNIZING THE CONTRIBU-
TIONS OF MICHAEL LIEBERMAN

HON. JOHN CONYERS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. CONYERS. Mr. Speaker, I rise to honor the contributions of an extraordinary individual, Michael Lieberman, who in September celebrated 35 years at the Anti-Defamation League. Over his 35 year tenure with ADL, Michael has made invaluable contributions to the civil rights community on issues such as religious freedom, fighting anti-Semitism and all forms of discrimination, and striking the right balance between security and civil liberties.

As ADL's Washington Counsel, his advocacy for hate crime legislation is particularly noteworthy. Michael worked to secure passage of a comprehensive federal hate crimes law for more than 15 years. His leadership on this issue was instrumental in the passage of the Matthew Shepard and James Byrd, Jr.

Hate Crimes Prevention Act, which was signed into law by President Obama in 2009. Michael also chairs the Hate Crime Coalition for the Leadership Conference on Civil and Human Rights, the most important civil rights coalition organization in Washington, and is widely recognized as one of our nation's foremost experts on hate crime laws.

As ADL's point person on Federal and state response to bullying and bias-motivated violence, Michael has participated in a number of academic and law enforcement training seminars on the subject—including training at the FBI Academy at Quantico. He has written numerous pieces on the issue, including training manuals and articles for criminal justice and civil rights publications. In 2015 he received the Justice Department's 2015 Meritorious Public Service Award for his leadership work in building coalitions to combat hate violence.

Michael embodies ADL's mission. He works tirelessly to stop the defamation of the Jewish people and to secure justice and fair treatment to all. His entire career has focused on making the world a better place for all individuals, regardless of who they are or where they came from. He is a remarkable professional, mentor, and friend. Everyone that has an opportunity to work with Michael is constantly impressed by his drive and passion to make a difference. His work at the League has made an impact on countless lives, and we thank him for his substantial contributions to the community and our nation.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

HON. C. A. DUTCH RUPPERSBERGER

OF MARYLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. RUPPERSBERGER. Mr. Speaker, due to my attendance at an event off the Capitol Hill campus, I was unable to make Roll Call vote No. 545. Had I been present, I would have voted aye.

RECOGNIZING TAIWAN NATIONAL
DAY

HON. TOM EMMER

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. EMMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of the 106th national day of Taiwan. The United States and Taiwan have enjoyed a fruitful partnership for decades, and I would like to wish the people of Taiwan a very Happy National Day.

Our two countries' partnership has flourished thanks to a mutual commitment to democratic values and constitutional government. Through its many successful elections and commitment to an open election process, Taiwan serves as a strong example of democracy for not only the Asia-Pacific region, but also the world. Yet it is not just our commitment to democratic and constitutional values that ties our two countries together.

In 2016, Taiwan ranked as the United States' 10th largest trading partner and 8th largest export market for U.S. agricultural products. In fact, Taiwan is Minnesota's 5th

largest export market, with over \$450 million in exports sent to our friends in 2016. This is a relationship I am proud to support and urge my colleagues to find areas where our two countries can partner to our mutual benefit.

The framework for the United States' relationship with Taiwan, the Taiwan Relations Act and the Six Assurances, were crafted almost four decades ago, but our belief in their principles remains resolute. With continued commitment to this important relationship, I would like to again wish the people of Taiwan a Happy National Day.

HONORING THE NEW JERSEY
STATE CONFERENCE OF THE
NAACP

HON. RODNEY P. FRELINGHUYSEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commend the New Jersey State Conference of the NAACP as it holds its annual convention in the Township of Parsippany, part of New Jersey's 111th Congressional District. I am honored to have Morris County host the nation's oldest and largest civil rights organization. The New Jersey State Conference of the NAACP is commended for bringing together advocates in one place under the theme: "Relating to the Past, Understanding the Present, Preparing for the future."

The NAACP has more than 500,000 members throughout the world serving as key leaders in civil rights, campaigning for equal opportunity and conducting voter mobilization. New Jersey, the nation's most densely populated state, has 41 branches, 9 college chapters, a prison unit, 15 youth councils, and 2 high school chapters devoting its time, through volunteerism, to close the gaps of inequality in the many social issues challenging us today—health, employment, education, justice, media and the environment. New Jerseyans are working hard to ensure the legacies of the great Civil Rights Leaders before us, live on. Richard T. Smith, New Jersey's NAACP Chapter President, was just named one of New Jersey's "Most Influential African-Americans" in South Jersey Journal. In Richard's words, "we will fight for freedom until all people have realized the equal hand of justice." With esteemed commendation, I thank Mr. Smith for his leadership and wish the New Jersey State NAACP conference a successful convention and year ahead.

By bringing together the state's leaders in education, religion, business, health care, public policy, and social advocacy, the convention fosters the very conversations we need to be having in order to break down racial barriers, move the nation forward and reach equality for Americans once and for all.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR
CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS PROGRAM

HON. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last month, the President made

the irresponsible decision to rescind the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals program. DACA gives hundreds of thousands of young individuals the opportunity to come out from the shadows and contribute to our great country without fear of being sent back to a country that they barely know.

Juan Carlos Cerda, a community organizer with the Texas Organizing project and recent graduate of Yale has already seen firsthand how much of an impact this policy change can have. Due to an error in USCIS's system, Juan Carlos's DACA status was temporarily suspended in the fall of 2016. He was forced to take a leave of absence from teaching at an elementary school in the Dallas Independent School District. He was even denied access to volunteer on campus. If this is the havoc that rescinding DACA can have on one individual, imagine how it would impact the 113,000 recipients in North Texas and the 800,000 recipients across the country.

DACA has allowed Erik Burgos, a Store Systems Engineer and graduate of Southern Methodist University, the opportunity to assist local students in achieving their academic ambitions as he currently does in his spare time. Without DACA he would be forced into the shadows and would no longer have a meaningful impact on students' lives.

Because of the President's decision Maria Roman, Cynthia De La Torre Castro, and countless others would be prevented from pursuing the careers that they studied on university campuses across this great country. Bouzidi Najoa would be forced to return to a country where her family faced persecution by their government without her parents or siblings. Simply put, this policy change would not just drastically impact DREAMers, it would impact their friends, families, and communities.

Mr. Speaker, these people are no different than you or I. They go to the same schools with our children, they're involved with their local church groups, and work hard every day to ensure that they too can one day live the American dream. This is why we need to bring the DREAM Act to the floor and pass this important bipartisan piece of legislation. These DREAMers have only known one home. It's time for this Congress to step up to the plate and let these young people know that we want them to always consider America their true home.

CELEBRATING THE LIFE OF
KATHLEEN PEILING CHANG, MD

HON. TED LIEU

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise to celebrate the life of Kathleen Peiling Chang, MD, a physician, wife, mother, sister, daughter, Ironman triathlete, and tireless school volunteer. Kathleen left this world peacefully on Friday, July 28, 2017 after a six-year battle with breast cancer. She was the center of the universe to her loving husband, Teddy Chen, and their two sons, Matthew, aged 8, and Alex, aged 6. I have had the honor of knowing Kathleen and Teddy and their beautiful family for many years.

Kathleen was born in December 1976 and grew up in Southern California where she and

her sister enjoyed many trips to the beach and Disneyland. She attended the University of California, Berkeley, and after graduating with degrees in neurobiology and psychology, she earned her MD at the University of California, San Diego. Kathleen completed her pediatric residency and infectious diseases fellowship at Children's Hospital & Research Center Oakland. She married Teddy during her residency and after completing her fellowship, she practiced at Kaiser Permanente in San Jose.

During their time together Kathleen and Teddy embarked on many adventures, including triathlons, scuba diving in underwater caverns, hiking the lava fields of Kilauea, climbing Half Dome, and ice climbing on glaciers in Switzerland.

While pregnant with Alex, at 34 years old, Kathleen was diagnosed with stage I breast cancer. Alex was induced and born a few days early so that Kathleen could begin treatment. After recovering from chemotherapy and surgery, Kathleen went back to work, ran half marathons with Teddy, and focused on being a mother. But the cancer was relentless, and exactly two months after running the Orange County Half Marathon in 2013, she was diagnosed with stage IV cancer, with extensive bone metastases causing pathologic fractures in her spine, and unresectable liver metastases. Kathleen's oncologist didn't expect her to live through the end of the year, and discussed transitioning to hospice care. But Kathleen was strong and full of will to live for her children, and searched for a better alternative. She found hope with the help of Dr. Michelle Melisko, an oncologist at the University of California, San Francisco.

During the next four years, she went back to work despite the advice of her doctors, because that was what she trained to do and she wanted to help her patients. Each time she was forced to go on disability leave, many of her patients waited for her to return. She worked part-time, ostensibly to rest and take it easy on her days off. Instead, she filled those days off with volunteering at her children's school, and continued to be a supermom, somehow juggling motherhood, her medical career, and cancer treatment. Kathleen insisted on living life to the fullest. She did many things likely inadvisable for a stage IV cancer patient with extensive bone metastases and several pathologic fractures including vertebrae, ribs, and hip. She ran or walked several 5Ks, biked, skied, bungee trampolined, rode roller coasters, and other things that made her doctors cringe. She also had the chance to see her children finish second grade and kindergarten, and renew her wedding vows with Teddy as the children looked on.

The cancer, however, was implacable, notwithstanding Kathleen's efforts to live life to the fullest. She faced each heartbreaking setback with incredible strength and courage, all the way to the end. Kathleen is survived by her husband, Teddy Chen, their two sons Matthew and Alex, her sister, Jennifer, and her parents, Kuo-Cheng and Christine. She is also survived by her extended family from Kaiser Permanente and from her residency at Children's Hospital Oakland, who provided love and support during her travails. She is and forever will be greatly missed. Her extraordinary life was cut too short at 40 years old, but the things she did in life will ripple through the years to come.

IN RECOGNITION OF MRS. ALICIA
WOLFE WISECARVER

HON. DAVID G. VALADAO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 4, 2017

Mr. VALADAO. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank Mrs. Alicia Wolfe Wisecarver for her service to my office and the people of California's Twenty First Congressional District.

Alicia Wolfe was born on June 28, 1987 to Don and Mary Kay Wolfe in Anaheim, California. The Wolfe Family eventually settled in Clovis, California where she attended and graduated from Clark Middle School and Clovis High School. She has three siblings, her brother Christopher, sister, Laura, and her identical twin, Emily.

After graduating from Clovis High School in 2005, Alicia went on to attend the University of California at Los Angeles where she received two Bachelor of Arts Degrees in both History and Political Science in 2009. Alicia then returned to Fresno to obtain her Masters in History at California State University, Fresno in 2011.

In July 2013, Alicia joined my team as Constituent Services Representative. She quickly proved to be a valuable asset to my Congressional Office and earned the title of Constituent Services Director. During her time in my office, Alicia maintained an impeccable work record and set high standards of organization and customer service. She has an excellent eye for detail and was instrumental in the daily operations of my District Office. In addition to casework, Alicia was responsible for my U.S. Military Service Academy Program, where she helped students throughout California's Central Valley realize their dreams of attending a military service academy.

Alicia's willingness to reach out to the community created great relationships with local veteran organizations and federal agencies. She was respected by her peers and was able to create and foster connections with constituents, business leaders, and public officials, all of which are integral skills of Congressional Staffers.

On May 27, 2017, Alicia married her husband Mr. Lee Wisecarver in Kingsburg, California. Outside of work, the newlyweds enjoy spending time with family, especially their two dogs, Duke and Peter. Peter too, was part of our office family, serving as the unofficial mascot.

Mrs. Wisecarver's time with my office came to a close on September 1, 2017 so she may pursue her new career as a teacher at Buchanan High School in her hometown of Clovis, California. Knowing Mrs. Wisecarver, her character, and her work ethic, I have no doubt that she will achieve many great things in her future.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues in the United States House of Representatives to join me in commending Mrs. Wolfe Wisecarver for her public service to the people of California's Twenty First Congressional District and wishing her well as she embarks on the next chapter of her life.

MUNICIPAL FINANCE SUPPORT
ACT OF 2017

SPEECH OF

HON. VICENTE GONZALEZ

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, October 3, 2017

Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas. Mr. Speaker, this bill requires federal banking regulators to define municipal obligations as liquid, readily marketable and investment grade.

Defining municipal securities in this way will allow financial institutions greater flexibility to manage their liquidity requirements and use their capital resources more impactfully and effectively. In short, this bill goes a long way to strengthen the liquidity risk management of banks, savings associations, and bank holding companies.

This bill does all this by redefining what qualifies as "High Quality Liquid Assets". Currently HQLAs are defined as U.S. Treasuries, Government Debt, Investment Grade Corporate Debt, and Excess Reserves held by the Fed. Notably absent from that list are Municipal Securities.

Better public policy calls for such securities to be redefined as HQLAs. This is important, because Municipal Securities are issued for vital purposes such as transportation projects, housing developments, healthcare and recreational facilities, as well as bridges, schools and hospitals.

The current exclusion of Municipal securities from the HQLA definition reduces the eligible pool of potential purchasers of municipal

issuances. This results in increased borrowing costs for our state and local governments, especially during times of economic stress. Simply put, high quality liquid municipal bonds (issued by U.S. states and local governments) should not be viewed as inferior to that of foreign sovereign debt. In fact, our domestic municipal issuances often have superior credit quality and market liquidity than do many foreign issuances.

The exclusion also discourages banks and other financial institutions from holding investment grade municipal securities and is causing many bank holding companies and national banks to retreat from investing in such securities, thereby forcing state and local governments to scale back spending on roads, schools, and other infrastructure projects.

Various former governors of the Federal Reserve have already suggested that some local and state debt is comparable to that of very liquid corporate bonds. Chairman Yellen herself has frequently declared her support of the expanded treatment of municipal securities as HQLAs.

According to the American Society of Civil Engineers, our states and local governments expect to confront an infrastructure spending gap of over \$2 Trillion dollars over the next 10 years. Let's pass this bill now so that the American people get the country they deserve.

SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate of February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate com-

mittees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, October 5, 2017 may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

MEETINGS SCHEDULED

OCTOBER 18

10 a.m.

Committee on the Judiciary

To hold an oversight hearing to examine the Department of Justice.

SH-216

OCTOBER 25

9:30 a.m.

Committee on Armed Services

Subcommittee on SeaPower

To receive a closed briefing on the major threats facing naval forces and the Navy's current and planned capabilities to meet those threats.

SVC-217

Daily Digest

Senate

Chamber Action

Routine Proceedings, pages S6293–6325

Measures Introduced: Eight bills and four resolutions were introduced, as follows: S. 1913–1920, and S. Res. 281–284. **Pages S6320–21**

Measures Passed:

Federal Emergency Management Agency: Senate passed H.R. 1117, 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. **Page S6324**

25th Anniversary of the 1992 Los Angeles Civil Unrest: Committee on the Judiciary was discharged from further consideration of S. Res. 147, commemorating the 25th anniversary of the 1992 Los Angeles civil unrest, and the resolution was then agreed to. **Page S6324**

National Character Counts Week: Senate agreed to S. Res. 283, designating the week beginning October 15, 2017, as “National Character Counts Week”. **Pages S6324–25**

National Dyslexia Awareness Month: Senate agreed to S. Res. 284, calling on Congress, schools, and State and local educational agencies to recognize the significant educational implications of dyslexia that must be addressed, and designating October 2017 as “National Dyslexia Awareness Month”. **Page S6325**

Quarles Nomination—Agreement: Senate resumed consideration of the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System. **Page S6316**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 62 yeas to 33 nays (Vote No. 212), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6316**

A unanimous-consent agreement was reached providing for further consideration of the nomination at approximately 9:30 a.m., on Thursday, October 5,

2017, with the time until 10 a.m. equally divided between the two Leaders or their designees. **Page S6325**

Nomination Confirmed: Senate confirmed the following nomination:

By 57 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. EX. 211), Eric D. Hargan, of Illinois, to be Deputy Secretary of Health and Human Services. **Pages S6316, S6325**

During consideration of this nomination today, Senate also took the following action:

By 57 yeas to 38 nays (Vote No. 210), Senate agreed to the motion to close further debate on the nomination. **Page S6298**

Messages from the House: **Page S6318**

Measures Referred: **Pages S6318–19**

Executive Communications: **Pages S6319–20**

Executive Reports of Committees: **Page S6320**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages S6321–22**

Statements on Introduced Bills/Resolutions: **Pages S6322–23**

Additional Statements:

Authorities for Committees to Meet: **Pages S6323–24**

Privileges of the Floor: **Page S6324**

Record Votes: Three record votes were taken today. (Total—212) **Pages S6298, S6316**

Adjournment: Senate convened at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 4:29 p.m., until 9:30 a.m. on Thursday, October 5, 2017. (For Senate’s program, see the remarks of the Acting Majority Leader in today’s Record on page S6325.)

Committee Meetings

(Committees not listed did not meet)

EQUIFAX CYBERSECURITY BREACH

Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the Equifax cybersecurity breach, after receiving testimony from Richard F. Smith, formerly of Equifax, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia.

2018 BUDGET

Committee on the Budget: Committee began consideration of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, but did not complete action thereon, and will meet again at 11 a.m., on Thursday, October 5, 2017.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Commerce, Science, and Transportation: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 1885, to support the development of highly automated vehicle safety technologies, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1872, to authorize the programs of the Transportation Security Administration relating to transportation security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1015, to require the Federal Communications Commission to study the feasibility of designating a simple, easy-to-remember dialing code to be used for a national suicide prevention and mental health crisis hotline system, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute; and

The nominations of Ann Marie Buerkle, of New York, to be Chairman of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, and to be a Commissioner of the Consumer Product Safety Commission, Howard R. Elliott, of Indiana, to be Administrator of the Pipeline and Hazardous Materials Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, and Walter G. Copan, of Colorado, to be Under Secretary for Standards and Technology, Timothy Gallaudet, of California, to be Assistant Secretary for Oceans and Atmosphere, and David J. Redl, of New York, to be Assistant Secretary for Communications and Information, all of the Department of Commerce.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Energy and Natural Resources: Committee ordered favorably reported the nominations of Bruce J. Walker, of New York, to be an Assistant Secretary for Electricity Delivery and Energy Reliability, and Steven E. Winberg, of Pennsylvania, to be an Assistant Secretary for Fossil Energy, both of the Department of Energy.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Environment and Public Works: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Michael Dourson, of Ohio, to be Assistant Administrator for Toxic Substances, who was introduced by Representative Chabot, and Matthew Z. Leopold, of Florida, who was introduced by Representative Dunn, David Ross, of Wisconsin, who was introduced by Senator Barrasso, and William L. Wehrum, of Delaware, who was introduced by Sen-

ator Inhofe, each to be an Assistant Administrator, all of the Environmental Protection Agency, and Jeffery Martin Baran, of Virginia, to be a Member of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Finance: Committee ordered favorably reported an original bill entitled, "Keep Kids' Insurance Dependable and Secure (KIDS) Act of 2017".

PERSONNEL DEPARTURE FROM THE U.S. EMBASSY IN CUBA

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee received a closed briefing regarding the ordered departure of personnel from the United States Embassy in Havana, Cuba from Christian J. Schurman, Deputy Assistant Secretary and Assistant Director for International Programs, Bureau of Diplomatic Security, John S. Creamer, Deputy Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Western Hemisphere Affairs, and Charles Rosenfarb, Medical Director, Bureau of Medical Services, all of the Department of State; and an official of the intelligence community.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Foreign Relations: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Samuel Dale Brownback, of Kansas, to be Ambassador at Large for International Religious Freedom, who was introduced by former Representative Frank R. Wolf, and Michele Jeanne Sison, of Maryland, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Haiti, both of the Department of State, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

FUTURE OF IRAQ'S MINORITIES

Committee on Foreign Relations: Subcommittee on Western Hemisphere, Transnational Crime, Civilian Security, Democracy, Human Rights, and Global Women's Issues concluded a hearing to examine the future of Iraq's minorities, focusing on what's next after ISIS, after receiving testimony from former Representative Frank R. Wolf, 21st Century Wilberforce Initiative, Falls Church, Virginia; and Denise Natali, National Defense University Institute for National Strategic Studies, Washington, D.C.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Homeland Security and Governmental Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported the following business items:

S. 146, to strengthen accountability for deployment of border security technology at the Department of Homeland Security;

S. 1887, to grant expedited hiring authority to the head of an agency to appoint college graduates and post-secondary students, with an amendment;

S. 1886, to amend subchapter I of chapter 31 of title 5, United States Code, to authorize agencies to make noncompetitive temporary and term appointments in the competitive service, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1888, to amend title 5, United States Code, to increase the maximum amount of a Voluntary Separation Incentive Payment and to include an annual adjustment in accordance with the Consumer Price Index, with an amendment;

S. 1847, to amend the Homeland Security Act of 2002 to ensure that the needs of children are considered in homeland security, trafficking, and disaster recovery planning, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1867, to amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the Carl Levin and Howard P. “Buck” McKeon National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative;

S. 1884, to provide for joint reports by relevant Federal agencies to Congress regarding incidents of terrorism, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1281, to establish a bug bounty pilot program within the Department of Homeland Security, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1769, to require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1869, to reauthorize and rename the position of Whistleblower Ombudsman to be the Whistleblower Protection Coordinator;

S. 1305, to provide U.S. Customs and Border Protection with adequate flexibility in its employment authorities, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

S. 1791, to amend the Act of August 25, 1958, commonly known as the “Former Presidents Act of 1958”, with respect to the monetary allowance payable to a former President;

H.R. 3210, to require the Director of the National Background Investigations Bureau to submit a report on the backlog of personnel security clearance investigations, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute;

H.R. 70, to amend the Federal Advisory Committee Act to increase the transparency of Federal advisory committees; and

The nomination of John Marshall Mitnick, of Virginia, to be General Counsel, Department of Homeland Security.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Cheryl Marie Stanton, of South Carolina, to be Administrator of the Wage and Hour Division, who was introduced by Senator Scott, and David G. Zatezalo, of West Virginia, to be Assistant Secretary for Mine Safety and Health, both of the Department of Labor, and Peter B. Robb, of Vermont, to be General Counsel of the National Labor Relations Board, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

BUSINESS MEETING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee ordered favorably reported S. 943, to direct the Secretary of the Interior to conduct an accurate comprehensive student count for the purposes of calculating formula allocations for programs under the Johnson-O'Malley Act, with an amendment in the nature of a substitute.

INDIAN GAMING

Committee on Indian Affairs: Committee concluded an oversight hearing to examine Indian gaming, focusing on new issues and opportunities for success in the next 30 years, after receiving testimony from Jonodev Osceola Chaudhuri, Chairman, National Indian Gaming Commission, and John Tahsuda III, Acting Assistant Secretary, Indian Affairs, both of the Department of the Interior; Keeny Escalanti, Sr., Quechan Tribe of the Fort Yuma Indian Reservation, Yuma, Arizona; Harold Frank, Forest County Potawatomi Community, Crandon, Wisconsin; Leonard Forsman, Suquamish Tribe, Suquamish, Washington; and Ernest Stevens, Jr., National Indian Gaming Association, Washington, D.C.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on the Judiciary: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Stephanos Bibas, of Pennsylvania, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Third Circuit, who was introduced by Senator Toomey, Liles Clifton Burke, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, who was introduced by Senators Shelby and Strange, Michael Joseph Juneau, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Louisiana, who was introduced by Senator Cassidy, A. Marvin Quattlebaum, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the District of South Carolina, who was introduced by Senator Scott, Tilman Eugene Self III, to be United States District Judge for

the Middle District of Georgia, who was introduced by Senators Isakson and Perdue, and John C. Demers, of Virginia, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Department of Justice, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

EQUIFAX

Committee on the Judiciary: Subcommittee on Privacy, Technology and the Law concluded a hearing to examine Equifax, focusing on continuing to monitor data-broker cybersecurity, after receiving testimony from Richard F. Smith, formerly of Equifax, Inc., Atlanta, Georgia; Jamie Winterton, Arizona State University Global Security Initiative, Tempe; and Tyler Moore, The University of Tulsa Tandy School of Computer Science, Tulsa, Oklahoma.

NOMINATIONS

Committee on Veterans' Affairs: Committee concluded a hearing to examine the nominations of Melissa Sue Glynn, of the District of Columbia, to be an Assistant Secretary (Enterprise Integration), Cheryl L.

Mason, of Virginia, to be Chairman of the Board of Veterans' Appeals, and Randy Reeves, of Mississippi, to be Under Secretary for Memorial Affairs, all of the Department of Veterans Affairs, after the nominees testified and answered questions in their own behalf.

INTELLIGENCE

Select Committee on Intelligence: Committee met in closed session to receive a briefing on certain intelligence matters from officials of the intelligence community.

ROBOCALLS

Special Committee on Aging: Committee concluded a hearing to examine efforts to combat robocalls, after receiving testimony from Lois Greisman, Associate Director, Division of Marketing Practices, Bureau of Consumer Protection, Federal Trade Commission; Pennsylvania Attorney General Josh Shapiro, Harrisburg; Kevin Rupy, USTelecom, Washington, D.C.; and Genie Barton, BBB Institute for Marketplace Trust, Arlington, Virginia.

House of Representatives

Chamber Action

Public Bills and Resolutions Introduced: 26 public bills, H.R. 3937–3962; and 4 resolutions, H. Con. Res. 84; and H. Res. 555–557 were introduced. **Pages H7840–42**

Additional Cosponsors: **Pages H7842–43**

Reports Filed: There were no reports filed today.

Speaker: Read a letter from the Speaker wherein he appointed Representative Woodall to act as Speaker pro tempore for today. **Page H7753**

Recess: The House recessed at 11:07 a.m. and reconvened at 12 noon. **Page H7760**

Guest Chaplain: The prayer was offered by the Guest Chaplain, Imam Abdullah Antepli, Duke University, Durham, NC. **Page H7760**

Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children—Appointment: Read a letter from Representative Pelosi, Minority Leader, in which she appointed the following individual to the Alyce Spotted Bear and Walter Soboleff Commission on Native Children: Dr. Dolores Subia BigFoot of Norman, Oklahoma. **Page H7777**

Recess: The House recessed at 7:18 p.m. and reconvened at 8:45 p.m. **Page H7834**

Meeting Hour: Agreed by unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow, October 5th. **Page H7834**

Establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027: The House considered 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. Consideration is expected to resume tomorrow, October 5th. **Pages H7777–H7835**

Rejected:

Grijalva amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 1 printed in H. Rept. 115–339) that sought to invest \$2 trillion in 21st century infrastructure and jobs; including comprehensive immigration reform, which protects DACA, and provide \$200 billion for immediate hurricane disaster recovery efforts and climate change research (by a recorded vote of 108 ayes to 314 noes, Roll No. 553); and

Pages H7817–26, H7834–35

Scott (VA) amendment in the nature of a substitute (No. 2 printed in H. Rept. 115–339) that sought to make investments in education, job training, transportation and infrastructure, and advanced

research and development programs that accelerate economic recovery; protect the social safety net without cutting Social Security, Medicare, Medicaid, or SNAP; and reduce annual budget deficit to 2.7% of GDP by FY 2027 (by a recorded vote of 130 yeas to 292 nays, Roll No. 554). **Pages H7826–34, H7835**

H. Res. 553, the rule providing for consideration of the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) was agreed to by a recorded vote of 232 yeas to 188 nays, Roll No. 552, after the previous question was ordered by a yeas-and-nays vote of 231 yeas to 189 nays, Roll No. 551. **Pages H7764–77**

Quorum Calls—Votes: One yeas-and-nays vote and three recorded votes developed during the proceedings of today and appear on pages H7776, H7776–77, H7834–35, H7835. There were no quorum calls.

Adjournment: The House met at 10 a.m. and adjourned at 9:57 p.m.

Committee Meetings

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Agriculture: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 2936, the “Resilient Federal Forests Act of 2017”; H.R. 2521, the “South Carolina Peanut Parity Act of 2017”; H.R. 2921, the “National Forest System Vegetation Management Pilot Program Act of 2017”; H.R. 2941, the “Kisatchie National Forest Land Conveyance Act”; and H.R. 3567, to authorize the purchase of a small parcel of Natural Resources Conservation Service property in Riverside, California, by the Riverside Corona Resource Conservation District, and for other purposes. H.R. 2936 was ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 2521, H.R. 2921, H.R. 2941, and H.R. 3567 were ordered reported, without amendment.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Education and the Workforce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3441, the “Save Local Business Act”. H.R. 3441 was ordered reported, as amended.

AIR QUALITY IMPACTS OF WILDFIRES: PERSPECTIVES OF KEY STAKEHOLDERS

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Subcommittee on Environment held a hearing entitled “Air Quality Impacts of Wildfires: Perspectives of Key Stakeholders”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Energy and Commerce: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3921, the “HEALTHY KIDS Act”; H.R. 3922, the “CHAMPION Act”;

H.R. 1148, the “Furthering Access to Stroke Telemedicine Act of 2017”; H.R. 2465, the “Steve Gleason Enduring Voices Act of 2017”; H.R. 2557, the “Prostate Cancer Misdiagnosis Elimination Act of 2017”; H.R. 3120, to reduce the volume of future electronic health record-related significant hardship requests; H.R. 3245, the “Medicare Civil and Criminal Penalties Act”; H.R. 3263, to extend the Medicare Independence at home Medical Practice Demonstration program; and H.R. 3271, the “Protecting Access to Diabetes Supplies Act of 2017”. H.R. 2465, H.R. 3120, and H.R. 3245 were ordered reported, without amendment. H.R. 1148, H.R. 2557, H.R. 3263, H.R. 3271, H.R. 3921, and H.R. 3923 were ordered reported, as amended.

EXAMINING THE SEC’S AGENDA, OPERATIONS, AND BUDGET

Committee on Financial Services: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Examining the SEC’s Agenda, Operations, and Budget”. Testimony was heard from Jay Clayton, Chairman, Securities and Exchange Commission.

STATE DEPARTMENT’S ANTITERRORISM ASSISTANCE PROGRAM: THE GAO REVIEW

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on the Middle East and North Africa held a hearing entitled “State Department’s Antiterrorism Assistance Program: The GAO Review”. Testimony was heard from Jason Bair, Acting Director, International Affairs and Trade, Government Accountability Office.

IRANIAN BACKED MILITIAS: DESTABILIZING THE MIDDLE EAST

Committee on Foreign Affairs: Subcommittee on Terrorism, Nonproliferation, and Trade held a hearing entitled “Iranian Backed Militias: Destabilizing the Middle East”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Homeland Security: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 3548, the “Border Security for America Act of 2017”. H.R. 3548 was ordered reported, as amended.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Full Committee concluded markup on H.R. 210, the “Native American Energy Act”; H.R. 424, the “Gray Wolf State Management Act of 2017”; H.R. 717, the “Listing Reform Act”; H.R. 1274, the “State, Tribal and Local Species Transparency and Recovery Act”; H.R. 1488, the “Indiana Dunes National Park Act”; H.R. 2600, to provide for the conveyance to the State of Iowa of the reversionary interest held by the United States

in certain land in Pottawattamie County, Iowa, and for other purposes; H.R. 2603, the “SAVES Act”; H.R. 2897, to authorize the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Director of the National Park Service to enter into cooperative management agreements for the operation, maintenance, and management of units of the National Park System in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes; and H.R. 3131, the “Endangered Species Litigation Reasonableness Act”. H.R. 210, H.R. 1274, H.R. 1488, H.R. 2600, and H.R. 2603 were ordered reported, as amended. H.R. 424, H.R. 717, H.R. 2897, and H.R. 3131 were ordered reported, without amendment.

LEGISLATIVE MEASURES

Committee on Natural Resources: Subcommittee on Indian, Insular and Alaska Native Affairs held a hearing on H.R. 146, the “Eastern Band Cherokee Historic Lands Reacquisition Act”; H.R. 2402, the “San Juan County Settlement Implementation Act”; and H.R. 2606, the “Stigler Act Amendments of 2017”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

POWERING EXPLORATION: AN UPDATE ON RADIOISOTOPE PRODUCTION AND LESSONS LEARNED FROM CASSINI

Committee on Science, Space, and Technology: Subcommittee on Space held a hearing entitled “Powering Exploration: An Update on Radioisotope Production and Lessons Learned from Cassini”. Testimony was heard from David Schurr, Deputy Director, Planetary Science Division, National Aeronautics and Space Administration; Tracey Bishop, Deputy Assistant Secretary for Nuclear Infrastructure Programs, Office of Nuclear Energy, Department of Energy; Shelby Oakley, Director, Acquisition and Sourcing Management, Government Accountability Office; and a public witness.

SMALL BUSINESS TAX REFORM: MODERNIZING THE CODE FOR THE NATION’S JOB CREATORS

Committee on Small Business: Full Committee held a hearing entitled “Small Business Tax Reform: Modernizing the Code for the Nation’s Job Creators”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

BUILDING A 21ST CENTURY INFRASTRUCTURE FOR AMERICA: RAIL STAKEHOLDERS’ PERSPECTIVES

Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure: Subcommittee on Railroads, Pipelines, and Hazardous Materials held a hearing entitled “Building a 21st Century Infrastructure for America: Rail Stakeholders’ Perspectives”. Testimony was heard from public witnesses.

IRS REFORM: CHALLENGES TO MODERNIZING IT INFRASTRUCTURE

Committee on Ways and Means: Subcommittee on Oversight held a hearing entitled “IRS Reform: Challenges to Modernizing IT Infrastructure”. Testimony was heard from Jeffrey Tribiano, Deputy Commissioner for Operations Support, Internal Revenue Service; Gina Garza, Chief Information Officer, Internal Revenue Service; Danny Verneuille, Assistant Inspector General for Security and Information Technology Services, Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration; and David Powner, Director, IT Management Issues, Government Accountability Office.

MISCELLANEOUS MEASURE

Committee on Ways and Means: Full Committee held a markup on H.R. 849, the “Protecting Seniors’ Access to Medicare Act of 2017”. H.R. 849 was ordered reported, as amended.

Joint Meetings

No joint committee meetings were held.

COMMITTEE MEETINGS FOR THURSDAY, OCTOBER 5, 2017

(Committee meetings are open unless otherwise indicated)

Senate

Committee on Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Gregory Ibach, of Nebraska, to be Under Secretary for Marketing and Regulatory Programs, and William Northey, of Iowa, to be Under Secretary for Farm and Foreign Agricultural Services, both of the Department of Agriculture, 9:30 a.m., SR-328A.

Committee on the Budget: business meeting to continue to markup the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, 11 a.m., SH-216.

Committee on Environment and Public Works: to hold hearings to examine the nomination of Paul Trombino III, of Wisconsin, to be Administrator of the Federal Highway Administration, Department of Transportation, 9:30 a.m., SD-406.

Committee on Finance: to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Jeffrey Gerrish, of Maryland, to be a Deputy United States Trade Representative (Asia, Europe, the Middle East, and Industrial Competitiveness), Department of State, Gregory Doud, of Kansas, to be Chief Agricultural Negotiator, Office of the United States Trade Representative, and Jason Kearns, of Colorado, to be a Member of the United States International Trade Commission, 10 a.m., SD-215.

Committee on Foreign Relations: business meeting to consider S. 832, to enhance the transparency and accelerate the impact of programs under the African Growth and

Opportunity Act and the Millennium Challenge Corporation, S. Res. 245, calling on the Government of Iran to release unjustly detained United States citizens and legal permanent resident aliens, and S. Res. 211, condemning the violence and persecution in Chechnya, 9:30 a.m., SD-419.

Full Committee, to hold hearings to examine the nominations of Carla Sands, of California, to be Ambassador to the Kingdom of Denmark, and W. Robert Kohorst, of California, to be Ambassador to the Republic of Croatia, both of the Department of State, 2:30 p.m., SD-419.

Committee on Health, Education, Labor, and Pensions: to hold hearings to examine the Federal response to the opioid crisis, 10 a.m., SD-430.

Committee on the Judiciary: business meeting to consider the nominations of Amy Coney Barrett, of Indiana, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Seventh Circuit, Joan Louise Larsen, of Michigan, to be United States Circuit Judge for the Sixth Circuit, William L. Campbell, Jr., to be United States District Judge for the Middle District of Tennessee, Thomas Lee Robinson Parker, to be United States District Judge for the Western District of Tennessee, Annemarie Carney Axon, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Alabama, Michael Lawrence Brown, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Thomas Alvin Farr, to be United States District Judge for the Eastern District

of North Carolina, William M. Ray II, to be United States District Judge for the Northern District of Georgia, Eric S. Dreiband, of Maryland, to be an Assistant Attorney General, Robert M. Duncan, Jr., to be United States Attorney for the Eastern District of Kentucky for the term of four years, Charles E. Peeler, to be United States Attorney for the Middle District of Georgia for the term of four years, and Brian D. Schroder, to be United States Attorney for the District of Alaska, all of the Department of Justice, 10 a.m., SD-226.

Select Committee on Intelligence: to hold closed hearings to examine certain intelligence matters, 2 p.m., SH-219.

House

Committee on Energy and Commerce, Subcommittee on Energy, hearing entitled "Powering America: Consumer-Oriented Perspectives on Improving the Nation's Electricity Markets", 10 a.m., 2123 Rayburn.

Committee on Financial Services, Full Committee, hearing entitled "Examining the Equifax Data Breach", 9:15 a.m., 2128 Rayburn.

Committee on Foreign Affairs, Full Committee, hearing entitled "The Rohingya Crisis: U.S. Response to the Tragedy in Burma", 9 a.m., 2172 Rayburn.

Committee on Small Business, Subcommittee on Agriculture, Energy, and Trade, hearing entitled "High-Tech Agriculture: Small Firms on the Frontier of Agribusiness", 10 a.m., 2360 Rayburn.

Next Meeting of the SENATE

9:30 a.m., Thursday, October 5

Next Meeting of the HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9 a.m., Thursday, October 5

Senate Chamber

Program for Thursday: Senate will continue consideration of the nomination of Randal Quarles, of Colorado, to be a Member of the Board of Governors of the Federal Reserve System, post-cloture, and vote on confirmation of the nomination at 10 a.m.

Following disposition of the nomination of Randal Quarles, Senate will vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, of Maryland, to be Director of United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, Department of Homeland Security. If cloture is invoked, Senate will then vote on confirmation of the nomination.

Following disposition of the nomination of Lee Francis Cissna, Senate will resume consideration of the nomination of Callista L. Gingrich, of Virginia, to be Ambassador to the Holy See, Department of State, and vote on the motion to invoke cloture on the nomination at 1:45 p.m.

House Chamber

Program for Thursday: Complete consideration of 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.

Extensions of Remarks, as inserted in this issue

Cartwright, Matt, Pa., E1320, E1321
Cohen, Steve, Tenn., E1322
Conyers, John, Jr., Mich., E1325
Cooper, Jim, Tenn., E1322
Courtney, Joe, Conn., E1320
Crowley, Joseph, N.Y., E1319
DesJarlais, Scott, Tenn., E1319
Emmer, Tom, Minn., E1323, E1324, E1325
Esty, Elizabeth H., Conn., E1319

Frelinghuysen, Rodney P., N.J., E1322, E1323, E1324, E1325
Gonzalez, Vicente, Tex., E1327
Granger, Kay, Tex., E1321
Gutiérrez, Luis V., Ill., E1319
Hastings, Alcee L., Fla., E1321
Huffman, Jared, Calif., E1323
Jenkins, Lynn, Kans., E1320
Johnson, Eddie Bernice, Tex., E1325
Lieu, Ted, Calif., E1319, E1326
Loeb sack, David, Iowa, E1324
Long, Billy, Mo., E1324

Norton, Eleanor Holmes, The District of Columbia, E1321
Palazzo, Steven M., Miss., E1322
Pallone, Frank, Jr., N.J., E1320
Rooney, Francis, Fla., E1319
Ross, Dennis A., Fla., E1319
Ruppersberger, C.A. Dutch, Md., E1325
Shimkus, John, Ill., E1320, E1323
Valadao, David G., Calif., E1326
Veasey, Marc A., Tex., E1324, E1325
Walorski, Jackie, Ind., E1321
Wittman, Robert J., Va., E1321



Congressional Record

printed pursuant to directions of the Joint Committee on Printing as authorized by appropriate provisions of Title 44, United States Code, and published for each day that one or both Houses are in session, excepting very infrequent instances when two or more unusually small consecutive issues are printed one time. ¶Public access to the *Congressional Record* is available online through the U.S. Government Publishing Office, at www.govinfo.gov, free of charge to the user. The information is updated online each day the *Congressional Record* is published. For more information, contact the GPO Customer Contact Center, U.S. Government Publishing Office. Phone 202-512-1800, or 866-512-1800 (toll-free). E-Mail, contactcenter@gpo.gov. ¶To place an order for any of these products, visit the U.S. Government Online Bookstore at: bookstore.gpo.gov. Mail orders to: Superintendent of Documents, P.O. Box 979050, St. Louis, MO 63197-9000, or phone orders to 866-512-1800 (toll-free), 202-512-1800 (D.C. area), or fax to 202-512-2104. Remit check or money order, made payable to the Superintendent of Documents, or use VISA, MasterCard, Discover, American Express, or GPO Deposit Account. ¶Following each session of Congress, the daily *Congressional Record* is revised, printed, permanently bound and sold by the Superintendent of Documents in individual parts or by sets. ¶With the exception of copyrighted articles, there are no restrictions on the republication of material from the *Congressional Record*.

POSTMASTER: Send address changes to the Superintendent of Documents, *Congressional Record*, U.S. Government Publishing Office, Washington, D.C. 20402, along with the entire mailing label from the last issue received.