# Neg – On Case

## Inherency Answers

### Courts Resolve It

#### Courts supporting DACA now.

**Jordan ’18** Miriam Jordan is the national immigration correspondent for the New York Times - “For Thousands of ‘Dreamers,’ It Has Been a Wild Ride. And It’s Not Over Yet.” – New York Times – April 25th - #CutWithRJ- https://www.nytimes.com/2018/04/25/us/daca-dreamers-court-ruling.html

In Congress, a number of bipartisan proposals that would protect Dreamers were either rejected by the White House or failed to gain enough support among lawmakers. **But the big action has been in the courts.** Jan. 9, 2018: A federal judge in San Francisco ruled that the Trump administration had ended the DACA program improperly and ordered the government not only to keep it in place, but to allow DACA participants to apply for renewals. On the first day, legal-aid organizations were deluged. In Los Angeles, people started lining up at 2:30 in the morning at the Coalition for Humane Immigrant Rights of Los Angeles. “I wanted to take this opportunity while the window lasts,” said Mario Hernandez, 29, who was whisked across the Mexico-United States border when he was a 1-year-old, and then raised in Los Angeles. Hours later, his sense of urgency seemed prescient. The Department of Justice filed a notice of appeal. April 24, 2018: This week, in the biggest blow yet to the Trump administration’s move to kill the DACA program, Judge Bates in Washington found that the decision was “virtually unexplained.” He gave the government 90 days to come up with sufficient legal justification, or be forced to begin accepting new DACA applications.

#### Trump will keep losing in Federal Courts and that Congress may act in the interim.

**Lind ’18** Dara Lind - Senior Reporter, Vox. Dara was a 2014 fellow with John Jay College's Center for Media, Crime and Justice, and a 2017 reporting fellow with the University of Southern California Center for Health Journalism. “The Supreme Court may have just kept DACA on life support for several more months” – Vox – Feb 26th - #CutWithRJ- https://www.vox.com/2018/2/26/17053202/daca-supreme-court-ruling-trump

The judicial battle over the Trump administration’s efforts to wind down the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program, which protected 690,000 young unauthorized immigrants from deportation, has just been extended **by several months.** On Monday, the Supreme Court rejected a highly unusual request from the Trump administration: to skip over the second level of the federal court process (the courts of appeals) by having the Supreme Court consider an order made in January by a California district court judge. The January order partially **reanimated the DACA program**, which the Trump administration began winding down in September 2017 (with the expectation that work permits issued under the program would start expiring in large numbers on March 5 of this year). Immigrants who have work permits under DACA (or whose work permits recently expired) are currently eligible to apply for renewals under the order. The Trump administration is trying to get that order overturned, so that it doesn’t have to renew anyone’s work permits while the case over the constitutionality of ending DACA works its way through the courts. By rejecting the administration’s request, the Supreme Court isn’t saying anything about the merits of the DACA program itself, or about the legal arguments over the Trump administration’s decision to end it. It’s just insisting that the case proceed the normal way, with the Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals hearing the administration’s appeal of the California judge’s order (and the Second Circuit Court of Appeals on the East Coast hearing an appeal of a similar order issued in February by a New York judge). That process is likely to take months — and it’s extremely unlikely that both appeals courts (both of which are fairly liberal and have consistently ruled against the Trump administration on immigration issues) are going to side with the administration. That means that renewals will likely remain open at least until the Supreme Court agrees to take up the cases after the appeals courts rule — which will almost certainly be during the Court’s next term, which starts in October of this year. In theory, by that point, **Congress may have passed a bill to provide a longer-term solution for the status of DACA recipients** and other unauthorized immigrants who came to the US as children (including those who meet the criteria for DACA but didn’t apply before September 5, 2017; even under the federal court orders, no one can apply for DACA for the first time).

### Congress Solves

#### Congress will figure it out.

**Gomez ’18** Internally quoting Ben Monterroso, executive director of Mi Familia Vota and Andrew Pincus, a Supreme Court litigator at the Mayer Brown law firm. Alan Gomez is a Reporter for USA TODAY - What the Supreme Court ruling means for DACA and almost 700,000 undocumented immigrants – USA Today – Feb. 26, 2018 - #CutWithRJ- https://www.usatoday.com/story/news/politics/2018/02/26/what-supreme-court-ruling-means-daca-and-almost-700-000-undocumented-immigrants/372704002/

With two brief sentences, the Supreme Court on Monday dramatically changed the debate over the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program and the fate of nearly 700,000 undocumented immigrants who are part of it. The uncertainty hovering over the program had left DACA enrollees terrified over their future and left Congress so conflicted that DACA negotiations contributed to a three-day government shutdown last month. By refusing to hear a California case, the high court ensured that DACA will survive **at least through the fall**, giving DACA enrollees a temporary reprieve from deportation and **Congress more time to craft a permanent solution for them.** "This temporary decision is, nonetheless, **a great legal victory** on behalf of the DACA recipients, who have been hanging by a thread, wondering if their permits would expire in a week," said Ben Monterroso, executive director of Mi Familia Vota, a group that recruits Hispanics to register to vote. Here's a look at what the ruling means for everyone involved. President Trump started the controversy in September when he announced he would end the Obama-era program, which was protecting nearly 700,000 undocumented immigrants from deportation. He set the official termination date as March 5, giving Congress six months to find a legislative solution. That left DREAMers in a state of panic, because they would be exposed to deportation if they lost their DACA protections, and would lose the work permits that came with DACA. Employers were starting to prepare to lay off DACA enrollees. And many participants in the program were unsure whether they would be able to remain in colleges and universities, or continue receiving grants and loans that helped them afford those schools. Now, those DREAMers can rest a little easier knowing that they will remain protected and can continue renewing their DACA protections as the case moves back to lower courts. Andrew Pincus, a Supreme Court litigator at the Mayer Brown law firm, said appeals courts would likely rule on several DACA-related lawsuits sometime over the summer. That means the issue would not come back before the Supreme Court until its next term, which begins in October.

#### Dems to win the midterms – which would help save DACA.

**Savage ’18** David G. Savage has covered the Supreme Court and legal issues for the Los Angeles Times in the Washington bureau since 1986 “Supreme Court extends relief for 'Dreamers,' refuses to rule now on Trump immigration plan” – LA Times – Feb 26th - #CutWithRJ- http://www.latimes.com/politics/la-na-pol-court-daca-20180220-story.html

Last September, Trump announced that he would end the DACA program and gave Congress until March 5 to pass legislation to resolve the legal status of the Dreamers. Then, in early January, U.S. District Judge William Alsup in San Francisco ordered the government to keep the DACA program running until legal challenges could be fully aired, ruling that Trump's order had been based on a "flawed legal premise." A district judge in New York this month issued a similar ruling. In seeking to get Alsup's order overturned, the Justice Department sought to leapfrog the U.S. appeals court in California, asking the Supreme Court to grant an "immediate review" of Alsup's nationwide order. The action the administration sought was rare. It has been nearly 30 years since the Supreme Court granted review of a district judge's ruling before an appeals court could weigh in. And the court said Monday it had no interest in following that course in the DACA case. The justices, without dissent, turned down the administration's petition "without prejudice," meaning that the government could return to the high court once the appeals court rules. "It is assumed that the Court of Appeals will proceed expeditiously to decide this case," the justices noted in a brief order. Even though the action by the high court was procedural in nature, not a ruling on the substance of the case, it has significant impact **because it keeps in place Alsup's injunction** for as long as the case wends its way through the judicial system, **which could be quite a while.** In their appeal to the high court, administration lawyers said the injunction would likely last well into 2019 if the appeals run their normal course in the lower courts. That's a **significant victory for the Dreamers** and a defeat for administration hard-liners, led by Stephen Miller, Trump's domestic policy advisor. They have tried to use renewal of DACA as a bargaining chip to get Congress to adopt new policies to restrict legal immigration. With DACA now effectively off the congressional agenda for this year, the possibility of new immigration restrictions is also **much less likely**. Democrats hope to regain control of at least one house of Congress in the midterm elections, which would give them **considerably more of a say in any legislation**.

## Economy Answers

### Econ Up Now

#### Recession is not coming now – top forecasting tools go our way.

**Skiadopoulos ’18** George Skiadopoulos, Ph.D., is professor of finance at Queen Mary University of London and University of Piraeus. “Opinion: A new economic indicator is saying there’s no sign of a U.S. recession” – Market Watch - June 5th - #CutWithRJ- https://www.marketwatch.com/story/a-new-economic-indicator-is-saying-theres-no-sign-of-a-us-recession-2018-06-05

A gauge built on stock index options prices highlights when sophisticated investors are risk averse owing to worries over the economy A new economic indicator, based on stock index options prices, predicts the U.S. economy is poised to expand robustly with **no sign** **of a recession** in sight. Moreover, this highly unconventional forecasting tool has a record of accuracy **greater than traditional forecasting variables**, especially noteworthy as some economists who rely on traditional indicators are forecasting a recession in 2019, and a growing number are predicting one in 2020. When the Great Recession began in December of 2007, virtually all forecasters were caught by surprise. It was clear that economic forecasting needed improvement. My colleagues — Renato Faccini of Queen Mary University of London, Eirini Konstantinidi of the University of Manchester and Sylvia Sarantopoulou-Chiourea at the Independent Authority for Public Revenue in Greece — and I believed that the financial markets, which are based on future expectations, could be helpful. The options market, in particular, tells us the degree to which investors are averse to risk. This data, the Implied Relative Risk Aversion (IRRA) can be factored into an economic forecast. An option is a contract that gives the buyer the right to buy or sell an underlying security at a specified price on a specified date. Using the OptionMetrics Ivy DB databases (academia’s definitive source of historical options pricing data) for the most liquid of stock index options contracts, those that trade based on the S&P 500 Index SPX, -0.07% we found Implied Relative Risk Aversion outperforms existing economic indicators once it is used in conjunction with them. A decrease in IRRA predicts an increase in economic growth because investors boost investments when they become less risk averse. Conversely, an increase in risk aversion points to a slowdown in growth because investors lower investments when they become more risk averse. Implied Relative Risk Aversion is currently quite low, at 3.6 for May, after readings of 3.7 in April and March, implying that traders in the S&P 500 options market anticipate an increase in U.S. economic growth. The last pop in IRRA occurred in December 2013, as seen in the accompanying graph (above), when IRRA hit 6.8. Shortly afterward, the U.S. economy contracted by 0.9% in the first quarter of 2014. Even more revealing, in the second half of 2007 IRRA rose sharply in anticipation of the recession’s beginning in December of that year. IRRA reached its historic peak of 9.3 in February 2008. Afterward, the depths of the Great Recession followed, with four consecutive quarters of negative gross domestic product (GDP). In contrast to other economic predictors, IRRA manages to forecast the future state of the U.S. economy more accurately because it is constructed by index option market prices. Option markets tend to attract more sophisticated investors than other markets on which the standard economic indicators rely because they offer leverage and they often enjoy smaller transaction costs. As a result, index option prices reflect the expectations of informed investors first before other markets’ prices do, and hence they are more informative about the future state of the economy. To further test the forecasting technique, we calculated IRRA for South Korea using stock index options trading on the KOSPI 200 Index, the world’s most liquid stock index options. IRRA also successfully forecast growth and contraction in the South Korean economy.

#### Recession isn’t coming – GOP tax cut is too powerful.

**Fox ’18** Michelle Fox is a producer and journalist for CNBC and is internally quoting Howard Lutnick – who is currently the Chair and CEO of Cantor Fitzgerald, a financial services firm . Lutnick holds a degree in Economics and is also the Chair and CEO of BGC Partners, a global financial services company – “The economy got 3 more years of life from Trump tax cuts” - CNBC – June 6th - #CutWithRJ- https://www.cnbc.com/2018/06/06/economy-got-3-more-years-of-life-from-trump-tax-cuts-howard-lutnick.html

The economic "pop" from President Donald Trump's corporate tax cuts should head off any recession in the next few years, Howard Lutnick, chairman and CEO of BGC Partners, told CNBC on Wednesday. In fact, he believes the Trump administration's target of 3 percent economic growth is "absolutely in the cards as a reasonable outcome." With the corporate tax rate now at 21 percent, down from 35 percent, companies will earn more money and invest in plants and equipment, said Lutnick, also chairman and CEO of financial services firm Cantor Fitzgerald. "That tax cut, people do not understand how strong that is for corporate America. And that creates jobs, creates growth," he told Bob Pisani on "Power Lunch." On top of that, the government is cutting regulation and letting banks do more business, he added. "What could have been the end of the [economic] cycle was given three more years because he just hit it with an adrenaline pop."

#### No recession – best forecasts prove – tax cuts prevent downturn

**Needham 18** (“US, global growth estimates on the rise”, BY VICKI NEEDHAM - 02/27/18 02:03 PM EST, http://thehill.com/policy/finance/375836-us-global-growth-estimates-on-the-rise)

Expectations for U.S. growth this year are getting a **boost** from the newly implemented tax cuts, according to a February analysis. The economy is expected to expand at a 2.7 percent pace in 2018, an increase from a November forecast of 2.3 percent, Moody’s Investors Service said on Tuesday in its latest update. Yet even the faster rate of growth falls short of the 3 percent target the White House Council of Economic Advisers forecasting for 2018 and several years beyond in a report released last week. The forecast also expects faster global economic growth, which will peak in 2018, driven by improvement in advanced economies.

### Alt Causes

#### Trump wrecks the economy through tariffs and trade wars

**Swanson 18** (“Trump Upends Global Trade Order Built by U.S.”, Ana Swanson Trade Reporter, 6-10, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/06/10/business/trump-trade-tariffs.html)

WASHINGTON — At the rockiest annual meeting of major Western powers in decades, President Trump criticized the tariffs imposed on American goods as “ridiculous and unacceptable” and vowed to put an end to being “like a piggy bank that everybody is robbing.” Behind Mr. Trump’s outrage is his belief that the United States is at a disadvantage when it comes to global trade and is on the losing end of tariffs imposed by other nations. But to many of the country’s trading partners, the president’s criticisms ring hollow given that the United States places its own tariffs on everything from trucks and peanuts to sugar and stilettos. “While the system has problems, it is in no way ‘unfair,’ to the U.S., which as a hegemon has set the rules and the exceptions to the rules,” said Susan Aaronson, a professor at George Washington University’s Elliott School of International Affairs. The United States has long been the biggest champion of global trade, viewing the opening of borders as essential to strengthening not only its economy but the global economy as well. It led the way in building the international trading order in the 20th century, rising to become the world’s predominant economy. Tariffs were used as a way to offer protection for certain industries, but free trade was considered the tide that would lift all boats because all countries involved would benefit. Instead of viewing trade as a mutually beneficial relationship, the president has described trading relationships as a zero-sum game, in which the United States loses out when other countries have more favorable terms. Mr. Trump has seized on trade policy to prop up industries that he has promised to revitalize, such as manufacturing, by limiting foreign competition. Many of the United States’ tariffs were put in place to protect influential industries that lobbied the government to set high barriers to foreign products, including a 25 percent tariff on sugar and foreign trucks, and a 163 percent tariff on imported peanuts. Mr. Trump has singled out specific products where American producers face barriers, like Canada’s 270 percent tariff on imported milk and Europe’s 10 percent tariffs on American cars. On Saturday night, as Mr. Trump left the Group of 7 summit meeting en route to Singapore for a meeting with North Korea, he lashed out at Prime Minister Justin Trudeau of Canada once again for his country’s dairy tariffs and for his criticisms of Mr. Trump’s trade measures. “Very dishonest & weak,” Mr. Trump wrote in a tweet aboard Air Force One. “Our Tariffs are in response to his of 270% on dairy!” But on average, American tariffs are on par with those of other rich, developed countries, which tend to be low, according to the World Bank and the United Nations. Among the developed nations that make up the Group of 7 that met in a resort town near Quebec City this weekend, the United States has tariffs that are slightly [higher, on average, across all its imported products](https://data.worldbank.org/indicator/TM.TAX.MRCH.WM.AR.ZS?end=2016&start=2016&view=bar) than Canada or Japan and exactly equivalent to the four European nations in the G-7. So far this year, Mr. Trump has imposed tariffs on nearly $60 billion of steel, aluminum, solar products and washing machines that flow into the United States from around the world. He is threatening additional tariffs on foreign goods that would expand his trade penalties significantly, including a tariff on $350 billion of imported automobiles and parts and levies on $150 billion worth of Chinese goods, on the assumption those will force trading partners to drop their own barriers to entry. The approach risks upending the United States’ longstanding embrace of free trade and its use of trading relationships to help power economic growth in the United States and the world economy writ large. Since the Second World War, the United States has cut its tariff rates in step with other developed countries. It also gave some less-developed countries access to its markets, with the idea of increasing wages and improving quality of life. Mr. Trump appears ready to change that equation and increasingly views every country as a threat, regardless of its economic strength. Critics fear Mr. Trump’s approach will hurt developing nations and result in an escalating series of tariffs that raise costs for American consumers and industries, potentially harming the very manufacturers Mr. Trump says his trade policy is intended to protect. “Trump’s bull in a china shop act is clearly grating on other trading partners, who now see the U.S. as a recalcitrant and unruly member of the global trading system rather than as a responsible steward,” said Eswar Prasad, a professor of international trade at Cornell University. He said allies’ tolerance had waned to a point “where they are more likely to retaliate and escalate trade disputes rather than give in to U.S. demands.”

### DREAM Hurts Budget

#### The DREAM act strains taxpayer money and social programs

**Dane 18** (Bob Dane, 1-16-2018, "DREAM Act: Straining Budgets, Punishing American Workers," ImmigrationReform, https://immigrationreform.com/2018/01/16/dream-act-straining-budgets-punishing-american-workers/)

The Congressional Budget Office says the DREAM Act will cost Americans $26.8 billion over the next decade. That’s a net expense, and it’s just the beginning. The DREAM Act, which would grant lawful permanent residence to some 3.25 million illegal aliens, is being played as a bargaining chip in negotiations over immigration reforms. It’s no bargain. The CBO estimates 2 million aliens eligible for conditional resident status would become naturalized citizens. That projection – a low-ball figure in light of prior amnesties and DREAM Act provisions – minimizes the true fiscal impact. If history is a reliable guide – and there’s no reason to think it isn’t — significantly more aliens are likely to apply. This would add billions to the DREAM Act’s initial price tag. Witness the amnesty embedded in the Immigration Reform and Control Act of 1986. Some 2.7 million illegal aliens established legal residence through IRCA, significantly more than the government’s top estimates. Language in the DREAM Act ensures that more low-skill, low-education aliens will be waved through – granting them access to legal employment, as well as a full smorgasbord of public benefits (your $26.8 billion at work). The most expensive benefit would be Obamacare subsidies ($12 billion), earned income and child tax credits ($5.5 billion), Medicaid ($5 billion) and food stamps ($2 billion). CBO understates the impact here, too, by excluding state and local outlays. A “confidentiality” provision in the DREAM Act bars Immigration and Customs Enforcement officers from examining amnesty application files, raising the odds for fraud. Further, government adjudicators are required to accept easily doctored documents – utility bills, rent receipts, even remittance records — as evidence of eligibility. If all else fails, applications can be approved for “humanitarian purposes or family unity.” “It will be exceedingly difficult for the government to deny an applicant and not be sued for ‘abuse of discretion’ when those are the standards for grants of waivers to criminals, smugglers and illegal voters,” notes the Center for Immigration Studies. The not-so-dreamy DREAM Act gashes a broken immigration system while further straining American workers and taxpayers, says Rep. Louie Gohmert, R-Texas. “Isn’t it interesting that the people who keep demanding immediate legalization also demand that there be no wall? They don’t want border security. It’s pretty transparent they don’t care about U.S. workers whose wages have been stagnant, or have been unable to find jobs,” Gohmert said.

### No Econ Impact

#### Even massive economic decline has zero chance of war

**Jervis ’11** Robert, Professor in the Department of Political Science and School of International and Public Affairs at Columbia University, December 2011, “Force in Our Times,” Survival, Vol. 25, No. 4, p. 403-425

Even if war is still seen as evil, the security community could be dissolved if severe conflicts of interest were to arise. Could the more peaceful world generate new interests that would bring the members of the community into sharp disputes? 45 A zero-sum sense of status would be one example, perhaps linked to a steep rise in nationalism. More likely would be a worsening of the current economic difficulties, which could itself produce greater nationalism, undermine democracy and bring back old-fashioned beggar-my-neighbor economic policies. While these dangers are real, **it is hard to believe that the conflicts could be great enough** to lead the members of the community to contemplate fighting each other. It is not so much that economic interdependence has proceeded to the point where it could not be reversed – states that were more internally interdependent than anything seen internationally have fought bloody civil wars. Rather it is that **even if the more extreme versions of free trade and economic liberalism become discredited**, it is hard to see how without building on a preexisting high level of political conflict leaders and mass opinion would come to believe that their countries could prosper by impoverishing or even attacking others. Is it possible that problems will not only become severe, but that people will entertain the thought that they have to be solved by war? While a pessimist could note that this argument does not appear as outlandish as it did before the financial crisis, an optimist could reply (correctly, in my view) that the very fact that we have seen **such a sharp economic down-turn** without **anyone** suggesting that force of arms is the solution shows that **even if bad times bring about greater economic conflict**, **it will not make war thinkable**.

#### Economy is resilient---it’s booming and won’t stop

**Cohen 18** (“U.S. Economy Grew at 2.6% Rate in Fourth Quarter”, By Patricia Cohen, Jan. 26, 2018, https://www.nytimes.com/2018/01/26/business/economy/gdp-economy.html)

The American economy finished off last year on a firm footing, and is poised for more vigorous growth in the months to come. Preliminary estimates released by the government on Friday showed that the nation’s output increased at an annual rate of 2.6 percent in the final quarter of 2017. Although that performance amounts to less than the heady 4 percent annual growth that President Trump has promised, it is **further evidence** — along with a sinking jobless rate and surging consumer confidence — **of the economy’s resilience**. “The year-end is solid,” said Joel Prakken, chief United States economist at Macroeconomic Advisers by IHS Markit. Details within the report, about climbing business investment and depleted inventories, suggest more economic strength than the bare-bones headline number might indicate. “It portends well for 2018 demand,” he said. In the year ahead, hefty tax cuts, particularly for businesses, are expected to encourage more investment and spending, although many economists predict ballooning deficits will overtake the positive effects in the longer term. One-time quirks that could affect growth measurements this year could also end up artificially pumping 2018’s figures. Even analysts with ambitious forecasts for the next year, however, agree that the United States is unlikely to sustain annual growth of much more than 2 percent given a smaller, aging work force; sluggish productivity growth; and soaring deficits. “The economy’s sustainable trend is around 2 percent,” Mr. Prakken said. The Commerce Department’s report on the gross domestic product — which showed growth for all of last year at 2.3 percent — is a rough draft. The fourth-quarter estimate will be revised twice in the next couple of months, and it could increase or drop by as much as a percentage point, based on previous recalculations. After all, government statisticians have to put together the fourth-quarter estimate without complete data on construction, trade and inventories. Mr. Trump inherited an improving economy, and during his first year in office, the trend continued and growth accelerated. Supporters credit Mr. Trump with revving up business and consumer confidence, and say tax cuts and eased regulation are fueling capital investment and job creation. They also point to a booming stock market, though market gains are not necessarily a gauge of economic underpinnings. The president ticked off those items on Friday when he hailed America’s economic strength at the World Economic Forum’s annual meeting in Davos, Switzerland, where global leaders have been sharing encouraging economic news all week. The American economy recovered from a plodding start in the first three months of 2017, when sharp cuts in consumer spending limited G.D.P. growth to 1.2 percent on an annualized basis. It sprang back over the next six months, with the rate reaching 3.1 percent in the second quarter and 3.2 percent in the third. In the fourth quarter, holiday shoppers were enthusiastic, and spending on business and residential housing was up. A persistent appetite for foreign goods continued to widen the trade deficit — it reached nearly $72 billion for goods alone in December — and dragged down gains. But inventory declines that detracted from G.D.P. last quarter should rebound over the next as businesses refill empty shelves. The American economy’s performance has also been buoyed by simultaneous growth in nations around the world, which has fueled trade and enabled foreign consumers to buy more American-made products.

#### Growth is resilient---wage growth, massive investment, and tax cuts

**TCB 18** (The Conference Board, a global, independent business membership and research association working in the public interest, 2/14/18, “The Conference Board Economic Forecast for the U.S. Economy,” https://www.conference-board.org/data/usforecast.cfm)

Volatility has returned to the economy with a vengeance. The major downward correction in US and global equity markets during the beginning of the month demonstrates that while the **fundamentals** of the US economy remain strong, there are **no guarantees**. 2017 reflected a harmonic convergence of many positive factors. The US, Euro Area and China saw synchronized strong growth performance. Major central banks kept their powder dry as low inflation prevailed. Businesses and consumers stayed chipper, especially after **expectations for tax cuts in the US were realized**. It was a year that featured remarkably little bad economic news.

So, why have bears come out of hibernation? It comes down to the realization that an economy, which will grow by as much as 2.9 percent in 2018, is likely to see **wage growth and higher producer prices**, which both signal firming inflation. The Federal Reserve may therefore have to boost rates four rather than three times in 2018. Rising interest rates on government bonds reflect not only the activities of the Fed, but also increased government borrowing as a result of the new tax plan. This could feed into both corporate and mortgage rates, possibly muting both business and residential investment.

Market jitters though **do not signal that an economic slowdown is imminent**. Consumers can cheer **higher wages and lower income tax burdens**. Businesses face robust global demand and the **tax plan will lower costs** for investment in hard assets. 2018 should be **another strong year for the domestic and global economy**. Volatility though reminds business leaders that **expansions are not immortal**. With fewer workers on the sideline, increased investment must yield productivity growth or else the economy will slow with the risk of recession rising.

## Military Answers

### No Recruitment Crisis

#### There’s no readiness or recruitment crisis in the status quo

**O'Hanlon ‘17**

Michael O'Hanlon is a senior fellow in foreign policy at the Brookings Institution, where he specializes in U.S. defense strategy, the use of military force and American national security policy. “'Military readiness crisis' a risky misdiagnosis” – The Hill – October 5th - #CutWithRJ- http://thehill.com/opinion/national-security/354042-military-readiness-crisis-a-risky-misdiagnosis

However, these budgetary shenanigans, combined with recent high-profile accidents like the U.S.S. Fitzgerald and U.S.S. McCain tragedies, have led numerous officials to **wrongly declare a military readiness crisis.**

To be sure, after nearly two continuous decades of war, the armed forces are under significant stress. But to exaggerate today's problems as a "crisis" is risky.

Doing so can divert attention from other military challenges, like long-term modernization. It may embolden foes who mistakenly conclude we are unprepared and lead to cynicism among taxpayers who wonder why a defense establishment consistently funded at more than $600 billion a year (well above the Cold War average, in inflation-adjusted terms) is sometimes described in terms reminiscent of the "hollow force" era of the 1970s.

Today's armed forces, while challenged, are far from hollow. They need more consistent and modestly higher budgets. But rather than wait for readiness salvation in the form of much higher budgets that are unlikely to appear, Pentagon officials also need to think of what they can do to mitigate readiness problems through better management of the forces at hand.

Current military readiness — i.e., the ability of the U.S. military, unit by unit, to carry out assigned tasks promptly and competently — can be summarized as follows: First, **most major categories of equipment are in fairly good shape**, in terms of their "mission-capable rates" relative to historical norms.

For example, major Army vehicle readiness rates typically exceed 90 percent today. That said, a number of categories of equipment across the services, like certain helicopter fleets, are not in good shape.

Second, **funding for major training is being provided to the military at 85 to 95 percent of comprehensive rates**. That is not perfect, but by historical standards, it is still rather good.

Third, the quality of our personnel is quite high, **and recruiting as well as retention statistics are strong.** Yet, we do not have enough people for some specialties, and we have real dearths in areas like certain types of pilots and equipment maintenance personnel.

#### Status quo solves recruitment shortages – the Army is providing flexibility in recruiting standards that ensure a sufficient amount of recruits sign up

**Woody ’17**

Christopher is a reporter and editor at Business Insider, October 18, “The Army is trying to bring in more recruits, and it's changing its standards to get them”<http://www.businessinsider.com/army-changing-recruiting-standards-to-attract-more-soldiers-2017-10>

Continued demand for more soldiers likely means the Army will maintain some flexibility in its recruiting standards, drawing more from the pool of less qualified troops and offering waivers for previously disqualifying things like marijuana use, according to a USA Today report.

Relaxed recruiting standards became common in the mid-2000s, during periods of intense operations and longer deployments in Iraq and Afghanistan.

The number of new troops the Army could draw from Category Four recruits — Army prospects who scored in the lower one-third of standard military exams — was expanded to 4% and sometimes exceeded that. Previously it had been limited to 2%, but the Army maintains the 4% threshold today.

Recruits with lower qualifications have presented dangers both during their service and afterward. One soldier who got waivers for previous criminal behavior was involved in the rape of an Iraqi girl in 2006.

High demand for recruits during the war on terror allowed gang members and criminals to join. Some recruiters issued "moral waivers" to meet quotas, and some right-wing extremists were able to join as long as their uniforms covered their tattoos.

Maj. Gen. Jeffrey Snow told USA Today that he thought **the Army would be able to reach its new recruitment goal without compromising on quality**.

During fiscal year 2017, the Army recruited almost 69,000 soldiers for active duty, 1.9% of whom belonged to Category Four, according to USA Today, up from .6% in 2016.

The Army has brought in more Category Four recruits during periods where recruiting is typically more difficult in order to fill training requirements, and that pool of prospects has gained appeal as an improving economy gives potential recruits more civilian job opportunities.

Beth Asch, a military-recruiting expert at Rand Corp, told USA Today that the Army could avoid the problems it saw in the mid-2000s as long as it continues to accept a small number of less qualified personnel.

Being more flexible with recruiting standards and offering waivers for things like drug use — so long as recruits promised not to use drugs again — can help the Army maintain troop levels while saving on bonuses, Asch said.

Ryan McCarthy, the acting Army secretary, has echoed Milley's calls for more troops.

"If we continue to get asked to support national objectives worldwide, we will require more people," he told Army Times.

McCarthy added that what size the force ultimately aims for will depend on national-security objectives, which are currently being reviewed.

"I think we need to be bigger than we are today, but how big in the future, in large measure, depends on the national objectives," he said this month. "We are in the process of a national defense strategy that will come to a conclusion around the holidays."

### Troops Not Key

#### Troop numbers are irrelevant – technology and modernization are more important for ensuring readiness

**Freedberg ‘17**

Sydney is the deputy editor for Breaking Defense. Sydney graduated summa cum laude from Harvard and holds masters' degrees from Cambridge and Georgetown. November 7 “‘At War Next Week’: Bob Work On Readiness, Modernization, & COCOMs” https://breakingdefense.com/2017/11/at-war-next-week-bob-work-on-readiness-modernization-cocoms/

WASHINGTON: The US can’t afford to modernize its military and increase its size at the same time, said the former deputy secretary of defense , Bob Work. It can’t build up war-ready forces to deter Russia and China while engaging in non-stop operations around the world, the way we have since 1991. If we have to choose – and we do have to, he said – **modernization must take priority over growth** and warfighting must take priority all other missions.

“When Secretary Mattis came in, he was shocked when he said, ‘ok, what happens if Korea goes up?'” because he got deeply unsatisfactory answers about the readiness of the force, said Work, who was Jim Mattis’s deputy at the time.

“This was one of the greatest moments I had as the deputy secretary of defense,” Work told an audience at SAIS yesterday evening. “Sec. Mattis looked at all of the senior military officers in the department and said, ‘I want you to think and operate every day as though we’re at war next week….You need to be thinking that things can go south in an hurry and we’ll have to respond regardless of the state of our forces.”

Two Traps

As the White House, Congress, and the Pentagon struggle to restore the US military’s readiness for war, Work said, they must avoid two great traps. First, he said, we can’t let the insatiable demands of the theater combatant commanders (COCOMs) siphon off forces from the vital task of deterring rival nation-states, above all Russia and China. Second, he said, **we can’t let** well-intentioned **enthusiasm to build a bigger force** – as President Trump and House Republicans have promised – **come at the expense of readiness and modernization** for the military we already have.

During the Cold War, Work said, US policymakers had clarity about the military’s missions. Deterring the Soviet Union by standing ready to fight it – primarily with conventional forces in Europe, but with nukes if necessary – was unambiguously number one. Readiness to respond to lesser crises such as Vietnam came second. “Shaping” operations to advance peace, stability, and democracy around the world came a distant third. In the years of US unipolar dominance after the fall of the Berlin Wall, however, those priorities reversed, until shaping become the dominant mission in both official doctrine and operational practice.

So even as Central Command waged two prolonged wars in Afghanistan and Iraq, CENTCOM and other COCOMs kept up an intense pace of operations to take out terrorists, train local partners, respond to disasters, and generally show the flag. In fact, the way the Defense Department works, COCOM commanders could make unlimited demands without paying any of the cost, leaving it to Pentagon planners and the overstretched services to figure out how to meet them.

The result, Work said, has been a terrible erosion of readiness to fight an actual war.

Modernization vs. COCOMs

The Japan-based 7th Fleet, for example, was waiving certifications on training to get ships out to sea for “presence” patrols, contributing to two deadly accidents. Maintenance on submarines is badly backlogged, leaving few boats ready to respond in a crisis.

“Cut presence before cutting maintenance, for God’s sake!” fumed Work, a retired Marine and former navy undersecretary. “The US Navy, the greatest navy on the planet, is in big trouble right now because it tried to chase all of the shaping requirements that were levied upon it, rather than just say no.”

It’s worth noting that Trump’s relatively new Navy Secretary, Richard Spencer, has said publicly the Navy should start saying no to missions that come at the expense of readiness. Defense Secretary Mattis has put readiness as priority No. 1 across the board. So there are signs this mindset is taking root in the Trump administration.

Work’s other key argument, however, may be less welcome in Washington. “Before substantially increasing the size of the joint force, I would argue, hone the force we have,” he said. President Trump has promised a larger military, and while the president’s proposed budgets have been modest, House Republicans in particular have been keep to add more troops, ships, and planes. Work argues **that’s a mistake, because, in a limited budget, hiring more people and buying more weapons comes at the expense of developing and fielding better weapons**.

To deter rising great power rivals, Work argued, the US must invest in a range of key technologies, especially

artificial intelligence and robotics, a major theme of the Third Offset Strategy he championed as deputy secretary;

space operations, including offensive warfighting in space, another area Work championed as deputy;

hypersonics, which operate in realm above the highest-flying aircraft but below the lowest-orbiting satellite, a realm Work says we have unilaterally ceded to China;

air and missile defense, from short-range battlefield systems (SHORAD) to Patriots;

cyber and electronic warfare, the ability to dominate the digits on which modern militaries and societies rely;

cheap-to-operate light attack aircraft so we can reserve high-tech fighters for high-threat missions

and a new nuclear triad of ICBMs, bombers, and submarines.

All **those areas “don’t require a lot of forces**,” Work said. “**They require a lot of money.”**

So where does the money come from? “I do expect an increase in defense spending,” Work said. “I don’t think the increases will be as big as some people hope for or expect.”

“If it turns out that we get no increase in defense, then I can state with absolute certainty that the force structure we have right now is too big for the budgets we have had for the last several years,” Work went on. “As a result, we’ve had to make very serious choices, not buy as many munitions, cut back on maintenance availabilities, not modernize the ground forces.”

“So,” Work concluded, “if it becomes evident we will not get an increase in defense spending, then, in my opinion, we must make the force smaller and make it more capable and ready.”

### No Readiness Impact

#### No impact to readiness loss – their threats are all exaggerated

**Mueller 16** (John Mueller, Woody Hayes Senior Research Scientist, Mershon Center for International Security Studies; Adjunct Professor, Department of Political Science, Ohio State University, June 5, 2016, “Embracing Threatlessness: US Military Spending, Newt Gingrich, and the Costa Rica Option,”<http://politicalscience.osu.edu/faculty/jmueller/CNArestraintCato16.pdf>)

The United States seems to be **substantially free** from threats that **require a great deal of military preparedness**. To begin with, it really seems time to consider the consequences of the fact that a conflict like World War II is **extremely unlikely to recur**. Spending a lot of money for an eventuality—or fantasy—of ever-receding likelihood is highly questionable. Some envision threat in China’s rapidly-increasing prosperity. But, although its oft-stated desire to incorporate (or re-incorporate) Taiwan into its territory should be watched, armed conflict would be extremely—even overwhelmingly—costly to the country. And Chinese leaders, already rattled by internal difficulties, seem to realize this. Russia’s recent assertiveness bears watching, but it does not suggest that the game has been crucially changed. It might make sense to maintain a containment and deterrent capacity against rogue states in formal or informal coalition with other concerned countries. However, the military **requirements for the task are limited**. Humanitarian intervention with military force is unlikely due to a low tolerance for casualties in such ventures, an increasing aversion to the costs of nation-building, and the lack of political gain from successful ventures. Concern about nuclear proliferation is overwrought: long experience suggests that when countries obtain the weapons, they “use” them only to stoke their national ego and to deter real or imagined threats. Europe seems to face no notable threats of a military nature, the Taiwan/China issue remains a fairly remote concern, and Israel’s primary problems derive from the actions of sub-state groups. The military relevance of the terrorism “threat” has been **substantially exaggerated**, and it mainly calls for policing and intelligence work and perhaps for occasional focused strikes by small units.

#### Extremely low risk of conflicts – economic disincentives, nuclear, and cyber deterrence constrain great power aggression and ensure that wars won’t break out

**Harari ’17** Yuval Noah is an Israeli historian and a tenured professor in the Department of History at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, June 23, “Why It’s No Longer Possible for Any Country to Win a War”<http://time.com/4826856/russia-trump-north-korea-china-war/>

The last few decades have been the most peaceful era in human history. For the first time ever, fewer people die today from human violence than from traffic accidents, obesity or even suicide. Whereas in early agricultural societies human violence caused up to 15% of all human deaths, and in the twentieth century it caused 5%, today it is responsible for only about 1%. Yet the international climate is rapidly deteriorating; warmongering is back in vogue, and military expenditure is ballooning. Both laypeople and experts fear that just as in 1914 the murder of an Austrian archduke sparked the First World War, in 2017 some incident in the Syrian Desert or an unwise move in the Korean Peninsula might ignite a global conflict. Yet there are several key differences between 2017 and 1914. Back then, war had great appeal to elites across the world because they had concrete examples for how successful wars contribute to economic success and political power. Now, **successful wars seem to be an endangered species.** From the days of Assyria and Rome, great empires were usually built through war, and elites in 1914 had plenty of recent examples for the huge profits a successful war can bring. In 1846–48 the United States invaded Mexico, and for the price of 13,000 dead American soldiers, it got California, Nevada, Utah, Arizona, New Mexico and parts of Colorado, Kansas, Wyoming and Oklahoma. It was the bargain of the millennium. Similarly, imperial Japan cherished its victories over China and Russia; Germany glorified its triumph over France; and almost every great power had a string of splendid little colonial wars to its name. When France, Britain or Italy contemplated putting boots on the ground in Vietnam, Nigeria or Libya, their main fear was that somebody else might get there first. In 2017, global elites don’t know what a successful war even looks like. They may have read about them in history books and seen fanciful recreations in Hollywood blockbusters, but they have good reason to suspect that this type of war has gone extinct. **Though some** third-world **dictators** and non-state actors still manage to **flourish through war,** it seems that **major powers no longer know how to do so.** The greatest victory in living memory — of the United States over the Soviet Union — was achieved without any major military confrontation. The U.S. then got a fleeting taste of old-fashioned military glory in the First Gulf War — which only tempted it to waste trillions on humiliating military fiascos in Iraq and Afghanistan. China, the rising power of the early twenty-first century, has assiduously avoided all armed conflicts since its Vietnamese debacle of 1979, and it owes its ascent strictly to economic factors. In this, it has emulated not the Japanese and German empires of the pre-1914 era, but rather the nonviolent Japanese and German economic miracles of the post-1945 era. Even in the Middle East, regional powers don’t know how to wage successful wars. Iran gained nothing from the long bloodbath of the Iran-Iraq War and subsequently avoided all direct military confrontations. It became regional hegemon by default, as its two main enemies — the U.S. and Iraq — got embroiled in a war that destroyed both Iraq and the American appetite for Middle Eastern quagmires. Much the same can be said of Israel, which waged its last successful war fifty years ago. Since 1967, Israel has prospered despite its many wars, not thanks to them. Its conquered territories are a heavy economic burden and a crippling political liability. Like Iran, Israel has recently improved its geopolitical position not by waging successful wars, but by avoiding getting sucked into the wars that devastated Iraq, Syria and Libya. The only recent successful war waged by a major power has been the Russian conquest of the Crimea. However, it was made possible by an extraordinary set of circumstances: The Ukrainian army showed no resistance; other powers refrained from intervening; and the Crimean population either supported the invaders or peacefully accepted the conquest as a fait accompli. These circumstances will be hard to reproduce. If the precondition for a successful war is the absence of any enemies willing to resist, it limits the available opportunities. Indeed, when Russia sought to reproduce its Crimean success in other parts of the Ukraine, it encountered substantially stiffer opposition, and the war in eastern Ukraine bogged down into an unproductive stalemate. Conquering decrepit Soviet-era factories in Luhansk and Donetsk hardly pays for the war, and it certainly does not offset the costs of international sanctions. The conquest of Crimea notwithstanding, it seems that in the twenty-first century **the most successful strategy is to keep your peace and let others do the fighting for you.** Why has it become so difficult for major powers to wage successful wars? One reason is the change in the nature of the economy. In the past, if you defeated your enemy on the battlefield, you could easily cash in by looting enemy cities, selling enemy civilians in the slave markets and occupying valuable wheat fields and gold mines. Yet in the twenty-first century, only puny profits could be made that way. Today, the main economic assets consist of technical and institutional knowledge — and you cannot conquer knowledge through war. An organization such as ISIS may flourish by looting cities and oil wells in the Middle East — in 2014, ISIS seized more than $500 million from Iraqi banks and in 2015 made an additional $500 million from selling oil. But China and the U.S. are unlikely to start a war for a paltry billion. As for spending trillions of dollars on a war against the U.S., how could China repay these expenses and balance all the war damages and lost trade opportunities? Would the victorious People’s Liberation Army loot the riches of Silicon Valley? True, corporations such as Apple, Facebook and Google are worth hundreds of billions of dollars, but you cannot seize these fortunes by force. There are no silicon mines in Silicon Valley. A successful war could theoretically still bring huge profits by enabling the victor to rearrange the global trade system in its favor, as the U.S. did after its victory over Hitler. However, present-day military technology would make it extremely difficult to repeat this feat. By definition, profits large enough to make a global war worthwhile for the victor will also make it worthwhile for the loser to resort to weapons of mass destruction. **The atom bomb has turned “victory” in a World War into collective suicide**. It is no coincidence that since Hiroshima superpowers never fought one another directly, and engaged only in what (for them) were low-stake conflicts in which none was tempted to use nuclear weapons to avert defeat. Indeed, **even attacking a second-rate nuclear power** such as Iran or North Korea **is an extremely unattractive proposition.** Cyber warfare makes things even worse for would-be imperialists. As recently as the days of George W. Bush, the U.S. could wreak havoc in far-off Fallujah while the Iraqis had no means of retaliating against San Francisco. But if the U.S. now attacks a country possessing even moderate cyber warfare capabilities, malware and logic bombs could stop air traffic in Dallas, cause trains to collide in Philadelphia and bring down the electric grid in Michigan. In the great age of conquerors, warfare was a low-damage, high-profit affair. At the battle of Hastings in 1066, William the Conqueror gained the whole of England in a single day for the cost of a few thousand dead. Nuclear weapons and cyber warfare, by contrast, are high-damage, low-profit technologies. You could use such tools to destroy entire countries, but not to build profitable empires. Hence in a world filling up with saber-rattling and bad vibes, perhaps **our best guarantee of peace is that major powers aren’t familiar with any recent example of a successful war**. While Genghis Khan or Julius Caesar would invade a foreign country at the drop of a hat, present-day strongmen talk loud but are very careful about actually launching wars. Of course, if somebody does find a formula to wage successful wars under twenty-first-century conditions, the gates of hell might open with a rush. This is what makes the Russian success in the Crimea a particularly frightening omen. Let’s hope it remains an isolated example. Though, even if it is impossible to wage successful wars in the twenty-first century, that does not give us an absolute guarantee for peace. We should never underestimate human stupidity.

## Healthcare Answers

### No Solvency

#### Solvency has to be decades away or they don’t solve—their Japsen evidence says DACA produced “113 students” to apply to medical schools. The national shortage is 40K and creeping on 100K

#### Their “unique” skill is being multilingual—no ev that ties those specific patients to being terror targets.

#### Healthcare is a mess – funding and coordination are alt causes.

Michael **Lighty 14,** testimony from Michael Lighty, director of public policy for National Nurses United, to the California Assembly Health Committee, 11-25-2014, "Ebola Preparedness Without a Single-Payer System," http://www.pnhp.org/news/2014/november/ebola-preparedness-without-a-single-payer-system

This is a proud moment for California Nurses Association/National Nurses United, whose members have taken the lead in blowing the whistle for Ebola preparedness. From a die-in on the Las Vegas Strip in September to the 50,000 strong national day of action on Nov. 12, the nurses of CNA/NNU have made history. Contrary to what their hospital administrators have said about their adherence to the CDC guidelines — nurses reported quite the opposite in a survey of over 3,500 nurses from every state in the U.S. So this new guidance in California creates a real level of security for nurses, and we thank Governor Brown and Director Baker, and the staff who worked so diligently to set this new national standard. But what about the patients in a **fragmented**, **under resourced** “**non-system**” who are **at the mercy** of their insurance company’s high-deductible, minimal benefit, narrow network, sparse drug formulary health plan? And those on Medi-Cal who can’t find a doctor to accept them, or those undocumented workers and others who must rely solely on ER visits and a decimated public health system? Funding for public health preparedness and response activities in the U.S. was **$1billion less in 2013**, than in 2002, according to a CDC report from earlier this year. According to CMS data collected in 2013, patients in California Emergency Departments faced waits that are 23 minutes longer than the national average. Specifically, California patients waited on average more than two-and-a-half hours in the ED. Further, if a patient is admitted to the hospital, the average wait increased to: About five hours and 18 minutes from arrival to the time a patient is admitted; and Nearly an additional two hours before a patient is moved to a bed. At least 5 percent of patients at 20 of the state’s EDs left before being treated because of the long waits, according to Center for Health Reporting/Daily News. Let’s make a distinction between an **integrated**, **well-resourced system** that **guarantees** a **single standard of care** for all with a **dedicated funding source** and real public accountability – known as **single payer** – verses the existing **fragmented approach** that seeks to regulate behavior sometimes with the force of law as in the case of this new guidance, and mostly as monetary incentives and voluntary guidance. Now, the treatment response to Ebola, for example, as other in **other pandemics** is largely governed by **private health care corporations** who are **only accountable to their shareholders or board of directors, not the public**. **Understaffing**, **access to treatment based on ability to pay**, **technology** replacing hands-on care, **difficulty gaining admission**: it could and does happen everyday in our fragmented corporate health care system. **All this happened to Ebola** patient Thomas Eric Duncan in a Dallas hospital, and in his case, **it was fatal** and two nurses were infected.

#### Immigration not key – tech solves healthcare shortage

Rebecca **Vesely, 11-7**-**2017**, "Tech may help solve the health care workforce shortage as population ages," Association of Health Care Journalists, https://healthjournalism.org/blog/2017/11/tech-may-help-solve-the-health-care-workforce-shortage-as-population-ages/

As many of us have been reporting for some time, an aging U.S. population and a growing shortage of health care workers are converging to create an access-to-care crisis over the next several decades. Can technology help fill the gap? **Some leading policy experts say yes**, and are imploring tech entrepreneurs to get busy creating solutions. Sandra Hernandez, M.D. and chief executive officer of the California Health Care Foundation (CHCF), dedicated her keynote address to this topic at the recent 10th annual Health 2.0 conference in Santa Clara, Calif. Health 2.0 is considered the premier national conference for developers in the digital health space. Oakland-based CHCF is a policy institution which also operates an innovation fund to provide seed money to promising companies. “We are aging at a very, very dramatic pace,” Hernandez said during her keynote. “Yet we are chugging along providing a workforce the same way it was designed and built 50 years ago.” Here are some stats on the growing “silver tsunami:” By 2030, the U.S. population over age 65 will grow by 55 percent. By 2030, there will be a shortfall of between 7,300 and 43,100 primary care physicians. The median age of physicians and nurses is gradually inching up, meaning a wave of retirements in the coming years. In just California, the number of seniors who have trouble caring for themselves will increase by 88 percent by 2030. By 2030, at least a million seniors will need help with self-care such as cooking, bathing and cleaning in California alone. Most people prefer to “age in place,” meaning they will require home care and retrofits to their homes. The population will continue to become more diverse, requiring culturally and linguistically appropriate care for seniors. So how can technology help solve these problems of shrinking healthccare workforce and an aging population? Here are few examples cited by Hernandez and others during Health 2.0: Team-based care with technology support. An example is Quartet, a software platform that allows primary care and behavioral health providers to communicate and collaborate securely while also conducting population health management. The CHCF is an investor in Quartet. Identifying and meeting patient social needs. Seven out of the 17 minutes in a primary care visit is spent on social needs, Hernandez says. Examples of services that help primary care providers address patient social needs include HealthLeads and using text messages to connect patients with appropriate community services such as food banks. Tackling social issues that contribute to poor health in the elderly. Isolation and loneliness are significant drivers of mortality. Loneliness can have a negative impact on senior health equivalent to smoking 16 cigarettes per day, according to Robin Caruso, the first-ever chief togetherness officer at CareMore, a medical group and health plan based in California. CareMore screens its members for loneliness and then provides counseling and peer-to-peer virtual interactions. You can read more about the program here. Voice-controlled smart personal assistants: Investors in digital health said at Health 2.0 that they see tremendous potential for Amazon’s Alexa and Google’s Echo as platforms for at-home health care. Hands-free, voice-activated and relatively cheap, these systems can be used by providers to prompt patients to take their medications at specific times, transmit vital signs and conduct check-ins. How are your local hospitals, health plans and physician groups incorporating technology to help providers meet the needs of their aging patients? As Hernandez said: “What we really need to do is think about simple innovations that are going to allow us to completely rethink the health care workforce of the future.”

### No Bioterror Impact

#### Tech and logistic barriers overwhelm

**Keller 13** (Rebecca, 7 March 2013, Analyst at Stratfor, “Bioterrorism and the Pandemic Potential,” Stratfor, http://www.stratfor.com/weekly/bioterrorism-and-pandemic-potential)

The risk of an accidental release of H5N1 is similar to that of other infectious pathogens currently being studied. Proper safety standards are key, of course, and experts in the field have had a year to determine the best way to proceed, balancing safety and research benefits. Previous work with the virus was conducted at biosafety level three out of four, which requires researchers wearing respirators and disposable gowns to work in pairs in a negative pressure environment. While many of these labs are part of universities, access is controlled either through keyed entry or even palm scanners. There are roughly 40 labs that submitted to the voluntary ban. Those wishing to resume work after the ban was lifted must comply with guidelines requiring strict national oversight and close communication and collaboration with national authorities. The risk of release either through accident or theft cannot be completely eliminated, but given the established parameters **the risk is minimal**. The use of the pathogen as a biological weapon requires an assessment of whether a non-state actor would have the capabilities to isolate the virulent strain, then weaponize and distribute it. Stratfor has long held the position that while terrorist organizations may have rudimentary capabilities regarding biological weapons, the **likelihood** of a **successful attack** is **very low**. Given that the laboratory version of H5N1 -- or any influenza virus, for that matter -- is a contagious pathogen, there would be two possible modes that a non-state actor would have to instigate an attack. The virus could be refined and then aerosolized and released into a populated area, or an individual could be infected with the virus and sent to freely circulate within a population. There are **severe constraints** that make **success** using either of these methods **unlikely**. The technology needed to refine and aerosolize a pathogen for a biological attack is **beyond the capability** of most non-state actors. Even if they were able to develop a weapon, other factors such as **wind patterns** and **humidity** can render an attack **ineffective**. Using a human carrier is a less expensive method, but it requires that the biological agent be a contagion. Additionally, in order to infect the large number of people necessary to start an outbreak, the infected carrier must be mobile while contagious, something that is **doubtful** with a **serious disease** like small pox. The carrier also cannot be visibly ill because that would limit the necessary human contact.

#### No escalation

**Bailey 13** (Regina Bailey is an About.com Guide who holds a bachelor's degree in biology from Emory University, in Atlanta, Ga., Biological Weapons,<http://biology.about.com/od/biotechnologycloning/a/biological-weapons.htm>, Website last updated 2013)

Biological Weapons Biological weapons are toxic materials produced from pathogenic organisms (usually microbes) or artificially manufactured toxic substances that are used to intentionally interfere with the biological processes of a host. These substances work to kill or incapacitate the host. Biological weapons may be used to target living organisms such as humans, animals or vegetation. They may also be used to contaminate nonliving substances such as air, water and soil. There are a variety of microorganisms that can be used as biological weapons. Agents are commonly chosen because they are highly toxic, easily obtainable and inexpensive to produce, easily transferable from person to person, can be dispersed in aerosol form, or have no known vaccine. While it is possible to develop biological weapons from microbes, typically bacteria, finding a means of distributing the substances is difficult. One possible way is through aerosols. This can be ineffective as the materials often get clogged when spraying. Biological agents distributed by air may also be destroyed by UV light or rain may wash them away. Another method of distribution may be to attach the toxins to a bomb so that they may be released upon explosion. The problem with this is that the microbes will most likely be destroyed by the explosion as well.

#### Even if they acquire weapons, it’s lack of coverage that deters them

**Zuber 12.** (James Zuber, J.D. Candidate, The Catholic University of America, Columbus School of Law, May 2012; M.A., American University; B.S., Denison University. Healthcare for the Undocumented: Solving a Public Health Crisis in the U.S. 2012. scholarship.law.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1037&context=jchlp)

**Another challenge that is raised by the absence of clear affordable health care for undocumented immigrants is the threat of the spread of disease.**128 **Undocumented immigran**ts, **unlike those who are legally admitted for permanent residence,** **undergo no medical screening to assure that they are not bearing contagious diseases**.129 **This is a tremendous risk to the public health,** where **we have seen resurgence of contagious diseases** that had been totally or nearly eradicated.130 **Excluding undocumented immigrants from receiving government-funded health care services is unlikely to reduce the level of immigration** and very likely to affect the well-being of the children who are United States citizens living in immigrant households.' 3 Children born to undocumented immigrant families in the United States are less likely to receive available health care due to their parent's immigration status. 32 This will have long-term, adverse effects on the health of United States citizens, a result contrary to state and federal objectives. **A crucial component of controlling the spread of infectious diseases is early identification and treatment**.' 34 Placing **barriers to accessing regular health care for undocumented immigrants threaten community resilience because those with pre-existing health conditions are more vulnerable to suffer severe effects from a disease outbreak or public health emergency**.135 **The** political **decision not to allow undocumented immigrants the option to purchase health care in PPACA could have serious consequences for our nation's health security, especially in the event of another pandemic, or a bioterrorist attack.**

### No Disease Impact

#### And those diseases won’t cause extinction – burnout or variation

**York 14** (Ian, head of the Influenza Molecular Virology and Vaccines team in the Immunology and Pathogenesis Branch, Influenza Division at the CDC, former assistant professor in immunology/virology/molecular biology (MSU), former RA Professor in antiviral and antitumor immunity (UMass Medical School), Research Fellow (Harvard), Ph.D., Virology (McMaster), M.Sc., Immunology (Guelph), “Why Don't Diseases Completely Wipe Out Species?” 6/4, http://www.quora.com/Why-dont-diseases-completely-wipe-out-species#)

But mostly diseases **don't drive species extinct**. There are several reasons for that. For one, the most dangerous diseases are those that spread from one individual to another. If the disease is highly lethal, then the population drops, and it becomes **less likely that individuals will contact each other** during the infectious phase. **Highly contagious diseases tend to burn themselves** out that way. Probably the main reason is variation. Within the host and the pathogen population there will be a wide range of variants. Some hosts may be naturally resistant. Some pathogens will be less virulent. And either alone or in combination, **you end up with infected individuals who survive**. We see this in HIV, for example. There is a small fraction of humans who are naturally resistant or altogether immune to HIV, either because of their CCR5 allele or their MHC Class I type. And there are a handful of people who were infected with defective versions of HIV **that didn't progress** to disease. We can see indications of this sort of thing happening in the past, because our genomes contain **many instances** of pathogen resistance genes that have spread through the whole population. Those all started off as rare mutations that conferred a strong selection advantage to the carriers, meaning that the specific infectious diseases were serious threats to the species.

#### Even if it mutates, they won’t spread

Nick **Beckstead 14**, Research Fellow at the Future of Humanity Institute, citing Peter Doherty, recipient of the 1996 Nobel Prize for Medicine, PhD in Immunology from the University of Edinburgh, Michael F. Tamer Chair of Biomedical Research at St. Jude Children’s Research Hospital, “How much could refuges help us recover from a global catastrophe?” in Futures, published online 18 Nov 2014, Science Direct

That leaves pandemics and cobalt bombs, which will get a longer discussion. While there is little published work on human extinction risk from pandemics, it seems that **it would be extremely challenging for any pandemic**—whether **natural or manmade**—to leave the people in a specially constructed refuge as the **sole survivors**. In his introductory book on pandemics (Doherty, 2013, p. 197) argues: “**No pandemic is likely to wipe out the human species**. Even without the protection provided by modern science, we survived **smallpox, TB, and the plagues of recorded history.** Way back when human numbers were **very small,** infections may have been responsible for some of the **genetic bottlenecks** inferred from evolutionary analysis, but there is **no formal proof** of this.” Though some authors have **vividly described worst-case scenarios** for engineered pandemics (e.g. Rees, 2003 and Posner, 2004; and Myhrvold, 2013), it would take a **special effort** to infect people in **highly isolated locations**, especially the 100+ “**largely uncontacted” peoples who prefer to be left alone.** This is not to say it would be impossible. A madman intent on annihilating all human life could use cropduster-style delivery systems, flying over isolated peoples and infecting them. Or perhaps a pandemic could be engineered to be delivered through animal or environmental vectors that would reach all of these people.

## Links to Base DA

#### The only support Trump has left is his base – blocking DACA is his last chance to preserve a dwindling base.

Cardona 17 (Maria T. Cardona, Maria is a principal at the Dewey Square Group, a Democratic strategist and a CNN/CNN Español political commentator, 9-5-2017, "Not even Trump's wall will be able to stop the backlash over DACA," TheHill, http://thehill.com/blogs/pundits-blog/immigration/349300-not-even-trumps-wall-will-be-able-to-stop-the-backlash-over)mo

The Trump administration, in one of the most demonstrably cruel, calculating and malicious decisions we have seen in recent history, has rescinded protections from deportations for children who were brought to this country by their parents without proper documentation. In one heartless tweet, followed by a cowardly move to hide behind his attorney general whom Trump had announce the decision, Trump declared DACA was over and that there would be a six-month delay so that Congress could “do their job,” implying that it is up to Congress to give these kids permanent legislative protection. Trump was not only cold and cowardly today, his action is specious, his reasoning disingenuous, and the White House spin surrounding it offends the intelligence of American voters. This day will have vast and long-term political repercussions for this White House and for the Republican Party that has supported this move. President Obama signed the executive order known as Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) in 2012, in the wake of Republican inaction on comprehensive immigration reform, shielding these young people from deportation to a country they do not know and to which many have no family connection. While deeply disappointing and heartbreaking for these kids and their families who will now live in uncertainty, limbo and fear, we should not be surprised by this decision from this president, who has proven to be the most anti-immigrant, anti-Hispanic president our country has had. What else should we expect from a president who launched his presidential campaign by calling Mexicans rapists and criminals? What else should we expect from a president who promises to build a physical wall between the United States and Mexico, one of our most important trading partners and allies, simply as political bait for his anti-immigrant base? What else should we expect from this president who insults a U.S.-born judge by declaring he could not be objective in his job simply because of his Mexican heritage? What else should we expect from a president who conjures up pernicious images of immigrants in this country, depicting them as killers, to inflame his supporters and excite the darkest devils of their psyche? After all, this is a president who equates white-supremacist, neo-Nazi, racist, xenophobic, violent protesters with those who come out in support of civil rights, social justice and equality for all. Amigos, this is the man who was voted into the Oval Office by scapegoating immigrants, accusing our first African American president of being born in Kenya, and hiring well-known white nationalists as his closest advisors. Let’s be very clear. The president did not “wrestle” with this decision. He has talked about ending DACA many times during his campaign. Sure, he sent mixed signals by saying he wanted to treat this issue and these kids with “great heart” but we all knew where he stood. If he truly “wrestled” with this, he simply would have shown leadership, kept DACA in place and worked with Republicans and Democrats to codify protections for Dreamers into law. After all, wasn’t this the president who boasted that only he could fix our nation’s problems? Some fix. More like a dodge. These Dreamer kids are some of the best this country has to offer. They work hard, have gone through background checks; many hold down two or three jobs to help make their families’ ends meet. Collectively, they contribute more than $460 billion to our economy in a decade. Many are summa cum laude graduates, or have fought, bled and died in our military for the exact same American values this president trampled on today so heartlessly. One Dreamer even lost his life while volunteering to save others during Hurricane Harvey. And this is how we repay them? For shame! We are better than this — though the president is not. Sadly, what Trump doesn’t understand is that this is not a partisan issue. This is a values issue. Most Americans agree that Dreamers should be allowed to stay. A majority also believes they should be given a pathway to citizenship. Even majorities of Republicans, including three-fourths of Trump voters, believe Dreamers should be allowed to stay legally in the only country they know. Trump is doing this to placate the very narrow and narrow-minded anti-immigrant nationalist core of his base because he is so weak otherwise. It is as if he has given up trying to be president of the United States of America, and is seeking to preside over an even more divided America. That may keep him popular among his dwindling base, but it is no way to win re-election or to give your party the edge in the upcoming midterm elections. There is a reason why so many Republicans have spoken out in defense of DACA and against the president’s draconian decision. Paul Ryan said last Friday he did not think it was something the president should do. Why are they speaking out now? Because Republicans know two things: that it will be very difficult for Congress to pass something Trump will sign, and that their party is in a perilous place if they and their president are the ones who callously threw 800,000 of our brightest students, soldiers, young entrepreneurs, community advocates and hard-working kids who are American — in every way that matters — under the bus. They also know 800,000 Latinos turn 18 every year. They realize Trump is at record-low disapproval among all Americans, and especially Latinos. Granted, the Latino vote was not enough to keep Trump from the White House in 2016. But the wave he is creating among not just Latinos, but among Americans who feel this president is a cancer on our American values, will be one that will flood the voting booths in 2018 and 2020 to get him and Republicans who stood with him out of office. It will be a wave not even Trump’s wall will be able to stop. Dreamers, America is with you. We will keep dreaming and fighting by your side. Si Se Puede!

# Parole CP

### Parole Solvency

#### Most of the aff references DACA, which is a parole mechanism – Work permits and ending deportation threats is sufficient.

Avila ’17 (Sergio, “The Difference Between DACA and the DREAM Act” – FileRight: Immigration Solutions, July 28, 2017, https://www.fileright.com/blog/the-difference-between-daca-and-the-dream-act/)

The term “DREAMers” is consistently in the news. It refers to the young men and women who were brought to the United States illegally by their parents when they were children or teens. In 2012, former President Barack Obama signed an executive order that provided DREAMers some level of relief from deportation. The executive order was called Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals or DACA for short. Obama’s order allowed the undocumented youth to receive work permits and made them a low priority for deportation. As a result, Hundreds of thousands of undocumented youth came out of the shadows and applied for the program. According to the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services, nearly 800,000 undocumented youth have applied for and received DACA protections. The program was ended by President Donald Trump in September 2017, but if DACA recipients are called DREAMers, what’s the DREAM Act? The DREAM Act is a bill that was introduced in the United States Senate in July of 2017. The bill is also designed to protect DREAMers from deportation. Both DACA and the DREAM Act are similar in that regard. The reason they’re different is because one is a temporary solution while the other is permanent. When Obama signed the executive order creating DACA he did so knowing that it could easily be undone by future presidents. President Donald Trump has kept DACA in place but it’s future is in question.

#### DACA alone gives employment authorization and contribute.

Chmurak ’18(Elizabeth, Business Reporter for NBC News, “The Economic Impact of Losing DACA Workers,” 3/6/18, https://www.nbcnews.com/business/velshi-ruhle/economic-impact-losing-daca-workers-n852751)

For 24-year-old Nicolas Ugaz-Valencia, every work day is living the American dream. He is a manager for a home health care service in New York City, using his Spanish language skills to help people in need. Back in 2001, Nicolas and his family left their home country of Peru in pursuit of creating a new life in the United States of America. "My parents gave up completely everything, my mom had left all her family behind for us to have a life here and I am forever grateful of that," said Ugaz-Valencia. For years, Nicolas and his family lived in the shadows, because they lacked legal status to be in the U.S. That got in the way of opportunities that most Americans take for granted such as going to college and pursuing a career. “The biggest challenge with higher education was the finances — and going to college is super expensive here. As an undocumented person you cannot get state funding, loans, in-state tuition. You either pay out of pocket or you get a scholarship, those are really the only options,” said Ugaz-Valencia. That all began to change in 2012, when then-President Barack Obama signed an executive order creating "Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals" or "DACA." The program offers immigrants who arrived in the U.S. as children legal waivers allowing them to stay and work in the country. DACA recipients must undergo background checks and are required to renew their waivers every two years. Since its inception, roughly 700,000 applicants known as "Dreamers" have been approved for the program, including Nicolas and his two brothers. "Without DACA I can't work, without DACA I can't walk the streets safe thinking I'm not going to get deported," said Ugaz-Valencia. “Knowing that it was going to be disbanded I was terrified every single day.” Last fall, President Donald Trump said he would phase out the DACA program and ordered March 5th as the deadline to end it. But, a federal appeals court order has rendered that date meaningless. So, current enrollees can continue to renew their DACA status while the court decides whether the suspension can proceed. If it rules in favor of the administration, hundreds of thousands of "Dreamers" could be subject to deportation. “If you keep the DACA recipients in the United States and you allow them to legally work and live here, not only is that going to be a boom for the economy that is, they're going to earn more money and they're going to pay more taxes. But it's also going to grow the broader economy,” said Ike Brannon, Senior Fellow at the CATO Institute. Ike Brannon, a senior fellow at the CATO Institute, a libertarian think-tank in Washington D.C has studied the impact of DACA recipients on the U.S. economy. He recently co-authored a new report that forecasts the cost of reversing DACA. "We expect in the next 10 years if we allow the DACA recipients to remain in the United States, that would add an extra $350 billion to the economy compared to excluding them from being able to work legally. And we also estimate that that would result in an additional $90 billion of tax revenue, just for the federal government," said Brannon. Nicolas's employer, Cocoon Homecare, contacted an immigration attorney to see if it could protect him if and when DACA ends. The company was told there was nothing that could be done. Cocoon said not having Nicolas as part of the team would be a huge loss, because he is good at connecting with patients. So, as DACA recipients await their fate, Nicolas says he has no choice but to carry on. "You have to be very resilient as an immigrant, because in the midst of all this adversity, you have to stand tall and really keep on fighting, because that is what we have been doing since we came to this country. We have to fight and continue to have dreams," said Ugaz-Valencia.

#### DACA empirically sufficient to solve economic growth.

Reyes 9/5/17 (Raul, reporter for NBC News, Opinion: DACA Decision Is Cowardly, Cruel and Bad Economic Policy,https://www.nbcnews.com/news/latino/opinion-daca-decision-cowardly-cruel-bad-economic-policy-n798831)

What’s astonishing is that our first “CEO President” fails to grasp the economic argument for leaving DACA in place. There is ample research showing that the program has been a net gain for the U.S. economy. One study found that DACA benefitted both immigrants and the native-born. That’s because, thanks to DACA, hundreds of thousands of young people are working, spending, starting businesses, and paying taxes. Conversely, the Cato Institute has reported on the negative fiscal impact of ending DACA. “We estimate that the fiscal cost of immediately deporting the approximately 750,000 people currently in the DACA program would be over $60 billion to the federal government along with a $280 billion reduction in economic growth over the next decade,” their researchers wrote in January.

### Welfare Net-Benefit

#### The DREAM Act confers eligibility for Federal benefits – that requires spending.

C.B.O. ’17 (CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE COST ESTIMATE - S. 1615 - Dream Act of 2017 - As introduced in the Senate on July 20, 2017 - December 15, 2017 - #CutWithRJ- https://www.cbo.gov/system/files/115th-congress-2017-2018/costestimate/s1615.pdf)

S. 1615 would allow certain noncitizens—namely, inadmissible or deportable aliens— who arrived in the United States before the age of 18 to receive **lawful permanent resident** (LPR) status under certain conditions. If they met further qualifications—related to education, employment, or uniformed service—the bill would permit them to remove the conditional basis of their LPR status, making them eligible to naturalize. CBO estimates that S. 1615 would provide lawful immigration status and work authorization to around 2 million people who otherwise would be physically present in the United States but lacking such legal authority. The bill would affect direct spending by **conferring eligibility for federal benefits**—health insurance subsidies and benefits under Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), among others—provided that those applicants met the other eligibility requirements for those programs. S. 1615 would also affect federal revenues: The increase in the number of workers with employment authorization would affect receipts of individual and corporate income taxes and payroll taxes. Newly authorized workers also would become eligible for some refundable tax credits (included in the spending total below). CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that enacting S. 1615 would increase direct spending by **$26.8 billion** over the 2018-2027 period. Over that same period, CBO and JCT estimate that the bill would increase revenues, on net, by $0.9 billion—a decline in on-budget revenues of $4.3 billion and an increase in offbudget revenues of $5.3 billion. In total, CBO and JCT estimate that changes in direct spending and revenues from enacting S. 1615 would increase budget deficits by **$25.9 billion** over the 2018-2027 period, boosting on-budget deficits by $30.6 billion and decreasing off-budget deficits by $4.7 billion over that period. Pay-as-you-go procedures apply because enacting the bill would affect direct spending and revenues. CBO also estimates that providing higher education assistance for newly eligible people under S. 1615 would cost $1.0 billion over the 2018-2022 period; such spending would be subject to the availability of appropriated funds. CBO and JCT estimate that enacting S. 1615 would increase net direct spending by more than $2.5 billion and on-budget deficits by more than $5 billion in at least one of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028. This bill contains no intergovernmental or private-sector mandates as defined in the Unfunded Mandates Reform Act (UMRA). Some state and local colleges and universities may experience increased enrollment as a result of this bill, but any associated costs would not result from intergovernmental mandates. ESTIMATED COST **TO THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT** The estimated budgetary effects of S. 1615 are shown in Table 1. The costs of this legislation fall within budget functions 500 (education, training, employment, and social services), 550 (health), 570 (Medicare), 600 (income security), 650 (Social Security), and 750 (administration of justice).

#### That balloons the Federal Deficit. The counterplan doesn’t link because DACA doesn’t grant eligibility for Federal benefits.

Kirby ’17 (Brendan Kirby is a Senior Political Reporter for LifeZette – the Author is internally quoting Chris Chmielenski, director of content and activism at NumbersUSA - “Uh-Oh! Budget Agency Sees DREAM Act Adding $26 Billion to Deficit” - PoliZette - Dec 27th 2017 – #CutWithRJ- <https://www.lifezette.com/polizette/uh-oh-budget-agency-sees-dream-act-adding-26-billion-to-deficit/>)

Congressional Budget Office projects immigrant amnesty would **balloon the federal shortfall over 10 years** Granting legal status to young illegal immigrants under the DREAM Act would add $25.9 billion to the deficit over the next 10 years, the Congressional Budget Office (CBO) reported on Friday. The extra burden on taxpayers mainly is due to increased health insurance costs and spending associated with programs that benefit the working poor. The report adds kindling to the brewing fire about what to do about the people currently enrolled in the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA) program that was created during former President Barack Obama’s administration. The Development, Relief, and Education for Alien Minors (DREAM) Act would grant legal status to those recipients — brought to the United States by their parents when they were younger than 16 — along with to a broader group of illegal immigrants who did not qualify for DACA. DACA opponents seized on the report as one more reason not to codify what they consider an amnesty into law. “It really flies in the face of the argument that more immigration **expands the economy** and everything gets better,” said Chris Chmielenski, director of content and activism at NumbersUSA. Advocates of the DREAM Act largely ignored the report, however. “We cannot wait until March,” Rep. Luis Gutierrez (D-Ill.) tweeted. “The #DREAMAct and protections of #DACA are not light switches we can turn on and off.” A group of environmental organizations also signed a letter Friday urging passage. “Dreamers are scientists, scholars, lawyers, doctors, advocates, artists, and so much more,” the letter states. “Many have contributed immeasurably to our country, its institutions and communities, and its movements — including the environmental movement.” About 690,000 people are enrolled in DACA, which President Donald Trump said in March he would wind down. The CBO estimates that 2 million illegal immigrants would gain legal status **from the DREAM Act.** Attaining legal status would make beneficiaries eligible **for a full range of government assistance programs** from which **they currently are barred**. The biggest expense **would be health insurance subsidies** under Obamacare. The increased costs through 2027 would total $11.795 billion, according to the report. Spending on the earned **income and child tax credits** would total about $5.5 billion, while **Medicaid spending would increase** by $5 billion, according to the budget office. Other costs are due to use of the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (food stamps), the Supplemental Security Income program, Social Security, Medicare, and higher education assistance.

#### The DREAM Act’s spending goes too far. It kills fiscal discipline – turning their economy advantage.

Arthur ’17 (Andrew “Art” Arthur serves as Resident Fellow in Law and Policy for the Center for Immigration Studies, a Washington, DC-based research institute that examines the impact of immigration on American society. “CBO Says Senate DREAM Act Would Cost Taxpayers Billions” - Center for Immigration Studies - December 18, 2017 - #CutWithRJ- https://cis.org/Arthur/CBO-Says-Senate-DREAM-Act-Would-Cost-Taxpayers-Billions)

In Washington, bad news is generally released on Friday. On Friday, December 15, 2017, the non-partisan Congressional Budget Office (CBO) released its cost estimate of S. 1615, the DREAM Act of 2017. The news was not good for that legislation. The bill would direct the Department of Homeland Security (DHS) to cancel removal and grant conditional lawful permanent resident (LPR) status to illegal aliens and aliens in Temporary Protected Status (TPS)) who: were physically present in this country for the four years prior to enactment; were under 18 years of age when they initially entered the United States; are not inadmissible on criminal, security, terrorism, or other grounds; are not persecutors; have not been convicted of certain federal or state offenses; and have fulfilled specified educational requirements. The bill provides a waiver for the criminal removability bars "for humanitarian purposes or family unity or if the waiver is otherwise in the public interest." It would also provide for conditional lawful permanent resident status for aliens who have received Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals (DACA), unless the alien had engaged in conduct rendering the alien ineligible for DACA since gaining that status. Finally, the bill provides for removal of the conditions on that LPR status, and contains a confidentiality provision barring release of information provided by applicants for conditional LPR status or DACA, subject to limited exceptions. That estimate states: CBO and the staff of the Joint Committee on Taxation (JCT) estimate that enacting S. 1615 would increase direct spending by $26.8 billion over the 2018-2027 period. Over that same period, CBO and JCT estimate that the bill would increase revenues, on net, by $0.9 billion — a decline in on-budget revenues of $4.3 billion and an increase in off-budget revenues [Social Security taxes] of $5.3 billion. In total, CBO and JCT estimate that changes in direct spending and revenues from enacting S. 1615 would increase budget deficits by $25.9 billion over the 2018-2027 period, boosting on-budget deficits by $30.6 billion and decreasing off-budget deficits by $4.7 billion over that period. It also "estimates that providing higher education assistance for newly eligible people under S. 1615 would cost $1.0 billion over the 2018-2022 period." As the CBO explains: The bill would affect direct spending by conferring eligibility for federal benefits — health insurance subsidies and benefits under Medicaid and the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP), among others — provided that those applicants met the other eligibility requirements for those programs. With respect to direct spending, CBO finds that S. 1615 would increase earned income and child tax credits by $5.5 billion between 2018 and 2027. It finds that the bill would increase spending for Medicaid by $5.0 billion during that period, and would increase direct spending for SNAP benefits by $2.3 billion in that timeframe. Direct spending for Supplemental Security Income (SSI) benefits would increase by $900 million during that 10-year period under the bill. Finally, the bill would increase Social Security spending (which is off-budget) by $600 million, and Medicare spending by $300 million between 2018 and 2027. Federal direct spending for assistance for higher education would also increase, by $500 million in that timeframe under the bill, CBO estimates. Most significantly, however, "CBO and JCT estimate that enacting S. 1615 would increase outlays for subsidies for health insurance purchased through the marketplaces by $11.8 billion over the 2018-2027 period." In reaching the $0.9 billion revenue increase figure, CBO assumes that more employees would work "on the books", and therefore report their income, increasing revenue, "mostly in the form of Social Security taxes, which are categorized as off-budget." It finds, however, that "increased reporting of employment income would result in increases in tax deductions by businesses. ... As a result, corporations would report lower taxable profits and pay less in income taxes." In addition: "Noncorporate businesses, such as partnerships and sole proprietorships, also would report lower taxable income, which would decrease individual income taxes paid by the partners and owners." Finally: CBO and JCT estimate that there would be a $1.2 billion decrease in revenues over the 2018-2027 period associated with increases in the nonrefundable portion of the premium assistance tax credit provided through the health insurance marketplaces established under the Affordable Care Act. Therefore, CBO concludes, the increases in revenues "would be mostly offset" by the decreases. In the longer run: CBO estimates that enacting S. 1615 would increase net direct spending by more than $2.5 billion and on-budget deficits by more than $5 billion in at least one of the four consecutive 10-year periods beginning in 2028. Several factors would drive an increase in spending on federal benefits: The direct beneficiaries of S. 1615 would continue to naturalize, making them eligible to sponsor immediate relatives for LPR status without an annual limit. The later recipients of conditional LPR status and all family-sponsored legal permanent residents would exceed five years in LPR status, conferring eligibility for full Medicaid benefits and SNAP. (Legal permanent residents who naturalize after five years also would become eligible for SSI.) Both the direct beneficiaries of S. 1615 and their family members who later receive LPR status would pay enough years of payroll taxes to become eligible for Social Security and Medicare. In reaching these conclusions, CBO estimates that 3.25 million aliens would potentially be eligible for conditional lawful permanent resident status, but that not all of them will apply for that status or be approved. Consequently, CBO estimates that approximately two million aliens would be granted conditional lawful permanent resident status under that bill. Conditions would be removed for 1.6 million of those aliens, and "roughly 1 million of the 1.6 million people receiving unconditional LPR status would become naturalized U.S. citizens during the 2018-2027 period, and that a substantial number of people would naturalize in the following decades." Needless to say, S. 1615 will have a significant effect on the federal deficit. Deficit reduction has long been a goal of congressional Republicans. For example, Sen. Jeff Flake (R-Ariz.), one of the cosponsors of the bill, states on his home page that he "has long fought the expansion of the federal government and the growing national debt," and that the "lack of fiscal discipline is a threat to our economic growth and our national security."