

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

NOT VOTING—13

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

□ 1359

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

COMMUNICATION FROM THE DEMOCRATIC LEADER

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

OCTOBER 4, 2017.

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

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

Soboleff Commission on Native Children Commission.

Thank you for your attention to this appointment.

Sincerely,

NANCY PELOSI,
Democratic Leader.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

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

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

□ 1402

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

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

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

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Tennessee.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Many of our friends across the aisle and in the media said that a 1.9 percent economic growth is the new normal and that we are doomed to continue the economic stagnation of the Obama years.

They have a pessimistic view of our Nation's ability to create jobs and to build our foundation of greater opportunity for all.

America has the greatest workers, the greatest innovators, and the entrepreneurial ethos to far surpass the economic growth of the last 8 years, if only the Federal Government would get out of the way.

In this budget, we put our trust in the American people. But a stronger economy is not enough; we must also strengthen our military.

The number one job of the Federal Government is to protect its citizens. Over the last 8 years, the weak foreign policy of President Obama has led to an increase in threats from all corners of the globe while the funding for our men and women in uniform has failed to keep pace. Building a Better America invests \$621.5 billion in our military and \$75 billion specifically for the global war on terrorism for fiscal year 2018. These resources will help our men and women in uniform complete the mission with which they have been tasked.

Building a Better America presents us with an opportunity to change the trajectory of our country forever. The election of President Trump was a signal to all of us that the American people will no longer accept the status quo.

This budget is also a very personal one for me. As I and my committee have gone through the long and arduous process of getting this budget to the floor, I have had to stop and think about not just what we are doing but where we are going.

I have a picture of my six grandchildren taped to the back of my voting card. I was a nurse for more than 40 years and still hold my license today. Government and public service was never an ambition of mine, but when I saw what was happening in my State and in this country, I couldn't sit back and do nothing.

Every time I put my voting card into a slot, I am reminded of why I left the career that I loved to join the political fray. It is for them. It is for my children and grandchildren and for yours as well.

I grew up in an America where a poor girl, whose parents' only ambition was for her to finish high school, could graduate from college, become a nurse, and eventually become a Member of the House of Representatives.

I grew up in an America that was a land of—that is a land of opportunity and was a land of opportunity then of strength and of compassion. But that America is slipping away from us. For too many young people in this country, the opportunity to live the American Dream is out of reach. A government that was supposed to be of, by, and for the people has left them behind.

Building a Better America requires a government that spends within its means, a military with the resources to complete the mission, an economy that creates the opportunity for all, and a Federal bureaucracy that respects the taxpayers.

It also requires an understanding that the greatness of America does not lie in the grand buildings and the stone pillars of Washington, D.C. The greatness of America lies in the spirit and the tenacity of the people.

We designed Building a Better America to put this vision into practice, to empower individuals to live their version of the American Dream. Future generations of Americans are counting on us, and failure is not an option.

I want to take this opportunity to thank the members of this committee for their hard work that they have done, for the months that we have worked tirelessly to come together and build a budget that reflects our principles.

It hasn't been easy, but producing a budget that puts our vision for fiscal sanity into practice will be worth it, and I thank each and every one of you for your hard work.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget we are debating here today is a shockingly extreme document that gives to the rich and takes from everyone else. It calls for more than \$5 trillion in spending cuts that threaten our economic progress and our national security, and it willfully ignores the needs and priorities of the American people.

This budget isn't about conservative policy or reducing the size of our debt and deficits. It is not even about American families. This budget is about one thing: using budget reconciliation to ram through giant tax giveaways to the wealthy and big corporations and to do it without bipartisan support.

□ 1415

This budget and the tax cuts it exists to support are built on a foundation of lies. They are part of a dangerous and deceptive three-step process Republicans have used before with serious consequences for our Nation and the American people.

This is what they do. First, my Republican colleagues call for massive tax cuts for the rich, claiming they will generate so much economic growth, that they will pay for them-

selves. Last week, congressional Republicans announced a \$2.4 trillion tax cut plan that benefits the wealthy at the expense of everyone else. Yes, I said trillions with a T.

For example, under this tax plan, millions of families making \$50,000 a year would be subject to a tax increase, while millionaires get a \$230,000 average tax cut. That is not tax reform. That is a shakedown.

In total, individuals will see their taxes go up by more than \$450 billion, while corporations, wealthy pass-through entities, and rich estates get a tax cut totaling \$2.9 trillion.

One might justifiably ask why anyone would want to do that. After all, the income disparity in the United States is greater than almost every other country on Earth, and it is getting larger. Just a few decades ago, the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans earned about one-fourth of all national income. Today, it is close to 40 percent. Yet, once this plan is fully phased in, 80 percent of the entire tax cut in this plan goes to just the top 1 percent, while 45 percent of all households with children see a tax increase.

You could be someone who gets a \$1 million salary, owns billions in corporate stock, be a partner in a hedge fund, or just the heir to a massive fortune, no matter the type of millionaire you are, Republicans make sure you will get a tax cut. No matter how many times President Trump, Secretary Mnuchin, or my colleagues across the aisle say it and how much they hope the American people will fall for it, these tax cuts won't pay for themselves.

That is not just my argument. That is the conclusion of the Federal Reserve, the Congressional Budget Office, and respected economists of all stripes.

Conservative economist and former CBO Director Douglas Holtz-Eakin said: "There is just no evidence that the tax cuts actually pay for themselves."

Even Goldman Sachs, Secretary Mnuchin's former employer, says any growth will be minimal, maybe up to two-tenths of a percent.

Bruce Bartlett, the man who wrote Reaganomics, which codified the trickle-down theory, told Congress last week that he now thinks it is: "bull." Well, that is half of the word he used, but you get the idea.

The historical record is clear. We went through this in the early 1980s, the early 2000s under George W. Bush, and we recently saw it play out to disastrous effect in Kansas. Now congressional Republicans want to try it again.

We all know the truth. The tax cuts in this plan will increase deficits and debt by approximately \$2.4 trillion in the first 10 years alone and trillions more in the years after. These aren't special, supernatural tax cuts. They aren't going to magically defy expert analysis, historical precedence, and empirical evidence. This budget will

blow enormous holes in the Federal budget, which brings me to the second part of the Republican deception.

When the growth fails to happen as promised and these tax cuts keep digging our economy down deeper and deeper, Republicans will again bemoan the horrors of deficits and debt.

These cries will lead us to the third and final part of the plan. They will call for congressional action, not to roll back the tax cuts to the wealthy that caused all the damage, but for drastic cuts to important programs that the American people need and support. Education, healthcare, research, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits are already threatened in this budget. It includes an astonishing \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts; \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid alone. It even assumes \$49 billion in cuts to veterans' benefits.

The enormity of these cuts and the severity of the consequences for American families cannot be overstated, but more cuts will be coming if my Republicans get their way with this budget. We will see more attacks on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, nutrition assistance, on important benefits and services that help American families get ahead, and on key investments that keep our economy and our Nation strong.

To be clear, and with all due respect to my friend and colleague from Tennessee, by voting on this budget, for this budget, they are jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 515,000 hungry children in Tennessee so that the wealthiest person in that State, who has a net worth of \$8.8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Democrats have a different budget and a far different vision for our country. Our priorities reflect the priorities of the American people.

We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families; public investments that lead to a brighter future, such as rebuilding roads, bridges, and other vital infrastructure; retirement security for seniors now and for millions of Americans who fear they will never be able to afford to stop working; affordable education so that young people will be able to compete for the careers of the future; affordable, quality childcare for hardworking parents; and affordable quality healthcare for all Americans.

We believe in a government that helps individuals with nowhere left to turn and a Tax Code that helps families get ahead. Those are American priorities, and they should be the priorities of this Congress.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose this budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Indiana (Mr. ROKITA), the vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ROKITA. Mr. Chair, I thank the chairwoman and all the members of the Budget Committee who voted for this budget, and now it is on the floor.

I encourage all Members of the House to vote in favor of this budget, and that is because our national debt continues to grow exponentially every day, every hour, every minute, and every second. We cannot afford to have any more time waiting to address the spending crisis that we are in.

This budget begins to put these irresponsible elitist policies behind us, and creates a culture around here that makes sure that our friends and neighbors who really need the help get the help without forcing our Nation's bills on our children and grandchildren, future generations, some of whom don't even exist yet.

Specifically, this budget reforms mandatory spending so it is focused on those, Mr. Chairman, in our communities who really need help. This will ensure that our country will focus limited resources on those who are most vulnerable, while encouraging a culture of self-reliance instead of government dependence.

We should be measuring, Mr. Chairman, success of these programs on how many people we get off of them, not how many people we trap in them.

Mr. Chairman, as the chart I am holding shows, because mandatory spending is over two-thirds of our total annual spending, reforming this part of our spending is the only way to really get our debt and deficits down. This budget, for the first time, starts addressing this part of the pie, \$203 billion worth, and that is because of the leadership here of Republicans in the House of Representatives.

Now, this budget also protects our friends and neighbors by making sure our families are safe, that the military has the tools that they need, and that the administration has the money it needs to secure our border.

This budget also jump-starts tax reform, which will put money back in the pockets of hardworking Hoosiers and all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, in closing, as President Ronald Reagan once said: "We don't have a trillion-dollar debt because we haven't taxed enough; we have a trillion-dollar debt because we spend too much."

That is still true today, Mr. Chairman, except that that \$1 trillion is now \$20 trillion and growing.

Again, I encourage all my colleagues to vote in favor of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Indiana that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,150,553 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Indiana to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax break.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Chair, I rise today as a member of the Budget Committee to express my strong opposition to this budget resolution, which, if passed, would leave countless working families behind, and not to mention would, in fact, raise the Federal debt by at least \$3 trillion over the first decade and by at least \$6.6 trillion by the end of the second 10 years.

This proposed budget is an atrocious representation of our values. As more Americans find it harder and harder to get by, this budget guts what people need to be most successful. It takes away dollars from education; it takes away dollars from the programs we rely on for retirement, for switching between jobs, for healthcare.

We should be focused on funding the things that will enable the workforce to prepare for the 21st century, not gutting programs that will leave them falling further behind.

Rather than funding luxury travel for the Trump administration, let's invest in quality education, job skills training, and properly fund the State Department and foreign aid programs that Secretary of Defense Mattis and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Dunford have said are critical to our national security.

This budget puts working families, our economy, and our national security at risk.

Passage of this budget would also pave the way for Republican tax reform, if you want to call it that, which would favor big businesses that destroy our small towns.

It shouldn't be easier for a company to get a tax break on buying another robot than training their employees to gain skills for the modern economy. We need a tax plan to incentivize companies to invest in their workers instead of engaging in a race to the bottom where workers are viewed as a burden rather than an asset.

We need a budget that will foster economic growth for all of our people, and we need to make taxes more simple and fair for working families, not give handouts to the rich.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this proposed budget so that we can go back to the table—or, actually, to go to the table for the first time as Democrats and Republicans, and have a conversation about funding the resources that will actually move our economy and country forward into the 21st century and beyond.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), who is also a member of our committee and also of the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Chair, I must first start by thanking Chairwoman BLACK for her excellent work on this bill.

There are a lot of things that I can talk about that are very positive in

this budget, but today I want to emphasize how it prioritizes our national security.

With the growing threats around the globe, it is imperative that we fund defense of our Nation in an appropriate and a substantial way. We need to invest in our Armed Forces. We have to upgrade our defense systems and weapons systems, and we have to ensure the readiness of our military.

The United States must continue to lead on a global scale. This budget takes us in that direction by investing in our national defense. Obviously, coupled with targeted soft diplomacy funding, we accomplish that.

This budget takes us, as I said, in that direction, and it does so in a very positive way. I believe this budget makes those critical investments.

Mr. Chairman, I don't have to tell you that under the previous administration, cuts to our defense spending left the world a more dangerous place and it left our country in a more vulnerable place. Thankfully, the current administration recognizes the failure of the last 8 years and is, again, willing to lead again. Now it is up to us to do our part to provide the resources to allow the administration and our military to lead again. This budget gets us there. I am pleased to support it.

Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for her invaluable leadership. I urge my colleagues to do the same and, again, make sure that we stand toe to toe with our adversaries and we stand, most importantly, with the national security interests of the United States.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my friend and colleague from Florida that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 1,448,000 hungry children in Florida so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$13.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this dangerous budget proposal.

With many working families and businesses still struggling to adapt to a rapidly changing economy, our top priority in Congress should be to help expand opportunities and sustain long-term economic growth and security so no American is left behind as we forge new paths ahead.

□ 1430

To spur robust job growth, we must invest in our education system to provide the training and skills workers need to be prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow.

We should invest in infrastructure that will put people to work and make our communities better places to do business, and we should invest in growing a strong middle class, the backbone of our economy.

But instead, we are debating a budget that will go nowhere in the Senate simply so it can be used as a vehicle to give the wealthiest Americans a massive tax cut on the backs of middle class families.

This reckless budget cuts early childhood, K-12, and higher education programs, as well as job training and apprenticeships. It guts nutrition assistance, which provides benefits to more than 43 million Americans a year, almost half of whom are children. It continues the destructive cycle of neglecting our already crumbling infrastructure, even though we know the longer we wait, the more costly repairs will be in the future and the less economically competitive our communities will be.

Slashing programs that help working families in order to line the pockets of the wealthiest Americans has never led to jobs or economic growth, and it never will. Every dollar we spend is a reflection of our values, which is why I am deeply disappointed that this budget demonstrates an utter disregard for middle class Americans, a lack of vision for what our future could look like with smart, targeted investments, and a complete lack of empathy for the most vulnerable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), a member of the Budget Committee and also the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chair, I want to thank the chairwoman for yielding time to me, and I particularly want to congratulate her on doing something that is going to be pretty remarkable today. She is bringing a budget that actually balances in 10 years.

My good friends on the other side will bring us three budgets, none of which come into balance in 10 years. In that, to be fair, they follow the tradition that President Obama set, who never ever brought us a budget that balanced and left us with a national debt roughly twice the size of the one he had when he came into office. If we don't do what Chairwoman BLACK suggests here, we are going to be in exactly that same position.

I particularly want to congratulate the chairwoman for having the courage to take on the tough issue of entitlement and mandatory spending reform. She has \$200 billion of it. It sounds like a lot of money, but it is out of \$30 trillion over 10 years. This is something we can do—frankly, we should do more of—and that is the way to actually move toward balance.

I also want to congratulate the chairwoman for actually working with other committee chairmen to help them identify the cuts so they are real. They are not just fictional things in an imaginary document.

Finally, I particularly want to commend her for a wise investment in national security. That is a tough decision to make, but we have all seen the

ravages left by sequester and by continuing resolutions that are the number one enemies of the United States military. We have actually, under the last administration, inflicted more damage on the military than any enemy could do on any battlefield anywhere in the world. Our chairwoman and our committee stops that, reverses that, and begins to invest.

Mr. Chair, I just want to end by pointing out the long-term solution here to our problems really is entitlement reform. We have to get serious about mandatory spending. It is two-thirds of the budget now. Without changing the direction we are going, it will be 81 percent a decade from now. It is simply not sustainable.

It is nice to talk about this discretionary program or that discretionary program. The fundamental problem that we face is mandatory spending. The chairwoman addresses it in her budget. We can come back and build on what she does next year and continue to go after the area that really unbalances the budget.

Mr. Chair, I urge the passage of the budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note, for my friend and colleague, that by voting for this budget, he will force 678,763 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Oklahoma all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$10.2 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, I rise today in opposition to the fiscal year 2018 Republican budget resolution, a budget that comes nearly 6 months late and days into the new fiscal year. This Republican budget betrays millions of hardworking middle class families, while showering billionaires with irresponsible tax cuts.

By cutting \$211 billion over the next 10 years for student loans and college aid, it makes it harder to send our kids to college. It abandons our Nation's crumbling infrastructure by cutting \$245 billion over 10 years for transportation. It turns its back on families putting food on the table with SNAP by cutting \$150 billion from the program over the next 10 years. It neglects our grandparents and our seniors with a \$487 billion cut to Medicare in the next decade, and it assumes the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, leaving over 20 million Americans uninsured.

I offered two amendments during the markup of this budget—one to fully fund programs for our veterans, and another to reject paying for a border wall—both of which were blocked by my Republican colleagues.

This budget boosts defense spending to \$622 billion, \$72 billion above the budget cap for defense and well over even the President's request, and it underfunds nondefense spending at \$5 billion below the cap.

At the same time, Republicans have included instructions to fast-track a tax proposal that would add trillions to our Nation's deficit—trillions. It would end almost all itemized deductions, and according to the Tax Policy Center, increase taxes for roughly one in four taxpayers.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlemen from California an additional 15 seconds.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Chair, this budget completely ignores a balanced approach to achieving fiscal sustainability and stacks the deck even higher against middle class families, seniors, and students.

Mr. Chair, I reject today's Republican budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I want to remind my colleagues from the other side of the aisle that, during the time of the previous administration, there was \$9 trillion added to the debt, 1.9 percent economic growth, and that was the high of that period of time, and there were 14 million people who left the labor workforce. If their policies worked, we wouldn't see these kinds of statistics.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. McCLINTOCK), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding, and I thank her for her leadership on this important issue.

Mr. Chairman, for the first time in many years, this budget uses reconciliation for the purpose it was intended: to bring mandatory spending under control.

The appropriations that dominate so much of the debate comprise less than one-third of our total spending, and that is called discretionary spending. The budget sets a level; the appropriations process spends to that level. That is everything from general government to defense.

We have actually been able to bring that under control, but the other two-thirds of spending is called mandatory spending. It is beyond the annual control of Congress. It continues automatically until and unless the statutes that call for it are actually changed.

It is the mandatory spending that is eating our country alive. Mandatory spending is supposed to be controlled by reconciliation. Instructions are sent to the various authorizing committees to make whatever changes are necessary in current law to stay within our means. But this powerful fiscal tool has been ignored or squandered in past budgets, and this neglect is undermining the solvency of our country.

For the first time in many years, the House budget finally restrains mandatory spending by instructing our committees to find at least \$200 billion in savings over the next decade. That means this budget will get us back to

balance within the decade, and this is why it is so important.

If the Democrats had their way and we maintain our current path, the Congressional Budget Office warns that in just 4 years, in 2022, our deficits will surpass \$1 trillion a year. That is where economists warn we run the risk of damage or even loss of our access to credit, a sovereign debt crisis.

If you want to know what that looks like, Venezuela is going through it right now, and within our own territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico—pension systems implode, basic services falter, the economy collapses.

Two years after that, in 2024, 6 years from now, the CBO warns that the annual interest cost on our debt will reach \$654 billion. That is more than we currently spend on defense.

I would remind my friends on the left that you cannot provide for the common defense or promote the general welfare if you can't pay for it, and the ability of our country to do so is being undermined by our spending trajectory.

At the same time, we charge the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, sending trillions of dollars of capital and hundreds of thousands of jobs to other countries. In the last 8 years, we have averaged only half of our postwar economic growth.

I remind my friends that corporations do not pay corporate taxes. Corporate taxes can only be paid in one of three ways: by consumers through higher prices, by employees through lower wages, by investors through lower earnings. Cutting corporate taxes means lower prices for consumers, higher wages for employees, and higher earnings for investors.

Tax relief is absolutely vital to reviving the economy, but experience does warn us that revenue growth only partially offsets revenue lost to tax reductions. Indeed, when we are told that the choice is between taxes and debt, those are two sides of the same coin.

Taxes and debt are the only two possible ways to pay for spending. Once we have spent a dollar, we have already decided to tax it. We either tax it now, or we borrow it now and tax it later. Either way, it is entirely driven by spending. By restraining spending, this budget makes possible the tax relief that our economy desperately needs to grow.

Frankly, we could do much more if we summon the political will, and I will be presenting such a budget tomorrow on behalf of the Republican Study Committee.

But this budget moves us a long way in the right direction. It sets in motion the policies that Presidents from Calvin Coolidge to John F. Kennedy to Ronald Reagan have all used to revive and expand our economy. It brings us closer to that day when families will awaken to a new and prosperous morning for America.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I want to note for my colleague that, by voting

for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,319,000 hungry children in California so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$62.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Chair, since the gentlewoman, my friend from Tennessee, remarked upon economic growth, let me, as one who was here at the time, perhaps correct the RECORD.

Bill Clinton's economic growth was higher than Ron Reagan's, and that is not in dispute. Barack Obama's economic growth was higher than George W. Bush's. We were losing 800,000 jobs a month at the end of the Bush administration, to bring up one point, which, by the way, is closer to 2.1 percent.

People here know I follow these issues like a hawk, but the truth is that this budget today that is being put forward is a threat to Medicare and Social Security down the road.

The previous speaker said he is concerned about mandatory spending. I gotcha. Put out a plan. Put out a plan on Social Security and Medicare. And don't do it in the backdoor way here as they complain about deficits and they prepare to embrace a tax cut of \$1.5 trillion or, over 10 years, \$2.2 trillion on top of the Bush tax cuts in 2001 and 2003 which amounted to \$2.3 trillion. So we are at \$5 trillion worth of tax cuts, and the Clinton administration left us with four balanced budgets and \$5 trillion worth of surplus.

This is not a budget that supports meaningful tax reform. I am ready, and she knows because of our working together in the past, prepared to work with Republicans on fundamental tax reform. The system is begging for it.

Don't call tax reform tax reform when it is really a tax cut. And that is where this is headed, and I think they know that as well.

This is a partisan roadmap that has failed in the past. They are using reconciliation instruction so that the majority can ram through a tax plan here. That is all it is about.

Last night, by the way, the tradeoff is in some States you can keep the mortgage interest deduction if you are willing to give up the State and local tax deduction.

I want to tell you something, I guarantee you right now, based on long history, we will end up keeping both, and they will have to add more to the debt as time goes on.

Is this a cut for the wealthy? Eighty percent of the tax cut goes to the top 1 percent in 2027.

□ 1445

This is from the Tax Policy Center in Washington. Incidentally, how great is it to have a nonpartisan scoring committee offer us a snapshot of the future?

The average tax cut for millionaires, \$230,000 a year in 2027. The average tax

cut for the top one-tenth of 1 percent is \$1 million in the year 2027.

The people in this country who need tax relief are the middle class. We should be investing in human capital, community colleges; we should be investing in vocational education.

So 45 percent of all households with children will see a tax increase in 2027. Among households earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000, you are going to see a one-third tax increase in 2027.

I look at this and say: Why are we not offering some relief to middle class Americans? Why are we not investing in them? Do we not have enough faith in them to help them get through what have been difficult times with children in college and costs mounting all of the time?

Instead, it is back to tax relief for people at the very top. I guess concentrated wealth in America now is not a big issue. I guess the top 1 percent in America who, by the way, aren't even asking for tax relief—that is the irony of this. They are not asking for tax relief. They are arguing for more investment in America rather than concentrating more money in fewer hands.

The American people deserve a Tax Code that is based on fairness. Our code should reward hardworking, middle class families, small business, innovation, and ensure that no one, no matter how wealthy they are, can avoid paying their fair share.

Our focus is going to be on helping the middle class, creating jobs, boosting wages, and giving people the assistance they need in a complicated economy with their grocery bills and childcare as well. Invest in human capital today.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of our committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, it kind of blows my mind. You look at the sign that was just displayed by our colleague; it says that the Republican budget is a bad deal for working Americans.

Well, I don't know what Americans you folks are talking to, but the middle class Americans that I talk to, they want an economic growing, job creating, tax cutting budget and tax relief effort. That is what they want out of the House. That is what the Republican plan is bringing.

We not only rebuild our military, but we do something that has not been done in years. We begin to get into that mandatory spending and the out-of-control spending that we have here in our Nation's Capitol.

Former Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff said that the biggest threat to our national security is our national debt. How are we ever going to do that if we don't begin to address mandatory spending?

Mr. Chair, we have brought a good budget, a responsible budget, one that balances in 10 years to the floor. We need to get every colleague in this

Chamber to get behind it because it is good for working Americans, it is good for working families, and it is the responsible thing to do.

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

I want to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,154,337 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Ohio to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$6.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

And just in case my colleagues on the other side are wondering where this information comes from as to the wealthiest person in each State, it is from that notoriously leftwing magazine, *Forbes*, this year.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Chairman, any budget requires an examination of how and who pays for it and how that budget impacts the economy.

We were told by President Trump and Treasury Secretary Mnuchin that there would be no new tax cuts for the wealthy; and that this budget, and its blueprint, is a middle class miracle. That was last Wednesday.

One week later, this Wednesday, the facts are in. If you make \$730,000 in America, next year your income will rise by 8.5 percent, or \$129,000, or \$10,750 a month.

If you make \$67,000, your income will rise by 1.2 percent, or \$670 next year, or a whopping \$56 a month. This is no miracle. This is fraud being perpetrated against the middle class.

We are told that tax cuts pay for themselves through the magic of dynamic scoring. Their budget will increase the deficit by \$2.5 trillion over 10 years. Where are all the deficit hawks? Where are any of the deficit hawks?

Goldman alumnus Mnuchin and Gary Cohn, the National Economic Adviser, said that this bill will grow the economy. Goldman economists said that their budget will have no good impact in terms of growth in the Federal budget over the next several years.

Finally, infrastructure. The infrastructure budget for America, a nation of 300 million people, for the next 10 years is about the same as we spent rebuilding the roads and bridges of Iraq and Afghanistan over the last 10 years. This is unacceptable. We can do much better.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the chairwoman for her work on this incredible budget that we are talking about here today.

I rise today in support of the FY18 budget entitled "Building a Better

America." Never has a budget had a more fitting title. The budget set forth by the House Budget Committee will balance the budget within 10 years, provide our military with the resources they need for national defense, and cut more than \$200 billion in mandatory spending.

Picture this: \$6.5 trillion in total deficit reduction over 10 years. On that fact alone, I would hope my colleagues would support this legislation.

This budget also paves the way for the recently released Unified Framework for Fixing Our Broken Tax Code.

On a telephone townhall with thousands of constituents on the phone from my district, 53 percent of participants reported that their most important priority for tax reform is a simpler, fairer Tax Code. The framework does just that and more.

I urge all of my colleagues to support the budget, to reduce the deficit, and take a huge step toward progrowth tax reform that will increase paychecks, spur economic growth, and make our Tax Code simple, affordable, and competitive.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 809,000 hungry children in Georgia so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the Democratic whip.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Chairman, the Budget Act, adopted in 1974, requires that the House complete work on its budget for the next fiscal year by April 15. That is 172 days ago.

Yet we now have a budget resolution on the floor, already into the fiscal year for which the budget supposedly is planned. Some may ask why. The answer is a simple one.

This is, first of all, not a realistic budget which could or should stand as a budget resolution. No, this budget is not about putting our country on a sustainable fiscal path, and—this is indisputable—it is not a budget to inform the appropriators of budget priorities and constraints.

No, the Appropriations Committee will not be informed. Why? Because we have already passed the appropriations bills. This budget doesn't have anything to do with the appropriation bills. They are passed, they are gone. They are in the Senate.

This is merely a vehicle for achieving partisan tax reform of the kind that President Trump and Republican leaders in Congress outlined last week. Despite what this sham of a budget pretends, their plan is to push through tax changes that massively increase deficits—I call it the granddaddy of all debt increases—while shifting even more wealth from middle class and

working families to people like Donald Trump.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the tax cuts in this proposal would go only to those who make over \$900,000 a year. Hear me. The tax cuts mainly go to those making, in this Nation, over \$900,000 per year.

Despite promises from President Trump and Republicans here in the House, their plan actually raises taxes—hear me—while cutting taxes on those over \$900,000, it actually raises taxes on 1 in 3 middle class families who earn between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. Even though Republicans continue to assert the discredited supply-side mantra that tax cuts pay for themselves, no responsible economist believes that, not one—responsible is the operative word. The Tax Policy Center's analysis found that their tax cuts would add \$2.4 trillion to deficits over the next 10 years.

The previous speaker said this balances the budget in 9 years. That is Alice in Wonderland balance. It will never happen. I have been here for 36 years; I have heard those comments all the time. It never happened.

But it is even worse, Mr. Chairman. The budget resolution also proposes to disinvest in job creation, pretends Republicans were able to repeal the Affordable Care Act—it hasn't been repealed, yet they pretend it has been repealed—to kick 23 million off their coverage and make those with preexisting conditions uninsurable.

It guts Medicaid and would end the Medicaid guarantee.

Furthermore, it would severely cut programs that reduce poverty and provide the kind of job training proven to get more people back into the workforce.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from Maryland an additional 1 minute.

Mr. HOYER. This resolution is a grab bag of all the worst Republican policies: partisan tax cuts for the wealthy that leave the middle class behind, the cruelty of TrumpCare, and draconian reductions in domestic investment. The product is just as bad as the sum of its parts; indeed, it is worse.

Instead, we ought to be working together to enact bipartisan tax reform that is fiscally responsible and focused on the middle class.

I urge my colleagues to defeat this resolution, and I ask Republicans, who believe that tax reform must be permanent and, therefore, bipartisan, to join us in doing so.

Only one person can stop spending; that is the President of the United States. He can veto spending bills.

The debt under Ronald Reagan increased 189 percent. Under Bush I, 55

percent; he had 4 years. Under Clinton, 37 percent; under Bush II, 86 percent; and under Obama, who was dealing with the deepest recession of our lifetimes, 87 percent.

A budget is supposed to inform the Appropriations Committee of how it ought to proceed. This budget comes after the fact, and it is only for tax cuts for the wealthy.

□ 1500

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to remind my colleagues on the other side that we are talking about the budget. We are not talking about tax reform. We are going to have an opportunity to talk about that later.

Our budget does not assume that tax cuts pay for themselves, and our budget does not reflect that claim. Our budget includes a host of pro-growth economic policies, including comprehensive tax reform, as one of those, but regulatory reform; a reform in the improper payments; restoration of incentives for people to work and save and invest.

Most economists believe that this bundle of pro-growth tax policies will lead to a stronger economy than what we have under the current law. But we are talking about the budget here. So I would like for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle to speak about the budget, and we will talk about tax reform at another time.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WESTERMAN), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. WESTERMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the budget resolution, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK on her leadership and tireless efforts.

Much has been said about our \$20 trillion debt, and I would like to add that we know that that debt can only be paid back with tax dollars that will be extracted from future taxpayers.

We debated and passed 12 appropriations bills in this Chamber. As heated as those debates were, they were on less than one-third of Federal spending. To attack our debt, we have to attack mandatory spending. This budget does that.

As I traveled around my district and talked to people in my district, I have been pleased to hear that business is good. Businesses want to grow, and they want to expand. But I have not been pleased when they told me that they cannot find employees. So I went back and looked at data. Arkansas has our lowest unemployment rate ever right now, but we have also got the lowest labor participation rate.

In the years from 2008 to 2016, we saw a 5.7 percent population growth. We saw a decrease in unemployment from 6 percent down to 4 percent, or 5½ down to 4 percent, but we had fewer people actually working in 2016 than we had in 2008. We had a decrease of 0.8

percent of people working and a decrease of 2.4 percent of people in the labor force during that time period.

We have to put plans and programs in place to get our economy growing. We have to get more people back to work. During that same time, we saw an increase in SNAP benefits. We saw 330,000 people, or over 14 percent of our State's population of able-bodied, working-age adults, getting their health insurance through Medicaid expansion.

We need to focus on addressing our budget woes. We need an economy that is growing and a labor force that is working. We need a military that is strong. We have to address the 70 percent component of spending that is driving our debt. This budget is the first step in achieving those results, and I urge everyone to vote for this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 594,596 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Arkansas to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, first, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding and for his leadership as our ranking member on our Budget Committee.

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's so-called budget plan. I am a member, yes, of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee, and I know, because we work on this each and every day, that our national budget is a statement of our national priorities and our values. I know very well that the Republicans have put forward, quite frankly, a sinister budget whose chief purpose is to hand tax breaks to billionaires.

Budgets are moral documents. They should not be rigged in favor of special interests and the wealthy few, but the Republican budget is. Our Nation's budget should prioritize working families and the middle class, too many of whom are making low wages and living below the poverty line.

It should assist those struggling to find a job and investment in workforce training, education, job creation, and job training. Instead, this Republican budget creates tax cuts for billionaire, millionaires, and corporations.

Our budget should expand to protect healthcare for all. Instead, this budget steals nearly \$2 trillion from lifesaving Medicaid and Medicare.

Our budget should also invest in our crumbling infrastructure, which, of course, creates jobs. But the Republican budget cuts funding for our roads, our bridges, and our railways.

Finally, with nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, our Nation's budget should contain a serious and effective strategy to end poverty, especially for communities of color and

rural communities who have higher poverty rates.

The House Republican budget does not do this. In fact, it slashes programs that help create good-paying jobs for struggling families by \$5.4 trillion. No family in America should be forced to go hungry. Yet, because wages are so low across this country, millions of families now rely on nutrition and food assistance. Yet this budget cuts \$150 billion from SNAP, food assistance, and nutrition assistance, which will create more poverty for people who are working. It doesn't make any sense. It is fundamentally immoral.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from California.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chair, once again, Republicans are determined to balance their budget on the backs of the most vulnerable; to hand tax breaks to millionaires, and billionaires, and corporations; and slush funds for Pentagon contractors.

This budget is cruel and unusual punishment for those who are not rich. I urge my colleagues to reject this un-American, heartless budget, and to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chair, I would say to my colleague from Kentucky, I think the rhetorical device that he is using at the end of each speaker is very effective and it is persuasive. But I would challenge him with this: I think one of the things that we have got to struggle with as a body, both Republicans and Democrats alike, is not being selective on the issue of the deficits. What we can't say is deficits are okay if it involves more spending for all of us as a body to distribute as we see fit, but deficits are not okay if they involve a tax cut and sending money back to individuals within each of our communities.

It is for that reason, again, I have voiced my concerns with regard to some of the components of this budget. But I think that the big issue for me is, simply, we cannot continue to spend as we are and have the ship of America sail forward.

It was Erskine Bowles who was the Democratic Chief of Staff to former President Clinton who observed: "We are walking our way toward the most predictable financial crisis in the history of man if we don't get our arms around spending."

So, for me, while not perfect—and I certainly cede that point—I think the building blocks of what this budget is trying to get toward is a sustainable economy.

How do you have a sustainable economy?

Many of the things that my Democratic colleagues have talked about in

terms of education, workforce development, those things. But it is also about the foundation of: Is our spending sustainable?

You can't go on spending more than you take in forever without having bad things happen at the individual level, at the corporate level, and certainly at the governmental level.

I think it is about: Is our tax load sustainable?

Spending drives tax loads, which is interesting. I pulled a chart that shows for the first 100 years of our country's existence, we spent about 3 percent of GDP. It bumped up after World War II. We are now roughly around 20 percent, and we are on our way to 30 percent.

The question we have to ask in this budget or any other budget like it is: Can we continue to do this without going to the exact spot that Erskine Bowles was talking about?

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from South Carolina.

Mr. SANFORD. Finally, I would simply make this point: Not only can you only squeeze but so much blood from a turnip—and there are certainly limits that have shown themselves, which is around 18 or 20 percent of GDP, regardless of tax rate, up, down; there is that—but there is also this: You can pay me now, or you can pay me later in life.

A deficit is simply a deferred tax. A debt is simply an accumulation of deferred taxes. One of the things, again, we have to get our arms around is that we are stacking up deferred taxes. We are stacking up an accumulation of taxes with debt and deficits. This budget, I think, begins to nudge us in the right direction in doing something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the comments of my colleague from South Carolina, and I certainly have a great deal of respect for his thoughtfulness. But I also must note that if he votes for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 366,000 hungry children in South Carolina so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT), the ranking member of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution and its intent to fast-track tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations. This resolution, first of all, is not serious. It assumes \$800 billion in savings from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, which we know will not happen. We have the Treasury Secretary being quoted as saying that "massive tax cuts will actually reduce the deficit. . . ."

Well, we know how that works. You cut taxes for the wealthy and say they

are going to pay for themselves. When that doesn't work and the deficit explodes, you come back and demand massive tax and massive cuts in Medicare, Social Security, and education.

Anyway, the Republican budget resolution, even if it did add up, makes the wrong choices for America. By calling for trillions of dollars in spending reductions, the Republican budget undermines America's investments in infrastructure, the environment, scientific research, and much more.

I wanted to use my limited time to focus on its harmful impacts on the jurisdiction of the Education and the Workforce Committee, where I serve as the Democratic ranking member. Under the Republican budget resolution, children in need of a healthy school meal, students in pursuit of an affordable college education, and workers in search of skills and training to get a better job all take the back seat to tax cuts to the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

In education, the budget harms students and families by undermining our Nation's education system, and instructs the House Education and the Workforce Committee to eliminate \$20 billion in investments in higher education by providing less funding for Pell grants and student loans.

In terms of other instructions, it instructs the Department of Labor to reduce funding designed to provide job training, protect workers from wage theft, and ensure that there is a sufficient number of inspectors to make sure that workers can come home safely from their jobs.

The budget also threatens child nutrition programs. In fact, during the Budget Committee's hearings, it was made clear that child nutrition programs are a target for savings to pay for tax cuts.

Today, almost 10 million children and 20,000 schools have access to universal, healthy school meals, where children are served nutritious meals without the stigma or need for paperwork. Cutting investments in programs to ensure that children have healthy school meals to partially fund tax cuts shouldn't be our Nation's goal.

Mr. Chairman, the Federal budget is a statement of our values. Unlike other Democratic substitutes that responsibly strengthen our economy and expand opportunity for all Americans, the Republican budget undermines priorities in which students, workers, and their families take a hit, and lays the groundwork for a return to a regressive framework benefiting a wealthy few.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the Republican budget resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), who is the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Chairman, I thank Chairwoman BLACK for yielding.

Imagine what our opinion would be of a movie review where the reviewer simply looked at a movie poster and then

wrote the review and came to a conclusion that they didn't like the movie. They didn't listen to the music. They didn't see the direction. They didn't see the pacing. They didn't see the acting. They didn't see the script. They didn't see the cinematography. They saw nothing other than a movie poster and they came to a conclusion.

We would dismiss that and we would say: How ridiculous. How absurd.

Mr. Chairman, that is exactly what the Tax Policy Center did this past week. They wrote a review of a proposal as it relates to tax reform, and they didn't have the details.

Why didn't they have the details?

Because many of these details don't exist.

□ 1515

Specifically, they wrote a review which was very pejorative, which the Wall Street Journal completely trashed. They made this finding, and they had no notion of what the income brackets are like in our proposed tax reform plan. They had no notion about the anti-abuse rules that the Ways and Means Committee is working through to make sure there is not an abusive situation as it relates to pass-through entities. They had no notion about some of the offshore protections that are being contemplated.

Let's avoid the hyperbole. Let's avoid the hackneyed, old, tired, and faded bumper sticker that says that any kind of pro-growth tax reform is a sop to the rich. It is complete nonsense.

I think the proof will be in a tax reform proposal that this House hopefully will be considering in the coming weeks and months that will bring buoyancy, optimism, and a real opportunity for us to take advantage of a once-in-a-generation opportunity for a Tax Code that nobody can defend and nobody likes. But let's get real and evaluate real numbers and not just look at posters and bumper stickers.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I would note for my colleague from Illinois that, by voting for this budget, he will force 2,066,376 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Illinois to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$8 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), who is the ranking member of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Chair, I thank Ranking Member YARMUTH for the time to speak in opposition to the Republican budget.

As ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I am really perplexed as to why the majority continues their assault on American excellence, following President Trump's lead and divesting from investments in American global leadership, science, and infrastructure.

This budget would cut \$5 billion for domestic and international invest-

ments, while violating the Budget Control Act for defense spending and triggering a \$72 billion sequester of all defense accounts.

My Republican colleagues might argue that slashing nondefense investments is necessary to reduce the debt, but this is a false choice. Why would the Republican majority give tax cuts to the very wealthiest if it means this country has to take a backseat to China in research and development or let our own workforce go without the training to fill 21st century jobs?

We know there is a role for government where the private sector has left voids. Many in the private sector believe we should be investing more in basic research, STEM programs, and public transportation. This budget and the appropriations bills that enact this budget have fallen short in these areas.

Given the budget is 6 months late and the appropriations process has actually moved before the budget, we do not have to guess the implications of the budget. We have seen what the Republicans would do under these draconian levels.

Just look, Mr. Chairman, at the Labor, Health, and Education bill that passed the House last month. That bill eliminated entire job training programs like apprenticeship grants, cut the Pell grant surplus, and eliminated Supporting Effective Instruction State grants, a \$2 billion investment that reduces class sizes and improves classroom instruction. This cut would cost 8,500 teachers their jobs.

The transportation spending bill eliminated the Department of Transportation's major infrastructure grant program, TIGER, a direct contradiction to the President's promise to improve our Nation's infrastructure and which Transportation Secretary Elaine Chao confirms "funds innovative projects that improve the safety of America's passengers and goods."

Mr. Chairman, we can and should—we must—do better than this. I urge a "no" vote on the Republican budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Chairman, for too long Congress has been allowed to play by a different set of rules than the American people in regard to how we budget. No one lives in a world where there is seemingly an endless supply of money, that is, until you enter the fantasy world of Washington, D.C.

However, hardworking American families, businessmen, and businesswomen live in the real world. They have to budget. They have to prioritize and make trade-off decisions: wants versus needs, what is good and what is essential. The bottom line, they have to live within their means.

But, apparently, our government has been exempt from such basic principles of fiscal responsibility under which we the people must live. The prevailing budget philosophy over the years

among our representative leaders has been as follows: as long as we can borrow it, you can bet your bottom dollar we can spend it. And spend it they have.

This borrowing-and-spending delusion has left us on the brink of bankruptcy. We are \$20 trillion in debt, which puts our country in the worst debt position in the history of America, and this with the sacred constitutional charge to secure liberty for our posterity. That means give freedom to our children.

Mr. Chairman, there is no freedom with this level of debt. If we don't do something about this looming debt crisis and stay on our current spending trajectory, in less than 10 years, we will be at \$30 trillion in debt. We will have \$1 trillion in annual deficit. We will be spending more—get this—on our interest on the debt we owe than on national defense.

Mr. Chairman, enough is enough. I rise in support of this budget, a budget that begins to rein in this reckless spending, a budget that funds our national priorities and our core responsibilities and initiates a historic opportunity for tax relief for middle and working class families.

Let's stop spending our children's future and stop pretending that they won't inherit a disaster as a result. Let's live in the same reality as every other American. Let's focus on our main mission as a limited Federal Government by rebuilding our military, by maintaining our infrastructure, and by securing our food supply so we can maintain the ability to feed our own people.

Let's unleash our job creators from the highest tax burden in the free world. Let's allow our families and individuals to keep more of their hard-earned money, and let's hand this country safer, stronger, and freer than we found it.

Mr. Chairman, let's pass this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 2,060,000 hungry children in Texas so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.2 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), who is a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank my good friend, my fellow alum, for his leadership. I recognize and thank the chairwomen of the committee.

To my good friend that was on the floor, I think he wants limited government when disaster is not in his district.

So I think it is important as a member of this Budget Committee of which I am so very proud of its service, as the Democrats have worked so hard, and as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, a committee called upon

for domestic tranquility and domestic security, might I just add that we are now marking up a bill just a few floors away from this House that is asking for \$15 billion to pay for a border wall in the midst of the horror of tragedy and in the midst of a lowering number of individuals even coming to the United States across the border, the very border wall that was told to us would be paid for by the people of Mexico.

But I think the important point is that my good friends who are supporting this dastardly budget that tears at the fabric of America are, as well, supporting a tax cut for the wealthy that will provide \$2.9 trillion of debt to the American people and increase the debt as well as the deficit. It will mean that working and middle class families will have taxes raised on them by \$470 billion. We will see the heavy brunt of this budget on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

Just a few hours ago, I said the American people do not need to have the government step on them; and I can assure you, with this budget, which cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare, we will step on the American people.

We will end the Medicare guarantee, and it will narrowly shortchange soft power by cutting and decimating the State Department, the very partner that we need to continue the security of the American people, raising defense, of whom I support all of our military. Texas is a military State. But it is \$72 billion above cap, and that is not giving our military personnel their due. It is going above the needs of the military.

We need to be prepared, but this skinny budget will undermine education and the workforce at \$326 billion, energy and commerce at \$1.56 billion, homeland security by \$25 billion, justice and the needs of civil justice by \$67 billion, and veterans by \$49 billion.

It will cut the Community Development Block Grant, and it will hurt Virgin Islands U.S. citizens, Puerto Rico U.S. citizens, and Texas, that is still struggling.

Before I came to this floor, I was engaging with my State about more disaster food stamp sites because I have people who are unhoused in the 18th Congressional District, who are needing the resources.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I have individuals who our wonderful first responders had to drag out of the raging waters in Hurricane Harvey. I have homes that were underwater that need disaster relief. I have individuals who are walking along highways like oceans, and then I have children who are with families who do not have jobs

because of Hurricane Harvey, who need the Children's Health Insurance Program or need the disaster food stamps.

This is a budget that steps on the American people. It steps on our disaster relief, and it does not recognize what the United States Government is. It is a refuge and a relief for the American people.

Vote "no" on the Republican budget. Mr. Chair, as a member of the Budget Committee, a senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, and the proud representative of the 700,000 residents of 18th Congressional District of Texas who are still coping with the devastation caused by Hurricane Harvey, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

Why do I urge every Member of this House to vote against this Republican budget resolution, laughingly called the "Building a Better America Budget," but which more accurately should be named the "Nightmare on Capitol Hill Budget"?

Let us count the ways; here are eight to start.

1. Republican budget mandates \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts to top priorities like disaster relief, education, infrastructure, research, veteran benefits, and programs that expand opportunities for American families.

2. Republican budget provides \$2.9 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while raising taxes on working and middle class families by \$470 billion.

3. The budget includes fast-track reconciliation procedures to push through cuts to programs that tens of millions of Americans count on totaling \$203 billion across 11 House committees.

4. The steep reductions in program investments proposed in this Republican budget fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

5. Republican budget immediately guts investment critical to expanding economic opportunity by lowering the already inadequate austerity-level spending caps by an additional \$5 billion in 2018 and by even more in subsequent years.

6. Republican budget adopts Trumpcare but does even more damage because in addition to depriving more than 20 million Americans of healthcare, denying protection to persons with preexisting conditions, and raising costs for older and low-income adults, cuts more than \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

7. Republican budget ends the Medicare guarantee and calls for replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with fixed payments for the purchase of health insurance, shifting costs and financial risks onto seniors and disabled workers; this represents a \$500 billion cut to Medicare over ten years.

8. The Republican budget focuses too narrowly on the military, shortchanging American soft-power and other essential elements of national security by increasing defense spending by \$72 billion above the cap and hollowing out the State Department and foreign aid agencies with cuts of \$11 billion and environmental and natural resource protection by more than \$6 billion.

Mr. Chair, the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of our values and priorities as a nation.

Sadly, this Republican budget, just like the President's "skinny budget" fails this moral test of government.

America will not be made great by stealing another \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, abandoning seniors and families in need, depriving students of realizing a dream to attend college without drowning in debt, or disinvesting in the working families just to give unwanted tax breaks to wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent.

America will not be positioned to compete and win in the global, interconnected, and digital economy by slashing funding for scientific research, the arts and humanities, job retraining, and clean energy.

Even a cursory review leaves the inescapable conclusion that this budget represents a betrayal—of our values as a nation, and of the promises made by the President during the election campaign.

This Republican budget is not a budget for the real world that real Americans live in but is as much a fantasy budget as the Trump "Skinny Budget" in that it pretends to achieve balance by assuming that painless spending cuts can and will be made by the following standing committees of Congress in the following amounts:

1. Agriculture Committee: cut \$207 billion
2. Armed Services Committee: cut \$33 billion
3. Education and Workforce Committee: \$326 billion
4. Energy and Commerce Committee: \$1.656 trillion
5. Financial Services Committee: cut \$124 billion
6. Homeland Security Committee: cut \$25 billion
7. Judiciary Committee: cut \$67 billion
8. Natural Resources Committee: cut \$59 billion
9. Oversight and Government Reform Committee: cut \$282 billion
10. Transportation and Infrastructure Committee: cut \$3 billion
11. Veterans Affairs Committee: cut \$49 billion
12. Ways and Means Committee: cut \$800 billion
13. Unassigned (i.e., Intelligence; Foreign Affairs; Small Business; Science, Space, and Technology Committees: cut \$747 billion
14. Total Cuts: \$4.38 trillion

To put these reckless, irresponsible, and draconian budget cuts in perspective, it is useful to examine what they mean when applied to the programs depended upon by Americans to rise up the economic ladder, plan for the future, provide for their families, and strive to achieve the American Dream.

The elimination of funding for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) drains resources from communities, even in times of disaster because CDBG provides flexible grants to local communities for a wide range of unique needs, including Meals on Wheels, housing programs, and community infrastructure improvements.

The Republican budget targets disaster grants made by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, which help families and businesses when their disaster-related property losses are not covered by insurance.

The Republican budget makes higher education more expensive by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs, like Pell Grants, over ten years.

The Republican budget also eliminates subsidized loans, making it difficult for students, particularly low-income students, to afford college and compounds the damage by making it more difficult to repay student loans by eliminating the Public Sector Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs.

The Republican budget's solution to the affordable housing crisis currently facing cities large and small all across the country is to convert all discretionary spending on affordable housing into a block grant, which means there will be even less assistance to help the 71 percent of extremely low income renter households who spend more than half their income on housing.

The Republican budget cuts \$154 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) over the next ten years by essentially converting it to a block grant, cutting off funding for eligible individuals and requiring cash-strapped states to either fill in the gap or take away food assistance from millions of working families, children, and seniors.

Mr. Chair, as economists and policy experts have documented time and again, immigration reform would expand the size of the U.S. workforce, and in turn would increase the size of the economy and reduce deficits.

The Republican budget, however, again rejects comprehensive immigration reform that would bring clear and just rules for those seeking citizenship and help secure the nation's borders.

In doing so, the Republican budget squanders an opportunity to reduce deficits by an estimated \$900 billion over the next two decades, boost the economy by 5.4 percent, and extend the solvency of Social Security.

Mr. Chair, none of us can forget the President's favorite boast and central campaign promise that he would build a wall on our southern border and guarantee that Mexico would be made to pay for it.

The Republican budget deprives the President of the opportunity to make good on his foolish boast by forcing American taxpayers to foot the bill for President Trump's \$1.6 billion border wall that will do nothing to stop unauthorized entry into the country and will not fix our broken immigration system.

The Republican budget continues to target federal employees by cutting their compensation and benefits by at least another \$163 billion over ten years, which comes on top of the \$182 billion in cuts federal employees have already absorbed in the form of higher retirement contributions, pay freezes, and furloughs.

The Republican budget puts U.S. transportation network on the road to ruin by slashing transportation spending, by \$254 billion over ten years, or 25 percent below current estimates.

The Republican budget cuts hurts veterans by cutting veterans benefits by nearly \$50 billion over the next ten years, with newly eligible veterans experiencing cuts in programs that pay for education benefits as well as loan guarantees.

Finally, Mr. Chair, it must be pointed out that the Republican budget's pretension to balance is based on reliance on trillions of dollars in budget games and gimmicks to rig the numbers.

The Republican budget counts a dubious \$1.8 trillion "economic dividend" from cutting taxes and taking away consumer protections that is not backed up by any credible analysis and assumes \$1.5 trillion of this "dividend" will go toward deficit reduction.

The Republican budget assumes, despite all precedent and evidence to the contrary, that tax reform will be revenue neutral, even though Republican tax plans are projected to lose between \$3 trillion and \$7 trillion.

Given these budgetary shenanigans, never could it more truly be said that "figures don't lie, but liars figure."

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped.

It is for this reason that in evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the budget must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards.

Because the American people deserve to know exactly what ills Republicans have in store for them, I strongly oppose H. Con. Res. 71 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this reckless, cruel, and heartless measure that will do nothing to improve the lives or well-being of middle and working class families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. BERGMAN), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Chairman, it has been an honor to work with the chairman of the Budget Committee as a new Member of Congress because it is such a learning curve to understand the challenges that we have in our country in so many ways, but especially on the fiscal side of things.

I would like to spend my time talking to my grandchildren right now. I am talking to your grandchildren as well.

In the last 48 hours, I have had an opportunity—it was more of a responsibility—to chat with my grandchildren about the horrific events that occurred in Las Vegas. When you are 8 or 16, you assimilate those things in different ways. I talk to them a lot about responsibility for behavior, responsibility for money, and responsibility for their own lifestyles.

I talked to them today to say that we are not going to put you into the debt hole caused by the spending that has occurred over the last decades in this country. We are not going to pass that along to you, because the hole is only getting deeper and more extensive, and we are passing it along to those next generations. Not only is it not right, it is morally wrong and absolutely irresponsible.

We have to ask ourselves the questions: If not now, then when do we

begin to bend the spending curve? If we don't do it, then who will?

We know that mandatory spending within our grandchildren's lifetime will eclipse almost, if not, 100 percent of the Federal budget. That means no money for research, for medical, for education, and for all of those discretionary dollars that are so wisely spent.

We have to begin to bend the spending curve now, and that means cuts in mandatory spending, while responsibly using the other dollars, the discretionary dollars, to advance good programs.

□ 1530

That takes discipline, that takes effort, that takes making tough decisions that are unpopular but necessary for the future of our country.

Our Budget Committee wrestled long and hard to present what you are going to vote on, and I am proud of the fact that with the discourse and debate that we had over tough issues, in the end, the American people are taking a next first step forward towards fiscal responsibility that reflects the reality that we owe to our grandchildren, just like our parents and grandparents felt that they needed to do for us during the Great Depression and a couple of World Wars to make sure that we have a physically viable country. This budget is a next first step.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee and an alumnus of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Chairman, ugly is ugly.

This is an ugly budget, and it exists primarily to be a vehicle for tax cuts for the already fortunate, the top 1 or 2 percent in America, at the expense of everybody else. It will hemorrhage red ink for as far as the eye can see.

That is not a theory. That is what happened in the previous massive tax cuts, both under Ronald Reagan and George W. Bush.

Let me give you one example of the ruinous aspects of this budget, and it has to do with Federal employees.

This budget cuts Federal employee compensation and benefits by another \$163 billion over the next 10 years, \$32 billion of which is included in reconciliation and instructions which I sought to strike with an amendment submitted to the Rules Committee that was not allowed.

The Republican cuts include higher retirement contributions; elimination of the FERS supplement, which law enforcement retirees heavily benefit

from; lower annuities by changing the retirement calculation and reduced healthcare benefits; a 10 percent reduction in the Federal workforce at non-security agencies, even though nearly all of the workforce increases, since 2001, occurred in security-related agencies.

The Federal workforce provides vital services to our Nation. It includes those who patrol and secure our borders, protect us from terrorists, take care of our veterans, help run our airports, counter cybersecurity attacks, find cures for deadly diseases, and keep our food supply safe. Veterans make up 31 percent of those Federal employees.

Federal employee pay and benefits are not the cause of this country's deficit and debt. The Federal workforce has already contributed nearly \$200 billion toward reducing the country's deficit in the form of pay freezes, pay raises insufficient to keep pace with inflation, furloughs, and increased retirement contributions.

We should honor and revere the service of our Federal workforce, not denigrate it with the attacks included in this ugly budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), my dear friend.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chairman, I thank the distinguished chair of the Budget Committee for a job well done.

Mr. Chairman, I came to the floor today to weigh in on this budget debate.

I find it incredible that my friends on the other side of the aisle seem to be in a state of denial on the fact that this country, the greatest on the planet, is \$20 trillion in debt.

These are the same people in opposition, Mr. Chairman, who will present a budget tomorrow that will add nearly \$3 trillion in more taxes and more than \$6 trillion in more spending. This debt is going to land squarely on the shoulders of our children, our grandchildren, and—let me just say it for the record—is so large that it is going to land on our grandchildren's grandchildren.

When does this insanity stop?

There is not an easy way out of the mess. This budget puts us on a path to fiscal sanity. It targets Federal spending that is outside the purview of the Appropriations Committee.

The budget ensures a strong national defense. It puts us on a path to fiscal sustainability, and it gives us the opportunity to do deficit reduction. The budget has progrowth policies that move us in a more sustainable direction.

I understand the opposition coming from the other side. Their answer, Mr. Chairman, as always, is: let's tax more and let's spend more. That is not a responsible course. It won't lead to a good outcome for this country.

Mr. Chairman, let me finally say that it is time we had a national conversation about the math problem facing this country. This budget starts that conversation. I encourage all my col-

leagues to support it, recognize where we are as a country, and resolve to do something about it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 200,000 hungry children in Arkansas all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$38.5 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the budget resolution before us today.

You have got to get a charge out of what you are hearing and listening to today.

If one were to draw a chart from 2001 and 2003 to the present time, what contributes to the deficit and the debt?

I am glad to hear someone from the other side talk about that debt, because I thought you forgot all about it. This budget seems to think that you have amnesia.

If you look at the chart, what grows the debt? The tax cuts that you put into effect in 2001 and 2003, which helped the rich and brought us to an economic abyss 4 years later. You did it, and you are trying to do it again.

So we will see if Democrats are irrelevant, since you didn't include us, so far, up to this point. So much for our bipartisanship.

You asked for \$203 billion in mandatory spending cuts across 11 committees. It will have to be reconciled with a Senate budget that explodes our deficit by \$1.5 trillion. Good luck.

While this Republican budget claims to balance in 10 years, it does so with unnamed cuts, gimmicks, and magical thinking about the economic growth.

The budget is built on the same premise on which you tried to cut the ACA, the Affordable Care Act. Let's take \$750,000, cut down on Medicaid, and we will give that money in tax cuts to the very wealthy. That was your plan. You saw how the country received it.

This budget cuts Medicare by \$487 billion by eliminating the Medicare guarantee. How can you justify that and look into the eyes of seniors in this country?

It assumes repeal of the Affordable Care Act. You want to use the Affordable Care Act's money, but you want to dissolve it, choke it, and starve it. It assumes an appeal of that act, which would take 23 million Americans off their healthcare insurance.

It assumes a \$1 trillion cut to Medicaid—it is in your budget—and \$2.5 trillion in other mandatory cuts, with no specifics.

The gentleman from Michigan needs to study the facts. You have got to get him the facts.

The greatest contributor, as I said, were the two tax cuts of 2001 and 2003. We know the breakdown of where that went to.

This is not a serious budget. It is a desperate attempt to enact deficit-exploding tax cuts.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield the gentleman from New Jersey an additional 30 seconds.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman is reminded to direct all remarks to the Chair.

Mr. PASCRELL. I am making all my remarks through the Chair.

Mr. Chairman, 1 percent would be the recipients of 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts within 10 years.

This budget, like the phony tax plan, is a joke and is insulting to us as Members of Congress. I know you have some problems with your own Conference. I don't know how you are going to figure that out. Don't expect us to bail you out.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote "no."

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would first like to thank the gentleman from Tennessee for her leadership during this budget process. She has done an amazing job of showing wisdom and patience and negotiating this all through this process. My sincere thanks are given to the gentleman.

This budget is a critical step in getting our economy growing and our national debt under control. Not only does it balance in 10 years and put our country on the path to fiscal stability, it also lays the groundwork for tax reform.

With this budget, we are demonstrating that it is possible to have fiscal discipline and keep our promises to the American people. We can no longer continue to kick the can down the road on our mandatory spending crisis. We are leaving behind more and more debt for our children and grandchildren, and it is morally wrong.

We must put politics aside and have tough conversations to ensure that we can keep the promises that we have made to Americans and to future generations.

This budget does not solve our mandatory spending crisis overnight, but it begins that process by achieving a \$203 billion savings in mandatory spending.

By passing this budget, we will also kick-start tax reform. I have said time and time again that America should be the best place in the world to do business, yet we have a Tax Code that tells our businesses that they should take their jobs and their profits overseas.

Every American benefits from lower taxes and growing the economy. The tax reform framework we released last week will do just that. Americans will get to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks, companies will have the freedom to reinvest in their businesses and workers, and more people can move to the American Dream.

Before we can make these changes, we must pass the budget. The reconciliation instructions in the budget will set us on a path to comprehensive tax reform in both the House and the Senate.

This is not just a conversation about dollars and cents. It is about Americans who are counting on us to keep our commitments. We must do the tough work of reforming our mandatory spending programs and reforming our Tax Code.

I am excited to support this budget to build a better America and pledge to continue working toward comprehensive mandatory spending reform.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 1,519,461 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Georgia to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$12.6 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY) the Democratic Caucus chairman.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman, my friend and colleague from Kentucky, for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, the Republican budget proposal is just cruel. It isn't just cruel; it will set our country backwards. It is worse than cruel.

It puts more than \$5 trillion in cuts on the backs of working and middle class Americans. At the same time, it doles out billions of dollars in tax breaks to wealthy individuals, while leaving everyday Americans empty-handed.

Are you a senior who relies on Medicare or Medicaid for important healthcare needs?

Too bad, says the Republican budget. Your care will simply be cut.

Are you a student looking to get a good education and launch your career?

Tough luck, says the Republican budget. Pell grants are on the chopping block, if Republicans have their way.

Are you struggling to recover after a natural disaster?

Forget about it, says the Republican budget. Grants from FEMA and other programs that help rebuild our Nation will be eliminated.

The facts are clear: this Republican budget does nothing to invest in America, the American people, or our future. It cuts funds for our crumbling infrastructure, rather than rebuilding our schools and roads and putting millions back to work. It slashes investment in green energy technology, rather than preparing a new generation of Americans to lead us into the economy of tomorrow.

Worst of all, it ramps up funding for endless wars overseas while gutting programs that help the brave veterans who served their country so well.

Eighty years ago, then-President Franklin Delano Roosevelt spoke of a

national nightmare when he saw a third of our Nation "ill-housed, ill-clad, and ill-nourished."

□ 1545

When you look at this budget, it is not hard to see why FDR's words haunt us to this day, because this budget would take us back to that terrible time when dreams were dashed, futures were uncertain, and hope was all but lost, put back to a time when people were hurting.

That is not the America I want. That is not the America our constituents deserve. They deserve a better deal for all Americans.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Chairman, Democrats believe that our constituents deserve a better deal, a better deal for all Americans, a plan to bring better jobs, better wages, and a better future to everyone, and a vision to give every American the opportunity to prosper and to succeed.

That is the kind of America we should be working towards. That is the better idea that America should be working towards. That is why I will vote "no" on this terrible plan.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I tell you what is cruel. That is doing the same thing over and over again and getting the same results. That is cruel. Especially when we look in our grandchildren's eyes and say: We are really sorry we didn't take 40-year-old programs and reform them so they could be better, so we could reduce the spending, we could give good services and reduce the spending. That is cruel when you don't do that.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the Building a Better America budget. Last month, our country's national debt exceeded \$20 trillion. Interest payments under that alone are scheduled to go up to \$768 billion per year and will skyrocket to \$1 trillion should these artificially low interest rates return to their normal levels.

The debt not only threatens to bankrupt our country, it threatens our children's future and the American Dream.

Now, we can't change the culture of spending in Washington overnight, but this budget puts us on the right path to fiscal sustainability. Our budget balances in 10 years, works to begin paying down the debt, and promotes job growth policies like tax, regulatory, and entitlement reform.

For the first time in decades, this budget resolution finally directs Congress to address mandatory spending, the main driver of these deficits. As this graph shows, if nothing is done to address entitlement programs and our

interest payments, mandatory spending will fully eclipse the Federal budget in the next few years.

Now, politicians in Washington have promised to address exploding debt and deficits for years, but now we have the opportunity to actually do it. We cannot solve our debt crisis, however, without economic growth. That is why our budget provides reconciliation instructions for tax reform.

Today we have a Tax Code that is overly complicated, punishes work, rewards special interests, and discourages job creation and investments here in America. The result has been an anemic recovery of only 1 or 2 percent. This stagnation has made it harder for families in Minnesota and all over the United States to realize the American Dream.

That is what this is about. Every time tax reform has been tried in the 1920s, in the 1960s, in the 1980s, it has worked to make America globally competitive by encouraging private sector investment that is more productive.

That is why today I urge my colleagues to support this budget, tax reform, economic growth, and fiscal sanity.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would like to note for my friend and colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 216,000 hungry children in Minnesota so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$5.4 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. MAXINE WATERS), the ranking member of the Financial Services Committee.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to the Republican's 2018 budget, which would dramatically increase our deficit and debt by trillions of dollars to give millionaires and billionaires a massive tax cut.

Don't be fooled. This plan directly benefits President Trump, his family, and his administration, including Treasury Secretary Mnuchin, Education Secretary DeVos, and Commerce Secretary Ross, but offers breadcrumbs for the middle class and nothing for low-income Americans.

The craziest thing about all of this is that Republicans have been crowing for 7 years that the deficit is too large and that it is hurting our job growth, yet here they go abandoning their principles to cash out their rich benefactors.

I also want to talk about some of the ways Republicans partially pay for this tax cut for the rich. During the same week that Equifax and Wells Fargo executives are testifying about the harm they have caused to millions of Americans, Republicans propose gutting the Consumer Bureau, which has successfully helped millions of our constituents receive compensation by effectively eliminating its funding and independence.

What is more, Republicans would eliminate the backup authority to safely unwind failing megabanks without harm to our economy. Rather than eliminate this tool, we should instead be talking about how to break up bad megabanks like Wells Fargo, who repeatedly break the law and harm millions of consumers. Yet, both the Consumer Bureau and the megabank wind-down authority are sacrificed to pay for the richest 1 percent tax cut.

So I would urge all of my colleagues to reject this measure.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL).

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Building a Better America budget. That is truly what it does. For too long, our government has spent money on a credit card with our children and grandchildren's name on it. It shocks some here in this Chamber, but the era of overspending is over.

Adopting this budget will allow us to deliver the key promises we have made to Americans: getting our spending under control, balancing the budget, and paving the way to deliver meaningful tax reform.

This resolution balances the budget within 10 years and produces a \$9 billion surplus in fiscal year 2027. It achieves deficit reduction of \$6.5 trillion over 10 years. It also reduces the size of our bloated government by giving instructions to 11 House committees to achieve at least \$203 billion in mandatory savings.

This resolution curbs our unsustainable spending while maintaining a strong defense and protecting critical programs like Medicare.

There is much work to be done to create jobs and get our economy moving beyond the pathetic 2 percent growth. This budget is an important step to doing just that.

This budget allows us to deliver on our promise to the American people to fix our broken Tax Code. Workers living paycheck to paycheck, like my parents did, need relief and they need it now. We cannot delay any longer.

My colleagues on the other side of the aisle seek to raise taxes by \$3 trillion and simply spend more. I suggest they study how that approach worked in Greece.

I urge my colleagues to support the Building a Better America budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he will force 1,895,558 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in Michigan to pay more for lifesaving Medicare all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has net worth of \$5.9 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Chairman, in a nutshell, here is the Republican and the President's case. They want you to

believe that if you cut corporate taxes, if you cut taxes on the investor class, that this is going to raise wages. That is the President's argument.

Here is what I don't understand. If you want to raise wages, why not just raise wages? Why not just give the tax credits to working families?

The President's Wall Street bankers have a different theory that only gets credence in the beltway. This is not about economics. This is about common sense. Think about it. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that the better way to raise wages is not to cut taxes for corporations, but to actually give the tax relief to people making under \$75,000.

You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you cut taxes for shareholders and corporate CEOs, they are probably going to invest it overseas. If you cut the taxes or give the tax relief to people making 50 grand in Michigan or Ohio, they are going to spend it and create jobs in the United States.

This is just common sense. You don't have to be a Ph.D. economist to know that if you really want to create jobs, invest in technical training for the million skills gap we have, instead of putting hopes on corporate CEOs who already have record profits, that somehow they are going to create more jobs.

Mr. Chair, it used to be that there were serious thinkers on the Republican side, people like Jack Kemp. I disagreed with him, but at least he had innovative ideas of enterprise zones and how to really create jobs. But for the past 20 years, the Republican party has been devoid of ideas.

It is a mantra: tax cuts, tax cuts, tax cuts.

Oh, we are changing into a digital economy. How do we solve it? Tax cuts. That is not a constructive solution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to talk about common sense just for a moment. Common sense is if our other OECD countries have an average corporate rate of 18 to 20 percent and ours is between 35 and 39, and we have companies that now decide to go overseas. It seems to me to be common sense to at least be equal to what other countries are doing.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. SMUCKER), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Chairman, the national debt is a staggering \$20 trillion. We are handcuffing future generations with what—if we don't take action—will become an unsurmountable fiscal crisis. This budget resolution before us today is a step toward putting our Nation back on a sustainable fiscal path. But even more, it will lead to greater prosperity and opportunity for American families and generations to come.

My own experience as a 17-year-old, I had the good fortune to be able to buy a small construction company from my older brother for \$1,000 when I was

fresh out of high school. Through a lot of hard work and a dedicated team of individuals, we were able to grow that company, employing over 150 people with family-sustaining jobs, family-sustaining wages.

That is what we call the American Dream. There are countless stories like that: the idea that we can begin with little or nothing, work hard, play by the rules, and achieve our dreams.

Unfortunately, in today's economic environment, for many, the American Dream seems out of reach.

Mr. Chair, that is why this budget is so important. Not only will it put us on a sustainable fiscal path, but it lays out the path forward for tax reform that will give American families the opportunity to improve their lives.

Consider a constituent that I spoke to this week. This particular constituent is a single father of 5 in Lancaster County. He asked me if our tax plan means more money in his paycheck. Now, he makes it work today, but it is difficult for him, and he could use some help. This is exactly the kind of hardworking American we are trying to help with our reforms.

Americans deserve this budget because it lets us pass tax reform to help families like the one I just described. They deserve it because too many Americans today do everything right but still struggle to make ends meet. Americans deserve it because they should have a more honest Federal Tax Code and a simplified filing process that allows them to spend more time with their family, to save for their children's college fund, or to plan for their retirement.

Passing this budget helps to make these things possible, and I strongly urge my colleagues in this Chamber to support it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I want to note for my colleague that by voting for this budget, he is jeopardizing meals and food assistance for 734,000 hungry children in Pennsylvania all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3.8 billion, gets a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Chairman, debating this budget resolution is a partisan and pointless exercise, and I will point out to the chairman that it is October, after the fiscal year has expired and after we have already passed every single appropriations bill out of the House of Representatives, and, I might add, a continuing budget resolution.

□ 1600

Just as when we considered it in committee this summer, this resolution stands as a demonstration of the

majority's willful and disgraceful neglect of the needs of the American people.

With so many critical legislative issues for us to discuss, the majority has decided it is a better use of our time to discuss tax breaks for millionaires and wealthy corporations; taking healthcare away from 20 million Americans; blowing up our deficit with an ineffective, immoral border wall; and gutting crucial investments in jobs, education, and medical research.

Instead, this House should be enacting legislation to expand background checks and ban assault weapons to combat senseless firearm violence after this Nation witnessed, once again, the deadliest mass shooting in U.S. history.

This House should be passing the Dream Act to protect DREAMers who call this Nation home and protect them from this administration's heartless deportations.

Finally, instead of wasting taxpayer dollars and our constituents' time with this harmful budget resolution, this House should be reauthorizing CHIP, the bipartisan-backed Children's Health Insurance Program, which expired over the weekend and which potentially is going to leave children who badly need healthcare insurance twisting in the wind without it.

Congressional Republicans have chosen instead to bring this incredibly irresponsible and extreme bill to the floor.

In stunning ignorance of reality, it assumes TrumpCare will still pass. Just how many times must the majority be reminded that TrumpCare is not going to become law and the Affordable Care Act is the law of the land that Americans support?

How many times will the majority try to cut Medicaid by \$1 trillion, cut Medicare benefits, and raise insurance costs on elderly and low-income Americans?

Enough is enough. Instead of pandering to the well connected and our worst impulses, this budget should embody America's best values, and it is far from it.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The time of the gentlewoman has expired.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield the gentlewoman from Florida an additional 30 seconds.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Sadly, this budget does not reflect our responsibility to care for and invest in the American people.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chair, I rise in support of the proposed budget resolution, which will provide the spending cuts that Washington needs and give a pathway to reconciliation for tax reform.

Our national debt sits at an astronomical \$20 trillion and is projected to

reach close to \$30 trillion within 10 years. Washington's out-of-control spending hinders our economy, Mr. Chair, and by kicking the can down the road, it puts the financial burden on the backs of our children and of our grandchildren.

Not only is our debt unsustainable, but high levels of government debt needs substantial resources, and taxpayers' dollars must go to servicing our debt. Over the next decade, the cost to service our debt will rise 219 percent, meaning we will spend close to \$800 billion by the year 2027 simply to pay the interest on our debt.

This budget reduces spending by \$5.4 trillion over a 10-year window. It does not expand the size of Federal Government. It does not encroach on State or local authority.

This is a conservative path forward and will help us accomplish what we came here to do: meaningful tax reform.

While I would like to see our government make even more wise choices with taxpayers' dollars, this budget resolution puts us on the road to achieving that goal. With this resolution as a vehicle for updating our outdated Tax Code, Mr. Chair, I truly believe we can accomplish something that has not been done in over 30 years.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this budget resolution.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I would remind my colleague that, by voting for this budget, he will force 941,169 seniors, disabled individuals, and other seriously ill people in South Carolina to pay more for lifesaving Medicare, all so that the wealthiest person in his State, who has a net worth of \$3 billion, can get a massive tax cut.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH), a distinguished member of the Oversight and Government Reform Committee.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTH. Mr. Chairman, I thank the ranking member for yielding.

Mr. Chair, the budget before us today sets up a tax plan that would harm hundreds of thousands of working families in Illinois and millions across the Nation.

It has been widely reported that this tax plan enables a budget that would eliminate the State and local tax deduction, also known as the SALT deduction, S-A-L-T, SALT deduction.

In my home State of Illinois, this SALT deduction represents a sizeable portion of taxpayers' income, accounting for approximately 6 percent of the average itemizers' average gross income.

Within my district, the SALT deduction allows families in Cook County to save an average of \$4,000 a year. In Kane and DuPage Counties, the numbers are even greater, \$5,000 and \$6,600, respectively.

Simply put, Mr. Chair, this SALT deduction prohibits double taxation on

working families. That is why numerous bipartisan and nonpartisan organizations have spoken out in support of the SALT deduction, including the National Governors Association and the United States Conference of Mayors.

If this budget passes, the tax structure it creates will cause a dramatic increase in the tax burden on working families.

There is no doubt that our Tax Code needs to be updated, but we need to do so in a way that upholds the President's promise that working families would not see a tax increase.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to oppose this double taxation budget and this increase in taxes on working families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. SHIMKUS).

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

Mr. SHIMKUS. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and I thank Chairman BLACK for her hard work developing this blueprint.

Our Nation's national debt now exceeds \$20 trillion. While there are many factors driving our Nation's fiscal health and long-term spending outlook, I am working to address one of those items this year: our Nation's need to dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

In 1982, Congress passed the Nuclear Waste Policy Act and enacted a formal nuclear waste management program for the Federal Government and set a 1998 deadline for the Department of Energy to begin to dispose of used fuel. Nuclear utilities signed a contract with DOE requiring this deadline to be met. Unfortunately, the Federal Government did not meet that deadline and has yet to take title to this material.

Since then, the Federal Government has been held liable for not meeting this deadline, and the courts awarded financial damages to utilities due to the breach of contract. The payments resulting from these lawsuits are paid from a specific Department of the Treasury account, known as the judgment fund, a permanent, unlimited fund not subject to budget caps or annual appropriations.

Since 2009, DOE's total liability has escalated from \$12 billion to nearly \$30 billion, or over \$2 billion in total liability for each year of delay. Last year alone, the nuclear waste costs were about one-third of all Federal Government payments due to litigation. Put another way, American taxpayers are paying over \$2 million every single day in which we neglect our moral and legal obligation to permanently dispose of spent nuclear fuel.

It is time to get our nuclear waste management program back on track. Bipartisan legislation I introduced, H.R. 3053, the Nuclear Waste Policy Amendments Act of 2017, which passed out of the Committee of Energy and Commerce by an overwhelming vote of

49-4, would do just that. I look forward to continuing to work with my colleagues to address this budget challenge.

Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK again for her leadership and support of this important issue.

Mr. Chair, I urge support of this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Chair, first, let me thank Chairman BLACK for her leadership on this remarkable budget.

When I ask my constituents from Texas about their biggest concerns for their family and the Nation's future, the overwhelming response is about the debt our country faces. Washington's spending just continues to grow too fast. Our national debt has topped \$20 trillion, and without action, our great country is poised for a difficult and painful fiscal reckoning.

Today, with this budget, we have the opportunity to do something about it, the opportunity to tackle our Nation's fiscal challenges head-on with a strong, two-part approach.

First, this budget provides real fiscal responsibility. It balances within 10 years. It preserves and improves Medicare for the long term. It returns power to our State and local governments so they can do what is best for their communities, not Washington.

Now, these measures get us moving in the right direction, but fiscal accountability is only one crucial piece of the puzzle. If we want a healthier American economy for the long term, we need a growing American economy for the long term. That is why this budget by Chairwoman BLACK also lays the groundwork—the runway, if you will—for a once-in-a-generation pro-growth, pro-family, pro-middle class tax reform.

The House and the Senate are unified with President Trump in delivering a new Tax Code for a new era of American prosperity. We have released bold ideas to deliver more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for the American people, especially our middle class families.

We are united in getting tax reform legislation to the President's desk this year, but if we do not pass the budget, tax reform doesn't move forward. So I would like to ask all my colleagues today on both sides of the aisle: Where do you stand? Are you content with an unsustainable national debt, a slow-growth economy, and a broken pro-Washington, pro-special interest Tax Code, or do you stand in support of fiscal responsibility and pro-growth tax reform that allows all Americans to keep more of their paychecks?

This is our time to show the American people we don't accept that slow-growth future.

Mr. Chair, I would like to thank Chairman BLACK of the Budget Committee for her remarkable leadership in bringing this budget forward.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, may I inquire how much time both sides have remaining.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 37½ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Mexico (Mr. PEARCE).

Mr. PEARCE. Mr. Chair, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I am pleased to rise today in support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution.

On behalf of Chairman HENSARLING, I would like to take a moment to speak about the instructions given by the chairwoman of the Budget Committee to the Financial Services Committee to find savings of \$14 billion.

Now, that is what we were sent here to do: to find those places where it makes sense to cut the budget and we don't harm anything. In fact, in this case, the Financial Services Committee is going to help things in rural communities by finding those savings that the chairwoman instructed us to find.

Several years ago, the Democratic majority passed the Dodd-Frank resolution, the Dodd-Frank Act. That enshrined too big to fail. It created unaccountable agencies like the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau.

Earlier this year, this body passed H.R. 10, the Financial CHOICE Act. That was trying to prune back the capabilities of CFPB to hurt the rural areas, which it had been doing in my district.

Carlsbad National Bank recently shared with us how it takes them 185 pages to complete a mortgage loan, 185 pages for a small bank for just the simple resolution of buying a home.

Many times our community banks are simply stopping to offer that service. No one else is willing to come in to New Mexico and lend into these rural communities. So we are facing a very serious problem.

Sometimes community banks are having to consolidate. That hurts rural communities even worse, because the consolidation usually moves the bank's headquarters outside the State or outside the community. It weakens the fabric of the community.

So by finding the savings in this budget resolution which we were instructed to do, we not only save the money, but we also stop the encroaching regulations that CFPB is putting out, harming the rural communities, harming rural homeowners.

So for those reasons, I gladly support H. Con. Res. 71, the Budget Resolution Act, and urge its passage.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alaska (Mr. YOUNG).

Mr. YOUNG of Alaska. Mr. Chair, I thank Chairman BLACK and Chairman BISHOP for including ANWR, the Alaska National Wildlife Refuge, in the budget process.

I am looking forward to this. With this legislation, we contribute money to solving some of our national debt.

The small area of 1002 in the National Wildlife Refuge is an area of 2,000 acres, smaller than Dulles Airport.

□ 1615

Potentially, though, we have a little over 20 billion barrels of oil. Think how much money that would bring to the Treasury immediately through the bidding process.

This is an issue I have been working on for the last 45 years. It is time we passed it. Once it went to the Senate, and President Clinton vetoed it because it wouldn't help us with that embargo we had at that time.

Now is the time to make sure this Nation is independent totally. It won't happen overnight, but only Congress can do this. It is not a wilderness area. It is designated to be drilled at the behest of the Congress for the good of the Nation.

It will reduce the debt. Again, I said I expect bids of about \$10 billion to \$20 billion just to have the right to drill. With the new royalties that are coming down from the Secretary of the Interior, we will have not only a large amount going into the Treasury, we will have about 776,000 new jobs created by the discovery of this oil.

We have already seen what we have been able to do in other States by fracking and becoming more energy independent and how that controls the OPEC nations. But this is the area which oil has been developed by God. It is only going to be available to the United States, and it is time that this Congress steps forth and brings this to fruition for the people.

We will hear a lot from the other side of those interest groups that have no knowledge at all about the area I am talking about. We hear that the caribou herd will be affected. It is ironic that Prudhoe Bay has produced 17 billion barrels of oil, and when we started, there were 5,000 caribou. Now we have about 31,000 caribou. Oil didn't disturb them.

Oil is not evil. It is the necessity for this Nation socially to create jobs. It will make a healthier economy. I am asking my colleagues again to consider this legislation. It is necessary for this Nation. It is necessary, very frankly, for the good of this Congress. With \$20 trillion in debt, I have yet to hear anything that will create new wealth. You can cut all you want to cut, I will cut what I want to cut, but you have to create new wealth. You have to bring it into the fold of the general budget process and for the economy of this Nation.

Let's not keep putting our heads in the sand and saying: Oh, we don't need to do this; it is not the time to do it. Now is the time for the good of the Nation and because we are in debt.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to consider this in this budget. I compliment Mrs. BLACK and her work, her chairmanship, on the budget. It is a very difficult process.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time so we can hear from the Joint Economic Committee.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio (Mr. TIBERI) and the gentleman from New York (Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY) each will control 30 minutes on the subject of economic goals and policies.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Ohio.

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

Mr. Chair, we are making a choice today about the kind of future that we want. We can choose a future of more deficits and more debt piled onto our children, or we can continue having a weak economy where people in their prime working years can keep leaving the job market.

Or we can choose a future where America's job creators, people who go to work every day, decide that they will be better off starting or moving their business overseas.

Or we can choose the future of more of the same, and it is not the wealthy who will suffer more of the same. It is the most vulnerable, low-income Americans trying to climb out of poverty. It is the middle class families who find it harder and harder to keep up, to get ahead—people like my dad, a machine operator who is now retired as a United Steelworker.

It is our children and our grandchildren who will have to pay tomorrow for the mistakes that we make today.

But we can instead choose a better future, Mr. Chair, where the government learns to live within its means and move forward toward balanced budgets; a future where job-creating small businesses aren't punished by our Tax Code when they succeed; a future where we stop losing jobs and businesses to foreign countries with lower tax rates, when workers can finally get the pay raises they deserve, more money in their pockets, and more prosperity is widespread, not just concentrated on our coasts and a few large urban cities.

We will be voting soon on a budget that restores fiscal responsibility and paves the way for a world class Tax Code built for growth and a better future for our kids and our grandkids.

Yesterday, at the Joint Economic Committee, Mr. Chair, we held a hearing on the decline in business startups, the engines of job growth and innovation in America, and the role tax reform could play in reversing this downward spiral.

Among other things, here is what we heard yesterday at the hearing. First, simplify the Tax Code. Entrepreneurs spend way too much time and way too much money complying with the Tax Code instead of focusing on growing their businesses.

Second, lower the tax rates that our companies and employers pay. That is something that foreign governments around the world, both friends and foes, have already done to attract more jobs, more businesses.

Third, let companies of all sizes write off the cost of their growth-producing investment immediately, this is called expensing, instead of deducting them slowly from the taxes over many years under very complicated depreciation rules.

Fourth, stop punishing our businesses for investing overseas profits by bringing them back home to America. Move away from the system that double taxes American companies that do business overseas.

These steps will boost economic growth. Growing markets will give entrepreneurs the confidence to risk starting a business, which many won't even do today, as we have seen more and more startups not making it to the starting line.

More startups create more jobs, an average of six new jobs per startup, and more economic growth means continuing to spread that prosperity.

I am happy to report that these recommendations are a large part of our tax reform framework that has just recently been unveiled: simplicity, lower tax rates, expensing, stop double taxing our American businesses that do business abroad, reward investment in America, and boost economic growth.

We need a Tax Code that makes America the best place in the world to do business and grow your business and keep your business.

Our job creators who are corporate taxpayers now face the highest tax rate in the developed world. While other countries aggressively lower their tax rate, Mr. Chair, to attract new businesses, we left our businesses standing still.

Mr. Chair, the tax reform framework would slash our corporate rate from the highest in the world, at 35 percent, to a competitive 20 percent. Instead of the worst, we get much better. In a global economy, that is just not a luxury, that is a necessity.

Our tax reform framework will not only help American companies compete with foreign ones, but also bring capital back to America to invest and grow jobs here at home.

Let's look at how the Tax Code is punishing our small businesses who pay individual taxes as pass-throughs, not just with complex taxes but also high tax rates.

When Main Street businessowners went to sleep on December 31 of 2012, their highest tax rate was 35 percent. When they woke up the following year in January of 2013, Mr. Chair, their top

rate spiked to 44.6 percent due to Obama administration policies.

Many on the other side of the aisle will say that most small businesses don't pay the top rate, but taxpayers who do pay the top rate, those small businesses, in many cases, are responsible for much of our economic activity and our employment as pass-through businesses.

Every small business owner dreams of being successful, and the high top rate punishes the very success that we want them to achieve in America. Adding to the Federal rate, the tax rate, the local rate, many of these small businesses pay over 50 percent in taxes.

The tax reform framework not only slashes rates for American employers but our small businesses as well. The top rate for pass-throughs will be 25 percent.

Another feature of the tax reform framework, Mr. Chair, would allow businesses of all sizes to deduct their business expenses, their investments, immediately through expensing. This would encourage companies to make the kind of investment like buying state-of-the-art equipment that would lead businesses to grow, create more jobs, pay better wages, higher economic growth, and the best part of all, larger paychecks for workers.

Mr. Chair, we have a choice to make. We can turn our backs on the most vulnerable Americans and doom them to more of the same, subpar growth, stagnant wages, more debt, less opportunity, a complex and outdated Tax Code that punishes job creation and investment in America, or I hope we choose a better path forward, a better future for Americans, bigger paychecks, and it starts today with the passing of this budget.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this budget.

Ultimately, a national budget is like a deal between the American taxpayers and Congress about how this country will spend their money. Anyone who looks at the fine print in this budget plan can tell, with a glance, that the American people want, need, and deserve a better deal.

In the Republican tax plan that goes with this budget, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent. The top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts.

A better deal would drop plans to slash Medicare and Medicaid to pay for massive tax cuts for the wealthiest few—a deal that instead would be a bipartisan effort to bring middle class tax relief, badly needed investments, and greater opportunity.

But what we have instead is a budget that cuts \$5.4 trillion in spending over 10 years, including \$4.4 trillion in cuts to the mandatory programs that help average Americans get and stay ahead.

These aren't just paper cuts. These are huge cuts—cuts that would cause enormous damage in the lives of children, students, veterans, and other Americans. About half of these cuts in nondefense spending are in programs that help people who need the help the most—cuts in programs that provide food to those in need, programs that help students from low-income families afford a college education. They even have cuts in the badly needed disaster relief that is helping so many in our country.

In fact, by 2027, more than one-third of the resources for low- and middle-income people would be gone. Struggling Americans deserve a better deal than that. And who pays under the Republican tax plan? Seniors, single parents, and middle class families, it goes up.

Nondefense discretionary is already at its lowest level since the category has been tracked. Republicans want to cut even more, and so they target senior citizens and healthcare.

This budget cuts half a trillion dollars from Medicare, replacing Medicare's guaranteed benefits with a voucher-like system and increasing its eligibility age to 67.

□ 1630

The CBO estimates that these cuts would cause part B premiums to increase 25 percent by 2020. And this budget claims that it "saves" \$1.5 trillion by repealing the Affordable Care Act, even though they have already tried to repeal it about 60 times on this floor, without success, thank God, and the American people have made it clear that they don't want it repealed.

They still have no replacement plan for the Affordable Care Act. So that means that they would just be leaving millions without health insurance and threatening the coverage of all those with preexisting conditions and chronic illnesses, and would leave millions facing huge premium increases.

Their plan also cuts \$114 billion from Medicaid, ripping away coverage from low-income families and the disabled. This is just plain wrong. Our seniors deserve a much better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for the opportunity to speak a little bit here about the tax reform opportunities that we are seeing now.

Some people don't like to admit it, but there is a proven, inescapable correlation among tax treatment, capital investment, and job creation. As this chart right here shows, unequivocally correlating an investment of capital with economic change, when you have more money put in, you get more jobs and more economic growth. And some people don't like to admit that connection, but it is inescapable. It has been that way ever since the first commerce took place in the Roman era.

We have a second chart that shows the post-World War II GDP change, an average of 3.1. The American middle class was built on opportunity, lower taxes, economic stimuli, and growth. It wasn't built on this 2.3 to 1.6 that we are going to get if we don't get back to some serious business-centric, investment-centric tax reform.

There is another equally inescapable fact, and that is that capital is fungible. If tax treatment nurtures it, like watering your yard, it will grow. If not, it will be invested somewhere else. Just look at Texas, just look at my home State of Florida, and look at Ireland, for example.

When the tax climate is nurturing and favorable for investment, you get money put in, you get jobs created, you get economic growth. Investment goes where it is most favorably treated. So going to 20 and 25 percent from 35 to 40 percent will unleash a torrent of capital investment and job formation.

Rapid capital recovery by expensing capital assets purchases will attract massive investments, stimulate our economy, make our manufacturing companies do better, and build up the capital stock of our country again, like we used to do. This is going to create one thing: job-creating economic growth.

That is what we need and that is what the Republican reform program offers.

It also offers one more thing and it changes treatment of foreign income, which is something I have some experience in, and it will incentivize companies to keep their income here. That is a good thing for America.

So I might just mention for just a second about what they say and what we say. They say tax cut for the wealthy. No, it is not a tax cut for the wealthy. It lowers taxes on all businesses and middle class Americans.

They say rising brackets on low income. This is an absolute incorrigible falsehood. No. We are taking the 10 percent rate to zero. We are taking the 15 percent rate to 10. By the way, Ronald Reagan reduced the 11 percent rate to zero.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. They say it will explode the deficit, but we all know that economic growth shrinks deficits. Ronald Reagan proved that in spades, and we are going to see it again. When we eliminate many of these narrowly-crafted, special interest, lobbyist-driven credits and deductions, we are going to save enough money. Especially when we eliminate the State and local tax deduction, we are going to save a couple of trillion dollars that will help balance this.

Then they say loss of itemized deductions is a bad thing. When we double the standard exemption, no one is going to need to itemize. The people that do itemize, fine, they can have

mortgage interest reduction, charitable reduction, whatever. But most Americans are going to be able to pay their taxes on a postcard.

In the polling in this country, the frustration of Americans with the IRS is directly related to the fact that nobody can fill out a tax form anymore. So we have great progress here.

Mr. Chair, I appreciate the opportunity to speak.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent, and the top 1 percent gets an average of \$200,000 in tax cuts. And what we see in this budget is a slashing of investments in the future strength of our country.

Instead of slashing infrastructure spending, as this budget does, we should be increasing our spending to fill the giant infrastructure pothole that Republican policies have left us with.

We have airports that feel Third World. We have bridges that are crumbling, tunnels that need replacing, roads that need fixing. Failing to do so costs all of us in time, money, and economic development.

This budget totally fails to recognize the value of infrastructure investment. It cuts \$254 billion from transportation over 10 years. Funding would drop from \$92 billion next year to just \$65 billion in 2022.

It eliminates the Transportation Investment Generating Economic Recovery grant program used for infrastructure development and repair projects for interstate highways, bridge improvements, and ports. This is incredibly shortsighted.

According to a study by the American Society of Civil Engineers, failing to close the infrastructure investment gap brings serious economic consequences: \$3.9 trillion in losses to the U.S. GDP by 2025; \$7 trillion in lost business sales in 2025; and 2.5 million lost American jobs in 2025.

I have seen with my own eyes what infrastructure development can mean to business development and the quality of life in the city that I serve. The Second Avenue Subway, built with the help of Federal funds, opened in January and has already had a huge economic impact. Stores say their business is up 20 to 30 percent along that line and it has cut overcrowding and reduced traveling times.

New York's old Kosciuszko Bridge, which was first opened in 1939, was originally designed for 10,000 vehicles a day. It was carrying 18 times that and had become an accident choke point.

Thanks to Federal funding, it has been replaced, and the biggest city in the country will have a brand-new, 21st century bridge soon because these kinds of investments boost productivity and bolster our economy, with each \$1 in infrastructure investment

generating up to \$1.80 in additional economic activity.

The American Society of Civil Engineers gives our national infrastructure an overall grade of D-plus and our transit system a D-minus. It is just plain irresponsible to slash spending on our crumbling highways and bridges now, because if we don't make needed investments today, we will jeopardize our competitiveness tomorrow.

Let's be clear: we are already significantly underinvesting in infrastructure. As you can see from this chart, public investments in infrastructure and other public fixed assets have fallen over the last few years, dropping to a low of \$274 billion in 2014, from more than \$357 billion in 2009.

We have created a giant infrastructure spending pothole that you see right here. All told, it costs our Nation more than half a trillion dollars in lost investment over 5 years.

The people of this country deserve modern infrastructure. They deserve a better deal.

This budget also cuts \$154 billion from nutrition, from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, ignoring the more than 40 million low-income families, including children, the working poor, the elderly, and the disabled, to say nothing of the 8 million people, including 4 million children it lifts out of poverty. The hungry children of America deserve a better deal than that.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. PAULSEN), a senior member of the Joint Economic Committee, as well as a senior member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Chairman, the budget that is being considered here today sets in motion the process of the first major tax reform that we will have been able to see in 3 decades. We are on the cusp of a really exciting opportunity to give Americans what they deserve: a Tax Code that works for them, not against them.

Now, on the House Ways and Means Committee, we spent many months meeting, holding hearings, discussing, working on almost a daily basis ways to craft a tax plan that is simpler and fairer for all Americans. The framework that was just rolled out last week takes that into account and lays out a plan that will lead to more jobs and, most importantly, bigger paychecks.

You know, the economic "recovery" since the Great Recession hasn't worked for a lot of Americans. It certainly hasn't worked for a lot of Minnesotans that I represent. Economic growth has been anemic, and we remain uncompetitive in far too many areas. Many are living paycheck to paycheck, and either have or now are at risk of having a lower standard of living than their parents.

Young people, like my daughter's generation, will go backwards if this

country is not fundamentally more competitive economically. They feel like they just can't get ahead.

Meanwhile, seniors, and baby boomers who will soon become seniors, are also at great risk. Their savings, as well as the government's ability to fulfill its commitment to Social Security and Medicare, could be undermined if we don't grow our economy at a higher rate.

So both Republicans and Democrats agree that it is time to fix our broken Tax Code. No one is defending the status quo, Mr. Chair. Our current Tax Code punishes American workers and manufacturers. It is a maze of special-interest loopholes that are unfair to hardworking Americans. It burdens families and small businesses with excessive paperwork and compliance costs, creating unnecessary frustration each and every tax season throughout the year. That is why 9 out of 10 Americans either pay someone to do their taxes or have to buy the financial software to do their taxes.

Mr. Chair, our Tax Code is holding our country back. It is holding our economy back. So we have a stark choice. We can either truly grow the economy and put ourselves back on a path to real prosperity, or we can continue with weak economic growth, which only benefits "the few" and will do nothing for the rest of us when the next economic downturn happens.

Tax reform, for me, is about one thing and one thing only. It is about restoring the hope for a prosperous future for ourselves, for our parents, and, most importantly, for our children.

It is about Paula in my district, in Plymouth, Minnesota, who said that the Tax Code is hurting her small business and preventing her from hiring more employees and giving them a raise.

It is about an owner of an extrusion company in Chaska, Minnesota, that I just spoke to. He said he would invest in new equipment and machines if this tax plan passes.

And it is about lowering rates across the board for all Americans, as well as small businesses, so that they can keep more of their first dollars earned.

Tax reform means increasing the personal income for average Americans and reducing the cost of living so that day-to-day expenses are more affordable. This will lead to families being able to save for their future and their retirement. It will allow people to take more control of their lives and their finances so that they can save and spend and invest their hard-earned money as they see fit.

Mr. Chairman, this is a really important opportunity we cannot let slip away to help middle-income families and small businesses. Passing this budget puts us on a path for tax reform that has so much potential to unleash and grow our economy to the benefit of middle-income families in Minnesota and across the country.

□ 1645

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, in 2001, some of our colleagues across the aisle said many of the same things we are hearing today about the miracle of tax cuts: that huge tax cuts for the most fortunate would pay for themselves, and that they would help grow our economy by trickling down through the miracle of so-called dynamic scoring.

But as we know from history, that was not the case. One year after the Bush tax cuts in 2002, here is what Brookings Institute said was happening in real life:

Our findings suggest that Bush tax cuts will reduce the size of the future economy, raise interest rates, make taxes more aggressive, increase tax complexity, and prove fiscally unsustainable.

A year after that, in 2003, the Brookings Institute said: "Over the past 2 years our country has experienced a dramatic deterioration in the Federal budget outlook."

In January 2001, when President George Bush took office, the Congressional Budget Office projected surpluses of \$5.6 trillion—as in "T," trillion—from 2000 to 2011.

But in 2011, nearly a decade after the GOP promised their budget would unleash the economy through tax cuts for the wealthy and budgets that cut services to the vulnerable, this is what we found, from National Public Radio: "Conservatives often promote tax cuts as a way to stimulate economic growth, but the years after 2001 were marked by the slowest growth since World War II."

All of us remember when President Obama came to office that this country was shedding 800,000 jobs a month and it was a long time to dig ourselves out of that big Republican hole and get us moving in the right direction with job growth.

So let's not go down that road again. I call upon my colleagues to remember history.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I would again like to point out this little chart that shows facts. At the bottom of the chart, if the viewers can see, is the United States with our corporate tax rate. All of these other countries, most of whom are our friends, even France, is lower than the United States, Spain, Canada, Netherlands, Austria, Turkey, Italy, New Zealand, Japan—you can go on and on.

Mr. Chairman, we have the highest corporate rate in the industrialized developed world. Facts are a stubborn thing to deal with, Mr. Chairman. This budget, as Congressman PAULSEN said, is the first step into dealing with something that we haven't dealt with in 31 years.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield 5 minutes to

the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. BEYER), my distinguished colleague.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the opportunity to address the House on this issue. I hear so much from my friends on the other side that I agree with, and I very much would like to work closely with them.

I point out to the chairman of the Joint Economic Committee, my friend from Ohio, that while we have the highest corporate rate in the world, 35 percent, which is clearly not desirable, I served in Switzerland for 4 years, where there were 700 American companies because the tax rate was so much lower. Yet that 35 percent rate, in actuality, turned out to be less than 14 percent across all American corporations, and a quarter of American corporations pay zero.

As we look at refining this, it is not just about dropping that rate. It is about making sure that every American corporation pays a fair share of their taxes to the U.S. citizens.

I rise in opposition to the Republican budget resolution. Budget resolutions, by their nature, are political documents. But this one also has an instrumental purpose, because the only reason this budget resolution is on the floor is to pave the way for the partisan process for the tax bill, which will significantly increase the deficit in order to give tax breaks to those who need them least.

I think everyone in this body agrees that the average American taxpayer, those who have had virtually no raise for 30 years, deserve and need tax breaks. If we can give them that tax relief, the economy will grow faster.

But the Senate reconciliation instructions that will ultimately pass are written to allow for a \$1.5 trillion increase in the deficit, and that is assuming that the fuzzy math and the rosy expectations actually work out. I appreciate the charts that my friend and colleague, Mr. ROONEY, showed that pointed out that we would like to get to 3.1 percent economic growth. I heartily agree.

But if we look at the period right now where we now have the worst disparity in wealth and the worst disparity in income that we have had in a long time, that tracks this decline from 3.1 percent to 1.6, 1.8, 2 percent.

When I started off in our family business, the corporate tax rate was 78 percent, and our economic growth was a lot higher. Not that we want to go back to 78 percent, but putting more money in the hands of the top 1 percent is not what is going to make this economy grow more quickly.

Actually, looking at the critical programs that are cut in this Republican budget gives us almost a handy guide of more effective ways to spend money. For example, this budget cuts transportation spending by 25 percent at a time when we have a D in our infrastructure by the American Society of Civil Engineers, when President Trump and candidate Hillary Clinton both

campaign hard on more infrastructure investment, not a cut.

This budget cuts student aid by \$211 billion when we know from our Joint Economic Committee hearings that the student debt our young people carry is one of the reasons they don't start new businesses, one of the things that suppresses the growth of new businesses in America.

We also know that human capital is the key to economic growth all through history and today. It contains massive cuts to Medicare and Medicaid, making healthcare more expensive for those who can least afford it, and that is not a way to grow the economy.

We have an opportunity to enact fiscally responsible, sustainable, bipartisan tax reform that focuses on the Americans whose wages have been stagnant for 30 years. I believe the Democrats are prepared to engage in real reform. It should be simpler. It should be fairer. We should absolutely do away with the special deals and credits and gimmicks, but we need a lower rate for most Americans, and not make sure that 80 percent of the tax benefits go to the people who need them the least, who have the smallest propensity to spend and to invest.

There are many other things wrong with this budget. Let me just point out two particular problems. Number one, the budget attacks the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge. It essentially sacrifices wildlife and environmental protections to pay for tax cuts for the wealthiest.

ANWR encompasses more than 19 million acres and is one of the last intact landscapes in America. It is essential that we protect this wild and spectacular land. The government briefly opened ANWR to seismic testing in the 1980s, and the damage from that activity is still visible today. Truck tracks still scar the expansive tundra where the permafrost never healed. Since then, the Federal Government has protected ANWR from harmful oil and gas drilling because of concerns about the impact on species like polar bears, muskoxen, and caribou.

Mr. Chairman, there are 37 land mammal species, 8 marine mammal species, 42 fish species, and more than 200 migratory birds that inhabit the ANWR. Seismic testing could do lasting damage to the fragile ecosystem way before drilling. Seismic activity sends shock waves underground, disturbing denning polar bears.

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

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. BEYER. Mr. Chairman, the caribou are a food source for Alaskan indigenous groups who have lived off the land for thousands of years. All of this devastation will likely do very little in the short run to reduce the deficit. The oil prices are so low that no oil com-

pany is going to attempt to extract fossil fuels at this time.

We believe the ANWR must be protected from the budget for future generations, its wildlife, and the native people who inhabit it.

Part two, Mr. Chairman, is the budget also attacks Federal Government employee retirement benefits. It instructs the Oversight and Government Reform Committee to reduce the deficit by \$32 billion. This clearly targets Federal employee retirement benefits because that is the only substantial mandatory spending within the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform's jurisdiction.

By slashing these promised benefits, the budget will eliminate any sense of financial security that Federal employees currently have. We should be protecting their rights and benefits. This was the original bargain they made. Most gave up much more lucrative careers in the private sector for the opportunity to serve all Americans, and for a small but secure Federal pension.

It is also going to make it a lot more difficult for us to recruit and retain the quality employees who make America great.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this budget, and let's work together to create a Tax Code that really does simulate our economy and that works for all Americans.

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LAHOOD), who represents the central part of Illinois, and is a new member of the Joint Economic Committee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This bill makes necessary and responsible funding determinations by reducing the size and scope of government, cutting Federal spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, and balancing the Federal budget in fiscal year 2027.

Given our Nation's more than \$20 trillion in debt, it is past time to get serious about our Federal spending so that important programs are able to be sustained long term. In addition, this bill sets the stage for much-needed tax reform. Small businesses and farmers are the bedrock of the American economy. For decades, we have allowed our Tax Code to balloon with loopholes and tax breaks for special interests, hurting our local economies and middle class workers.

That is why it is so crucial that we pass this commonsense budget as the first step in reforming our Nation's outdated Tax Code. Our current system continues to fail small business owners, farmers, and middle class families with its overwhelmingly complex system. That is why over 90 percent of Americans have to pay for help with filing their taxes every year.

Not only does this cost people their hard-earned money, but this also costs us our valuable time. Every year we

spend a combined 8.9 billion hours filing our taxes. That is time we could be using to focus on our work and families. For businesses, that is time they could use for expanding and growing our economy.

The solution here is not to defend the status quo, as some on the other side of the aisle continue to do, but to simplify our Tax Code and lower the rates for businesses and the middle class.

Another crucial part of reforming our Tax Code must be the elimination of the death tax, which harms farmers like those in the 18th Congressional District of Illinois. Family-owned businesses and farms that use their hard-earned dollars to invest back in their businesses are often forced to sell off parts or all in order to pay the death tax.

There is nothing fair about penalizing our job creators and the drivers of our economy for investing in and growing their business. In fact, it is estimated that repealing the death tax would grow our economy by 0.9 percent over 10 years.

These small business investments are often necessary for small businesses and farmers who depend upon expensive machinery to earn their living. Our current Tax Code, however, encourages businessowners to put off their investments as they are only able to deduct the cost of equipment over many years. By allowing full expensing, businesses and farmers can fully invest in the tools they need to become more productive, all the while earning more savings.

According to the Tax Foundation, full expensing would save businesses money, leading to nearly a 5 percent increase in income for low- and middle-income workers.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. LAHOOD. Mr. Chair, tax reform is about getting our economy back to working for the middle class, and for our small businesses, growing it from the inside out. This budget is the necessary first step in that process, and I am proud to support it. It will help bring relief to those who need it most.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chair, just to remind my colleagues, the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center points out that 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent.

But in this budget resolution that we are discussing, it slashes education funding, putting the drain of a college education for average Americans even further out of reach. It asks the American people who already experience crippling student loan debt to reach even deeper into their pockets for their education by cutting \$211 billion from student financial aid programs.

□ 1700

It freezes the maximum level awarded by a Pell grant at \$5,900, covering just 23 percent of an education by 2026, compared to the 30 percent it covers today or the 77 percent it covered in 1980. In addition, it also cuts \$3.3 billion from the Pell grant surplus, which provides a much-needed reserve to cover the cost of future education.

If that is not enough, after students graduate, this budget makes it increasingly difficult to pay off student loans and steers graduates away from public service and teaching jobs by eliminating the Public Service Loan Forgiveness and Teacher Loan Forgiveness programs. Our students and our teachers deserve a better deal than that.

I must say that we are suffering from three hurricanes, devastating hurricanes, yet this budget eliminates three programs that play very key roles in disaster relief. The Community Development Block Grant program, AmeriCorps, and the Legal Services Corporation are all eliminated. This budget abolishes these programs that are literally supporting our relief efforts from Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

Our Nation's veterans—our Nation's veterans—our bravest, are not spared the carnage of this heartless proposal. The GOP budget proposes \$50 billion in cuts to mandatory spending on veterans programs over 10 years, including education benefits and loan guarantees. So after we have already asked so much of our men and women in uniform, this budget refuses to give them the tools they need to transition to civilian life. Our veterans deserve a better deal than that from the country that they have served so honorably.

Cuts to research, where research is the future of our country, and this budget would also cut investments that are directly tied to our country's future prosperity by slashing basic research funding.

I want to point out how important research funding is to our country. In 1996, two Stanford graduate students took a \$4.5 million research grant from the National Science Foundation and developed a new algorithm called PageRank. Two years later, these same students took PageRank and launched a new internet search engine we now call Google. Today Google is worth over \$600 billion and employs over 72,000 Americans, and it all began with a Federal basic research grant of \$4.5 million.

Google is just one example on a long list of technological advancement companies and, most importantly, jobs that trace their roots to basic research investment. It is what has kept this country on top.

According to the Brookings Institution, two-thirds of the most influential technologies over the past 50 years were supported by Federal research grants. It has brought us lifesaving vaccines, the laser, touchscreen, GPS, and even the internet, technology that has served as a launching pad for cutting-edge medical treatment.

Sadly, the chart behind me reflects a sharp decline in the Federal share of funding of basic research dropping from 72 percent in 1967 to 44 percent in 2015. This GOP budget proposal follows that same trend with instructions to cut \$41 billion from science, space, and technology precisely at a time when we should be increasing investments in these sectors.

It is important to the future prosperity of America. Cuts now mean fewer jobs and economic growth in the future; they mean less innovation and less prosperity. So if my colleagues across the aisle want to grow the economy, turning this trend around is an important way to do it.

Now, I have heard all day from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle how very, very concerned they are about the deficit, but the GOP tax plan makes it worse. The tax framework released last week by the White House and Republican leaders would add \$2.4 trillion to the deficit in the first 10 years and another \$3.2 trillion in the next 10 years.

So the Republican budget is just totally unacceptable. This budget flat-out ignores the reality. So if Republicans are concerned about the deficit, then they should really rewrite their budget proposal.

In conclusion, look at the fine print of this proposed deal and imagine the harm it would cause to millions of American families, to our children, to our seniors, to our sick and suffering, to our disabled and our destitute, to our economy, to our research, and to our infrastructure. It is clear—clear—beyond any and all doubt that Americans deserve a better deal.

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

Mr. TIBERI. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CONAWAY), who is the distinguished chairman of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. CONAWAY. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in support of the budget before the House.

As a legislator, but more importantly, as a father and grandfather, I am seriously concerned about the mountain of debt our Nation is passing on to our children and grandchildren. Our Nation's total Federal debt is now bigger than our gross domestic product.

Think about that. As the leader of the free world and the driver of global innovation and entrepreneurship, over the next 10 years, we expect to reach a point where annual interest payments to our creditors will exceed the amount we spend on defending our Nation.

It is imperative that we change this trajectory, and I commend Chairwoman BLACK and her colleagues on the Budget Committee for providing a blueprint for tackling the problem. While Congress has made many decisions ahead of us to rein in mandatory spending, this budget is a critical starting point.

Not only is budgeting a fundamental principle of good governance, it is essential to our efforts to reform our outdated tax system to ensure it is simpler and reduces the tax burden for all Americans.

As a CPA with a current license, I look forward to the very real prospect of fundamental tax reform. This budget is the vehicle that can make that happen.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to support this budget.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I request the amount of time that is remaining.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. ZELDIN). The gentlewoman from New York has 4 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Ohio has 10½ minutes remaining.

Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York. Mr. Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chair, in closing, I believe that this proposal that is before us is an absolute disaster. We should be charting a fundamentally different course.

When you listen to people around their dinner table in America tonight, they would be talking about their concerns in education, infrastructure, jobs, healthcare, security, environment, and disaster relief. But this plan delivers, instead, deep and sometimes disabling cuts to badly needed programs for millions in order to give away benefits to a fortunate few. This is just plain wrong. Budgets are about values and priorities, and the people of this country deserve better.

We should not be cutting our education spending. Failing to train the world's most highly educated workforce is irresponsible and puts our entire economy at a disadvantage. We should be investing more in education at every level—early education and high schools—motivating students to become engaged in science, technology, math, and engineering. We should be leading the way in developing new and improved technical and trade training programs for those who would prefer it. We should be doing more, not less, to make college and postgrad study affordable once again. To do anything less is to fail in our obligation to the rising generation.

We already trail much of the economically advanced world when it comes to healthcare. We get sicker, die sooner, and pay more for our care than most developed nations. Millions are just one serious illness away from financial ruin. But this budget plan would cut spending for healthcare, and this budget would weaken the pillars of financial security for our seniors. The proposed cuts to Medicare and Medicaid will come at the expense of seniors, the disabled, and the middle class.

Mr. Chairman, we cannot afford this budget. I urge my colleagues to reject it, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chairman, America is at a crossroads, and this budget is about choices.

Mr. Chairman, there are moms and dads, single moms and elderly folks sitting at the kitchen table every night making choices on what to buy and what to pay for. They have to live within their means, Mr. Chairman.

The Federal Government, for too long, hasn't lived within its means, and this budget is about that. This budget is about tax reform. This budget is about growing our economy. We haven't seen the growth in this recovery that we have seen in others.

Mr. Chairman, I remember when I got my first job at McDonald's. My immigrant mother and my immigrant father sat me down and talked to me about the taxes that I would pay coming out of my first paycheck. I clearly remember my dad saying to me: Don't let the taxes that you pay stop you from saving most of this money, because in America, not only do you get taxed when you earn it, you get taxed when you save it, and if you save enough, you will get taxed when you die. That was my immigrant father with a fifth grade education. He was a steelworker.

Mr. Chairman, it is incredibly sad in America today when a successful entrepreneur will pay over 50 percent of what he or she makes in taxes at the Federal, State, and local levels.

Mr. Chairman, it has been 31 years since we reformed our outdated Tax Code, and now is the time—now is the time—at this crossroads to change the direction of America for our kids and our grandkids. I urge a "yes" vote on this responsible budget to live within our means, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 33 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Kentucky has 33¼ minutes remaining.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

Mr. Chairman, I do want to just begin this next section by making a brief comment about my good friend from Kentucky, who has been using some information off of Forbes as he responds to our speakers. I just want to say, I went out to look at Forbes to see what was on Forbes while we were on this brief intermission, and I found this article that was in Forbes just the day before yesterday that does say that the GOP tax framework is a pay raise for middle class families.

□ 1715

I encourage people to take a look at this. It actually does some scenarios for what we know at this point in time. However, I do want to say that what has been put out is a framework. It doesn't really have enough details to give too much on these scenarios, because there are some very important pieces that are missing.

Guessing on these key points really doesn't allow us to do a proper analysis. Things like the brackets have not

been definitively defined, and neither have the income thresholds or the enhanced child credit.

I think it is a little bit disingenuous to think that is really where we should be using those numbers right at this point in time to give a definitive scenario. I did want to say that that would be a good thing for people to look at if they would like to get a brief idea.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH), our ranking member, for yielding and also for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong opposition to this deeply flawed Republican budget resolution.

When we considered this resolution in July, Democrats offered 28 amendments. The amendments that we offered were meant to help set a course away from the disastrous path that the Republican majority and the Trump administration are steering us down.

We offered amendments on a broad range of issues important to our communities and our families. These included protecting our communities from the effects of climate change; preserving healthcare; investing in public health, research, and diplomacy; and investing in our Nation's workforce and infrastructure. Not surprisingly, not a single one of those made it through.

Instead, we have the resolution: a love letter to millionaires, billionaires, and corporations, and nothing but a manifesto of contempt for America's working families.

Mr. Chairman, the resolution we will be asked to vote on is based on the same faulty assumptions as the bill that came through committee. These include assuming that the repeal of the Affordable Care Act happened, which it did not, and an unrealistic economic growth of 3 percent.

The Republican budget resolution does little but hurt millions of American families in order to fast-track tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and corporations.

In addition, after all the Republican talk of deficit reduction, this cruel budget resolution massively increases the Federal debt by over \$2.4 trillion over the next 10 years and \$3.2 trillion in the 10 years after.

Where does putting the interests of corporations and the wealthiest ahead of working families get us?

Well, we have seen where this ends.

Earlier this summer, the Republican-dominated Kansas Legislature was forced to roll back its 2012 tax cuts. In fact, a recent Brookings Institution analysis found that the tax cuts resulted in an "anemic level of revenues,

which led to ballooning shortfalls, causing significant cutbacks in vital programs such as Medicaid, education, Temporary Assistance for Needy Families, court funding, and infrastructure.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield the gentlewoman from Washington an additional 1 minute.

Ms. JAYAPAL. This Republican budget resolution will lead us into that same hole, yet we know that this will only give Republicans license to call for further cuts to critical programs like Medicare, Social Security, and education.

We know who wins under this budget resolution. It paves the way for a Republican tax proposal that gives a huge tax cut to the wealthiest in our country.

Consider this: 80 percent of the Republican tax cut goes to the top 1 percent by 2027; the average tax cut for the top 1 percent would be \$207,000; for millionaires, the tax cut would provide \$230,000 a year; and 42 million middle class households would face a tax increase, including those people earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000.

Mr. Chairman, this budget resolution is unfair to working families and to our country's future. I urge my colleagues to vote against this resolution. Let's work together on a moral budget blueprint that supports all Americans.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Chair, typically, a budget is a blueprint for how our government plans to meet our obligations to our people; but not this time.

By including reconciliation instructions for their tax plan, the Republicans are using this budget as a blueprint to give tax cuts to the wealthiest few, without requiring bipartisan support.

Under this bill, a family making \$50,000 a year could see their tax burden go up, while millionaires will save \$230,000. And who will pay to make the rich richer? Our working families, children, and seniors.

This budget slashes priorities like education, infrastructure, and veterans' benefits, and even guts Medicare and Medicaid by \$1.5 trillion.

"You can't make guarantees," is how Treasury Secretary Mnuchin responded when asked if the Republican tax plan would help the middle class. But the thing is, you can make guarantees. If this Republican budget moves forward, it will guarantee that inequality gets worse, while the rest of us pay to help make millionaires into billionaires.

Mr. Chairman, I reject this budget and ask my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this budget resolution.

A budget is a moral document. It reflects our values. This budget is a stark reminder that the majority and the Trump administration are waging a war on the middle class and eviscerating the social safety net programs that help our most vulnerable citizens.

The social safety net was built on a bipartisan basis. Why is the majority hell-bent on destroying it?

Older Americans will suffer under this budget. It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid. It betrays middle class job seekers by cutting job training, education programs, and other nondefense programs by 34 percent over the next 10 years.

It decimates the Food Stamp program, SNAP benefits and assumes the enactment of the House-passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act, targeting American families who are struggling to get by.

If we were serious about addressing the problems that face middle class families, we would be voting on a budget resolution that invests in their priorities: job training, apprenticeships, paid family and medical leave, fair trade, and equal pay for equal work.

Instead, we are considering a budget that is merely a means for the majority to jam through their tax cuts for the wealthy and for corporations.

The biggest economic challenge of our time is that too many people now are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. We should be growing the middle class and looking for solutions that work for America's families.

We ought to be prioritizing the needs of working families, the ones who have entrusted us to come to Washington to fight for them and to fight for their families. Instead, this budget puts corporate profits first. It caters to those with the most lobbyists.

This budget is a disgrace to the promises that we have made to the American people, and I urge my colleagues to oppose it.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. DEFAZIO), the ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

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

I rise in strong opposition to the Republican budget proposal.

As the ranking member on the Transportation Committee, I want to focus in a little bit on what they do to transportation.

We heard great promises from President Trump of a trillion dollars in new investment. Nothing has come from the White House. The first substantive

action on transportation in this Congress is going to be the Republicans in the House of Representatives cutting transportation funding by \$254 billion.

That is right. No trillion dollars of new spending. We are going to spend \$254 billion less.

They are going to eliminate all long-route trains, isolating rural America. They are going to lose essential air service in rural America. And, by the way, the Republicans want to toll your interstate. So if you live in rural America, you can get in your car to go somewhere, but now you are going to have to pay to use the highway you already paid for.

Secondly, it eliminates critical funding for our urban areas, the economic engines of this country. It eliminates TIGER grants for freight and multimodal projects. It eliminates new investment in transit, new start projects. It eliminates all investments in high-speed rail and eliminates specific funding for bicycle and pedestrian projects. The Republicans just hate bicycles.

It also goes on—and this is totally amazing—seriously, you are going to cut funding for the Federal Emergency Management Agency? Haven't you been watching television? I think they are already out of money. You are going to cut funding?

We want to do away with those programs that might mitigate the disaster of future floods and hurricanes. You are going to cut grants for firefighters.

Then, that is not enough. We are going to roll back Davis-Bacon protections for people who work on federally funded projects. We are going to roll back Buy American? Really? So it is "Buy Chinese" in the Republican budget. Buy Chinese.

They want to devolve the obligation to fund Federal highways to the States. I have got news for you: we have tried that.

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

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

Mr. DEFAZIO. This is Kansas and Oklahoma. This is Kansas before we had the Eisenhower—by the way, a Republican—National Highway Program. They built their turnpike. Oklahoma said they would build theirs. They didn't. They were out of money. They didn't build it until they got an 80 percent Federal match.

So let's go back to the good, old days. We are going to devolve the obligations of putting together a 21st century transportation system in this country, knitting our country together, getting rid of congestion, moving people and goods more efficiently, but we are going to do it on a State-by-State basis. That is nuts. I just can't believe this.

Then, there is another little trick. The chairman of my committee wants to privatize the airspace in the United States and reduce the ticket tax that

pays for air traffic control. That would be a \$10 billion windfall to the airline industry, because they will raise prices. Then they are going to charge you a head fee to get on the plane.

Even better, it creates \$100 billion of new deficit. So this nifty little thing here contains a reserve fund of \$100 billion to try and make up for the fact and hide the fact that they are cutting \$100 billion of taxes that pay for the current system.

How are you going to pay for the next system?

The airlines will determine that, not Congress.

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

Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter that has been signed by 242 agencies and think tanks supporting this budget.

Among those who have signed this letter are the American Bankers Association, American Farm Bureau Federation, Americans for Tax Reform, Business Roundtable, Financial Services Forum, Manufactured Housing Institute, National Association of Manufacturers, the National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Grocers Association, National Retail Federation, Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, The Kentucky Chamber, and U.S. Chamber of Commerce, among many others.

SEPTEMBER 28, 2017.

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE UNITED STATES CONGRESS: We urge Congress to expeditiously pass a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions so that the promise of tax reform can be made a reality.

It has been 31 years since Congress last reformed the tax code. Since then, the code has become an anchor weighing down the economy, job creation, and wage growth for American families.

This Congress has a once-in-a-generation opportunity to fix the problem. Over the past several years, tremendous work has been done to prepare for this moment. In the 113th Congress the Ways and Means Committee conducted a comprehensive look at tax reform. Last year House Republicans released a Blueprint for reform. During the last Congress, the Senate Finance Committee convened bi-partisan working groups that tackled all the major aspects of reform.

President Trump has outlined his goals for reform, and the “Group of Six”—consisting of members from the House, Senate, and Administration—has presented a framework to guide the drafting and markup of legislation in the Ways and Means and Finance Committees.

While much work remains to be done, we believe Congress is well-positioned to move forward with comprehensive, pro-growth tax reform.

The single-most important next step is for Congress to adopt a budget resolution with reconciliation instructions that will permit tax reform to move forward without the threat of a filibuster.

Just like Members of Congress, each of our organizations will continue to advocate for specific priorities within tax reform as the relevant committees and ultimately the full House and Senate consider tax reform legislation.

But failing to pass a budget resolution now may mean that tax reform never moves forward. That outcome is unacceptable to all of

us and ought to be unacceptable to every Member of Congress who has advocated for reform.

Sincerely,

Aerospace Industries Association, African American Chamber of Commerce of New Jersey, Air Conditioning Contractors of America (ACCA), Alabama Retail Association, Alaska Chamber, Allen Fairview Chamber of Commerce (TX), Alliance for Competitive Taxation (ACT), American Bakers Association, American Bankers Association, American Council of Engineering Companies, American Exploration & Production Council, American Farm Bureau Federation, American Forest & Paper Association, American Foundry Society, American Gas Association, American Hotel & Lodging Association, American International Automobile Dealers Association, American Iron and Steel Institute, American Made Coalition, American Petroleum Institute (API).

American Supply Association, Americans for Tax Reform, Ames Chamber of Commerce (IA), Argentum, Arizona Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Asian American Hotel Owners Association, Asphalt Roofing Manufacturers Association, Associated Builders and Contractors, Associated Equipment Distributors, Associated General Contractors of America, Associated Wire Rope Fabricators, Association for Hose and Accessories Distribution (NAHAD), Association of American Railroads, Association of Equipment Manufacturers, Association of Washington Business, Auto Care Association, Baton Rouge Area Chamber (LA), Battle Creek Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Boca Raton Chamber of Commerce (FL), Brainerd Lakes Chamber of Commerce (MN).

Bristol County Chamber of Commerce (MA), Buckeye Valley Chamber (AZ), Buffalo Niagara Partnership (NY), Business Council of Alabama, Business Council of New York State, Business Roundtable, Cedar Rapids Metro Economic Alliance (IA), Cellular Telecommunications and Internet Association (CTIA), Central Louisiana Regional Chamber of Commerce, Chambers of Commerce Alliance of Ventura & Santa Barbara Counties (CA), Chester County Chamber of Business & Industry (PA), Coeur d’Alene Chamber of Commerce (ID), Colorado Association of Commerce and Industry, Colorado Retail Association, Consumer Bankers Association, Convenience Distribution Association, Coral Gables Chamber of Commerce (FL), Council for Citizens Against Government Waste, Covington County Chamber of Commerce (MS), Crowley Chamber of Commerce (LA).

Davis Chamber of Commerce (UT), Dayton Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Eatonton-Putnam Chamber of Commerce (GA), Edison Electric Institute (EEI), Edmond Area Chamber of Commerce (OK), Edwardsville/Glen Carbon Chamber of Commerce (IL), Energy Equipment and Infrastructure Alliance, Entertainment Software Association, Financial Services Forum, Florida Chamber of Commerce, Florida Retail Federation, Food Marketing Institute, Fox Cities Chamber of Commerce (WI), Gas and Welding Distributors Association, Georgia Chamber of Commerce, Georgia Retail Federation, Glenwood Springs Chamber Resort Association & Film Commission (CO), Granbury Chamber of Commerce (TX).

Grand Rapids Area Chamber of Commerce (MI), Greater Bakersfield Chamber (CA), Greater Cedar Valley Alliance & Chamber (IA), Greater Coachella Valley Chamber of Commerce (CA), Greater El Paso Chamber of Commerce (TX), Greater Flagstaff Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Ketchikan Chamber of Commerce (AK), Greater Lehigh Valley Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Louisville Inc. (KY), Greater North Dakota Chamber, Greater Oklahoma City Chamber

(OK), Greater Phoenix Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Greater Pittsburgh Chamber of Commerce (PA), Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce (LA), Greater Springfield Chamber of Commerce (VA), Greater Toms River Chamber of Commerce (NJ), Greater Yakima Chamber of Commerce (WA), Grocery Manufacturers Association, Hastings Area Chamber of Commerce (NE), Heating, Air-conditioning & Refrigeration Distributors International (HARDI), Henderson Chamber of Commerce (NV).

Hilliard Area Chamber of Commerce (OH), Hillsboro Chamber of Commerce (OR), Home Furnishings Association, Illinois Chamber of Commerce, Independent Insurance Agents & Brokers of America, Independent Office Products & Furniture Dealers Alliance, Independent Petroleum Association of America, Indiana Chamber of Commerce, International Foodservice Distributors Association, International Warehouse Logistics Association, Iowa Chamber Alliance, Irrigation Association, ISSA, The Worldwide Cleaning Industry Association, Jefferson Chamber of Commerce (LA), Jenkins County Chamber of Commerce (GA), Job Creators Network, Johnson City/Jonesborough/Washington County TN Chamber, Joliet Region Chamber of Commerce & Industry (MO), Kalispell Chamber of Commerce (MT), Kansas Chamber of Commerce, Kingsport Chamber (TN), Kyndle (Henderson County KY Chamber of Commerce).

Lake Havasu Area Chamber of Commerce (AZ), Lancaster Chamber (PA), Las Vegas Metro Chamber of Commerce (NV), Lemont Chamber of Commerce (IL), Lima Allen County Chamber of Commerce (OH), Little Rock Regional Chamber (AR), Long Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (CA), Louisiana Association of Business and Industry, Manufactured Housing Institute, McLean County Chamber of Commerce (IL), Metals Service Center Institute, Metro South Chamber of Commerce (MA), Metropolitan Milwaukee Association of Commerce (WI), Michigan Retailers Association, Minnesota Retailers Association, Missouri Chamber of Commerce and Industry, Monroe Chamber of Commerce (LA), Montgomery Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Motor & Equipment Manufacturers Association, Myrtle Beach Area Chamber of Commerce (SC), National Association of Chemical Distributors, National Association of Manufacturers, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies, National Association of Professional Employer Organizations.

National Association of Real Estate Investment Trusts, National Association of the Remodeling Industry, National Association of Wholesaler-Distributors, National Beer Wholesalers Association, National Black Chamber of Commerce, National Club Association, National Council of Chain Restaurants, National Electrical Contractors Association (NECA), National Grocers Association, National Lumber and Building Material Dealers Association, National Marine Manufacturers Association, National Office Products Alliance, National Ready Mixed Concrete Association, National Restaurant Association, National Retail Federation, National Roofing Contractors Association, National Stone, Sand and Gravel Association, Nebraska Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Nebraska Retail Federation, NFIB—National Federation of Independent Business.

North Carolina Chamber, North Country Chamber of Commerce (NY), North Dakota Retail Association, North Kingstown Chamber of Commerce (RI), North Myrtle Beach Chamber of Commerce (SC), North Orange County Chamber (CA), North San Antonio Chamber (TX), Office Furniture Dealers Alliance, Ohio Chamber of Commerce, Ohio

Council of Retail Merchants, Oklahoma Retail Merchants Association, Oshkosh Chamber of Commerce (WI), Oxnard Chamber of Commerce (CA), PA Chamber of Business and Industry, Pennsylvania Retailers Association, Plano Chamber of Commerce (TX), Portland Cement Association, Prattville Area Chamber of Commerce (AL), Precious Metals Association of North America, Professional Beauty Association.

Reforming America's Taxes Equitability (RATE) Coalition, Reno+Sparks Chamber of Commerce (NV), Retail Association of Nevada, Retail Association of New Mexico, Retail Council of New York State, Retail Industry Leaders Association, Retailers Association of Massachusetts, Richardson Chamber of Commerce (TX), River Heights Chamber of Commerce (MN), S Corporation Association, Sacramento Metro Chamber of Commerce (CA), Salt Lake Chamber (UT), San Diego Regional Chamber of Commerce (CA), San Gabriel Valley Economic Partnership (CA), Schuylkill Chamber of Commerce (PA), Securities Industry and Financial Markets Association, Service Station Dealers of America and Allied Trades (SSDA-AT), Silver City Grant County Chamber of Commerce (NM), South Summit Chamber of Commerce (OH), Southeastern Lumber Manufacturers Association.

Southwest Indiana Chamber, St. Cloud Area Chamber of Commerce (MN), St. Joseph Chamber of Commerce, St. Tammany West Chamber of Commerce, State Chamber of Oklahoma, Steel Manufacturers Association, Tampa Bay Beaches Chamber of Commerce (FL), Tennessee Chamber of Commerce & Industry, Texas Retailers Association, The Chamber of Commerce of the Santa Barbara Region (CA), The Chamber of Medford/Jackson County (OR), The Chamber Grand Forks/East Grand Forks (ND), The Fertilizer Institute, The Financial Services Roundtable, The Kentucky Chamber, The Longview Chamber of Commerce (TX), The Ohio Society of CPAs, The Real Estate Roundtable, Tile Roofing Institute, Tioga County Chamber of Commerce (NY).

Tire Industry Association (TIA), Truck Renting and Leasing Association, Tucson Metro Chamber (AZ), Tulsa Regional Chamber (OK), U.S. Chamber of Commerce, Union County Chamber of Commerce, United Corpus Christi Chamber of Commerce (TX), USTelecom—The Broadband Association, Utah Food Industry Association, Utah Retail Merchants Association, Virginia Chamber of Commerce, Virginia Small Business Partnership, West Baton Rouge Chamber of Commerce (LA), Wholesalers Association of the Northeast (WANE), Window and Door Manufacturers Association, Wisconsin Manufacturers and Commerce, WMDA/CAR Service Station and Automotive Repair Association.

Mrs. BLACK. There are 242 different entities that signed this letter to say that passing a budget is what we should be doing and that would lead us to tax reforms.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. FUDGE), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee and a fellow rabid Cleveland Indians fan.

Ms. FUDGE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in strong opposition to the Republican budget.

As Vice President Biden stated: "Don't tell me what you value. Show me your budget and I will tell you what you value."

The Republican's so-called Building a Better America budget shows us they do not value education, infrastructure, research and development, veterans' benefits, and other programs which expand opportunities for America's families.

□ 1730

This budget is immoral. It provides trillions of dollars in tax money to millionaires and wealthy corporations while shifting the burden onto the middle class. It cuts \$5.4 trillion from programs that American families rely on; programs like SNAP, Pell grants, Social Security, and healthcare.

The budget ends the Medicare guarantee. It cuts Medicare alone by almost \$500 billion over 10 years. A vote for this budget destroys American families in favor of a select few. This budget does not build a better America. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this budget.

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

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

Mr. Chairman, we have had numerous letters submitted to us taking a position in opposition to this budget resolution, and I think they are pretty compelling, and I would like to read from some of them.

Here is a letter from the Main Street Alliance:

Main Street Alliance, a network of small business owners throughout the country, strongly urges you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. This budget, if enacted into law, would cut \$3.4 trillion from Medicaid, Medicare, Social Security, education, employment and training, food and housing assistance, and infrastructure spending over the next 10 years. This will significantly harm small business owners and their employees, damage local economies, and decimate State budgets.

We urge you to protect Main Street small business owners, working families, communities, and economies, and oppose the House budget resolution. Reject any budget that enables tax cuts for the very wealthy and large profitable corporations to lose revenue, since it will force deep cuts in vital programs that harm small business.

This letter from the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare:

On behalf of the millions of members and supporters of the National Committee to Preserve Social Security and Medicare, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the House fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, and the Republican Study Committee budget. Instead, I ask you to support the Democratic Caucus, Congressional Progressive Caucus, and Congressional Black Caucus budgets.

The committee-passed budget resolution would slash funding to Medicare and Medicaid, repeal the Affordable Care Act, and make it easier for Congress to cut Social Security, all to pay for massive tax cuts for the very wealthy and profitable corporations.

This from the American Public Health Association:

On behalf of the American Public Health Association, a diverse community of public health professionals who champion the

health of all people and communities, I write in strong opposition to the House FY 2018 budget resolution, H. Con. Res. 71. This proposal does not eliminate sequestration and would drastically cut nondefense discretionary spending. Such cuts would devastate our Nation's public health and safety net system and would have a disproportionate impact on our Nation's most vulnerable citizens.

The proposal also includes the House passed repeal of the Affordable Care Act that would force millions to lose coverage, end the Medicaid expansion, drastically reduce Federal funding for the Medicaid program, and lead to increased cost and fewer benefits for millions of Americans.

This letter from the AFSCME, American Federation of State and County Municipal Employees:

On behalf of the 1.6 million members of AFSCME, I urge you to oppose H. Con. Res. 71, the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution approved by the House Budget Committee and scheduled to be considered in the full House.

This budget would impose considerable hardship on many Americans in order to slash taxes for the wealthy and corporations to boost defense spending. Rather than increasing revenues for investment that creates jobs and spurs economic growth, the proposed budget creates a fast-track process for tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit corporations and the wealthy.

In fact, according to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, the Trump GOP tax cut would largely benefit the richest 1 percent. The budget also relies on the gimmicks of dynamic scoring and sham accounting, hiding the true cost of unnecessary and harmful tax cuts.

And this, from AARP:

Proposals creating a defined contribution premium support program, restricting access by raising the age of eligibility, or allowing hospitals and providers to arbitrarily charge customers higher prices than Medicare can make healthcare unaffordable for older Americans. These proposals do little to actually lower the cost of healthcare but simply shifts cost from Medicare on to individuals, many of whom cannot afford to pay for their care.

Efforts to reduce or cap Medicaid funding could endanger the health, safety, and care of millions of individuals who depend on the essential services provided through this program.

Furthermore, caps could result in significant cost shifts to State governments unable to shoulder the cost of care without sufficient Federal support.

Proposals to block grant the program or impose work requirements will make SNAP less responsive and accessible in times of need, and without clear work requirement exemptions for the elderly and disabled, would bar these individuals from receiving SNAP benefits.

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

This from the Alliance for Retired Americans:

On behalf of the more than 4.3 million members of the Alliance for Retired Americans, I am writing to urge you to vote against H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for FY 2018. This budget blueprint cuts spending by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years, disseminating numerous domestic programs, including those that benefit older Americans.

It is shocking that the same budget that cuts services for many low-income Americans and raises taxes on the middle class will

also carry instructions to provide \$2.4 trillion in tax cuts to corporations and wealthy Americans.

These tax cuts, which will increase the deficit, sets up the perfect scenario for Congress to slash Medicare and Medicaid. We are not fooled by the House leadership's tax giveaway to the wealthy at the expense of ordinary Americans and urge you to oppose this draconian budget. We will be watching how you vote on this important issue.

This is a letter from the Coalition on Human Needs:

On behalf of the Coalition on Human Needs, I strongly urge you to vote "no" on H. Con. Res. 71, the proposed FY 2018 budget resolution, and to vote for the substitute budgets advanced by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Congressional Black Caucus, and the Democratic alternative budget resolution. Our members understand that the economic security of millions of American families depends on building on the progress we have made in health coverage, jobs, basic living standards, and ensuring that our children are well prepared for productive lives.

But the majority's proposed budget does not build. It breaks apart our engines of progress. It will make our Nation weaker for decades to come.

The budget advanced by the House Budget Committee would be a dangerous backwards plunge, stripping trillions of dollars from programs that work to reduce poverty and create security and opportunity.

Medicaid, Medicare, working family tax credits, nutrition assistance, education, and housing assistance, these are just some of the services the budget would massively cut.

The budget takes trillions in funding that supports economic security and progress and hands it to the wealthy and corporations in the form of enormous tax cuts.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, Republicans have chosen to lavish huge tax breaks on large multinationals and the top wealthiest few in our country instead of growing our economy by investing in all Americans. Investing in our workforce, in our physical infrastructure, in entrepreneurship, that is the way to really grow the economy; not these retread Republican tax policies that offer all the benefits to the top and hope something will eventually trickle down to everyone else, that only grow the national debt, as has been shown time and time again.

Our Republicans today call their budget a vision for our country, and what a grim vision it is for anyone who does not count themselves among the top 1 percent. Republicans would only widen income inequality with massive tax breaks for the few, while slashing trillions from initiatives that give more Americans the chance to get ahead, while, at the same time, strengthening our overall economic future.

For seniors, this is a budget that breaks Trump's promise not to cut Medicare to the tune of about half a trillion dollars in cuts, and it would slash an additional \$1 trillion for Medicaid, upon which so many seniors rely.

For students and families that are struggling to get a college education,

the ticket into the middle class, and into economic competitiveness, this budget will make it harder to climb the economic ladder with major cuts to Pell grants and other student assistance programs, and it will limit our investment in education and job training for American workers that are already out there trying to upgrade their skills.

What does the Republican budget do with all the money they save from cutting the middle class and working people, seniors, and those who are trying to get ahead? Well, it stuffs the pockets of those at the top and the large multinationals.

What President Trump and his Republican cohorts say their plan is, it isn't. You know, only last week, Trump said this about his tax plan: "I don't benefit. I don't benefit. In fact, very, very strongly, as you see, I think there is very little benefit for people of wealth."

Well, the analysis of the one tax return that leaked out suggests that President Trump will benefit to the tune of more than \$1 billion. Eighty percent of the tax breaks in this proposal go to the top 1 percent. That is people who are making more than \$730,000 a year while one in four Americans could actually see a tax increase.

That is why you can understand that they say they can't guarantee that taxes won't go up for many people in the middle class. And overall, this is a budget that is dripping in red ink.

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

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Chairman, we begin to understand why Trump calls himself "the king of debt," because there is plenty of debt that will be added onto this plan.

For Trump and his cohorts, fiscal responsibility is just a political slogan that they use to undermine those education and social service programs they were never for in the first place.

The Republican budget is not just numbers. It has a real human cost. By slashing investments in our economic future, it is a recipe for weakness, not strength. I urge my colleagues to side with the middle class, with working folks all over America, and reject this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I include in the RECORD a letter from the Compact for a Balanced Budget Commission, and I will read a portion of this letter. They say: "Dear Chairman Black: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your committee, H. Con. Res. 71, and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

"Our Nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the Federal budget returns to balance within the 10-year

budget period because runaway Federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational, and civil rights issue. We commend you and your committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest."

And again, this comes from The Compact Commission, Compact for a Balanced Budget.

THE COMPACT COMMISSION, C/O COMPACT FOR AMERICA EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATION, INC.,

Houston, TX, August 8, 2017.

Re 2018 House Budget Resolution and the Compact for a Balanced Budget.

Hon. DIANE BLACK,
Chairman, House Budget Committee, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BLACK: We have reviewed the text of the budget resolution reported by your Committee (House Concurrent Resolution 71) and write to offer our support. That rarest of political outcomes—sound policy that represents a win-win scenario for normally divergent factions—is possible as the budget process moves forward.

Our nation is facing a fiscal crisis. It is essential that the federal budget returns to balance within the ten-year budget period because runaway federal debt is not political or partisan—it is an economic, generational and civil-rights issue. We commend you and your Committee for reporting a resolution that balances within the budget period; its adoption is very much in the national interest.

We also commend the Committee for including Section 501 in the resolution, which endorses adding a balanced budget requirement to the Constitution.

Section 501 identifies the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which we represent on behalf of current and future member states. We believe the most practical, prudent enforcement mechanism is the state-of-the-art balanced budget amendment (BBA) being proposed by the Compact. This state-of-the-art BBA has been specifically designed to overcome concerns expressed in 40 years of congressional hearings that have considered how a BBA should be drafted. Such concerns may have prevented prior BBAs from being proposed.

To advance the policy prescription in Section 501 of the budget resolution in the House, we recommend: updating this section to reflect that the concurrent resolution to effectuate the Compact (House Concurrent Resolution 73) was introduced on July 26, 2017; and incorporating the language of House Concurrent Resolution 73 into Section 501. This could be done as one of several amendments you are probably already planning to bring up during floor consideration as the manager's package, and requires only a majority vote as opposed to the two-thirds required for balanced budget amendment proposals made by members of Congress.

Taking these steps establishes a strong enforcement mechanism, sustaining the budget resolution following its adoption. It would also strengthen the appeal of the budget resolution to fiscal conservatives in the House and taking these steps prior to the consideration of legislation to raise the debt ceiling should expedite approval of that legislation.

Supermajorities of Americans have demanded a balanced budget for decades. Our nation's debt threatens future generations to default or austerity, but we believe there's a chance here for a third option: principled leadership on the matter of debt and spending.

We hope you and your Committee members will agree that there is a path here which acknowledges the need for long-term fiscal

sanity while also meeting shorter-term political and policy needs.

Regards,

CHAIR MEAD TREADWELL,
Alaska Commissioner.
VICE CHAIR PAULATE
RAKESTRAW,
Georgia Commissioner.
GREG SNOWDEN,
Mississippi Commissioner.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I want to just bounce off of that and take a look at the chart that we have here. When we take a look at interest—and somehow we don't always talk that much about interest here. We talk about borrowing money and raising our debt ceiling continually. I have been here now for 6½ years, and the conversation is about raising that debt ceiling so that we can pay for our debt, but there comes interest on that.

Just as when we go to a bank and we borrow money, we have to pay interest on that. I remember years ago, when I bought my first house, we were at a period of time when President Carter was the President and the interest rates were outrageous, and our interest rate on our house at that time, when we purchased it as a young married couple, was, I think, somewhere between 14 and 16 percent.

Interest rates now are very much more reasonable for young couples purchasing. And so I want to turn our attention to this chart here to take a look at the outlays in 2027 under the CBO baseline.

If we continue down this path that we are going in, without taking a look at our mandatory spending, the amount of money that we borrow, and the debt that we pile up with an interest to it, just what will that look like?

□ 1745

I think if we look at our own household and we would say that our interest that we are paying on the credit card or whatever, or the car interest or the House mortgage, if it were more than all of the other things like the food and maybe the education for our children and buying books and pencils and things that they need for school, we would be looking at the way in which we were managing our household income and saying, wow, that is not something we want to keep doing. We are going to have to get on some kind of a budget plan and reverse the trajectory of where we would be going.

So here we are. At the end of the period of 2027, if we look at 17 years down the road and we don't do anything about the kind of mandatory spending, which is two-thirds of our budget, currently, and continues to grow, here is what happens:

We see \$768 billion being spent on interest alone.

We see the next one down, the defense, at \$741 billion. We would actually be paying more in interest than we were in the security of our Nation and supporting our men and women who serve in the military, and all of the

supplies and the necessary equipment that it takes to protect them as they protect us.

Look at what happens with Medicaid. We will be spending less on Medicaid that is for people who are the blind, the disabled, the elderly, the children, the pregnant mothers.

We talk about wanting to put our money and our values where we see the values really belong. Is this really where we want our values to be in the money that we spend, \$768 billion in interest compared to what we are spending on our military, what we are spending on our Medicaid?

Look at our veterans, our veterans that we talk about how much we honor them: \$248 billion as opposed to \$768 billion in interest.

Again, we must question where we are going and if this is the right direction. Is this the direction that we can all just raise our hand up and say, yes, we are making good decisions for the future of our country? Because look at where the interest is compared to the other programs that we both, Republicans and Democrats, have said are so important to us.

Over and over again, we have had colleagues on both sides of the aisle go and speak about the importance of what our values are. Our budget is a vision of what our values are.

Transportation, and I have heard more and more times on both sides of the aisle talking about infrastructure, how important that is for our Nation. Look at what our transportation and our infrastructure will be. I don't know that we want to spend only \$110 billion on that and \$768 billion on interest. Think of how many roads we could build, how many bridges we could repair if we reverse this trajectory.

Then, finally, at the bottom here is science-based technology. We all want to be competitive with those around the world to make sure that we are spending the money where we need to spend the money to stay in front of these other nations with our science and our space and our technology.

I want to recommend here that there are only two other programs, Social Security and Medicare, that exceed that net interest. So we will say Social Security, Medicare, and then our net interest; and from there, everything else that we say, both the Republicans and the Democrats, are so important, that we say are our values, are going to be underneath the interest. I don't think that is really where we want to go.

I have to think, my oldest grandchild right now is 19 years old, soon to turn 20, when he is 30 years old, he might say to me: Mimi, what were you doing when you were in Congress? What were you doing to help us, because now we are paying more in interest than we are all of these other programs that we contend to be so important to us?

So these are difficult decisions to make, I will acknowledge that. But I will also say to you, as someone who—

I consider myself to be a policy wonk. As I look at these various programs, I say there is nothing that we are doing in my life that I did 40 years ago that I am doing exactly the same. So if a program has been around for 40 years, should we not want to say maybe we can reform it? Not necessarily cut, but, in the reforming, you may find a way to decrease the spending that you are doing in that program.

Can't we all lock arms, Democrats and Republicans, and acknowledge that there are some decisions that have to be made with programs that have been there for a very long time?

Can we not acknowledge that there are some programs that perhaps have fraud, waste, and abuse that we can take care of, take that money and use it in these places where we really say our values lie?

So I would say that, as we talk about this budget, I am very proud of what we have done in this budget, in the cuts or, as I say, reforms in those programs that would result in \$203 billion worth of savings over a 10-year period, that these are programs that we gave the committees of jurisdiction an opportunity to look within their jurisdiction and to make those decisions and do the homework. It is your jurisdiction; it is not mine. We gave them recommendations and suggestions, but it is their jurisdiction.

Let them evaluate where it is that there are programs that can have new and creative ideas, things that can save us money, not necessarily using the word "cut," but in savings. Yes, you may have some cuts that are done, but these are good cuts. These are things that you have spent a lot of time thinking about.

That is really where we want to go. That is what this budget does is it says: Open up your minds. Think differently. Let's not do things the same old way and keep putting the same old programs out there that maybe aren't working.

And you know what? Maybe they are not even working for the people that we give them to. Maybe they are not working for them, because work is dignity.

When we say that someone who is able-bodied and without any dependents should be at work, that is not cruel. Do you know what that is? That is dignity. When people go to work, it is a dignified activity.

I always say, after I ask you what your name is, and we all do it, we say: What do you do? And when someone cannot tell you what they do, they don't feel dignified.

Look, I don't want to be cruel to people who are disabled, people who are having a really tough time and have other circumstances, but we should acknowledge that there is dignity in work; and when we can give people an opportunity to have that dignity, we should be willing to stand up and do that.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Chairman, this has been a robust debate. We had a robust debate in the Rules Committee yesterday, and we have had robust debates in the committee markup and during hearings, as well, over the priorities of this country.

As we close this debate tonight, recognizing there will be a few minutes tomorrow for comments, I just want to say that, since this could very well be the last time that I get to appear in Budget Committee business with Chairman BLACK, I have truly cherished the 9 months that we have spent working together.

The chairman is a gracious, fair, thoughtful, and very, very collegial individual, and I wish her the best in her campaign, at least through the primary. I thank her and her very, very competent and professional staff for all of the courtesies they have shown us during this year and this process.

I also want to pay tribute to the Democratic staff, people who work very, very hard every day and are brilliant in their fields and make me sound smarter than I probably am, but I would like to read their names: Jon Antista; Erika Appel; Ellen Balis, the staff director; Hayden Flanery; Jon Goldman; Elliott Grantz; Jocelyn Harris; Najy Kamal; Sam Lau; Sheila McDowell; Diana Meredith; Farouk Ophaso; Kimberly Overbeek; Scott Russell; and Ted Zegers.

They do terrific work, and I want them to know how much I and all the members of the Budget Committee, the minority, appreciate their work.

I would also like to thank my personal staff, led by my chief of staff, Julie Carr, for the work they contribute to this process as well.

In closing, there are a few comments I want to make about this debate.

We heard several times during the day that it is really not fair to talk about the consequences of the tax proposal that will be the end result of this process because the details haven't been ironed out yet. That is, you know, fair enough as it goes, but there were enough details in the outline that we saw last week to make a pretty good guess as to what the impact of these tax cuts would be.

Now, we have read over and over, as Republican speakers spoke, the fact that they were willing to jeopardize the health and safety and nutrition of their citizens to give the wealthiest people in their State tax cuts. Most of these numbers that we read were in the billions of dollars: \$38 billion, \$16 billion. These are individuals with net worths of astounding amounts.

The outline that was publicly released last week said that the Republicans intend, under this tax proposal, to eliminate the estate tax. If they eliminate the estate tax, much of that money is not going to be taxed. They will get to keep it. I don't think that they are going to be out there creating

new companies. Maybe their children will do it if they inherit it. Maybe they have given some of it away so those estates aren't quite as big. I suspect many of them have.

The point is, when you are talking about wealth, collectively, the wealthiest persons in the 50 States, collectively, have \$750 billion in net worth, which means that, if they paid the estate tax, there would be over \$300 billion in money that they would save if you eliminated the estate tax.

So while, yes, we may be off plus or minus 3 percent or 5 percent or 10 percent, the fact is that this is an enormous break for the people who have been the most fortunate in this country. I think it is more than fair to say, if you say you are going to eliminate the estate tax, if you say you are going to eliminate the AMT, the alternative minimum tax, and we can go look at President Trump's 2005 tax return, which said he paid \$31 million in tax because of the alternative minimum tax, it doesn't take any details to know that he would have saved \$31 million in that year if you eliminate the alternative minimum tax.

So, yes, the rates may vary. Ultimately, the tax bill that we have presented to us may not lower the highest rate from 39.6 to 35 percent, but if it does, we know the impact that that will have. We know who will benefit most from that. It is the wealthiest 1 percent of this country.

As I will say tomorrow when we close this debate, I am in the top 1 percent. Half of this body are millionaires. They are all going to benefit. We are all going to benefit. Meanwhile, the people who rely on many of the programs that will be slashed under this Republican budget will suffer. That is not fair.

Now, Republicans will make the argument, as they always do because this is a matter of religious faith to them, that if you give people more money, they will magically create all this growth. Well, has that really happened?

Out of the Fortune 500 companies, I think, in a recent study, 92 of them paid 20 percent or less in corporate tax. Collectively, they eliminated 300,000 jobs over a 5-year period. So they had more money than corporations paying 35 percent. Did they use it to create more jobs, more wealth among middle class and working families? No. They used it to pay dividends, to buy back stock, and to increase the wages of their CEOs.

That is what has happened in modern history every time we lower corporate tax rates or we let them bring taxes in from overseas. They do not create more jobs with the money that they save.

So I think it is very, very fair for us to look at this entire process, the budget proposal, which does anticipate a tax cut—which they claim is revenue neutral, but it is a tax cut—and the outline that we saw last week and say: Who, really, is this going to help?

It is not going to help the people who need the help. It is going to give more

money to the people who already occupy one of the strongest economic positions in a country with the greatest disparity of wealth in the world.

So as we conclude this debate, I urge my colleagues to carefully consider the alternatives that will be proposed by the Democratic Caucus, by the Congressional Black Caucus, and by the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and compare the values and the priorities of those budgets to those that the Republican budget represents.

I think, on balance, anybody in good faith will say that those budgets, not the Republican budgets, are the budgets that will create a stronger, fairer society in this country, and those are the ones that we should proceed to adopt.

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

□ 1800

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I likewise, would like to just say that the ranking member, Mr. YARMUTH, has just been wonderful to work with, and we may have differences of opinion, but we can do it in a very Southern hospitality way. I just so much appreciate his demeanor, his leadership on the committee, the way he honors the members of the committee, both Democrats and Republicans, and it has just been a joy to work with him. I am going to miss working with him and being able to have lively debate, which is good for this body and it is good for America.

I want to also thank all the members who participated in the debate today, both the Democrats and the Republicans. This is what our democracy is about, being able to voice our opinions and at the end of the day being able to come to a conclusion after that debate. I look forward to continuing discussion and voting on the final passage tomorrow.

As we finish up, I also want to thank our staff for their hard work, and there are many of them, so I am not going to read all of them to you. I do want to mention some of those who are the leaders of the House Budget Committee staff and have just been great to work with.

Rick May, who is the staff director; Jenna Spealman; Andy Morton; Tim Flynn; Mary, who has been here with me at my side the entire time. What would I do without having somebody to pass papers to us? So Mary has been great. Jim Bates, and I am going to leave it at that because I am going to get in trouble if I don't announce all of them.

The staff has just been tremendous to work with, many hours, weekends, and, indeed, even holidays that they have been here helping to gather the information both for the Budget Committee hearings and then, also, for this today.

Mr. Chairman, I look forward to a more lively debate tomorrow. I include in the RECORD the names of the staff of the Budget Committee.

HOUSE BUDGET COMMITTEE MAJORITY STAFF

Rick May
 Jenna Spealman
 Andy Morton
 Tim Flynn
 Patrick Louis Knudsen
 Benjamin Gardenhour
 Gary Haglund
 Chris Hartline
 Sarah Corley
 Sage Peterson
 Jim Bates
 Mary Popadiuk
 Jonathan Romito
 Elise Anderson
 Policy Advisors
 Jenna Spealman
 Steve Gonzalez
 Robert Cogan
 Eric Davis
 Robert Yeakel
 Ellen Johnson
 Andy Morton
 Emily Goff
 Brad Watson
 Brittany Madni
 Steve Waskiewicz
 Alex Stoddard
 Joe Guillen

PERSONAL STAFF (REPRESENTATIVE DIANE BLACK, TENNESSEE, 6TH DISTRICT)

Teresa Koeberlein
 Dean Thompson
 Heather Douglass
 Jon Toomey
 Ace Burch
 Katie Mitchell
 Hillary Lassiter
 Zachary Royster
 Greg Dowel
 Nicholas Ayers

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BISHOP of Utah. Mr. Chair, I rise to share my concern regarding potential budget reconciliation instructions to the House Oversight and Government Reform Committee. These instructions could potentially result in significant harm to federal employees and federal retirees, many of whom I represent.

The national debt is a serious challenge that Congress must address, but I urge members of this body to maintain the promises made to federal employees at the time of their hiring. At a minimum, any changes to federal employee retirement or benefits should only be made on prospective employees, not current or former employees.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee). All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the concurrent resolution shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule and is considered read.

The text of the concurrent resolution is as follows:

H. CON. RES. 71

Resolved by the House of Representatives (the Senate concurring),

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) **DECLARATION.**—The Congress determines and declares that prior concurrent resolutions on the budget are replaced as of fiscal year 2018 and that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.
 Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

Sec. 201. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

Sec. 301. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.
 Sec. 302. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.
 Sec. 303. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.
 Sec. 304. Limitation on advance appropriations.
 Sec. 305. Estimates of debt service costs.
 Sec. 306. Fair-value credit estimates.
 Sec. 307. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.
 Sec. 308. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
 Sec. 309. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.
 Sec. 310. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
 Sec. 311. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.
 Sec. 312. Prohibition on use of guarantee fees as an offset.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions

Sec. 321. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
 Sec. 322. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
 Sec. 323. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
 Sec. 324. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.
 Sec. 325. Application of rule regarding limits on discretionary spending.
 Sec. 326. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 401. Reserve fund for commercialization of air traffic control.
 Sec. 402. Reserve fund for investments in national infrastructure.
 Sec. 403. Reserve fund for comprehensive tax reform.
 Sec. 404. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
 Sec. 405. Reserve fund for the repeal or replacement of President Obama's health care laws.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Sec. 501. Policy statement on a balanced budget amendment.
 Sec. 502. Policy statement on budget process reform.
 Sec. 503. Policy statement on Federal regulatory budgeting and reform.
 Sec. 504. Policy statement on unauthorized appropriations.
 Sec. 505. Policy statement on Federal accounting.
 Sec. 506. Policy statement on Commission on Budget Concepts.
 Sec. 507. Policy statement on budget enforcement.
 Sec. 508. Policy statement on improper payments.
 Sec. 509. Policy statement on expenditures from agency fees and spending.
 Sec. 510. Policy statement on promoting real health care reform.
 Sec. 511. Policy statement on Medicare.
 Sec. 512. Policy statement on combating the opioid epidemic.

Sec. 513. Policy statement on the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
 Sec. 514. Policy statement on medical discovery, development, delivery, and innovation.
 Sec. 515. Policy statement on public health preparedness.
 Sec. 516. Policy statement on Social Security.
 Sec. 517. Policy statement on Medicaid work requirements.
 Sec. 518. Policy statement on welfare reform and Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program work requirements.
 Sec. 519. Policy Statement on State flexibility in Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program.
 Sec. 520. Policy statement on higher education and workforce development opportunity.
 Sec. 521. Policy statement on supplemental wildfire suppression funding.
 Sec. 522. Policy statement on the Department of Veterans Affairs.
 Sec. 523. Policy statement on moving the United States Postal Service on budget.
 Sec. 524. Policy statement on the Judgment Fund.
 Sec. 525. Policy statement on responsible stewardship of taxpayer dollars.
 Sec. 526. Policy statement on tax reform.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) **FEDERAL REVENUES.**—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,670,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,767,357,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,870,414,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,963,953,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,077,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,195,139,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,325,690,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,475,784,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,642,629,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,811,687,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: -\$63,213,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$66,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$80,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$95,958,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$105,330,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$122,777,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$136,738,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$146,394,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$146,749,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$146,700,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,232,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,286,018,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,299,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,290,186,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,975,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,483,686,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,528,872,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,655,413,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,746,208,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,824,652,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,164,885,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,265,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,283,026,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,323,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,441,603,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,467,047,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,497,308,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,620,210,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,727,971,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,806,792,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$494,529,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$497,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$412,612,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$359,511,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$364,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$271,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$171,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$144,426,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$85,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$4,895,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,059,756,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,720,619,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,263,387,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,717,657,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,120,068,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,414,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$23,577,205,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$23,665,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$23,701,446,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$23,484,672,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,399,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,971,804,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,477,150,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,920,847,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,371,706,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,720,326,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$17,949,306,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$18,156,356,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$18,299,466,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$18,345,826,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$629,595,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$607,810,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$660,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$636,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$693,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$666,519,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$728,125,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$698,761,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$731,818,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$717,568,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$735,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,401,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$739,157,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$742,886,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$729,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$747,414,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$734,037,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$751,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$737,798,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,210,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,965,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,654,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,585,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,623,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,021,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,795,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,285,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,102,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,121,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,025,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,175,000,000.

(3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,524,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,072,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,365,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,702,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,360,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,346,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,718,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,018,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,259,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,694,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,797,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,112,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,928,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,854,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,550,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,602,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,162,000,000.

(4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$3,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,559,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,714,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,179,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$11,813,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,705,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$754,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$491,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$4,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$1,052,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$2,233,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$2,324,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,370,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,641,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,856,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,751,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,581,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,295,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,909,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,684,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,186,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,598,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,081,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,520,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,921,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,186,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,526,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,078,000,000.

(6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,913,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,091,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$20,200,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,293,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,217,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,339,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,153,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,331,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,863,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,225,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,214,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,593,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,817,000,000.

(7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,601,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$7,517,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$15,753,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,358,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$18,126,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$13,446,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,106,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,470,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$12,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,598,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, -\$10,989,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,362,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$10,255,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$22,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,141,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$23,569,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$11,933,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$24,521,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,095,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$91,796,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,892,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,602,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,508,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,190,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$77,995,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$65,076,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,895,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,694,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$67,483,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,617,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$68,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,074,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,044,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,948,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,741,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,365,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,626,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,170,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,983,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,240,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,842,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,353,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$9,558,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,487,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,386,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,556,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,090,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,673,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,745,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,857,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,767,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,077,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,805,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,809,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,920,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,295,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$79,090,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,404,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,305,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,129,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$81,922,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$82,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,350,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,539,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,279,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$85,843,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,641,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,897,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$86,977,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$88,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$87,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$89,186,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,216,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$90,080,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$579,328,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$551,277,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$564,387,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$570,419,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$552,405,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$541,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$512,289,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$518,445,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$528,560,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$533,688,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$547,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$549,687,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$571,335,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$569,207,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,923,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$591,171,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$618,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$613,682,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$626,774,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$593,830,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$593,567,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$652,984,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$652,740,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$692,126,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$691,917,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$739,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$739,161,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$826,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$826,057,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$845,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$845,593,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$850,393,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$850,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$916,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$916,009,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$988,183,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$987,942,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,053,671,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,053,435,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$491,789,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$477,428,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$464,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$454,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$475,015,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$464,925,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,414,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$475,140,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$492,453,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$489,299,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$475,767,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$468,217,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$484,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$471,370,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$493,048,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$480,920,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$502,057,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$496,505,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$511,675,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$505,382,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.
 (15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$178,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$190,235,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$194,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$193,931,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,751,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$197,856,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$215,442,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$213,337,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$212,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$210,444,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$209,943,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,908,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$227,991,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$225,820,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$234,947,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$232,660,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$243,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,501,000,000.
 (16) Administration of Justice (750):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,367,000,000.

- (B) Outlays, \$61,079,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$58,245,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$58,867,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,720,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,036,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$61,054,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$60,946,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$62,092,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$61,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$63,671,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$63,462,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$65,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$65,043,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,947,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,498,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,907,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,200,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$70,270,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,722,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,564,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,091,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,948,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,314,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,557,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,303,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,386,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,190,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$23,127,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$23,013,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,420,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,057,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,351,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,917,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,855,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$25,722,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$376,842,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$376,842,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$409,185,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$409,185,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$450,859,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$450,859,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$493,778,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$493,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$531,929,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$531,929,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$565,282,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$565,282,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$589,292,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$589,292,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$607,012,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$607,012,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$620,536,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$620,536,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$623,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$623,911,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$44,505,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$23,272,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$42,219,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$34,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$45,246,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$40,640,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$48,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$44,164,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$50,544,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$47,877,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$52,326,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$49,819,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$53,659,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$51,411,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,439,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$51,908,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$52,127,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$55,254,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$53,919,000,000.
(20) Government-wide savings and adjustments (930):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$34,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$2,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,555,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$2,528,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$67,381,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$47,665,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$120,155,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$97,069,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$153,376,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$137,459,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$174,438,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$159,489,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$194,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$179,541,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$193,336,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$187,355,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$246,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$223,016,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$258,801,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$240,977,000,000.
(21) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,212,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,212,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,409,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,409,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$86,316,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$86,316,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$90,347,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$90,347,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$93,573,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$93,573,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$100,001,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$100,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$105,371,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$105,371,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$115,139,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$115,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$117,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$117,033,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$127,808,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$127,808,000,000.
(22) Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism (970):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$86,591,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,781,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$60,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,748,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$43,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,076,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$26,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,635,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$18,768,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$13,799,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$11,957,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$4,171,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$1,160,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$0.
(B) Outlays, \$165,000,000.
(23) Across-the-Board Adjustment (990):
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$909,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$740,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$837,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$956,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$895,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$979,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$944,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,004,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$968,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,030,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$993,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,056,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,018,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,083,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,045,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,112,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,070,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,140,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,099,000,000.

TITLE II—RECONCILIATION AND RELATED MATTERS

SEC. 201. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) SUBMISSIONS PROVIDING FOR RECONCILIATION.—Not later than October 6, 2017, the committees named in subsection (b) shall submit their recommendations on changes in laws within their jurisdictions to the Committee on the Budget that would achieve the specified reduction in the deficit for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) INSTRUCTIONS.—

(1) COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE.—The Committee on Agriculture shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to

reduce the deficit by \$10,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(2) COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES.—The Committee on Armed Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(3) COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION AND THE WORKFORCE.—The Committee on Education and the Workforce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(4) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND COMMERCE.—The Committee on Energy and Commerce shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$20,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(5) COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES.—The Committee on Financial Services shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$14,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(6) COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY.—The Committee on Homeland Security shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$3,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(7) COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY.—The Committee on the Judiciary shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$45,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(8) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$5,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(9) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—The Committee on Oversight and Government Reform shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$32,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(10) COMMITTEE ON VETERANS' AFFAIRS.—The Committee on Veterans' Affairs shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(11) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction sufficient to reduce the deficit by \$52,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

TITLE III—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

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

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 con-

secutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) LIMITATION.—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) SUNSET.—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

SEC. 302. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.

(a) SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) APPLICATION.—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) DESIGNATIONS.—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) ADJUSTMENTS.—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 303. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in

mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) AMOUNT.—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

- (A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;
- (B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and
- (C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) DETERMINATION.—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 304. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the heading—

(1) GENERAL.—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) VETERANS.—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) LIMITATIONS.—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed—

(1) GENERAL.—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) VETERANS.—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

SEC. 305. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

SEC. 306. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office

provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

SEC. 307. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives or the Senate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means—

(A) in the Senate, a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(I) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(II) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation; and

(B) in the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(i) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) designated as such by—

(I) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(II) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

SEC. 308. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

SEC. 309. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President’s annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

SEC. 310. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

SEC. 311. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 312. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

Subtitle B—Other Provisions**SEC. 321. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

SEC. 322. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.

(a) **APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

- (1) apply while that measure is under consideration;
- (2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and
- (3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) **AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 301 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) **OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.**—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

SEC. 323. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

SEC. 324. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 325. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

- (1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;
- (2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or
- (3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report,

would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

SEC. 326. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.

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

- (1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and
- (2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

TITLE IV—RESERVE FUNDS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**SEC. 401. RESERVE FUND FOR COMMERCIALIZATION OF AIR TRAFFIC CONTROL.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust, at a time the chair deems appropriate, the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure and other applicable committees of the House of Representatives, aggregates, and other appropriate levels established in this concurrent resolution for a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system if such measure reduces the discretionary spending limits in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 by the amount that would otherwise be appropriated to the Federal Aviation Administration for air traffic control. Adjustments to the section 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations, consistent with the adjustments to the discretionary spending limits under such section 251(c), shall only be made upon enactment of such measure.

(b) **DEFINITION.**—For purposes of this section, a measure that commercializes the operations of the air traffic control system shall be a measure that establishes a Federally-chartered, not-for-profit corporation that—

(1) is authorized to provide air traffic control services within the United States airspace;

(2) sets user fees to finance its operations;

(3) may borrow from private capital markets to finance improvements;

(4) is governed by a board of directors composed of a CEO and directors whose fiduciary duty is to the entity; and

(5) becomes the employer of those employees directly connected to providing air traffic control services and who the Secretary transfers from the Federal Government.

SEC. 402. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 403. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 405. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

TITLE V—POLICY STATEMENTS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**SEC. 501. POLICY STATEMENT ON A BALANCED BUDGET AMENDMENT.**

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

(1) In fiscal year 2017, the Federal Government will collect approximately \$3.3 trillion in taxes, but spend more than \$4.0 trillion to maintain its operations, borrowing 15 cents of every Federal dollar spent.

(2) At the end of fiscal year 2016, the national debt of the United States was more than \$19.5 trillion.

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

(4) As of the spring of 2016, 46 States have requirements to annually balance their respective budgets.

(5) Numerous balanced budget amendment proposals have been introduced on a bipartisan basis in the House. Currently in the 115th Congress, 8 joint resolutions proposing a balanced budget amendment have been introduced.

(6) In the 111th Congress, the House considered H. J. Res. 2, sponsored by Representative Robert W. Goodlatte of Virginia. Although it received 262 aye votes, it did not receive the two-thirds required for passage.

(7) In 1995, a balanced budget amendment to the Constitution passed the House with bipartisan support, but failed to pass by one vote in the United States Senate.

(8) Five States, Georgia, Alaska, Mississippi, North Dakota, and Arizona, have agreed to the Compact for a Balanced Budget, which seeks to amend the Constitution to require a balanced budget through an Article V convention by April 12, 2021.

(b) **POLICY ON A BALANCED BUDGET CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should propose a balanced budget constitutional amendment for ratification by the States.

SEC. 502. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET PROCESS REFORM.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should enact legislation that reforms the congressional budget process to—

(1) reassert congressional control over the budget process by reorienting the Views and Estimates that committees submit to the Committee on the Budget, as required under 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, to emphasize congressional rather than executive branch priorities;

(2) strengthen enforcement of budgetary rules and requirements by—

(A) enabling Members of the House of Representatives to enforce budget requirements in a manner that does not jeopardize the ability of the majority to work its will on legislation; and

(B) permitting members of Congress to determine whether emergency-designated appropriations are for unanticipated situations that pose a threat to life, property, or national security;

(3) increase control over the costs of Federal activities by—

(A) incorporating debt service costs into cost estimates prepared by the Congressional Budget Office;

(B) establishing a process for setting limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President;

(C) transitioning to fair-value accounting;

(D) budgeting for Federal insurance programs on an accrual basis; and

(E) developing and implementing a regulatory budget as provided in section 503;

(4) achieve greater control over mandatory spending by reforming reconciliation procedures and requirements to ensure they are transparent, objectively applied, and maximize opportunities for deficit reduction;

(5) increase the efficiency of the congressional budget process by—

(A) realigning the budget cycle with the calendar year and the congressional calendar;

(B) simplifying the procedures by which the Committee on Appropriations adjusts its section 302(b) suballocations to ensure they are consistent with the Committee's overall section 302(a) allocation; and

(C) increasing congressional accountability for budget decisions;

(6) improve the transparency of the Federal Government's obligations by—

(A) modifying the content of the budget resolution to reflect the budgetary decisions that Congress actually makes and enforces;

(B) requiring the Comptroller General to periodically report to Congress on the consolidated financial report of the Federal Government; and

(C) restructuring the baseline, as set forth in section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to treat mandatory spending and revenue on a comparable basis; and

(7) achieve control over long-term budget obligations by—

(A) establishing declining limits on the amount of debt incurred by the Federal Government from the private sector as a share of the economy that requires congressional action if such limits deviate from those previously determined by Congress and the President; and

(B) codifying limits on the amount legislation can increase the deficit beyond the ten fiscal-year period of the concurrent resolution on the budget.

SEC. 503. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.

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

(1) Federal regulations are estimated to cost \$1.9 trillion per year or approximately \$15,000 per household. Such costs exceed 10 percent of the Gross Domestic Product of the United States.

(2) Excessive Federal regulation—

(A) retards job creation, investment, wages, competition, and economic growth, slowing the Nation's recovery from economic recession and harming American households;

(B) operates as a regressive tax on poor and lower-income households;

(C) displaces workers into long-term unemployment or lower-paying jobs;

(D) adversely affects small businesses, the primary source of new jobs; and

(E) impedes the economic growth necessary to provide sufficient funds to meet vital commitments and reduce the Federal debt.

(3) Federal agencies do not systematically analyze both the costs and benefits of new regulations or identify and eliminate, minimize, or mitigate excess regulatory costs through post-implementation assessments of their regulations.

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

(5) Congress lacks an effective mechanism to manage the level of new Federal regulatory costs imposed each year. Other nations, meanwhile, have successfully implemented the use of regulatory budgeting to control excess regulation and regulatory costs.

(6) Significant steps have been taken already by President Trump and the 115th Congress, including the imposition of a regulatory pay-as-you-go regimen for new and revised regulations by the Trump Administration and the enactment of 14 measures under the Congressional Review Act that repealed regulations promulgated in the final 60 legislative days of the 114th Congress.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL REGULATORY BUDGETING AND REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with the public, consider legislation that—

(1) requires the President's budget submission to include an analysis of the costs of complying with current and proposed regulations;

(2) builds the institutional capacity of the Congressional Budget Office to develop a regulatory baseline and estimate regulatory costs;

(3) codifies the Trump Administration's regulatory pay-as-you-go requirements, which require agencies to offset the costs of new or revised regulations with the repeal or modification of existing regulations; and

(4) requires Federal agencies to give notice and allow for comments on proposed guidance documents.

SEC. 504. POLICY STATEMENT ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.

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

(1) Article I of the Constitution vests all legislative power in Congress.

(2) Central to the legislative powers of Congress is the authorization of appropriations necessary to execute the laws that establish agencies and programs and impose obligations.

(3) Clause 2 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures that provide appropriations for unauthorized programs.

(4) In fiscal year 2016, more than \$310 billion was appropriated for unauthorized programs, spanning 256 separate laws.

(5) Agencies such as the Department of State have not been authorized for 15 years.

(6) The House adopted a requirement for the 115th Congress, as part of H. Res. 5, that requires each standing committee of the House to adopt an authorization and oversight plan that enumerates all unauthorized programs and agencies within its jurisdiction that received funding in the prior year, among other oversight requirements.

(b) **POLICY ON UNAUTHORIZED APPROPRIATIONS.**—In the House, it is the policy of this concurrent resolution that legislation should be enacted that—

(1) establishes a schedule for reauthorizing all Federal programs on a staggered five-year basis together with declining spending targets for each year a program is not reauthorized according to such schedule;

(2) prohibits the consideration of appropriations measures in the House that provide appropriations in excess of spending targets specified for such measures and ensures that such rule should be strictly enforced; and

(3) limits funding for non-defense or non-security-related Federal programs that are not reauthorized according to the schedule described in paragraph (1).

SEC. 505. POLICY STATEMENT ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING.

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

(1) Current accounting methods fail to capture and present in a compelling manner the full scope of the Federal Government and its fiscal condition.

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

(3) The Federal budget currently accounts for most programs on a cash accounting basis, which records revenue and expenses when cash is actually paid or received. However, it accounts for loan and loan guarantee programs on an accrual basis, which records revenue when earned and expenses when incurred.

(4) The Government Accountability Office has advised that accrual accounting may be

more accurate than cash accounting in estimating the Federal Government's liabilities for insurance and other programs.

(5) Accrual accounting under the Federal Credit Reform Act of 1990 (FCRA) understates the risk and thus the true cost of some Federal programs, including loans and loan guarantees.

(6) Fair-value accounting better reflects the risk associated with Federal loan and loan guarantee programs by using a market based discount rate. CBO, for example, uses fair-value accounting to measure the cost of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) and the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac).

(7) In comparing fair-value accounting to FCRA, CBO has concluded that "adopting a fair-value approach would provide a more comprehensive way to measure the costs of Federal credit programs and would permit more level comparisons between those costs and the costs of other forms of Federal assistance".

(8) The Department of the Treasury, when reporting the principal financial statements of the United States entitled *Balance Sheet and Statement of Operations and Changes in Net Position*, may omit some of the largest projected Federal Government expenses, including social insurance programs. The projected expenses of these programs are reported by the Department in its *Statements of Social Insurance and Changes in Social Insurance Amounts*.

(9) This concurrent resolution directs CBO to estimate the costs of Federal credit programs on a fair-value basis to fully capture the risk associated with these programs.

(b) **POLICY ON FEDERAL ACCOUNTING METHODOLOGIES.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should, in consultation with CBO and other appropriate stakeholders, reform government-wide budget and accounting practices so Members and the public can better understand the fiscal condition of the United States and the best options to improve it. Such reforms may include the following:

(1) Providing additional metrics to enhance analysis by considering the Nation's fiscal condition comprehensively, over an extended time period, and how it affects Americans of various age cohorts.

(2) Expanding the use of accrual accounting where appropriate.

(3) Accounting for certain Federal credit programs using fair-value accounting to better capture market risk.

SEC. 506. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.

(a) **FINDINGS.**—The Congress finds the following:

(1) In 1965, the President's Commission on Budget Concepts made a series of recommendations that were adopted and continue to provide the foundation for the Federal budget process.

(2) Over the ensuing 52 years, the Federal budget process has undergone major transformations, including the following:

(A) Congress asserted its Article I "power of the purse" through the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 in the form of a congressional budget process predicated on the adoption of an annual budget resolution setting forth its priorities independent of the executive branch.

(B) Congress and the President have periodically augmented the President's budget submission and the budget resolution by establishing statutory budget rules and limits enforced through sequestration.

(C) The share of Federal spending that is not controlled through the annual appropriations process has ballooned from 32 percent of total Federal spending in 1967 to 69 percent in 2016.

(D) Activities previously considered the exclusive domain of the Federal Government have been fully commercialized, contracted out to the private sector, financed through third party arrangements, or devolved to State and local governments.

(E) Key functions of the Federal Government are now funded through user fees rather than general revenue, often shielding them from congressional control and oversight.

(F) The Credit Reform Act of 1990 placed Federal loans and loan guarantees on an accrual basis.

(G) Increasing shares of the economy are directed towards compliance with Federal regulations, which are not subject to the limitations applicable to Federal spending.

(b) **POLICY ON COMMISSION ON BUDGET CONCEPTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution on the budget that legislation should be enacted that establishes a Commission on Budget Concepts to review and revise budget concepts and make recommendations to create a more transparent Federal budget process.

SEC. 507. POLICY STATEMENT ON BUDGET ENFORCEMENT.

It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should—

(1) adopt an annual budget resolution before spending and tax legislation is considered in either House of Congress;

(2) assess measures for timely compliance with budget rules in the House;

(3) pass legislation to strengthen enforcement of the budget resolution;

(4) comply with the discretionary spending limits set forth in the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985;

(5) prevent the use of accounting gimmicks to offset higher spending;

(6) modify scoring conventions to encourage the commercialization of Federal Government activities that can best be provided by the private sector; and

(7) discourage the use of savings identified in the budget resolution as offsets for spending or tax legislation.

SEC. 508. POLICY STATEMENT ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.

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

(1) The Government Accountability Office defines improper payments as any reported payment that should not have been made or was made in an incorrect amount.

(2) Improper payments totaled \$1.2 trillion between fiscal years 2003 and 2016 with a reported Federal Government-wide error rate of 5.1 percent in fiscal year 2016.

(3) Improper payments increased from \$107 billion in 2012 to \$144 billion in 2016.

(4) The Earned Income Tax Credit, Medicare, and Medicaid account for 78 percent of total improper payments, with error rates of 24 percent, 11 percent, and 10.5 percent, respectively.

(5) Eight agencies did not report payment estimates for 18 programs that the Comptroller General deems susceptible to significant improper payments.

(b) **POLICY ON IMPROPER PAYMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that an independent commission should be established with the goal of finding tangible solutions to reduce total improper payments by 50 percent within the next 5 years. The commission should also develop a more-stringent system of agency oversight to achieve this goal.

SEC. 509. POLICY STATEMENT ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.

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

(1) Many Federal agencies and organizations have permanent authority to collect

and spend fees and other offsetting collections.

(2) The Office of Management and Budget estimates the total amount of offsetting fees and collections to be \$513 billion in fiscal year 2017.

(3) Agency budget justifications are, in some cases, not fully transparent about the amount of program activity funded through offsetting collections or fees. This lack of transparency prevents effective and accountable Government.

(b) **POLICY ON EXPENDITURES FROM AGENCY FEES AND SPENDING.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should reassert its constitutional prerogative to control Federal spending and exercise rigorous oversight over Federal agencies. Congress should subject all fees paid by the public to Federal agencies to annual appropriations or authorizing legislation and a share of these proceeds should be reserved for taxpayers in the form of deficit reduction.

SEC. 510. POLICY STATEMENT ON PROMOTING REAL HEALTH CARE REFORM.

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

(1) Patient-centered health care increases access to quality care for all Americans, regardless of age, income, or health status.

(2) States are best equipped to respond to the needs of their unique communities.

(3) The current legal framework encourages frivolous medical malpractice lawsuits that increase health care costs.

(b) **POLICY ON HEALTH CARE REGULATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the American health care system should encourage research, development, and innovation in the medical sector, rather than stymie growth through over-regulation;

(2) States should determine the parameters of acceptable private insurance plans based on the needs of their populations and retain control over other health care coverage standards;

(3) reforms should protect patients with pre-existing conditions, reward those who maintain continuous health coverage, and create greater parity between benefits offered through employers and those offered independently;

(4) States should have greater flexibility in designing their Medicaid program and State Children's Health Insurance Program;

(5) medical malpractice reform should emphasize compliance with best practice guidelines, while continuing to protect patients' interests; and

(6) States should have the flexibility to implement medical liability policies to best suit their needs.

SEC. 511. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICARE.

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

(1) More than 57 million Americans depend on Medicare for their health security.

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

(A) the Hospital Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted in 2029 and unable to pay the scheduled benefits;

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

(C) due to extended life spans, enrollees remain in Medicare three times longer than at the outset of the program five decades ago;

(D) notwithstanding the program's trust fund arrangement, current workers' payroll tax contributions pay for current Medicare beneficiaries instead of being set aside for their own future use;

(E) the number of workers supporting each beneficiary continues to fall; in 1965, the ratio was 4.5 workers per beneficiary, and by 2030, the ratio will be only 2.4 workers per beneficiary;

(F) the average Medicare beneficiary receives about three dollars in Medicare benefits for every dollar paid into the program;

(G) Medicare is growing faster than the economy, with a projected growth rate of 7.2 percent per year on average through 2026, peaking in 2026 at 9.2 percent; and

(H) by 2027, Medicare spending will reach more than \$1.4 trillion, more than double the 2016 spending level of \$692 billion.

(3) Failing to address the impending insolvency of Medicare will leave millions of American seniors without adequate health security and younger generations burdened with having to pay for these unsustainable spending levels.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICARE REFORM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to save Medicare for those in or near retirement and to strengthen the program's solvency for future beneficiaries.

(c) **ASSUMPTIONS.**—This concurrent resolution assumes transition to an improved Medicare program that ensures—

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

(2) future Medicare beneficiaries may select from competing guaranteed health coverage options a plan that best suits their needs;

(3) traditional fee-for-service Medicare remains a plan option;

(4) Medicare provides additional assistance for lower-income beneficiaries and those with greater health risks; and

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

SEC. 512. POLICY STATEMENT ON COMBATING THE OPIOID EPIDEMIC.

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

(1) According to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), 91 Americans die each day from an opioid overdose.

(2) Nearly half of all opioid overdose deaths involve a prescription opioid.

(3) Since 1999, the number of prescription opioids sold in the U.S. has nearly quadrupled.

(4) Since 1999, the number of deaths from prescription opioids has more than quadrupled.

(5) The CDC asserts that improving opioid prescribing practices will reduce exposure to opioids, prevent abuse, and stop addiction.

(6) The CDC has found that individuals in rural counties are almost twice as likely to overdose on prescription painkillers as those in urban areas.

(7) According to the CDC, nearly 7,000 people are treated in emergency rooms every day for using opioids in a non-approved manner.

(8) The 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act were signed into law in the 114th Congress in an overwhelming display of congressional and executive branch support in the fight against the opioid epidemic.

(9) Bipartisan efforts to eliminate opioid abuse and provide relief from addiction for all Americans should continue.

(b) **POLICY ON OPIOID ABUSE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) combating opioid abuse using available budgetary resources remains a high priority;

(2) the House, in a bipartisan manner, should continue to examine the Federal response to the opioid abuse epidemic and support essential activities to reduce and prevent substance abuse;

(3) the House should continue to support initiatives included in the 21st Century Cures Act and the Comprehensive Addiction and Recovery Act;

(4) the House should continue its oversight efforts, particularly ongoing investigations conducted by the House Committee on Energy and Commerce, to ensure that taxpayer dollars intended to combat opioid abuse are spent appropriately and efficiently; and

(5) the House should collaborate with State, local, and tribal entities to develop a comprehensive strategy for addressing the opioid addiction crisis.

SEC. 513. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.

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

(1) The State Children's Health Insurance Program (SCHIP) is a means-tested program that provides health insurance coverage to low-income children and pregnant women who do not qualify for Medicaid based on income.

(2) SCHIP eligibility varies by State, as States decide the income upper limit for beneficiaries; the current upper limit varies from 175 percent of the Federal poverty level to 405 percent of the Federal poverty level.

(3) SCHIP covered on average 6.3 million people monthly in fiscal year 2017.

(4) The average cost of a child enrolled in SCHIP to the Federal Government was approximately \$2,300 in fiscal year 2017, compared to approximately \$1,910 for a child enrolled in Medicaid.

(5) The Federal spending allotment for SCHIP will expire at the end of fiscal year 2017.

(6) The Medicaid and CHIP Payment and Access Commission recommends an extension of Federal SCHIP funding, and warns that all States are projected to exhaust their Federal SCHIP funds during fiscal year 2018.

(7) SCHIP should be preserved to assist the Nation's vulnerable children.

(b) **POLICY ON THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should work in a bipartisan manner to reauthorize SCHIP funding;

(2) the authorizing committees should consider establishing a Federal upper limit for SCHIP eligibility, rather than providing open-ended access to the program for those at higher income levels;

(3) the House should target resources designated for SCHIP toward those most in need of Federal assistance; and

(4) the House should require greater reporting by States of SCHIP data in order to better structure the program to meet beneficiaries' needs.

SEC. 514. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAL DISCOVERY, DEVELOPMENT, DELIVERY, AND INNOVATION.

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

(1) The Nation's commitment to the discovery, development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of the world for decades.

(2) The history of scientific discovery and medical breakthroughs in the United States is extensive, including the creation of the polio vaccine, the first genetic mapping, and the invention of the implantable cardiac pacemaker.

(3) Reuters ranks the United States Health and Human Services Laboratories as first in

the world for innovation on its 2017 list of the Top 25 Global Innovators.

(4) The United States leads the world in the production of medical devices, and the United States medical device market accounts for approximately 45 percent of the global market.

(5) The United States remains a global leader in pharmaceutical research and development investment, has produced more than half of the world's new molecules in the past decade, and represents the world's largest pharmaceutical market, which is triple the size of the nearest rival, China.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAL INNOVATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the Federal Government should foster investment in health care innovation and maintain the Nation's world leadership status in medical science by encouraging competition;

(2) the House should continue to support the critical work of medical innovators throughout the country through continued funding for agencies, including the National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, to conduct life-saving research and development; and

(3) the Federal Government should unleash the power of private-sector medical innovation by removing regulatory obstacles that impede the adoption of new medical technology and pharmaceuticals.

SEC. 515. POLICY STATEMENT ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.

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

(1) The Constitution requires the Federal Government to provide for the common defense. As such, the Nation must prioritize its ability to respond rapidly and effectively to a public health crisis or bioterrorism threat.

(2) There is a persistent threat of bioterrorism against American lives.

(3) Naturally-occurring public health threats can spread through the transmission of communicable diseases during international trade and travel.

(4) As of April 3, 2016, the World Health Organization reported nearly 29,000 cases of the Ebola virus worldwide, including 4 instances in the U.S.

(5) As of July 12, 2017, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reports that the current Zika epidemic resulted in over 5,000 cases of the Zika virus within the United States, with nearly 37,000 more cases reported in U.S. territories.

(6) Preventing the spread of disease to Americans requires halting threats before they breach the U.S. border.

(7) The United States is a leader in global public health assistance and orchestrates international responses to health crises.

(b) **POLICY ON PUBLIC HEALTH PREPAREDNESS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should continue to fund activities of the CDC, the National Institutes of Health, and the Biomedical Advanced Research and Development Authority to develop and stockpile medical countermeasures to infectious diseases and chemical, biological, radiological, and nuclear agents;

(2) the House should, within available budgetary resources, provide continued support for research, prevention, and public health preparedness programs;

(3) the Federal Government should encourage private-sector development of critical vaccines and other medical countermeasures to emerging public health threats; and

(4) the Secretary of Health and Human Services, the Secretary of Defense, and the Secretary of State should collaborate on

global health preparedness initiatives to prevent overlap and promote responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources.

SEC. 516. POLICY STATEMENT ON SOCIAL SECURITY.

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

(1) More than 60 million retirees, individuals with disabilities, and survivors depend on Social Security. Since enactment, Social Security has served as a vital leg of the “three-legged stool” of retirement security, which includes employer provided pensions as well as personal savings.

(2) Lower-income Americans rely on Social Security for a larger proportion of their retirement income. Therefore, reforms should take into consideration the need to protect lower income Americans’ retirement security.

(3) The Social Security Trustees Report has repeatedly recommended that Social Security’s long-term financial challenges be addressed soon. The financial condition of Social Security and the threat to seniors and those receiving Social Security disability benefits becomes more pronounced each year without reform. For example—

(A) in 2028, the Disability Insurance Trust Fund will be exhausted and program revenues will be unable to pay scheduled benefits; and

(B) with the exhaustion of both the Disability Insurance Trust Fund and the Old-Age and Survivors and Disability Trust Fund in 2035, benefits will be cut by as much as 25 percent across the board, devastating those currently in or near retirement and those who rely on Social Security the most.

(4) The recession and continued low economic growth have exacerbated the looming fiscal crisis facing Social Security. The most recent Congressional Budget Office (CBO) projections find that Social Security will run cash deficits of more than \$1.3 trillion over the next 10 years.

(5) The Disability Insurance program provides an essential income safety net for those with disabilities and their families. According to CBO, between 1970 and 2015 the number of disabled workers and their dependent family members receiving disability benefits has increased by more than 300 percent from 2.7 million to over 10.9 million. This increase is not due strictly to population growth or decreases in health. CBO also attributes program growth to changes in demographics and the composition of the labor force as well as Federal policies.

(6) In the past, Social Security has been reformed on a bipartisan basis, most notably by the “Greenspan Commission”, which helped address Social Security shortfalls for more than a generation.

(7) Americans deserve action by the President and Congress to preserve and strengthen Social Security to ensure that Social Security remains a critical part of the safety net.

(b) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should work in a bipartisan manner to make Social Security solvent on a sustainable basis. This concurrent resolution assumes, under a reform trigger, that—

(1) if in any year the Board of Trustees of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund annual Trustees Report determines that the 75-year actuarial balance of the Social Security Trust Funds is in deficit, and the annual balance of the Social Security Trust Funds in the 75th year is in deficit, the Board of Trustees should, no later than September 30 of the same calendar year, submit to the President recommendations for statutory reforms necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance

and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and any recommendations provided to the President must be agreed upon by both Public Trustees of the Board of Trustees;

(2) not later than December 1 of the same calendar year in which the Board of Trustees submit its recommendations, the President should promptly submit implementing legislation to both Houses of Congress including recommendations necessary to achieve a positive 75-year actuarial balance and a positive annual balance in the 75th year, and the majority leader of the Senate and the majority leader of the House should introduce the President’s legislation upon receipt;

(3) within 60 days of the President submitting legislation, the committees of jurisdiction should report a bill, which the House or Senate should consider under expedited procedures; and

(4) legislation submitted by the President should—

(A) protect those in or near retirement;

(B) preserve the safety net for those who count on Social Security the most, including those with disabilities and survivors;

(C) improve fairness for participants;

(D) reduce the burden on and provide certainty for future generations; and

(E) secure the future of the Disability Insurance program while addressing the needs of those with disabilities today and improving the determination process.

(c) **POLICY ON DISABILITY INSURANCE.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation on a bipartisan basis to reform the Disability Insurance program prior to its insolvency in 2028 and should not raid the Social Security retirement system without reforms to the Disability Insurance system. This concurrent resolution assumes reform that—

(1) promotes opportunity for those trying to return to work;

(2) ensures benefits continue to be paid to individuals with disabilities and their family members who rely on them;

(3) prevents a 7 percent across-the-board benefit cut; and

(4) improves the Disability Insurance program.

(d) **POLICY ON SOCIAL SECURITY SOLVENCY.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that any legislation the House considers to improve the solvency of the Disability Insurance Trust Fund must also improve the long-term solvency of the combined Old Age and Survivors Disability Insurance Trust Fund.

SEC. 517. POLICY STATEMENT ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.

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

(1) Medicaid is a Federal-State program that provides health care coverage for impoverished Americans.

(2) Medicaid serves four major population categories: the elderly, the blind and disabled, children, and adults.

(3) The Congressional Budget Office projects the average monthly enrollment in Medicaid for fiscal year 2018 to be 78 million people.

(4) Of this 78 million people, 27 million – more than one third of the enrollees – are non-elderly, non-disabled adults.

(5) Medicaid continues to grow at an unsustainable rate, and will cost approximately one trillion dollars per year within the decade, between Federal and State spending.

(6) Congress has a responsibility to preserve limited Medicaid resources for America’s most vulnerable – those who cannot provide for themselves.

(7) Forbes reported last year on a first-of-its-kind study conducted by the Foundation for Government Accountability. It analyzed data from the State of Kansas, which dem-

onstrates that work requirements have led to greater employment, higher incomes, and less poverty.

(8) The State of Maine implemented work requirements in 2014, and saw incomes rise for able-bodied welfare recipients by an average of 114 percent within a year.

(9) Work is a valuable source of human dignity, and work requirements help lift Americans out of poverty by incentivizing self-reliance.

(b) **POLICY ON MEDICAID WORK REQUIREMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) Congress should enact legislation that encourages able-bodied, non-elderly, non-pregnant adults without dependents to work, actively seek work, participate in a job-training program, or do community service, in order to receive Medicaid;

(2) Medicaid work requirements legislation could include 30 hours per week of work, of which 20 of those hours should be spent in the core activities of: public or private sector employment, work experience, on-the-job training, job-search or job-readiness assistance program participation, community service, or vocational training and education;

(3) States should be given flexibility to determine the parameters of qualifying program participation and work-equivalent experience;

(4) States should perform regular case checks to ensure taxpayer dollars are appropriately spent; and

(5) the Government Accountability Office or the Department of Health and Human Services Inspector General should conduct annual audits of State Medicaid programs to ensure proper reporting and prevent waste, fraud, and abuse.

SEC. 518. POLICY STATEMENT ON WELFARE REFORM AND SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM WORK REQUIREMENTS.

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

(1) Participation in the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has grown from 17 million Americans in 2001 to 44 million in 2016.

(2) The work support role of SNAP has declined, and the program increasingly serves as a replacement to work.

(3) Work requirements were key to the success of the Personal Responsibility and Work Opportunity Act (Public Law 104-193), which led to a two-thirds reduction in welfare case-loads, a reduction in child poverty, and an increase in work participation. The successful 1996 welfare reform law provides a model for improving work requirements in other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON WELFARE REFORM AND SNAP WORK REQUIREMENTS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the welfare system should reward work, provide tools to escape poverty, and expect work-capable adults to work or prepare for work in exchange for welfare benefits; and

(2) SNAP should be reformed to improve work requirements to help more people escape poverty and move up the economic ladder.

SEC. 519. POLICY STATEMENT ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SUPPLEMENTAL NUTRITION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM.

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

(1) Spending on Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has almost quadrupled since 2001.

(2) Various factors are driving this growth, but one major reason is that while States have the responsibility of administering the program, they have little incentive to ensure it is well run.

(3) In 1996, a Republican Congress and a Democratic President reformed welfare by limiting the duration of benefits, giving States more control over the program, and helping recipients find work. In the 5 years following passage, child-poverty rates fell, welfare caseloads fell, and workers' wages increased. This bipartisan success offers a model for improving other anti-poverty programs.

(b) **POLICY ON STATE FLEXIBILITY IN SNAP.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that SNAP should be reformed to reduce poverty and increase opportunity and upward mobility for struggling Americans on the road to personal and financial independence. Based on the successful welfare reforms of the 1990s, these proposals would improve work requirements and provide flexible funding for States to help those most in need find gainful employment, escape poverty, and move up the economic ladder.

SEC. 520. POLICY STATEMENT ON HIGHER EDUCATION AND WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITY.

(a) **FINDINGS ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—The House finds the following:

(1) A well-educated, high-skilled workforce is critical to economic, job, and wage growth.

(2) Average published tuition and fees have increased consistently above the rate of inflation across all types of colleges and universities.

(3) With an outstanding student loan portfolio of \$1.3 trillion, the Federal Government is the largest education lender to undergraduate and graduate students, parents, and other guarantors.

(4) Students who do not complete their college degree are at a greater risk of defaulting on their loans than those who complete their degree.

(5) Participation in Federal income-driven repayment plans is rising, in terms of the percent of both borrowers and loan dollars, according to the Government Accountability Office. Because these plans offer loan balance forgiveness after a repayment period, this increased use portends higher projected costs to taxpayers.

(b) **POLICY ON HIGHER EDUCATION.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to promote college affordability, access, and success by—

(1) reserving Federal financial aid for those most in need and streamlining grant and loan aid programs to help students and families more easily assess their options for financing postsecondary education; and

(2) removing regulatory barriers to reduce costs, increase access, and allow for innovative teaching models.

(c) **FINDINGS ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—The House finds the following:

(1) 7.5 million Americans are currently unemployed.

(2) Despite billions of dollars in spending, those looking for work are stymied by a broken workforce development system that fails to connect workers with assistance and employers with skilled personnel.

(3) The House Committee on Education and the Workforce successfully consolidated 15 workforce development programs when Congress enacted the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act in 2014.

(d) **POLICY ON WORKFORCE DEVELOPMENT.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution to build on the success of the Workforce Innovation and Opportunity Act by—

(1) further streamlining and consolidating Federal workforce development programs; and

(2) empowering States with the flexibility to tailor funding and programs to the specific needs of their workforce.

SEC. 521. POLICY STATEMENT ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.

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

(1) In 1995, fire activities made up 16 percent of the United States Forest Service's (USFS) annual appropriated budget. Since 2015, more than 50 percent has now been dedicated to wildfire.

(2) Wildland fire suppression activities are currently funded entirely within the USFS budget, based on a 10-year rolling average. Using this model, the agency must average firefighting costs from the past 10 years to predict and request costs for the next year. When the average was stable, the agency was able to use this model to budget consistently for the annual costs associated with wildland fire suppression.

(3) Over the last few decades, wildland fire suppression costs have increased as fire seasons have grown longer and the frequency, size, and severity of wildland fires has increased.

(4) The six worst fire seasons since 1960 have all occurred since 2000. Since 2000, many western states have experienced the largest wildfires in their State's history. In 2016 alone, there were a recorded 67,595 fires and a total of over 5.5 million acres burned. The suppression costs to USFS and other Federal agencies for 2016 totaled over \$1.9 billion dollars.

(5) As wildfire costs continue to increase, funding levels for USFS wildfire suppression activities will also continue to constrict funding levels for other necessary USFS forest management activities focused on land management and wildfire prevention.

(b) **POLICY ON SUPPLEMENTAL WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that Congress, in coordination with the Administration, should develop both a long-term funding mechanism that would allow supplemental wildfire suppression funding and reforms on reducing hazardous fuel loads on Federal forests and lands that could decrease wildfires.

SEC. 522. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.

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

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

(2) Since 2003, VA disability compensation and health care have been added to the Government Accountability Office's (GAO) "high-risk" list, due to mismanagement and oversight failures, lack of a "unified vision, strategy, or set of goals to guide their outcomes," and the inability to ensure allocated resources are used in a cost-effective and efficient way to improve veterans' health care access.

(3) The VA's failure to provide timely and accessible health care to America's veterans is unacceptable. While Congress has done its part for more than a decade by providing sufficient funding for the VA, the agency has mismanaged these resources, resulting in proven adverse effects on veterans and their families.

(b) **POLICY ON THE DEPARTMENT OF VETERANS AFFAIRS.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should require the VA to conduct an audit of its programs named on GAO's "high-risk" list and report its findings to the Committee on Appropriations, the Committee on the Budget, and the Committee on Veterans Affairs of the House of Representatives.

SEC. 523. POLICY STATEMENT ON MOVING THE UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE ON BUDGET.

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

(1) The President's Commission on Budget Concepts recommends that the budget should, as a general rule, be comprehensive of the full range of Federal activity.

(2) The Omnibus Reconciliation Act of 1989 (Public Law 101-239) moved the United States Postal Service (USPS) off budget and exempted it from sequestration.

(3) The USPS has a direct effect on the fiscal posture of the Federal Government, through—

(A) the receipt of direct appropriations of \$35 million in fiscal year 2017;

(B) congressional mandates such as requirements for mail delivery service schedules;

(C) incurring \$15 billion in debt from the Treasury, the maximum permitted by law;

(D) continued operating deficits since 2007;

(E) defaulting on its statutory obligation to prefund health care benefits for future retirees; and

(F) carrying \$119 billion in total unfunded liabilities with no foreseeable pathway of funding these liabilities under current law.

(b) **POLICY ON MOVING THE USPS ON BUDGET.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that all receipts and disbursements of the USPS should be included in the congressional budget and the budget of the Federal Government.

SEC. 524. POLICY STATEMENT ON THE JUDGMENT FUND.

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

(1) The Judgment Fund (Fund), established in 1956, was created to pay judgments and settlements of lawsuits against the Federal Government.

(2) As a result of the Fund's design, it is ripe for executive branch exploitation. The Obama Administration used the Fund to make billions of dollars in payments to Federal agencies and foreign entities. For example—

(A) on January 17, 2016, the State Department announced the Federal Government agreed to pay the Iranian government \$1.7 billion to settle a case related to the sale of military equipment prior to the Iranian revolution, of which \$1.3 billion was sourced through the Fund, without prior congressional notification; the Obama Administration's use of the Fund to make this and other payments raises serious concerns by sidestepping Congress; and

(B) in 2016, the Department of Health and Human Services announced its intentions to use the Fund for settlements with health insurers who sued the Federal Government over the loss of funds for risk corridors under the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act.

(3) Failing to address the lack of oversight over the Fund annually costs taxpayers billions of dollars, as payments exceeded \$4.6 billion in 2016 and more than \$26 billion in the preceding 10 year period.

(b) **POLICY ON JUDGMENT FUND.**—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider legislation that reclaims Congress's power of the purse over the Fund. Such legislation should—

(1) prohibit interest payments paid from the Fund for accounts or assets frozen by the Federal Government and listed on—

(A) the Sanctions Programs list of the Office of Foreign Asset Control of the Department of Treasury; or

(B) Sponsors of Terrorism list of the Department of State;

(2) amend sections 2414 and 1304 of titles 28 and 31, United States Code, respectively, to—

(A) provide a clear definition and explanation of a “foreign court or tribunal”; and

(B) require congressional notification whenever the Fund makes a settlement or court ordered lump sum or aggregated payment exceeding \$500 million; and

(3) require legislative action to approve payments from the Fund in excess of a specified threshold, increase transparency, and require Federal agencies to reimburse the Fund over a fixed time period.

SEC. 525. POLICY STATEMENT ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.

(a) FINDINGS.—The House finds that significant savings were achieved by the House by consolidating operations and renegotiating contracts.

(b) POLICY ON RESPONSIBLE STEWARDSHIP OF TAXPAYER DOLLARS.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that—

(1) the House should be a model for the responsible stewardship of taxpayer resources, and identify any savings that can be achieved through greater productivity and efficiency gains in the operation and maintenance of House services and resources, including printing, conferences, utilities, telecommunications, furniture, grounds maintenance, postage, and rent;

(2) the House should review policies and procedures for the acquisition of goods and services to eliminate unnecessary spending;

(3) the Committee on House Administration should review the policies pertaining to services provided to Members and committees of the House, and identify ways to reduce any subsidies paid for the operation of the House gym, barber shop, salon, and the House dining room;

(4) no taxpayer funds should be used to purchase first class airfare or to lease corporate jets for Members of Congress; and

(5) retirement benefits for Members of Congress should not include free, taxpayer-funded health care for life.

SEC. 526. POLICY STATEMENT ON TAX REFORM.

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

(1) A world-class tax system should be simple, fair, and promote (rather than impede) economic growth. The United States tax code fails on all 3 counts: it is complex, unfair, and inefficient. The tax code’s complexity distorts decisions to work, save, and invest, which leads to slower economic growth, lower wages, and less job creation.

(2) Standard economic theory holds that high marginal tax rates lessen the incentives to work, save, and invest, which reduces economic output and job creation. Lower economic output, in turn, mutes the intended revenue gain from higher marginal tax rates.

(3) Roughly half of United States active business income and half of private sector employment are derived from business entities (such as partnerships, S corporations, and sole proprietorships) that are taxed on a “pass-through” basis, meaning the income is taxed at individual rates rather than corporate rates. Small businesses, in particular, tend to choose this form for Federal tax purposes, and the highest Federal rate on such small business income can reach nearly 45 percent. For these reasons, sound economic policy requires lowering marginal rates on these pass-through entities.

(4) The top United States corporate income tax rate (including Federal, State, and local taxes) is slightly more than 39 percent, the highest rate in the industrialized world. Tax rates this high suppress wages, discourage investment and job creation, distort business activity, and put American businesses at a competitive disadvantage with foreign competitors.

(5) By deterring potential investment, the United States corporate tax restrains eco-

nomical growth and job creation. The United States tax rate differential fosters a variety of complicated multinational corporate practices intended to avoid the tax, which have the effect of moving the tax base offshore, destroying American jobs, and decreasing corporate revenue.

(6) The “world-wide” structure of United States international taxation essentially taxes earnings of United States firms twice, putting them at a significant competitive disadvantage with competitors that have more competitive international tax systems.

(7) Reforming the tax code would boost the competitiveness of United States companies operating abroad and significantly reduce tax avoidance.

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

(9) Increasing taxes to raise revenue and meet out-of-control spending would sink the economy and Americans’ ability to save for their children’s education and retirement.

(10) Closing special preference carve outs in our tax code to finance higher spending does not constitute fundamental tax reform.

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

(12) Many economists believe that fundamental tax reform, including a broader tax base and lower tax rates, would lead to greater labor supply and increased investment, which would have a positive impact on total national output.

(b) POLICY ON TAX REFORM.—It is the policy of this concurrent resolution that the House should consider comprehensive tax reform legislation that promotes economic growth, creates American jobs, increases wages, and benefits American consumers, investors, and workers by—

(1) simplifying the tax code to make it fairer to American families and businesses and reducing the amount of time and resources necessary to comply with tax laws;

(2) substantially lowering tax rates for individuals and consolidating the current seven individual income tax brackets into fewer brackets;

(3) repealing the Alternative Minimum Tax;

(4) reducing the corporate tax rate; and

(5) transitioning the tax code to a more competitive system of international taxation.

The Acting CHAIR. No amendment shall be in order except those printed in House Report 115-339.

Each amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, and shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent.

After conclusion of consideration of the concurrent resolution for amendment, there shall be a final period of general debate which shall not exceed 10 minutes, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I rise as the designee of the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN) to offer the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) DECLARATION.—Congress declares that this concurrent resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2017 and 2019 through 2027.

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

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Sec. 101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 102. Major functional categories.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

Sec. 1. Direct spending.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

Sec. 301. Point of order against advance Appropriations.

Sec. 302. Point of order against funding for certain immigration enforcement efforts.

TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

SEC. 101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2017 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

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

- Fiscal year 2017: \$2,566,010,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,231,053,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,754,112,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$3,852,015,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,011,871,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$4,197,338,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$4,295,865,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$4,405,818,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$4,617,110,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026: \$4,840,032,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027: \$5,069,484,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2017: \$0.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$497,484,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$920,604,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$901,439,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$951,960,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022: \$1,014,422,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023: \$977,949,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024: \$943,390,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025: \$994,932,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026: \$1,050,654,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027: \$1,111,097,000,000.

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

- Fiscal year 2017: \$3,558,164,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2018: \$3,809,501,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019: \$3,889,380,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020: \$4,085,946,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021: \$4,242,299,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$4,524,849,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,667,232,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,840,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,123,649,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,359,292,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,604,559,000,000.
 (3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$3,411,968,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$3,801,027,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,859,325,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$4,031,449,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$4,190,238,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$4,474,256,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$4,610,999,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$4,770,214,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$5,057,717,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$5,301,376,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$5,545,750,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: -\$845,569,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: -\$569,974,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: -\$569,974,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: -\$179,434,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: -\$178,367,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: -\$276,918,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: -\$315,134,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: -\$364,396,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: -\$440,607,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: -\$461,344,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: -\$476,266,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of debt subject to limit are as follows:

Fiscal year 2017: \$20,611,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$21,412,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$21,584,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$21,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$22,490,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$22,950,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$23,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,111,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$24,809,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$26,305,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2017: \$15,093,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018: \$15,752,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019: \$15,985,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,322,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021: \$16,693,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022: \$17,202,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023: \$17,794,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024: \$18,483,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,300,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027: \$21,166,000,000.

SEC. 102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2017 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$620,810,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$597,390,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$570,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$573,048,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$581,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$575,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$594,087,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$582,924,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$609,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$594,652,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$623,521,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$611,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$637,690,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$620,850,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$655,897,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$632,247,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$670,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$651,864,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$680,394,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$663,759,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$690,786,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$674,679,000,000.
 (2) International Affairs (150):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,533,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$55,508,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,831,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$60,425,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$55,384,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,369,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$59,870,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,106,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,547,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,255,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$73,094,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,697,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,618,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,476,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,127,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$88,702,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$83,952,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,835,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$87,887,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,562,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,853,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,239,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,151,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,678,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,747,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,880,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,204,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,117,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,567,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,123,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,766,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,490,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,818,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,349,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,198,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,390,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,003,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,017,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$57,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$54,382,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$59,900,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$56,610,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$61,645,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$58,813,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$63,511,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$60,658,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,073,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,314,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$64,918,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$62,631,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$65,290,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,142,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$66,119,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,100,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$67,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$70,575,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,547,000,000.
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,851,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,010,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$122,495,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$122,147,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$125,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$124,382,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$128,313,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$127,136,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$69,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,294,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$72,613,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,715,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,531,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$72,930,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$74,852,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$78,455,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$76,818,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$80,604,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,839,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$82,820,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$81,015,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,930,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,023,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,713,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,735,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,240,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,479,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,431,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,832,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,437,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,610,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,178,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,068,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,514,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,832,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,180,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,105,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,475,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,938,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,328,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, -\$2,759,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, -\$19,274,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,131,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,689,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,724,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$11,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,714,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$13,516,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$12,786,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,781,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$15,622,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$28,145,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$16,679,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$29,608,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,099,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$31,576,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$17,836,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,416,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$18,772,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,478,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$19,628,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$92,730,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$94,107,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$199,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$199,409,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$201,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,565,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$196,098,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$202,143,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,000,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$203,522,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$205,038,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$171,562,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$179,442,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$172,521,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,132,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$173,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$183,231,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$174,584,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$185,116,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$175,633,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$187,060,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$169,950,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$100,381,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$30,864,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$79,569,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,802,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,464,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,662,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,830,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,390,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,016,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,481,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,242,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,662,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,888,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$40,250,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,353,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$44,235,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$42,428,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$266,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$264,242,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$298,769,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$295,251,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$166,530,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$168,879,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,656,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$172,182,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$188,094,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$182,789,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$197,237,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$192,067,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$204,174,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$200,177,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$210,915,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,028,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$216,669,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$212,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$222,127,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$218,112,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$228,312,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$224,320,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$548,466,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$548,998,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$578,564,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$585,289,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$613,743,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$612,402,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$659,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$646,374,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$687,535,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$683,765,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$726,450,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,843,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$765,397,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$761,755,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$807,017,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$802,573,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$852,005,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$846,941,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$897,043,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$891,673,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$943,870,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$938,235,000,000.
 (12) Medicare (570):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$598,691,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,289,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$599,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$599,092,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$650,772,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$650,464,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$676,942,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$676,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$723,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$723,163,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$817,925,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$817,695,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$840,589,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$840,371,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$861,276,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$861,049,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$963,021,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$962,774,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,016,987,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,016,734,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$1,091,254,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,091,006,000,000.
 (13) Income Security (600):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$522,238,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$512,949,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$574,926,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$554,174,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$641,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$624,323,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$691,701,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$675,708,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$737,828,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$721,824,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$785,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$775,704,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$819,551,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$807,162,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$855,396,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$837,727,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$904,334,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$887,787,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$947,417,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$937,276,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$995,029,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$984,004,000,000.
 (14) Social Security (650):
 Fiscal year 2017:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,132,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,155,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,621,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,621,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,402,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,402,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,861,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,861,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$50,700,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$50,700,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$54,722,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$54,722,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$59,082,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$59,082,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,228,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,228,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,774,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$75,499,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,499,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$81,931,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,931,000,000.
(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$175,596,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$178,660,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$185,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$183,609,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$204,230,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$199,677,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$213,730,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$209,577,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$223,712,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$219,141,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$243,263,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,540,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$242,677,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$238,676,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$241,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$237,627,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$261,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$257,403,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$271,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$266,912,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$281,497,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$277,377,000,000.
(16) Administration of Justice (750):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$64,048,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$57,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,673,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$64,686,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$66,260,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$66,774,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$69,134,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$70,886,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$72,276,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$75,047,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$74,994,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$76,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$77,448,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$77,463,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$80,013,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$78,824,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$82,656,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$81,269,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$91,519,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$90,803,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$95,033,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$93,445,000,000.
(17) General Government (800):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$25,587,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$24,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$27,332,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$26,239,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$27,092,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$28,670,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,024,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$29,373,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$28,752,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,095,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$29,512,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$30,804,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,231,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$31,369,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$30,813,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$32,195,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$31,559,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,041,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$32,384,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$33,873,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$33,207,000,000.
(18) Net Interest (900):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, \$358,153,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$358,153,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$379,086,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$379,086,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$408,318,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$408,318,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$444,136,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$444,136,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$482,207,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$482,207,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$518,277,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$518,277,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$554,698,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$554,698,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$588,258,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$588,258,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$621,248,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$621,248,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$654,736,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$654,736,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$682,812,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$682,937,000,000.
(19) Allowances (920):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$886,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$515,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$20,852,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$16,580,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$9,233,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$9,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,552,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,804,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$156,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$69,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$223,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$3,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$1,215,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$1,084,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$291,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$200,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$168,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,018,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$971,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$1,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$1,565,000,000.
(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
Fiscal year 2017:
(A) New budget authority, -\$83,167,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$83,167,000,000.
Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
(B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.

TITLE II—ESTIMATES OF DIRECT SPENDING

SEC. 1. DIRECT SPENDING.

(a) MEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.—

(1) For means-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 6.8 percent.

(2) For means-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 4.3 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for means-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget adopts former President Obama's Earned Income Tax Credit (EITC) to expand eligibility, including for childless workers. Continues enhanced credits originally implemented under the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act to target those most in need. This includes extending the Child and Dependent Care Credit and the American Opportunity Tax Credit through 2027.

(B) The People's Budget includes former President Obama's proposal to boost the Child Tax Credit maximum deduction to \$3,000. It makes key expansions permanent to protect 50 million Americans who would otherwise be at jeopardy for losing part or all of their EITC and CTC.

(C) The People's Budget creates a debt free college that provides Federal matching program to support state efforts to expand investment in higher education, bring down

costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt. The program would encourage innovation by states and colleges to improve efficiency and enable speedy and less-costly degree completion. By treating higher education as a public good worth investing in, we can once again make higher education accessible to all.

(D) The People's Budget allows students to refinance their student loans at low rates and allows private borrowers to shift to more affordable government loans. Allowing student borrowers to reduce the value of their debt will free up income for purchases and will create a job-creating ripple effect throughout the entire economy.

(E) The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. The vast majority of SNAP recipients are households with children, seniors and individuals with disabilities, but recent cuts lowered average benefits by \$216 in 2014. Providing families with basic food security through SNAP is one of the most effective ways the Federal Government can stimulate the economy.

(F) The People's Budget provides an additional \$10.8 billion for child nutrition programs including program expansion and improvements for summer meals; essential improvements and expansion funding for preschool nutrition including increases in meal reimbursements to fulfill the new meal pattern, an additional meal or snack for children in long-term care, and expanded program eligibility; and investments in school meals and school kitchens.

(G) The People's Budget replaces the 40 percent excise tax with a public option to allow the Secretary of Health and Human Services to offer a public insurance option within the health insurance marketplaces. This ensures choice, competition, and stability in coverage. The Congressional Budget Office (CBO) estimates the premium costs for Americans under the public option will be 7 to 8 percent lower than costs in private exchange plans. The repeal of the excise tax costs \$132 billion while savings from the public option are \$176 billion.

(H) The People's Budget continues funding for the entire CHIP program until 2020.

(I) The People's Budget protects States programs by fully retaining maintenance of effort requirements and eliminating any States ability to arbitrarily implement enrollment caps. Without action, Federal funding for CHIP will expire jeopardizing the health care coverage of more than 10 million children and pregnant women.

(J) The People's Budget permits the Secretary of Health and Human Services (HHS) to negotiate prescription drug prices with pharmaceutical manufacturers. Giving HHS the ability to negotiate prices, as the Department of Veterans Affairs currently does, will save Medicare \$429 billion and will reduce costs for seniors.

(b) **NONMEANS-TESTED DIRECT SPENDING.**—

(1) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 10-year period preceding fiscal year 2018 is 4.8 percent.

(2) For nonmeans-tested direct spending, the estimated average rate of growth in the total level of outlays during the 11-year period beginning with fiscal year 2017 is 5.6 percent under current law.

(3) The following reforms are proposed in this concurrent resolution for nonmeans-tested direct spending:

(A) The People's Budget allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment

benefits in high-unemployment states for up to two years.

(B) The People's Budget also adopts former President Obama's reforms to improve solvencies and incentivize job training.

(C) The People's Budget improves the Affordable Care Act by repealing the excise tax on high-priced health plans. Proponents of the provision hoped that this tax would slow the rate of growth of health costs, while raising revenue. However, in an effort to avoid the tax, employers who traditionally offer excellent benefits have started offering less generous plans. This is an ineffective tool to bend the cost curve. Since the tax is attached to premiums instead of coverage it has the potential to hit plans it wasn't intended to impact.

(D) The People's Budget establishes a representative democracy that truly reflects the diversity and values of our nation by providing funding for the public financing of campaigns. This gives a voice to small donors that have been drowned out by dark money. Public financing keeps politicians accountable to the voters that elect them instead of to special interest money. In the era of the devastating Citizens United decision, big money has taken the reins of our election process. It is now more important than ever to provide candidates with effective alternatives to finance their campaigns.

(E) The People's Budget uses the Experimental Price Index for the Elderly (CPI-E) to calculate Cost of Living Adjustments (COLA) for Federal retirement programs other than Social Security. Affected programs include civil service retirement, military retirement, Supplemental Security Income, veteran's pensions and compensations. CPI-E is the most sensible and accurate measure of the real costs that seniors face in retirement, current underpricing of costs amount to cutting benefits for those on fixed incomes.

(G) The People's Budget makes a down payment of \$1.9 trillion to help close the nation's infrastructure deficit while protecting against climate change and creating millions of living wage jobs. The budget also helps boost private financing for critical state and local projects by creating a public-private infrastructure bank. The American Society of Civil Engineers (ASCE) estimates that the United States will need to invest upwards of \$2 trillion above current levels over the next decade just to make required repairs to roads, bridges, water, and energy systems.

TITLE III—MISCELLANEOUS BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

SEC. 301. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House, except as provided in subsection (b), any bill, joint resolution, amendment or conference report making a general appropriations or continuing appropriation may not provide for advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Advance appropriations may be provided for all programs administered by the Department of Veterans Affairs.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term "advance appropriation" means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or any new discretionary budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018.

SEC. 302. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST FUNDING FOR CERTAIN IMMIGRATION ENFORCEMENT EFFORTS.

It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment there-to or conference report thereon, that appro-

priates funds to implement Executive Order 13767, entitled "Border Security and Immigration Enforcement Improvements".

Amend the title so as to read: "Concurrent resolution setting forth the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and including the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2017 and fiscal years 2018-2027".

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise to offer this amendment to replace the reckless Republican budget that is being considered before this House.

Instead of a doomsday budget that presents a future where everything is bleak and opportunity is nonexistent, the Progressive Caucus is offering a budget that can prove that the future can be bright and prosperous.

The Republican budget sacrifices everything from public education to Social Security to Medicare and Medicaid. It does this for one reason and one reason only: to give the wealthiest few and the corporations more tax breaks and increase their standing and concentration of power and wealth in this country more than it is already.

It has been said over and over that the budget that we are presenting we feel does deal with the values of this country. It deals very directly with something that is important to this Nation, and that is the American people, the greatest resource that we have as a nation, and we see it day in and day out.

This budget invests in the American people. It invests in jobs, it invests in solid education, and it invests in the greater good.

This budget is not narrow, tilted to a few: the wealthiest and the corporations in this country. It deals with the totality of who the American people are: those who are struggling and need opportunity, those who are elderly and need the continued support of this Nation through Medicare and Social Security, those who are poor who need Medicaid and a good education system so their opportunity will be better in the future.

Our budget speaks to the values of the American people. Our budget speaks to the needs of the American people. Our budget speaks to a future that returns the values, to the American people, of opportunity, of hope, and of chance.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time in opposition.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 3 minutes.

Mr. Chairman, even though I disagree heartily with the budgets advanced by

the Progressive Caucus, they do us an invaluable service in the budget debate by bringing into sharp relief the two very different visions of governance advanced by the two parties.

The Progressive budget is a sincere and bold document. Unfortunately, it is also wrong. It would hike taxes by \$10.1 trillion over the next 10 years relative to the Republican budget.

Now, think of every trillion dollars that we throw around here as \$8,000 from an average family, because that is what it comes to. So \$10.1 trillion in new taxes ultimately translates as \$81,000 from an average family over the next decade taken either as direct taxes or as tax-driven price increases or as lower wages or as lower earnings as businesses pass on their burdens to consumers or employers or investors. Remember, investors are largely your 401(k) or your pension plan.

It also runs up \$2.6 trillion more in debt than the Republican budget over the next 10 years. That means another \$21,000 of debt added to that family's obligations that they will have to pay as future taxes just as surely as if it appeared on their credit card statement this month. And they have got to pay that back before they pay back their credit card statement. The IRS can get very insistent that they do.

And don't believe for a moment that only the rich will pay these taxes. It turns out that the so-called rich people aren't rich and they aren't even people. Many are struggling small businesses filing under subchapter S, small businesses that create two-thirds of the jobs in our economy.

We are told: "Don't worry. We are using that money to create wealth and jobs." Well, the problem is government does not create jobs because it cannot create wealth. Government cannot inject a dollar into the economy until it has first taken that dollar out of the same economy.

As Bastiat warned, we see the job that government creates when it puts the dollar back in the economy. What we don't see as clearly is the job that is lost when government first takes that dollar out of the economy. We see those lost jobs as stagnating wages and workers giving up and leaving the job market, or as it is also known, the Obama economy.

Here is what government can do and what the Progressive and Democratic budgets propose. It can transfer jobs from the private sector to the public sector by taxing one and expanding the other. It can transfer jobs from one sector of the private market to another by taxing one and subsidizing the other. That is precisely the difference between Apple Computer and Solyndra. It is the difference between FedEx and the post office. It is the difference between the Reagan recovery and the Obama recovery.

Reagan, like Coolidge and Kennedy before him, reduced the tax and regulatory burdens on the economy and produced one of the longest economic

expansions in our country's history. It truly felt like morning again in America. That is the Republican approach, and it works.

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

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), the co-chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I thank Mr. POCAN and his office staff for the fine work and time that they put into working on this budget that we are proposing today.

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Chair, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, also, for his leadership within the caucus.

I am proud to rise in support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget alternative. This is a practical, progressive vision for our country by providing solutions to counter the Republican cuts to vital programs and tax breaks for the wealthy.

Let me contrast the House GOP budget with the Progressive Caucus budget.

First, in healthcare, the Republican budget embraces TrumpCare by incorporating the House-passed American Health Care Act, which cuts at least 20 million people from their care. This includes up to \$1 trillion in cuts to Medicaid, threatening care for seniors in nursing homes, children, and struggling families. It makes \$500 billion in cuts to Medicare, ending the Medicare guarantee and shifting cost risk on to seniors.

The Congressional Progressive Caucus budget defends and strengthens the Affordable Care Act. It lowers prescription drug costs and expands access to mental healthcare and addiction treatment.

We invest in workers. The GOP plan slashes investments in workers and programs to help more Americans get back to work, programs like apprenticeships and job training. And yet the people's budget would create 2.4 million jobs over its first 3 years and raise wages for American workers.

The Republican budget, their \$5.4 trillion in spending cuts means less funding for roads and bridges and schools. Our budget puts a \$2 trillion investment into strengthening our Nation's infrastructure.

The Republican budget drastically cuts Federal funding, which could undermine our ability to respond to disasters. The people's budget provides \$200 billion in emergency disaster funds to rebuild communities devastated by hurricanes.

The Republican budget guts our public education system with cuts that could devastate schools and further disinvest in public universities. The Progressive Caucus budget makes debt-free college a reality and provides for the refinancing of student loans. It expands access to pre-K education and provides childcare for all families.

Let's get real. The reason we are debating the budget this week: Repub-

licans can't wait to get started on their tax breaks for the wealthy. The Republican tax plan should be called the Trump Family Tax Plan because it enriches the wealthy on the backs of the middle class.

The Progressive Caucus gets it right. Not one more penny in tax breaks for corporations and the wealthiest Americans. The Progressive Caucus budget ensures that the top 1 percent pay their fair share in taxes, we close corporate loopholes, and we expand the earned income tax credit and the child tax credit for working families.

We must reject the Trump Family tax cut and invest in our roads and bridges, our schools, our healthcare, and our workers. Progressives are proposing bold policy solutions as clear alternatives to the cruel budget cuts Republicans are proposing.

The people's budget is an investment in the American people, and I urge you to support the Progressive Caucus people's budget.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, my friend reminds me of a story when Ronald Reagan was pushing his tax reductions a generation ago that produced the biggest expansion in our Nation's history. He was approached one day by a working class fellow on a stop that the President was making, and the man looks at him and says: Mr. President, the Democrats say that you Republicans want to cut taxes on the rich. Is that right?

Reagan says: Well, that is what they say.

And the man says: Well, you go ahead and do that, Mr. President, because a poor person never gave me a job.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. WOODALL).

□ 1815

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Chairman, I appreciate my friend from California for yielding to me. As you know, Mr. Chairman, he is not just down here as the ranking member on the House Budget Committee. He is also the leader of the Republican Study Committee's Budget and Spending Task Force. The leadership he has provided in all those areas means a lot to the entire institution. I am grateful to him for it.

I also want to say I am grateful to my friends in the Progressive Caucus. I disagree with their budget, and I plan to vote against it.

Mr. Chairman, how often do we come down here and folks want to complain about what is not going right, but they don't want to do anything about it?

To my friends' credit in the Progressive Caucus, they laid out a vision, and that is exactly what I came here to Congress to be a part of. Let's lay out our visions. Let's have some votes. Let's count those votes and see where we go from there.

As you know, Mr. Chairman, absolutely any group could offer a budget today, yet we only have four alternatives being considered. That tells

you something about how hard it is to put your ideas forward. So I want to thank my friends on the Progressive Caucus for doing that.

I want to run through a couple of things that their budget includes, Mr. Chairman. It includes a 4 percent pay increase for Federal workers across the board. It includes \$500 billion in green energy incentives. It imposes a carbon tax to deal with greenhouse gases. It cuts \$70 billion from the Defense Department and, in fact, eliminates altogether the spending on the global war on terror.

Mr. Chairman, these are all legitimate policy disagreements.

Their budget also increases revenues, taxes, by \$10 trillion, but spends so much more on American priorities that we continue to end up with almost a \$1 trillion annual deficit in year 10.

Mr. Chairman, this is the kind of debate that we have to have. I want to understand the priorities of my friends. I want to understand where they want to see more investments. And then I want to understand how it is we are going to balance this budget together. Because what is lacking in this plan, Mr. Chairman, what frustrates me the most about the Progressive Caucus plan is not the investment in green energy, it is not the investment in the Federal workforce, it is not the investment in healthcare; it is the fact that they don't believe we can do these things while raising taxes by \$10 trillion on the American people and balance the budget at all.

Mr. Chairman, if folks want to raise taxes in this institution—I think our problem is a spending problem. I don't think it is a taxing problem, but I am willing to have that discussion with them to understand their point of view.

But the reason I will ask my colleagues to vote “no” on this budget is not because it raises taxes \$10 trillion; it is because it raises taxes \$10 trillion, yet continues to borrow from our children and our grandchildren in the form of annual debt and deficits.

I think we can do better. But we cannot do better without an honest discussion of the issues, Mr. Chairman. Say what you want to about the budgets you are going to see on the floor here, these alternatives that we are going to discuss.

There are a lot of talking heads on TV who just want to talk about it and don't want to do anything about it. If you are looking for a ray of hope today, look at the Progressive Caucus, which I disagree with about almost everything as it comes to how to peg the numbers, but they put their vision forward tonight. They said: Let's take a stand tonight.

If we can work together across that aisle, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely nothing that we cannot do on behalf of the American people.

Vote “no” on this budget, but applaud the effort that has gone into it such that we can try to find common ground going forward.

If we have but one thing to agree on in this institution, let it be to agree to pay for those things that we think are important. Whether it is wars or whether it is green energy, whether it is troops or whether it is Federal employees, let us agree that we should pay for those things today with our dollars, and the borrowing from our children and grandchildren should be ended forever.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, what the Progressive Caucus budget does, and does very clearly, is that we end the special treatment for Wall Street buddies of the majority of this Congress.

Meanwhile, their budget has no problem hitting low- and middle-income families with their tax plan. Under their plan, corporations get a \$2 trillion cut, \$2.4 trillion, and the richest 1 percent will get a tax cut worth \$130,000 next year; and many middle class families will have to pay more.

Mr. Chair, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a valued member of the Progressive Caucus.

Ms. JAYAPAL. I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his tremendous leadership as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus; and our other co-chair, MARK POCAN, for his tremendous leadership.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, the People's Budget. I agree with the gentleman from Georgia that there are two different visions being presented here. Let's be very clear about what those two different visions are.

The Republican budget says we should invest millions of dollars into tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and the largest corporations.

Our budget, the Progressive Caucus budget, says we want to invest in people. We believe in working families across this country who are working hard, want to have a decent life, and want to build a better future. I choose investing in the people. That is what this budget does. It invests in education, in jobs, infrastructure, research, and science, and diplomacy.

Let me just focus for a minute on education as the gateway to opportunity. The People's Budget commits \$1 trillion to help families afford childcare, provides universal access to pre-K, and upholds our Nation's commitment to our public schools, which are the bedrocks of our communities nationwide, through adequate funding and supporting educators with resources that they need to reach every student.

It makes debt-free college a reality by investing in college as a public good. It creates apprenticeship opportunities for all of our districts across the country—red and blue, urban and rural.

Our country's success, Mr. Chairman, lies in that of our children and young people, not in the Republican plan to

give tax cuts to the wealthiest. That is unacceptable.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to support this vision, this budget, and to invest in the people.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), a former director of the State Policy Network.

Mr. PALMER. Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to the Progressive Caucus' budget.

In his farewell address, President Eisenhower said: “We cannot mortgage the material assets of our grandchildren without asking the loss also of their political and spiritual heritage. We want democracy to survive for all generations to come, not to become the insolvent phantom of tomorrow.”

Instead of trying to put America on a sustainable financial path, the progressive budget seeks to mortgage even more of our grandchildren's and great grandchildren's future, frankly, by spending over \$57 trillion over the next 10 years. With the national debt surpassing \$20 trillion just last month, now is the time to rein in reckless government spending, not explode it.

In addition to these spending increases, the Progressive Caucus is proposing nearly \$9 trillion in tax increases over the next decade. These enormous tax increases do not come close to covering the cost of the irresponsible policies proposed. I want to repeat that. Enormous tax increases that don't come close to covering the cost of what they have proposed.

As a result, the Progressive Caucus' budget raises the debt to over \$27 trillion by 2027. In fact, by fiscal year 2027, our deficits would be near \$1 trillion.

Higher taxes and higher spending would stifle the American economy and put our debt on an expedited upward trajectory. It is time for us to make tough decisions when it comes to this country's budget. The decision to oppose the Progressive Caucus budget is not one of those tough decisions.

This budget also makes no effort to curb waste, fraud, and abuse. Instead, it would expand bureaucratic programs by trillions of dollars without proposing any oversight measures. For example, it would spend \$41 billion on “free college” promises, and \$1 trillion on childcare and universal pre-K.

Mr. Chairman, it reminds me of the shovel-ready programs that were part of the Obama package just a few years ago. We all had this expectation that this money would go to rebuild our infrastructure, and it turns out just a little over 3 percent of that money actually made it to infrastructure projects; somewhere in the range of \$30 billion out of over \$800 billion.

That is what I see in the progressive budget. It continues the failed ObamaCare experiment, and even goes so far as to allow States to experiment with socialized medicine.

It continues to encourage able-bodied adults without children not to seek work by providing them a government paycheck.

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

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. PALMER. It increases the pressure on Americans' pocketbooks by increasing the price at the pump and, really, at every level.

It proposes Washington-centric solutions to problems that the States are better equipped to determine, such as the whole college issue. And it spends \$500 billion on green energy and imposes a carbon tax.

Mr. Chairman, we have a moral responsibility to spend taxpayer dollars wisely, and the Progressive Caucus fails to do this in its budget. I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on this amendment.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, the Progressive Caucus budget invests in the American people, invests in America, and still reduces the deficit by \$4 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), my friend and a member of the Progressive Caucus.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Chairman, I thank Representative GRIJALVA for his leadership.

Our Nation's infrastructure is crumbling. The American Society of Civil Engineers estimates we have a \$4.6 trillion infrastructure deficit. That is why the People's Budget wisely invests \$2 trillion to fix our infrastructure.

Not only will this budget help repair roads, highways, and bridges, but it will also put broadband all over America, including rural areas, and create millions of good-paying jobs, over 2.5 million in its first year.

We are presenting this plan. We are asking for support. Donald Trump talks a big game on infrastructure, but he has yet to put out a plan. So we urge the President to support our plan. If he doesn't want to, then put out his plan so we can have a discussion on how to move forward on fixing our infrastructure and creating high-paying jobs for Americans.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GROTHMAN), my friend and colleague.

Mr. GROTHMAN. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for giving me an opportunity to address the Progressive Caucus, their budget. I think the budget is unacceptable. It is something the American people ought to pay attention to because the day may come in which a budget similar to the Progressive Budget passes this floor.

The first thing to look at is we are increasing maybe by an average of about a little under—well, around \$1 trillion increase in taxes over the next 10 years. So you are taking a lot more money away from Americans. And despite this huge increase in taxes, you are looking at about a \$70 billion cut in defense.

I suggest that the public and the people who are supporting the Progressive

Caucus take some time talking to their people in the current military, talk about the planes that can't fly, talk about the shortage of parts, and ask: How is it possible you could take this much more money from the American people and still feel we have to have significant cuts in our military budget?

But then you look at what we have to spend more on: a 4 percent raise for Federal workers. Look, we wish everybody had a raise, but, really, at a time when we are approaching \$20 trillion in debt, is it a priority to give Federal workers a raise?

We put more and more people dependent on government; a large expansion of the program providing free college to people. At a time when, quite frankly, many people who already have college degrees can't get jobs, we are expanding that program. And, of course, by making it free, people will respect it less. And not only will they respect it less, but by making it free, many people will go to college who perhaps otherwise don't feel it is for them.

They won't make adjustments to the food stamp program, which is a problem.

We greatly extend the time that you are on unemployment, and this is kind of bizarre because it is a time when our employment is near historic lows. But despite the fact that until now we haven't had such unemployment for a long period of time, we want to extend unemployment, thereby encouraging more people to stay on unemployment.

□ 1830

I would like to thank my friends from the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing students to refinance their student loans, which shows something or another that there is a heart there, a little bit anyway. I wish I could get my own Conference to put that in. But in any event, I urge rejection of the Progressive budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, Americans in this Congress do have a choice. Our budget is a contrast to what the Republicans are proposing. We can either cut Medicare to pay for more tax breaks for millionaires and billionaires as our Republican budget does, or we can close tax loopholes to protect essential programs that invest in jobs. We chose investment.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT).

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Chairman, a budget is a moral contract between elected officials—the government—and the people we were elected to represent. That is why I am proud to rise in support of the people's budget, presented by the Congressional Progressive Caucus. This budget serves as a Progressive alternative to the GPO's cruel budget plan, a plan that prioritizes tax breaks for billionaires over the need to fund care for seniors in nursing homes and children and struggling families in places like Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

I was proud to help draft the people's budget, which invests \$200 billion to ensure that families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida, and the U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need right now.

The people's budget would also reduce the deficit by \$700 billion over the next 20 years by investing in human capital. We would do this while enacting comprehensive immigration reform, protecting DREAMers, and ending funding for family detention centers.

Mr. Chair, I encourage my colleagues to support the people's budget and reject H. Con. Res. 71. Let's stand with the working class, the middle class, and the immigrants in our country. This is the right thing to do for our people and for our economy.

Mr. McCLINTOCK. Mr. Chair, I am prepared to close when the gentleman from Arizona is finished, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, may I inquire as to the remaining time each side has.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Arizona has 4¾ minutes remaining, and the gentleman from California has 2 minutes remaining.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a leader in our caucus and a leader here in Congress.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I just want to thank the gentleman and Congressman POCAN for their really great leadership of the Congressional Progressive Caucus and for crafting a budget which creates economic growth, a decent standard of living for everyone, and a strong yet rational national security budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget. Today, millions of Americans are struggling to make ends meet and millions more are working hard trying to find a job. Paychecks for everyday Americans are shrinking, while corporations are reaping record profits. Yet, instead of developing a budget to create jobs and to help American families, the House Republicans "balance" their budget once again on the backs of struggling families. And for what? To protect tax cuts for billionaires and millionaires and corporations. Again, this is totally disgraceful.

The CPC's people's budget stands in stark contrast to the House Republican budget. It creates 2 million good-paying jobs and invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure. It includes a plan to lift more Americans out of poverty, and it invests in communities of color, like expanding computer science education.

It ends the Pentagon's slush fund, known as the overseas contingency account, that for far too long has padded the pockets and the wallets of defense

contractors at the taxpayers' expense. It also tackles waste, fraud, and abuse at the Pentagon by demanding audit readiness. It is hard to believe that the Republican budget goes \$10 billion over what the Pentagon even requested.

Make no mistake, the people's budget does what the House Republican budget does not. It works for the American people, not special interests, nor defense contractors, or the 1 percent.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to do what is best for all American families, and that is support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' people's budget.

Mr. GRIJALVA. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the gentleman for his leadership. It has been more than a pleasure to serve as the vice chair of the Congressional Progressive Caucus for the number of years that we have had to put forward the people's budget.

I simply want to say what a budget is, Mr. Chairman. A budget is a roadmap for the American people. It is a question of whether America cares about the most vulnerable and whether or not, in our caring, we are prepared to do deeds to insist upon their success.

The Republican budget takes \$2 trillion and provides a big, wealthy tax cut for the rich, and it creates, in essence, a deep hole in affordable care for healthcare. It does not provide justice and fair elections. It takes away educational opportunity from students, and, of course, it does not bring the most vulnerable out of poverty and enhance the lives of the middle class.

The people's budget provides for supporting the Affordable Care Act. It provides for giving fair working tax cuts for others, and it provides fairness and justice.

I rise to support the people's budget. It invests in the American people. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD the top ten reasons to support the Congressional Progressive Caucus' budget.

TOP TEN REASONS TO SUPPORT THE PEOPLE'S BUDGET

(Supported by over 60 organizations including: AFT, NEA, Planned Parenthood, Communications Workers of America, Sierra Club, AFSCME, AFGE, Vote Vets, Social Security Works, NARAL)

(1) The People's Budget invests \$2 trillion in America's crumbling infrastructure while promoting job growth and strengthening our commitment to sustainability. This is an investment in America which will transform our fossil-fuel energy system, overburdened mass transit, deteriorating schools, lead-contaminated water systems, and crumbling roads and bridges through local hiring and livable wages.

(2) The People's Budget enacts comprehensive immigration reform which permanently protects Dreamers and their families and opposes immigration bans on Muslims and refugees. Our country needs an immigration system that honors our values of inclusion, diversity, and equality. Our Budget prohibits funding to Customs and Border Protection to implement President Trump's discriminatory Muslim and refugee bans.

(3) Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change and rebuild our local communities recently devastated by hurricanes. The People's Budget requires polluters to pay for their reckless behavior while eliminating tax breaks that incentivize fossil fuel energy over cleaner energy. It invests \$200 billion to ensure families in Texas, Louisiana, Puerto Rico, Florida and U.S. territories have the immediate assistance they need to begin the stable road to recovery. It also provides funding for climate change research, mitigation and adaptation to protect those most at risk from future environmental disasters.

(4) The CPC budget delivers on the promise of child care for all and Pre-K for all. It ensures that families will not have to pay more than 10 percent of their income for child care, whether that care is at home or at a child care center. Our budget also expands pre-k for children across the country.

(5) We make debt free college a reality for all students by overhauling the student loan system which currently leaves college students saddled with unmanageable levels of debt. The People's Budget creates a federal matching program that supports state efforts to expand investments in higher education, bring down costs for students, and increase aid to students to help them cover the total cost of college attendance without taking on debt.

(6) The People's Budget strengthens the Affordable Care Act, while pushing towards a single payer system. It prioritizes reforms to increase access, equity, and affordability. Maintaining the positive reforms from the ACA are critical as Republicans attempt to gut the health care system and leave millions of Americans stranded without access to critical insurance coverage. The People's Budget protects Medicare's integrity and improves its long-term solvency. It protects children and low-income Americans and gives states the freedom to transition to a single payer system. It also makes two significant policy changes to reduce the costs of prescription drugs: allows Medicare Part D to negotiate drug prices and ends "Pay for Delay" practice which keeps generics out of the market.

(7) The CPC Budget creates a fair tax system for working Americans. In order to make these bold, necessary investments in working families, we must rewrite the rules of a rigged economy that favors billionaires and big corporations. The People's Budget closes tax loopholes that corporations use to ship jobs overseas, and stops CEOs from receiving millions in tax-free bonuses. Our budget tackles inequality through fair tax rates for all Americans, leveling the playing field for working people.

(8) Our budget protects the right to vote and supports criminal justice reforms which strengthen public safety and avoid over-criminalization. Our budget calls for rebuilding trust in the justice system by funding community oriented policing reforms. It also strengthens Department of Justice voter protection programs, protects voting rights by increasing funding to voter protection agencies, and funds public financing of campaigns to curb the influence of special interests in politics. Additionally, the budget makes key investments in America's electoral integrity by upgrading our voting systems.

(9) The People's Budget creates pathways out of poverty by expanding proven anti-poverty programs and initiatives and restoring vital programs to our nation to provide prosperity for all. These include a national strategy to reduce poverty in half in ten years and \$12.8 billion investment to end family homelessness. The People's Budget restores cuts made to the Supplemental Nutrition As-

sistance Program (SNAP) and permanently adopts the enhanced levels established in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act. It also provides an additional \$10 billion for child nutrition programs and allows those who have lost a job through no fault of their own to claim up to 99 weeks of unemployment benefits for up to two years.

(10) We make veterans a priority by increasing funding for veterans supportive housing to eliminate veterans homelessness and expanding access to mental health care for all veteran and service members. Our budget also invests in job training opportunities for transitioning service members and veterans.

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

In the debate on the Republican budget and how it contrasts with the Congressional Progressive Caucus budget, we heard a lot about needing to control mandatory spending, that that was the real issue here, runaway mandatory spending.

Make no mistake, when my Republican colleagues talk about cutting mandatory spending, they mean they want to cut Medicare and Social Security to pay for the trillion-dollar tax scam and creative numbers that are part of their budget for the wealthy and for the corporations in America.

The other issue that we heard a lot about is that, by making these major cuts for the wealthiest and the rich, that somehow their net gain and their profit and their break on taxes is going to trickle down to the rest of us. Well, we have seen that movie before in this country. That trickle-down theory doesn't work. The money doesn't trickle down, and the American people won't be fooled about that again.

Our budget invests \$2 trillion in infrastructure and jobs immediately. Our budget takes bold action to fight climate change, and our budget delivers on the promise for our children, their inheritance of this country, the inheritance of the children that everybody is worried about a deficit. We are worried about their future as well.

Our budget delivers on the promise of childcare for all, pre-K for all, and a robust public education system to provide all kids with an opportunity to succeed in this Nation.

Our budget is about the future, our budget is about emphasizing the values that make this country special and great, and our budget is a contrast. It offers a contrast about what this country can be if it invests in its people.

The road that we have been on for far too long in which we have disinvested in people, shifted wealth and burden onto the middle class and the working class in this country, that time has ended. Our budget represents that end.

Mr. Chair, I urge a "yes" vote on the people's budget, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, have my friends on the left learned absolutely nothing over these past 8 years? If massive government spending, higher and higher

taxes, and deeper and deeper debt produced economic growth, the Obama years should have been the golden age of our economy. Instead, we suffered prolonged stagnation. We averaged 1.5 percent annual growth, only half the average economic growth that our Nation has enjoyed in the postwar era. The Progressive and Democratic budgets promise more of the same.

We choose a different path, the Reagan path that produced an average of 3.5 percent growth year after year, higher wages, better jobs. Not just a Republican policy, John F. Kennedy did the same thing. He reminded us that a rising tide lifts all boats. These are the policies that create prosperity.

The government cannot create jobs because it cannot create wealth, but what it can do is create the conditions where jobs multiply and prosper or where they stagnate and disappear. That it can do very well. We have very consistent experience with the policies that create these conditions.

If you increase the burdens on the economy as the Democrats again propose, the economy contracts. If you lighten the burdens on the economy, it grows and prospers. No nation has ever taxed and spent its way to prosperity, but many nations have taxed and spent their way to economic ruin and bankruptcy.

We know what works and we know what doesn't work because we have tried both paths many times before. The House Budget Committee's budget follows principles that have, time and again, consistently and rapidly produced economic expansion and prosperity.

The House Democrats' budget and the Progressive budget before us now double down on policies that have impoverished and bankrupted nations wherever they have been employed down through history.

That is the choice before us today. Let us choose wisely. Our future depends on it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA).

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

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

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. SCOTT OF VIRGINIA

The Acting CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The Acting CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

The Congress determines and declares that this concurrent resolution establishes the budget for fiscal year 2018 and sets forth appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

SEC. 2. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution:

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,944,569,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,089,508,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,274,576,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,420,911,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$3,596,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$3,749,916,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$3,965,428,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,166,178,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,361,378,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$4,619,387,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$211,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$256,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$324,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$361,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$414,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$432,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$503,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$544,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$572,000,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$661,000,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,875,166,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,829,543,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,845,871,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,920,549,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,149,670,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,282,139,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,411,746,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,653,359,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,865,876,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,058,527,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,538,175,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$3,808,907,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$3,890,015,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$3,963,843,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$4,167,060,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$4,267,110,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$4,373,622,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$4,615,778,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$4,833,878,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$5,032,183,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS (ON-BUDGET).—For purposes of the enforcement of this concurrent resolution, the amounts of the deficits (on-budget) are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: -\$593,606,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: -\$719,399,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: -\$615,439,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: -\$542,932,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: -\$570,144,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: -\$517,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: -\$408,194,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: -\$449,600,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: -\$472,500,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: -\$412,796,000,000.

(5) DEBT SUBJECT TO LIMIT.—The appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,175,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$22,085,529,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$22,866,575,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$23,578,811,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$24,291,408,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$24,985,937,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$25,599,925,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$26,248,973,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$26,981,444,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$27,552,527,000,000.

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

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,515,893,000,000.
Fiscal year 2019: \$16,336,714,000,000.
Fiscal year 2020: \$17,080,338,000,000.
Fiscal year 2021: \$17,782,001,000,000.
Fiscal year 2022: \$18,543,046,000,000.
Fiscal year 2023: \$19,291,339,000,000.
Fiscal year 2024: \$19,972,026,000,000.
Fiscal year 2025: \$20,739,642,000,000.
Fiscal year 2026: \$21,579,464,000,000.
Fiscal year 2027: \$22,413,681,000,000.

SEC. 3. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

The Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$611,786,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$583,502,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$624,900,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$605,816,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$638,087,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$620,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$651,309,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$634,689,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$664,521,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$652,811,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$678,690,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$661,612,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$692,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$670,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$707,145,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$689,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$722,394,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$703,660,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:
(A) New budget authority, \$737,634,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$718,554,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,264,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,815,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,630,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$42,812,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,563,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$43,970,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:
(A) New budget authority, \$45,705,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$44,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:
(A) New budget authority, \$46,744,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$45,271,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:
(A) New budget authority, \$47,817,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$46,175,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
(A) New budget authority, \$48,897,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,039,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:
(A) New budget authority, \$49,539,000,000.
(B) Outlays, \$47,725,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,634,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,596,000,000.
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):

Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,234,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,128,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,889,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,653,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,557,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,013,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,281,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,539,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,036,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$35,337,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,793,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,033,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,059,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$36,498,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,885,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,138,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,717,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,900,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,555,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$38,703,000,000.
 (4) Energy (270):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$8,500,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,864,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,876,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,684,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,507,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,334,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$6,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$5,169,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,504,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$4,195,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,997,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,712,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,926,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$3,746,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,216,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,054,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,341,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,248,000,000.

(5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,791,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$44,939,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,710,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$45,911,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,980,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,966,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,986,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,068,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,107,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$47,647,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,257,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$48,620,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$50,280,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,582,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$51,469,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$50,643,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$52,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$51,731,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$53,866,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$52,965,000,000.
 (6) Agriculture (350):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,223,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,691,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,664,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,998,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,211,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,231,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,614,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,737,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,490,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,910,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,549,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,468,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$21,933,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,232,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,586,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,505,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,867,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$23,373,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,755,000,000.
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$15,050,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$2,075,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,792,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,377,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$16,445,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$8,435,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$14,949,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,120,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,167,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,317,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$17,731,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$7,204,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,315,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,672,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,383,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,499,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,195,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,468,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,244,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$6,346,000,000.
 (8) Transportation (400):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$412,246,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$260,375,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$309,646,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$302,342,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$191,199,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$246,432,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$97,422,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$162,071,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$98,379,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$129,557,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$99,348,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$115,488,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,330,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$111,477,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,381,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$110,947,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,441,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$112,855,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,514,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$114,823,000,000.
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$41,581,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$34,517,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,840,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$37,726,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$27,338,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,834,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,297,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,883,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$24,806,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,354,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,296,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,249,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,298,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,080,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$25,839,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$22,489,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,384,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,071,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$26,080,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$23,400,000,000.
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$176,935,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$142,001,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$165,585,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$165,987,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,570,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$159,597,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2021:
 (A) New budget authority, \$162,088,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,233,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2022:
 (A) New budget authority, \$164,843,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$163,705,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2023:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,826,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$160,066,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2024:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,277,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$157,407,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2025:
 (A) New budget authority, \$156,679,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$156,729,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2026:
 (A) New budget authority, \$158,996,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$157,914,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2027:
 (A) New budget authority, \$146,273,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$151,875,000,000.
 (11) Health (550):
 Fiscal year 2018:
 (A) New budget authority, \$573,434,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$580,091,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2019:
 (A) New budget authority, \$602,568,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$604,320,000,000.
 Fiscal year 2020:
 (A) New budget authority, \$646,496,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$637,447,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$669,270,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$666,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$702,953,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$696,993,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$735,459,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$728,890,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$772,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$763,909,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$810,799,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$801,662,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$849,471,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$839,223,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$890,688,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$879,028,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,682,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$601,303,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$672,626,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$672,318,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$720,653,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$720,416,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$775,853,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$775,637,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$871,247,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$871,017,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$896,829,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$896,611,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$920,920,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$920,693,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,028,532,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,028,285,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,093,424,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,093,171,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,176,028,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$1,175,780,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$528,718,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$508,933,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$541,318,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$538,787,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$554,195,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$554,966,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$567,182,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$569,833,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$583,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$594,084,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$592,625,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$598,840,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,577,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$602,988,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$621,241,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$625,226,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$636,800,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$648,216,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$653,208,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$664,923,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,475,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$39,475,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,016,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$43,016,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,287,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$46,287,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$49,748,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$53,392,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$53,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$57,378,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$57,378,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$61,764,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$61,764,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$66,388,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,388,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,871,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,871,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$75,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$75,473,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$183,573,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$181,049,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$198,367,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$195,432,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$203,192,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$201,863,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$209,704,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$207,846,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$225,035,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$223,431,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$222,849,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$220,873,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$217,808,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$216,712,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$235,899,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$234,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$243,591,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$241,380,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$252,030,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$249,835,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$63,596,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$62,328,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$64,092,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$63,865,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,733,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,272,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$69,336,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,880,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,965,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,534,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,559,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,220,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$68,916,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,963,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,438,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$78,798,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$78,991,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$81,299,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$80,655,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,065,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$25,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,477,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$26,458,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,100,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,418,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,777,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,473,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$28,882,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,156,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,575,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,693,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,129,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$31,492,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,848,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,309,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$31,644,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$33,111,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$32,437,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$377,635,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$377,635,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$413,674,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$413,674,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$461,176,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$461,176,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$512,434,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$512,434,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$560,400,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$560,400,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$605,893,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$605,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,696,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$644,696,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$679,742,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$679,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$714,720,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$714,720,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$743,060,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$743,185,000,000.

(19) Non-Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$134,164,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$70,964,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,428,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$66,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,748,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$41,212,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$20,859,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$29,359,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$18,656,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,602,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$27,491,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,548,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$30,587,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$32,490,000,000.
 (B) Outlays, \$33,268,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

- (A) New budget authority, \$43,431,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$43,971,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027:
- (A) New budget authority, \$47,372,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, \$47,860,000,000.
- (20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$82,782,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$82,782,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$85,754,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$85,754,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$85,454,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$85,454,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$87,183,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$87,183,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$88,846,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$88,846,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$89,285,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$89,285,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$92,809,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$92,809,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$101,023,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$101,023,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2026:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$98,551,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$98,551,000,000.
- Fiscal year 2027:
- (A) New budget authority, -\$101,256,000,000.
- (B) Outlays, -\$101,256,000,000.
- (21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):
- Fiscal year 2018:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2019:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2020:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2021:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2022:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2023:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2024:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2025:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2026:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.
- Fiscal year 2027:
- (A) New budget authority, \$0.
- (B) Outlays, \$0.

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

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Virginia.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more credible and responsible alternative than the underlying Republican budget.

The Nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the Republican budget continues to highlight the wrong prior-

ities. It fast-tracks tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and claims that unrealistic economic growth will pay for these cuts when, in reality, those tax cuts will ultimately be paid for by children, seniors, and those in need.

It cuts \$1.5 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare and also cuts programs that support basic living standards, including nutritional assistance, and undermines national security by cutting diplomatic programs and foreign aid.

The Republican budget also cuts education, job training, research and development, and infrastructure. Their budget leaves hardworking American families out in the cold and would devastate our economic recovery after years of consistent job growth.

The Congressional Black Caucus budget is in stark contrast to the Republican budget. It is compassionate. The numbers add up. It addresses the needs of the most vulnerable and improves our economy. Unlike the Republican budget, the CBC budget uses real numbers, not overly optimistic growth projections and assumptions of things that won't happen.

The CBC budget proposes \$3.9 trillion in revenue enhancements, and unlike the Republican budget, we show exactly how Congress can realistically reach this revenue target by outlining almost \$11 trillion in revenue options from which Congress could pick and choose \$3.9 trillion.

With the additional revenue, the CBC budget protects and strengthens the social safety net and commits the Federal Government to eradicating poverty in America.

Our budget includes a comprehensive infrastructure and jobs program, totaling over \$1 trillion over 5 years, and according to the Economic Policy Institute, it will create 2 million jobs next year.

In addition, the CBC budget eliminates any further threat of sequestration, eliminating the arbitrary budget caps and across-the-board budget cuts that are scheduled for next year.

It allocates \$200 billion for hurricane relief, \$100 billion to address the looming pension crisis, and additional funding for our veterans.

Even with the elimination of the sequestration and strong investment in programs that we know will create jobs and economic opportunity, the CBC budget is still estimated to reduce the deficit, when compared to the baseline, by approximately \$2.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

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

□ 1845

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

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

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

Mr. Chairman, I want to start by saying that I appreciate the opportunity to have this discussion today because it is an important one. I know that the gentleman from Virginia and I both want to address the challenges facing our Nation and our fellow Americans.

We agree that the status quo is insufficient to meet the needs of the future, and we share a passion for protecting the vulnerable, breaking the cycles of poverty, and lifting Americans up.

But I must oppose this budget because it will not accomplish those things. This budget raises taxes by \$4 trillion, increases spending by \$1.4 trillion, and it never balances.

It proposes more Washington-mandated answers to problems that States and communities are better equipped to solve. It makes no effort to control Federal deficits and debt, and it will leave our country bankrupt.

I want to be clear what this means. This budget will double down on generational theft—spending more and more money that we don't have today and leaving our children and grandchildren to foot the bill tomorrow.

In contrast, the Republican budget confronts our Nation's fiscal challenges head on by requiring mandatory spending reductions of at least \$203 billion and balancing within 10 years.

While this budget measures success on how much the Federal Government spends, the Republican House budget proposes to measure success by outcomes. If we have learned nothing from decades of spending on Federal welfare programs, it is that more money cannot resolve the complex issues underlying systemic poverty.

We must change our approach, and this starts with changing how we measure results.

This budget also fails to address a critical piece of the upward mobility agenda: reforming our broken Tax Code. Instead, it calls for tax increases that would stifle economic growth that the country so desperately needs.

America should be the most competitive place in the world to do business, but everything in our Tax Code today tells companies to take their jobs and their investments overseas and to leave them there.

Higher taxes on job creators and small businesses is the exact opposite of what we need to bring workers back into the labor force and get our economy growing again. Now is the time for comprehensive tax reform that unleashes the entrepreneurial spirit of America, increases business and personal investment, and promotes job creation. By failing to move the ball forward on tax reform, this budget leaves the American workers and families behind.

Lastly, Mr. Chairman, I want to note what this proposal does make cuts in, and that is in our national defense. In a time when we face increasingly complex and evolving international threats from places like North Korea, Russia, and Iran, this budget would cut overall

defense spending and compromise the readiness and safety of our servicemembers and our national freedoms.

The first job of the Federal Government is to provide for our national security. We need to reinvest in our military to deter global threats and protect our homeland. That is why the Republican budget fulfills Congress' commitment to ensure robust funding for our country's national defense.

Mr. Chairman, we will have a lot of conversations today about priorities, because that is what budgets are: clear illustrations of our priorities.

We want to leave our Nation better for our children and grandchildren. We all want every person, regardless of their socioeconomic status or ZIP Code, to have the opportunity to realize the American Dream.

I oppose this budget proposal because it will not help us achieve these goals. It avoids the tough questions and substitutes more spending for better results.

It does nothing to promote vibrant economic growth, and it doubles down on bad ideas that stifle ingenuity and the spirit of entrepreneurship that we need. We have a responsibility to secure our Nation's fiscal future and improve the lives of our citizens, but this budget is not the way forward.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. RICHMOND), who is the chairman of the Congressional Black Caucus.

Mr. RICHMOND. Mr. Chairman, let me thank the ranking member of the Committee on Education and the Workforce, BOBBY SCOTT, for his hard work, and the rest of the CBC in putting this budget together.

Mr. Chairman, I think that what I am having a hard time doing is wrapping my mind around the same failed arguments that we hear over and over again that we are going to cut trillions of dollars in taxes so that we can help the upper middle class and the top 1 percent really, and that is somehow going to benefit the poorest people in the country; we are going to exacerbate the deficit saying that we are going to create jobs.

We know it never happens, and then all of a sudden we find ourselves with an increasing debt and deficit, and then we go to the poorest people in this country and we ask them to pay for it. We cut the programs that are vital to lifting them out of poverty.

I agree with my colleague on the other side of the aisle. My mother is a perfect example that a great education will lift you out of poverty and that having a Historically Black College and University that you can go to will prepare you for your future. But the problem is we don't talk about the fact that the Republican budget cuts education.

So how can we say with a straight face that we propose to lift people out

of poverty, help people achieve the American Dream, help our children dream the impossible dream, and then give them the power so that they can go achieve it while we are cutting their education and we are cutting all the programs that help them to achieve it?

Look, we always hide behind protecting our country and the national defense. The biggest threat to our national defense resides on 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue. It is a shame when most people in this country and my colleagues wake up in the morning and say: Are we going to war with North Korea? That is not good for the economy, and that is not good for the mental health of the country. But I think that the Secretary of State has a great disposition and strategy when it comes to the national defense and diplomacy.

I think the key with what we have to do with budgets is understand that they are moral documents and they express our values, and cutting the disabled and others is not a true statement of American values.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS).

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Chairman, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to the Congressional Black Caucus substitute budget if for no other reason that there is a price on work, savings, and investment. When you raise that price too high, guess what you get? You get less work, savings, and investment, and you get less economic growth.

Look at the growth rates we have had over the last 10 years under astronomical debt and deficits. If spending could create an economic juggernaut, we would have one now. But instead, we have got 1.5 percent growth, 1.9 percent growth, and 2 percent growth—nowhere near what the prospending lobby would suggest.

Yet, if you look at the 1920s, if you look at the 1960s, and if you look at the 1980s—remember JFK in that famous Economic Club of New York speech said that the surest way to raise revenues is to cut tax rates now.

It worked then, it worked in the 1920s, and it will work right now as it did in the 1980s as well.

The reason is simple. The reason is very simple. Once you lower the price of work, savings, and investment, you not only get more of that, but you leave more capital in the private sector where it is put to use.

When you have capital put to use in the private sector, workers become more productive, and they earn more. I have always said the truck driver is much more productive with the truck, and the people who have the capital that can buy the truck is what makes the economy go.

We don't have a revenue problem in this country. Last year, we had record tax revenues: \$3.26 trillion, yet a deficit of \$587 billion. We have a spending

problem, and the CBC budget increases spending above the CBO baseline over 10 years, while our budget is underneath the CBO baseline for 10 years. Our budget cuts taxes across the board including eliminating the bottom rate that we suggest in our tax reform plan.

This is a question of American vision and the American Dream. Our vision is for more capital in the private sector, more incentives to work, savings, and investment, and more people with rising incomes. Their vision is to protect the government budget.

Mr. Chairman, so I stand in opposition to this particular substitute budget.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from California (Ms. LEE), who is a member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman for yielding. Also I want to thank him for his tremendous leadership in continuing to craft the Congressional Black Caucus' budget which really does reflect our Nation's priorities and our values, so I rise in strong support of this budget.

As a member of the Budget and the Appropriations Committees and as chair of our Task Force on Poverty, Income Inequality, and Opportunity, I am really proud that the Congressional Black Caucus budget includes \$300 billion in investments into initiatives that have proven to lift millions out of poverty.

For example, it restores the cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, it extends emergency unemployment insurance, it expands access to affordable housing, and it also increases funding for job training and trade assistance programs.

The CBC budget creates a fair Tax Code that provides investments in communities. It boosts GDP by \$329 billion and helps create 2 million jobs. This budget addresses poverty head on by investing \$120 billion in creating jobs, \$25 billion to restore our Nation's public housing, and \$80 billion to modernize our schools.

Also, our budget employs the 10-20-30 formula championed by our assistant leader, the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), by directing at least 10 percent of Federal spending into areas with poverty rates of more than 20 percent over the last 30 years. We will make progress toward ending entrenched and generational poverty that hurts families and communities.

With regard to the Pentagon, yes, we require that we audit the Pentagon and encourage DOD to implement remaining GAO recommendations that would likely lead to tens of billions in costs savings.

This is a budget that stands with the American people. It is a message to the American people that we stand with those who are working hard to find a job, and we stand with those working hard at a job with low wages. It is a message to the country that balancing

the budget on the backs of struggling families to provide giveaways to billionaires and corporations is unacceptable. That is not the American way.

The CBC budget provides for the national security and the economic security of our Nation.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Chairman, as one of the youngest Members of Congress, I feel an obligation not only to my district but to my generation. Right now in America, we are midway through the greatest wave of generational theft in all of human history.

The budget offered by the Congressional Black Caucus takes the problems of Washington and makes all of them worse by doubling down on deficit spending and irresponsible financial decisions.

Mr. Chairman, I tell my constituents I am on two of the scariest committees in Congress—Armed Services and Budget—because on the Armed Services Committee, I see every day that our adversaries are closing the capability gap. They are able to do more while, after 8 years of the Obama administration, our military has been left in shambles. This budget does nothing to rebuild the military. It leaves our troops on the battlefield without the tools they need to win, and it is absolutely shameful.

Mr. Chairman, when we look at the budget today, we absolutely have to get back on a path of fiscal discipline. This budget, however, doesn't do that. It punishes American workers and American businesses with new taxes and more taxes.

It pours billions into the failed experiment of ObamaCare. To take things a step further, it would promote a healthcare system that is a single-payer system. Not only will this bankrupt our Nation, it will bankrupt hard-working Americans.

How much would premiums go up under a State-run single-payer system? \$1,000 a month? \$2,000? Of course, taxes would increase, too. The same families in this system would see enormous challenges meeting their needs because they would be funding irresponsible spending in Washington.

So beyond making our citizens sick and poor, this budget would gut our defense, weaken our military, and put more Americans in danger. Everyone here knows that the threats we face are serious: ISIS, Hezbollah, North Korea, and regional instability and volatility across the Middle East. Yet, bizarrely, this budget cuts funding for the global war on terror.

Under President Obama, readiness fell to the lowest levels in a century, GDP growth sputtered, the quality of healthcare for the middle class got worse, and our debt skyrocketed. These are not policies we should repeat, and certainly not policies we should expand.

Instead, let's vote for the Republican budget that has the greatest reduction

in entitlement spending since Newt Gingrich was Speaker of the House and can actually restore the great promise of the American Dream.

□ 1900

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), the co-chair of the Congressional Black Caucus' Budget Task Force.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I rise in strong support of the CBC alternative budget, and I commend Representative SCOTT and his staff for the tremendous work that they have done.

The CBC budget provides for all of the essentials, including defense and infrastructure, but what I like most about it is that it is focused on job creation, rebuilding our veterans' hospitals, rebuilding infrastructure in our communities, and putting people to work.

Mr. Chairman, my constituents need jobs and opportunities to work. The CBC budget focuses on jobs. I strongly support it, and I urge all of my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Chairman, I rise today in opposition to this proposed amendment to the budget resolution.

I think it is very important, when discussing spending such as suggested before us, to remember that we do not live in a fantasy world. We live in a world where resources are limited. We have to make difficult choices. These are the same choices every family makes with their budget every day of the year.

Currently, our national debt rests at over \$20 trillion. The entire U.S. GDP in 2016 was only \$18.57 trillion.

Should we continue to spend money that we don't have without restraint?

This proposal never balances. It does raise taxes, though. With the tax increases in this proposal totaling \$3.9 trillion, one would expect this budget to balance.

What this does do is add over \$1 trillion in new spending. What is another trillion when you are only \$20 trillion in debt?

I challenge the supporters of this proposed budget to research the potentially catastrophic impacts of defaulting on our national debt. We are saddling future generations with an unsurmountable burden.

When our grandchildren and children look back on what we have done here, do we want this work to be that we left our country broke?

I don't think so.

Mr. Chairman, I urge my colleagues to not kick the can down the road and to not pass this proposed amendment.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, can you advise how much time is remaining on both sides?

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Virginia has 7½ minutes remain-

ing. The gentleman from Georgia has 5 minutes remaining.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 seconds just to point out that the healthcare plan in the budget is a public option, which CBO scores as a savings of over \$100 billion. We have \$1 trillion in spending for infrastructure, the same as the President has promised, but at least we pay for it.

Mr. Chairman, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, as a member of the Budget Committee, I find the CBC budget to be a principled and thoughtful budget.

It ends the threat of sequestration, it will accelerate our economic recovery, it will help eradicate poverty in America, and it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

On the other hand, the tax cut that our Republican friends are proposing will cause a deficit by giving a whopping \$2.4-plus trillion in tax cuts, most to the top 1 percent of the American people.

It will not help the young child as he grows to seek opportunities and jobs. This will be a bill that is at a price that is not right. If you work hard, you get less.

Our budget, on the other hand, gives \$665 billion in immediate investments to rebuild our Nation's crumbling infrastructure. It is crumbling even more so after the devastating hurricanes. It gives \$120 billion to fund a national direct job creation program and full employment trust fund program.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It provides \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools, \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program, \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services, \$25 billion for recapitalization, \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding VA hospitals, \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods program, and \$5 billion for summer jobs for young people.

I can attest to the fact that, in discussions with the Federal Communications Commission, the connectivity in vulnerable neighborhoods and communities is at an all-time low. Expanding broadband services is a vital need.

It is a vital need to expand the educational services for this young man in order for him to be capable of taking a job in the 21st century. There are hundreds of thousands of jobs that go unapplied for because the skill set of our young people have been deprived because of inadequate education.

This budget of the Congressional Black Caucus is a people investor. It invests in people. For that reason, I believe it is the right way to go. It balances our needs for the military and it provides for the American people.

The Acting CHAIR. The time of the gentlewoman has again expired.

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. It, in fact, provides that roadmap to ensure that the American people are taken care.

I want to make mention that it provides for \$300 billion for programs that are proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

Shouldn't this be what we are doing?

Right now, in my district, thousands are online for the disaster Food Stamp program. That program needs to be extended.

This is what we do. We do not make people dependent. We give them a hand up, not a handout. That is what the budget is supposed to be: a roadmap for opportunity.

I support the Congressional Black Caucus budget, for that is what it is: a roadmap for opportunity.

Mr. Chair, I rise in strong support of the Amendment in the Nature of a Substitute (ANS) offered by the Congressional Black Caucus to H. Con. Res. 71, the House Republicans' "Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018."

I support the CBC Budget for four principal reasons:

1. It ends the threat of sequestration;
2. It will accelerate our economic recovery;
3. It will help eradicate poverty in America; and
4. It will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, if we reject the House Republicans' "Price Is Not Right" and "Work Harder to Get Less" Budget with its discredited economic gimmicks and unrealistic projections and adopt the CBC Budget, we will get instead a comprehensive jobs program that would rebuild our nation's infrastructure and reinvest in our communities totaling \$1 trillion over the next decade.

The jobs created will accelerate our economic recovery and ensure that it reaches every community in America, while also making the necessary investments to ensure America's long-term economic competitiveness.

Specifically, the CBC Budget will create jobs by providing:

1. \$665 billion in immediate investment to rebuild our nation's crumbling infrastructure;
2. \$120 billion to fund a National Direct Job Creation Program and Full Employment Trust Fund Program;
3. \$80 billion to fund the modernization of schools;
4. \$45 billion to fund an energy infrastructure modernization program;
5. \$20 billion to expand access to broadband services;
6. \$25 billion for public housing recapitalization;
7. \$15 billion for improving and rebuilding V.A. hospitals and extended care facilities;
8. \$25 billion for HUD's Choice Neighborhoods Program and for communities that desperately need revitalization; and
9. \$5 billion for summer jobs so young persons can save money to attend college and plan for their futures.

Mr. Chair, when it comes to addressing the poverty that is still too prevalent in our coun-

try, the CBC Budget is clearly superior to the Republican's "Work Harder, Get Less" Budget.

The CBC Budget provides for \$300 billion for programs that have proven instrumental in lifting millions of Americans out of poverty.

The funding provided will be used to restore cuts to the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, extend emergency unemployment insurance, expand access to affordable housing, increase access to quality and affordable education, and increase funding for job training and trade adjustment assistance programs.

Additionally, Mr. Chair, to ensure that federal resources are targeted more efficiently towards eradicating poverty and are actually reaching communities most in need, the CBC budget proposes the codification of the "10-20-30" policy for federal spending.

Under the "10-20-30" policy at least 10 percent of the federal funds in certain accounts are to be directed to areas that have had a poverty rate of 20 percent for the last 30 years.

Finally, I support the CBC Budget because it puts an end to the draconian sequester burdening the economy and our people for the last several years.

In addition, according to an analysis by the Congressional Budget Office, it will reduce the deficit by approximately \$2.72 trillion over 10 years.

Mr. Chair, it is said often, but is no less true, that the federal budget is more than a financial document; it is an expression of the nation's most cherished values.

As the late and great former senator and Vice-President Hubert Humphrey said:

"The moral test of government is how that government treats those who are in the dawn of life, the children; those who are in the twilight of life, the elderly; and those who are in shadows of life, the sick, the needy, and the handicapped."

The Republican budget resolution fails this moral test; the CBC Budget does not.

For these reasons, I urge my colleagues to join me in rejecting the House Republicans' budget and voting for a better alternative, the CBC Budget.

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

I certainly understand our colleagues' desire to fight poverty. I would like to share a little bit of my experience and what we have done to fight poverty at the local level.

For generations now, we have continued to throw more and more money towards eliminating poverty, with fewer and fewer results.

Yes, we have succeeded in alleviating the effects of poverty, but we have made very little progress in actually lifting people out of poverty. Instead of giving people a hand up, we are giving them a handout and essentially telling them life can't get any better than where they are. That is morally wrong, and I think that we can do better.

The key to solving poverty isn't just simply throwing more money at the problem. It is to try something different and find innovative ways to fix our welfare entitlement system, improve our education system, and return

the dignity of work to our fellow citizens.

The proposed amendment does none of these things. It simply perpetuates the cycle of generational poverty that has been passed down from parent to child.

I saw the same situation in my hometown of West Point, Georgia. In fact, it is what motivated me to enter public service and run for mayor.

We had a community that was dying. Folks were trapped in generational poverty and had been stripped of the dignity of work.

Instead of continuing the current system, we made changes. We worked to get the government out of the way and allow the job creators to innovate and grow their businesses to hire more workers. We invested in our infrastructure and we were able to create over 15,000 advanced manufacturing jobs.

For the first time in a generation, we saw more people moving into the middle class than moving into poverty.

We made changes to our education system, working to break through the generational cycle of poverty and prepare today's students to work in a 21st century workforce.

With all of these changes, we saw our community come back to life. People had jobs and opportunity. They took advantage of it. They had the advanced manufacturing sector spring back to life, and we saw a revitalization of not only our community, but of our people.

These lessons are from the folks in the Third District. They sent me here to push those same type of ideas here in Congress.

The Republican budget puts us on a path to this type of reform, and I believe my colleagues and I share the desire to fight poverty in this country. However, I do not believe that the CBC budget proposal does us that justice.

I look forward to passing the House budget.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2¼ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Chairman, I thank my friend from Virginia for yielding.

I rise in strong support of the Congressional Black Caucus budget, which is a more responsible alternative than the GOP budget.

A nation's budget reflects its priorities, but the GOP budget continues to push the wrong ones, catering to the wealthy and the special interests.

The GOP likes to say that a rising tide lifts every boat, but that is only if every vessel is seaworthy. The GOP budget leaves too many Americans in dinghies, rubber rafts, and rowboats, subject to being capsized.

It includes trillions of dollars in irresponsible cuts, such as \$5.4 trillion slashed from job-creating programs; \$2 trillion cut from Medicaid and Medicare; \$5 billion eliminated from investments in education, research, and infrastructure that will prevent us from competing globally.

The GOP budget would devastate our economy by balancing the budget on the backs of students, workers, seniors, the disabled, and vulnerable communities in Maryland and across our country.

And for what?

To provide tax cuts to the top 1 percent—people who make at least \$900,000 every year.

In stark contrast, the CBC would create a fairer Tax Code and provide for much-needed investments in our communities. Our budget would boost our GDP by \$329 billion.

I, too, Mr. Chairman, served on the House Armed Services Committee, and I stand here to say that the CBC's budget would end sequestration for our military so that we can improve military readiness and, at the same time, restore critical domestic programs that support working families and revitalize our neighborhoods.

Rather than giving the top 1 percent a \$6 trillion tax cut, our budget would call for major investments here at home. We invest \$665 billion to modernize highways and infrastructure, \$120 billion in job-creating programs, \$80 billion so that every child learns in a modern classroom, and \$15 billion to rebuild our VA.

Perhaps, most importantly, Mr. Chairman, we invest \$300 billion over the next decade to eradicate poverty and provide basic standard of living to all Americans.

Mr. Chairman, our budget responsibly pays for all of our investments. Our budget is a credible alternative and a real plan for America, and I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON).

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, I stand here to talk a little bit about the Republican budget first. It is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear in America.

Once again, Americans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era. The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and larger corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle- and low-income Americans. This has never helped, and it won't help now.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our community while cutting other important social safety network programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion. Nondefense discretionary spending across the government would also be

cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand tonight with my colleagues to support the Congressional Black Caucus budget to propose an alternative to this budget we are facing.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentlewoman.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Chairman, our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Mr. Chair, the Republican budget is a poor reflection of the values and priorities that we hold dear as Americans.

Once again, Republicans insist on dooming the American people to the failed trickle-down economics of the Reagan era.

The Republican budget shifts the tax burden away from the wealthiest Americans and largest corporations and places it squarely on the backs of hardworking middle and lower income Americans.

Not only would the Republican budget increase the national deficit by \$2.4 trillion over 10 years, but it also foots the bill over to the most vulnerable segments of our population while cutting other important social safety programs.

For example, the budget proposes to slash Medicaid by \$1.1 trillion and Medicare for seniors by \$487 billion.

Non-defense discretionary spending across the government would also be cut by \$1.3 trillion at the expense of education, infrastructure, clean energy programs, medical research, and job training.

These are only some of the reasons why I stand with my colleagues of the Congressional Black Caucus to propose an alternative budget amendment that serves the interests of the greater good, and not just a select few.

The CBC's alternative budget asks those who have done well in our country to finally pay their fair share.

Our budget seeks to invest \$665 billion to modernize our crumbling infrastructure.

Our budget looks to invest \$80 billion in our children by modernizing our schools and better preparing our future generations to compete in a global economy.

Our budget looks to bring \$20 billion in new investment to extend broadband internet to rural areas, so that everyone—not just the wealthy few—can have access to high-speed internet and access to information.

Our budget delivers \$300 billion over the next decade for social programs that help provide millions of Americans a basic standard of living.

This is a reflection of the values and priorities of the American people, not what is embodied in the Republican budget.

I, for one, do not believe that our nation does well by cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans while increasing taxes for the poor.

I do not believe that our nation does well by making massive cuts to social programs while allowing corporations to hide trillions of dollars overseas.

I do not believe that our nation does well by destroying Medicare and Medicaid for our elderly and poor while pushing tax cuts for the top one percent.

This is not the future that I envision for our country and neither do the American people—at least not 99 percent of them.

Mr. Chair, the Republican Budget is not a true; reflection of the priorities of the American people.

This budget serves the interest of a select few at the heavy cost of exploiting millions of others.

We need to oppose the Republican budget in favor of a viable alternative such as the CBC Budget Alternative, which is more reflective of the values that we treasure in our society.

□ 1915

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, the Congressional Black Caucus is a more compassionate, fiscally responsible alternative to the underlying Republican budget and does not rely on unrealistic growth projections or bizarre suggestions that massive tax cuts can pay for themselves. It makes our Tax Code fairer, protects and strengthens the Affordable Care Act, makes college more affordable, and ensures more Americans are lifted out of poverty. It also improves retirement security for our seniors.

With these targeted investments, our budget creates 2 million jobs next year and reduces our Nation's deficit by \$2.5 trillion over the next decade and puts us on a more sustainable path compared to the CBO projections of our budget. I urge my colleagues to support the CBC budget.

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

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to urge my colleagues to join me in opposing the budget presented by the gentleman from Virginia. This budget does nothing to address our mandatory spending challenges. It never balanced. It raises taxes, it increases spending, it cuts funding to our military. We can do better, we must do better, and the House budget is the way forward.

The American people sent us here to get our fiscal house in order. This budget does not accomplish that goal. I urge my colleagues to vote against it.

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

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT).

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

Mr. SCOTT of Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Virginia will be postponed.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise. The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN) having assumed the chair, Mr. DUNCAN of Tennessee, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, had come to no resolution thereon.

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 18 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2045

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. COLLINS of Georgia) at 8 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.

HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 9 a.m. tomorrow.

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

There was no objection.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

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

Will the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. MITCHELL) kindly take the chair.

□ 2046

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

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

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today,

a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in House Report 115-339, offered by the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. SCOTT) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in House Report 115-339 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. GRIJALVA of Arizona.

Amendment No. 2 by Mr. SCOTT of Virginia.

The Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the time for any electronic vote after the first vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 IN THE NATURE OF A SUBSTITUTE OFFERED BY MR. GRIJALVA

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GRIJALVA) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 108, noes 314, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 553]

AYES—108

Adams	Gabbard	Norcross
Barragán	Gallego	Pallone
Bass	Gomez	Panetta
Beatty	Green, Al	Pascrell
Beyer	Grijalva	Payne
Blumenauer	Gutiérrez	Pingree
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings	Pocan
Brady (PA)	Higgins (NY)	Price (NC)
Brown (MD)	Huffman	Raskin
Butterfield	Jackson Lee	Richmond
Capuano	Jayapal	Roybal-Allard
Cárdenas	Jeffries	Rush
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)	Ryan (OH)
Castor (FL)	Johnson, E. B.	Sánchez
Chu, Judy	Kaptur	Sarbanes
Clark (MA)	Kelly (IL)	Schakowsky
Clarke (NY)	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Clay	Khanna	Scott, David
Cleaver	Kildee	Serrano
Clyburn	Lawrence	Sherman
Cohen	Lee	Sires
Conyers	Lewis (GA)	Slaughter
Crowley	Lieu, Ted	Smith (WA)
Cummings	Loftgren	Soto
Davis, Danny	Lowenthal	Takano
DeFazio	Luján, Ben Ray	Thompson (MS)
Demings	Lynch	Tonko
DeSaulnier	Maloney,	Vargas
Dingell	Carolyn B.	Vela
Doggett	McCollum	Velázquez
Ellison	McEachin	Wasserman
Engel	McGovern	Schultz
Españolat	Meeks	Waters, Maxine
Evans	Meng	Watson Coleman
Frankel (FL)	Moore	Welch
Fudge	Nadler	Wilson (FL)
	Nolan	Yarmuth

NOES—314

Abraham	Arrington	Barton
Aderholt	Babin	Bera
Aguilar	Bacon	Bergman
Allen	Banks (IN)	Biggs
Amash	Barletta	Bilirakis
Amodei	Barr	Bishop (GA)

Bishop (MI)	Griffith	O'Halleran
Bishop (UT)	Grothman	O'Rourke
Black	Guthrie	Olson
Blackburn	Hanabusa	Palazzo
Blum	Handel	Palmer
Bonamici	Harper	Paulsen
Bost	Harris	Pearce
Brady (TX)	Hartzler	Perlmutter
Brat	Heck	Perry
Brooks (AL)	Hensarling	Peters
Brooks (IN)	Herrera Beutler	Peterson
Brownley (CA)	Hice, Jody B.	Pittenger
Buchanan	Higgins (LA)	Poe (TX)
Buck	Hill	Poliquin
Bucshon	Himes	Polis
Budd	Holding	Posey
Burgess	Hollingsworth	Quigley
Bustos	Hoyer	Ratcliffe
Byrne	Hudson	Reed
Calvert	Huizenga	Reichert
Carbajal	Hultgren	Renacci
Carter (GA)	Hunter	Rice (NY)
Carter (TX)	Hurd	Rice (SC)
Cartwright	Issa	Roby
Castro (TX)	Jenkins (KS)	Roe (TN)
Chabot	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (AL)
Cheney	Johnson (LA)	Rogers (KY)
Cicilline	Johnson (OH)	Rohrabacher
Coffman	Johnson, Sam	Rokita
Cole	Jones	Rooney, Francis
Collins (GA)	Jordan	Ros-Lehtinen
Collins (NY)	Joyce (OH)	Roskam
Comer	Katko	Ross
Comstock	Keating	Rothfus
Conaway	Kelly (MS)	Rouzer
Connolly	Kelly (PA)	Royce (CA)
Cook	Kilmer	Ruiz
Cooper	Kind	Ruppersberger
Correa	King (IA)	Russell
Costa	King (NY)	Rutherford
Costello (PA)	Kinziger	Sanford
Courtney	Knight	Scalise
Cramer	Krishnamoorthi	Schiff
Crawford	Kuster (NH)	Schneider
Crist	Kustoff (TN)	Schrader
Cuellar	Labrador	Schweikert
Culberson	LaHood	Scott, Austin
Curbelo (FL)	LaMalfa	Sensenbrenner
Davidson	Lamborn	Sessions
Davis (CA)	Lance	Sewell (AL)
Davis, Rodney	Langevin	Shea-Porter
DeGette	Larsen (WA)	Shimkus
Delaney	Larson (CT)	Shuster
DeLauro	Latta	Simpson
DeBene	Lawson (FL)	Sinema
Denham	Levin	Smith (MO)
Dent	Lewis (MN)	Smith (NE)
DeSantis	Lipinski	Smith (NJ)
DesJarlais	LoBiondo	Smith (TX)
Deutch	Loeb sack	Loudermilk
Diaz-Balart	Love	Smucker
Donovan	Lowey	Speier
Duffy	Lucas	Stefanik
Duncan (SC)	Luetkemeyer	Stewart
Duncan (TN)	Lujan Grisham,	Stivers
Dunn	M.	Swozell
Emmer	MacArthur	Suzuki (CA)
Eshoo	Maloney, Sean	Taylor
Estes (KS)	Marchant	Tenney
Esty (CT)	Marino	Thompson (CA)
Farenthold	Marshall	Thompson (PA)
Faso	Massie	Thornberry
Ferguson	Mast	Tiberi
Fitzpatrick	Matsui	Tipton
Fleischmann	McCarthy	Torres
Flores	McCaul	Trott
Fortenberry	McClintock	Tsongas
Foster	Foxx	Turner
Franks (AZ)	McKinley	Upton
Frelinghuysen	McMorris	Valadao
Gaetz	Rodgers	Veasey
Gallagher	McNerney	Visclosky
Garamendi	McSally	Wagner
Garrett	Meadows	Walberg
Gianforte	Meehan	Walden
Gibbs	Messer	Walker
Gohmert	Mitchell	Walorski
Gonzalez (TX)	Moolenaar	Walters, Mimi
Goodlatte	Mooney (WV)	Walz
Gosar	Moulton	Weber (TX)
Gottheimer	Mullin	Webster (FL)
Gowdy	Murphy (FL)	Wenstrup
Granger	Neal	Westerman
Graves (GA)	Newhouse	Williams
Graves (LA)	Noem	Wilson (SC)
Graves (MO)	Norman	Wittman
Green, Gene	Nunes	Womack