

bold in putting out the type of policy that will help the grazing be an effective tool in that and not cower every time an environmental organization may come along and wish to threaten the entanglement of lawsuits that are stopping good management like that. It is hurting the habitat, it is hurting the sage-grouse population, it is hurting western lands, and western economy.

Mr. Speaker, we need solutions coming from Washington, D.C., not impediments.

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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 580 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 580

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table 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 the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion.

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

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

□ 1230

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, it is budget day. I don't know if you were as excited about that when you got out of bed this morning as I was, but, to be fair, I sit on the Budget Committee.

I have the great honor of serving on the Rules Committee, and that is why I have the great honor of bringing this

rule to the floor today. But I serve on the Rules Committee by night. By day, I serve on the Budget Committee with my friend Mr. PASCRELL and others, and we have been working since January to produce a budget for the United States of America.

I have got to tell you, Mr. Speaker, we produced a whale of a budget coming out of the House Rules Committee. You remember that budget, you supported that budget. We did a fantastic collaborative job bringing that budget to the floor, and then it went to the United States Senate.

Now, you know how this happens, Mr. Speaker. We all grew up watching, "I am just a bill sitting here on Capitol Hill. Well, it is a long, long journey to the capital city, it is a long, long wait while I am sitting in committee." We all know the song from our childhood.

It is a long process to move a bill through, and nine times out of ten, it comes back differently from the United States Senate than the way we sent it over there.

Well, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today by concurring with the Senate amendment, and if we pass this rule, that is what we will have an opportunity to do. If we pass this rule, we will have an opportunity to have the debate, concur in the Senate amendment, and bring a unified budget to the floor.

Now, what does that mean, Mr. Speaker?

We have already been working on appropriations bills this cycle, and for the uninitiated, that is the bulk of the Federal spending that goes on. All of the mandatory spending that you and I both know about, Mr. Speaker, Medicare, Social Security, those important income support programs on which so many Americans depend, that money is already going out the door.

So today what we have an opportunity to do in passing this budget is to create what they call reconciliation instructions, because contained inside this unified budget of which the House and the Senate agree are reconciliation instructions that allow us to bring what I believe will be the most comprehensive, fundamental reform of our Tax Code since Tip O'Neill and Ronald Reagan did it in 1986.

Since 1986, 4 decades ago, Mr. Speaker, we have an opportunity today to do something that no other Congress has been able to do since I have been an adult, and I am excited about that opportunity.

Now, to be fair, we are going to have a lot of disagreement about how to get that done. That is not the debate we are having today. For any of my colleagues or anybody back home, Mr. Speaker, who is worried that right here in this debate on a Wednesday, we are going to sort out our entire Tax Code, fear not, fear not. That is not the debate we are having today.

The debate we are having today, Mr. Speaker, is will we or will we not take on the challenge of reforming our Tax Code. I believe that we will.

The debate that we are going to have today is will we or will we not confront the fact that America has one of the least competitive tax codes in the world, but Americans deserve one of the most competitive tax codes in the world.

The debate we are going to have today, Mr. Speaker, is not about the details of tax reform, but about the premise of can we do better for the American people or can we not.

I have the great benefit, Mr. Speaker, of not having to learn what I know about this Chamber from watching it on TV or reading it in the headlines. I consider myself very blessed to have the opportunity to serve among these men and women. If I just had to read about them in the headlines, I would have a very low opinion of them. I confess, I would have a low opinion. But because I get to work with these men and women, Mr. Speaker, I get to see the real commitment to their constituencies, the real commitment to their home States, the real desire to deliver on behalf of their constituencies and on behalf of the United States of America.

We may have a divisive debate today. We sometimes do. But my prediction here in hour one, Mr. Speaker, is that by the time we leave this floor, we are going to have an agreement to take on one of the challenges that no party has been able to take on since Democrats and Republicans came together in 1986 to get it done.

It is my great hope that we will use that model, that we will repeat that model, that we will improve upon that model, and that we will produce something that all of our constituency can be proud of. I know that America is hungry for tax reform, and I believe we can deliver it for them.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support this rule, support the underlying concurrence in the Senate amendment.

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

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

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia, my friend Mr. WOODALL, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in very strong opposition to this rule. Today, House Republicans are pushing a job-killing budget so they can use fast-track reconciliation procedures to steamroll through their billionaires-first tax plan.

Mr. Speaker, we are supposed to be the people's House. We ought to have the people's budget, a budget that helps the millions of Americans who sent us here to Congress, not a budget that helps only a few, the well-connected and the well-off.

I disagree with Mr. WOODALL. This is not a time to celebrate. This is a terrible budget. This budget will devastate America's investments in good

paying jobs, it threatens growing wages and the bedrock promise of a secure and healthy retirement. It makes cuts across the board that would hurt seniors, children, veterans, and the hardworking people across this country who are already struggling to get by.

Why are Republicans doing this?

Well, it is all in the name of fast-tracking the Ryan-McConnell tax plan, which explodes the deficit by \$1.5 trillion, and then provides multitrillion-dollar tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. We Democrats think this is a horrible idea.

What is particularly astonishing is the blatant hypocrisy of Republican leaders pushing this deficit-busting budget. Republicans are always telling us how much they care about the deficit, but when it comes to giving their beloved tax cuts to their billionaire friends, they suddenly develop a convenient case of amnesia. They say: What deficit? Don't worry. These tax breaks will pay for themselves.

Mr. Speaker, this is absurd. In this Republican-controlled Congress, we can now say with certainty that the deficit and debt no longer matter. All of the talk by Republicans, well, they didn't really mean it.

If Republicans really cared about the deficit, they would in no way imaginable bring up a bill, a budget that is as reckless as this to the floor. This kind of shows what they truly believe, where their values are, where their priorities are.

How many times have Republicans talked about the importance of a balanced budget?

The Speaker called for a deficit-neutral tax plan in his Better Way agenda. Well, I guess this debt-creating budget is the "Somewhat Less Better Way" plan.

Your budget chair took to Twitter just 2 weeks ago to chastise Senate Republicans for not pursuing a balanced budget, yet now she is fully in support of their budget, which adds \$1.5 trillion to the deficit with no way to pay for it.

Now, let me spell this out for my Republican friends. This is not a balanced budget. Clearly, Republicans desperately need a refresher on basic arithmetic.

Mr. Speaker, there is absolutely nothing balanced about hitting middle class families and millions of hardworking Americans with cuts while giving billionaires and corporations tax cuts they simply do not need. Billionaires aren't knocking down our door asking for more tax breaks. This is disgusting. This is shameful.

The Republican budget destroys middle class jobs by stealing hundreds of billions of dollars from investments in infrastructure, job training, advanced energy, and research and development. It devastates Medicare and Medicaid. It demands deep cuts to safety net programs like SNAP. I am talking about food for hungry children and hardworking families. It goes after college affordability. It makes college more

expensive for working families. It undercuts key supports for veterans and their families.

What is particularly offensive is that Republicans are using this terrible budget as a means of passing tax cuts for the wealthy as quickly as possible regardless of the consequences and without bipartisan support.

The tax reform framework supported by Republicans in Congress will raise taxes on the middle class and cut taxes for the wealthy. Under the Republican plan, the top 1 percent would receive 80 percent of all tax benefits. Let me repeat that. The top 1 percent would receive 80 percent of all tax benefits. Give me a break.

Those making more than \$900,000 a year would receive an average tax cut of more than \$200,000. Think about that. A person working full time in minimum wage makes \$290 a week before taxes. And under this plan, people who make over \$432 an hour, \$900,000 a year, would get a massive tax break. Corporations will receive a tax cut totaling \$2 trillion.

Who loses in this plan, Mr. Speaker?

According to the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, one in three middle class taxpayers earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000 would actually receive a tax increase, and nearly half of middle class families with kids will see their taxes go up.

Can you believe that: raising taxes on the middle class to pay for tax cuts for billionaires and corporations?

This is insane.

To make matters worse, Republicans are planning to steamroll their tax plan through Congress. We are reading in the press that we might see actual text of their plan next week and maybe a markup and floor consideration a week or two after that.

Really? Don't you think we owe it to our constituents to have thoughtful, open debate on this legislation which will impact every single one of them?

I guess not.

Democrats agree that our tax system needs to be updated, to be more fair, and especially to be more fair to the middle class and to working families. We have always been willing to engage in real bipartisan tax reform, but the Republican tax framework is not tax reform. It is just one more GOP multitrillion-dollar giveaway to the wealthiest at the expense of the middle class and working Americans.

In all my time in Congress, I have never seen a budget and a tax plan that harms so many just to benefit so few. I urge my colleagues to vote against this rule, to vote against this cruel Republican budget, and to oppose a tax plan that puts wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent ahead of hardworking middle class families.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I had an opportunity to mention at the beginning that we

might be debating the details of the tax reform plan that does not exist today. I see that we are, in fact, going to do that.

There are a lot of studies out there on this tax reform plan that does not yet exist, but let me tell you that we can all agree that we have the single least-competitive Tax Code on the planet today. We can all agree that with the click of a mouse, a company can transfer its assets overseas and grow jobs there instead of growing jobs here.

Let us have the debate that we want to have about who should bear the burden of American taxation. That is a legitimate debate and we should have it. But let us not have the debate about whether foreign workers should benefit or American workers should benefit from American capital, because that answer should be clear in the hearts and minds of every single Member of this Chamber.

We have an opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to go from worst to first. Now, I confess that I don't actually expect to get all the way to first. I will settle for getting up in the top five and getting out of the bottom five when it comes to being able to lead in this country. But I want to mention, Mr. Speaker, what I think is a source of frustration of constituencies on both sides of the aisle, and that is the us-against-them conversation that goes on day in and day out.

I looked at the chart my friend from Massachusetts brought down to the House floor. It happened to be in university colors of Georgia's red and black, but I can see that as a representative of all the hardworking families in my district, that chart didn't do anything to inspire me about the impact of tax reform going forward.

My friend quoted the Tax Policy Center. Now, The Wall Street Journal called the Tax Policy Center a shill for those groups that don't want to see any tax reform of any kind, but that is currently. The Tax Policy Center has been doing research for a long time. The research my friend from Massachusetts quoted was a study of a bill that does not yet exist. The research I am going to quote is of historical tax rates in this country.

What my friends at the Tax Policy Center said is that about 30 percent of Americans—one-third of Americans—pay no income taxes today; that the Tax Code, as it exists today, protects them from any tax liability at all.

Now, what we are proposing when we get into fundamental tax reform, Mr. Speaker, is to double the standard deduction. For those families that are already claiming the standard deduction, we are talking about doubling it. Now, the brackets are still in question, the details are still in question, but we are talking about doubling the number of folks who don't have to deal with the IRS at all.

Today, about 30 percent of American families don't pay any income taxes,

and that same 30 percent gets a refundable tax credit that rebates to them their entire Social Security and Medicare contribution that they make and the entire Social Security and welfare contribution that their employer makes on their behalf.

Now, these are not my numbers; these are the Tax Policy Center's numbers, that a full third of Americans aren't paying one penny in Federal income tax or Federal payroll tax of any kind.

□ 1245

Now, I am not here to debate the wisdom of that, Mr. Speaker. I am here to tell you that I don't know how much lower I can cut taxes in that group. I don't know how in the world I can lower the tax burden on folks who are not only paying no income taxes, but are having all of their payroll taxes rebated to them also.

Is this a group we should talk about, Mr. Speaker? Should we talk about folks who are grabbing onto the bottom rung of the economic ladder and struggling to climb to the top?

We should, and we do.

Should we talk about how it is that the entitlement system, the benefit system in this country, is trapping people at the bottom of the ladder and not allowing them to climb to the top?

We should.

I would say to you, Mr. Speaker, that it would be misleading to the American public to suggest that this tax bill is focusing its attention in one direction instead of another direction. The fact simply is that I can't lower taxes any more at the bottom of the spectrum.

We are talking about lowering taxes on corporations. That doesn't inspire many people. I have that conversation regularly: ROB, what in the world are you doing lowering taxes on corporations?

I support the FairTax, and in the spirit of folks who are not particularly enthusiastic about tax reform, I am not in that camp. I am enthusiastic about tax reform. I just thought there was a better way. I couldn't get the votes to have my better way done.

My better way is the FairTax, and what I would say to you is corporations don't pay taxes. Corporations do not pay taxes. They collect taxes from their consumers in the form of higher prices, from their employees in the form of lower wages, or from their shareholders in the form of lower capital—lower capital returns.

Now, lest you think: ROB, you are just a conservative Republican from the Deep South. What do you know about this?

I will again quote the Tax Policy Center, which says that a full 20 percent of the corporate income tax burden falls on workers. Fair enough. If we want to argue about where the tax rates are going to end up and how the cuts are going to look and what the policies are going to be, let's have that debate.

Let us not mislead the American people into believing there is a free lunch anywhere in this Tax Code. We have an opportunity to move from worst to first, and every single American, regardless of their region, regardless of their politics, is going to benefit from that change. They benefited from it when Democrats and Republicans came together to do it in 1986, and they will benefit from it when we come together and get it done today, as I believe that we will. We must.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, boy, I don't even know where to begin after that.

My good friend, the gentleman from Georgia, made reference to the Tax Policy Center, and I have the report from the Tax Policy Center here. In fact, it is their analysis that was the basis for that chart that I held during my opening remarks, which said that the top 1 percent would receive 80 percent of the tax breaks based on the Republican framework.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD excerpts from the Tax Policy Center report.

[From the Urban Institute & Brookings Institution Tax Policy Center Staff, Sept. 29, 2017]

A PRELIMINARY ANALYSIS OF THE UNIFIED FRAMEWORK ABSTRACT

The Tax Policy Center has produced preliminary estimates of the potential impact of proposals included in the "Unified Framework for Fixing Our Broken Tax Code." We find they would reduce federal revenue by \$2.4 trillion over ten years and \$3.2 trillion over the second decade (not including any dynamic feedback). In 2018, all income groups would see their average taxes fall, but some taxpayers in each group would face tax increases. Those with the very highest incomes would receive the biggest tax cuts. The tax cuts are smaller as a percentage of income in 2027, and taxpayers in the 80th to 95th income percentiles would, on average, experience a tax increase.

The findings and conclusions contained within are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect positions or policies of the Urban Institute, the Brookings Institution or their funders.

ALTERNATIVE WAYS OF PRESENTING CHANGE IN DISTRIBUTION OF TAX BURDENS

BY EXPANDED CASH INCOME PERCENTILE

Expanded cash income percentile, Percent change in after-tax income, Share of total federal tax change (%), Average federal tax change, Dollars, Percent, Share of federal taxes, Change (% points), Under the proposal (%)

Panel A: 2018.

Lowest quintile, 0.5, 1.1, -60, -10.4, 0.0, 0.9; Second quintile, 0.9, 4.1, -290, -9.3, 0.0, 3.8; Middle quintile, 1.2, 8.2, -660, -7.2, 0.2, 10.1; Fourth quintile, 1.2, 11.6, -1,110, -5.5, 0.6, 18.7; Top quintile, 3.3, 74.5, -8,470, -9.6, -0.7, 66.5; All, 2.1, 100.0, -1,570, -8.6, 0.0, 100.0.

Addendum.

80-90, 0.8, 5.1, -1,140, -3.1, 0.9, 15.1; 90-95, 0.7, 3.3, -1,500, -2.6, 0.7, 11.4; 95-99, 2.3, 12.8, -7,620, -6.9, 0.3, 16.4; Top 1 percent, 8.5, 53.3, -129,030, -17.6, -2.6, 23.5; Top 0.1 percent, 10.2, 30.3, -722,510, -20.4, -1.7, 11.1.

Panel B: 2027.

Lowest quintile, 0.2, 0.8, -50, -5.4, 0.0, 1.0; Second quintile, 0.5, 3.0, -230, -5.0, 0.1, 4.1; Middle quintile, 0.5, 4.9, -420, -3.4, 0.4, 10.2; Fourth quintile, 0.4, 4.3, -450, -1.7, 0.9, 17.3; Top quintile, 3.0, 86.6, -10,610, -8.5, -1.3, 67.4; All, 1.7, 100.0, -1,690, -6.7, 0.0, 100.0.

Addendum.

80-90, -0.4, -3.5, 820, 1.8, 1.2, 14.4; 90-95, -0.3, -1.5, 760, 1.1, 0.8, 10.3; 95-99, 1.8, 11.9, -7,640, -5.3, 0.2, 15.4; Top 1 percent, 8.7, 79.7, -207,060, -17.4, -3.5, 27.2; Top 0.1 percent, 9.7, 39.6, -1,022,120, -19.0, -1.8, 12.2.

Source: Urban-Brookings Tax Policy Center Microsimulation Model (version 0217-1)

The full report can be found at: http://www.taxpolicycenter.org/sites/default/files/publication/144971/a_preliminary_analysis_of_the_unified_framework_0.pdf

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, where did I get this figure about adding to the deficit by \$1.5 trillion? Did I just make that up?

I will tell the gentleman where I got it from. It is basically the Republican report in the Senate on the budget. Let me read from their report here.

It says: "This title includes two reconciliation instructions to the Senate committees. The first would allow the Finance Committee to reduce revenues and change outlays to increase the deficit by not more than \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years."

These are the words of Republicans in the Senate.

The gentleman wants to know why we are talking about the tax plan. It is because we are presented here with a budget that essentially fast tracks a tax plan. He is right, we don't have all the details yet because it is being negotiated and written in some back room somewhere in this building. I wish I knew where it was so we could maybe try to find out some more details. But what we do know is the framework that the Republicans have put forward, and that is the basis for the analysis that economist after economist have stated that this budget basically is a giveaway to the wealthiest individuals in this country, and it is not somehow a break for the middle class. It is the exact opposite.

This is a gift for billionaires and millionaires, and it does nothing for working families. That is why this is all relevant. This budget puts in place procedures for the Republicans to fast track a tax bill that they are now writing in some back room somewhere that nobody will see probably until the last minute, and basically it will be rushed through here, and it is a big giveaway to the wealthiest individuals in this country. I just wanted to clarify that for the RECORD.

Mr. Speaker, let me say that Republican plans for tax reform would also eliminate the State and local tax deduction, called SALT. This deduction prevents millions of middle class families from being taxed twice on the same income by deducting already-paid State and local taxes from their Federal income tax.

Half the people hit by this tax hike would be middle class families earning a household income of less than \$100,000, and local communities will also feel that pain.

Repealing the SALT deduction, which would effectively make State and local taxes more costly for taxpayers, would put pressure on local governments to lower taxes.

The bipartisan National Governors Association said in a September 22 letter that the SALT deduction, "has contributed to the stability of State revenues that are essential for providing public services." These services include healthcare, police and fire departments, and schools.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the letter from the National Governors Association.

NATIONAL GOVERNORS ASSOCIATION,
Washington, DC, September 22, 2017.
Re Tax Reform (State and Local Tax Deduction and Municipal Bonds).

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
Majority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
Minority Leader, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. ORRIN HATCH,
Chairman, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. RON WYDEN,
Ranking Member, Committee on Finance, U.S. Senate,
Washington, DC.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
Chairman, Committee on Ways & Means, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

Hon. RICHARD NEAL,
Ranking Member, Committee on Ways & Means,
U.S. Senate, Washington, DC.

DEAR MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER, SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, CHAIRMAN HATCH, RANKING MEMBER WYDEN, CHAIRMAN BRADY, AND RANKING MEMBER NEAL: The nation's governors appreciate congressional efforts to reform and improve federal tax policy. Federal and state tax systems are complex and often interconnected. Therefore, as Congress considers reforms, we urge you to maintain the balance between state and federal tax systems by preserving the income exclusion for municipal bond interest and the deductibility for state and local taxes.

The financing engine that drives U.S. infrastructure is the \$3.8 trillion municipal bond market. Changes to federal laws and regulations should not increase issuance costs to states for municipal bonds or diminish investor demand for them. If federal changes make issuing municipal bonds cost-prohibitive for states and local governments, then fewer projects could be funded, taxes could rise, fewer jobs created, and economic growth will suffer.

Governors also believe that no federal law or regulation should preempt, limit, or interfere with the sovereign rights of states. A mark of sovereignty includes the ability to develop and operate revenue and tax systems. Deductibility of state and local taxes has contributed to the stability of state revenues that are essential for providing public services. We encourage you to avoid changes to the tax code that would undermine the ability of state and local governments to meet the needs of the citizens whom we all serve.

Eliminating state and local tax deductibility, moreover, exposes a higher share of an itemizing taxpayer's income to federal

taxation because it adds back mandatory payments of state and local taxes already paid, as taxable income.

Federal tax reform requires an intergovernmental partnership because decisions at the federal level will affect state and local governments profoundly. We look forward to working with Congress on bipartisan tax reform to maintain balance between our systems and modernize the federal tax system to meet the needs of our citizens.

Sincerely,

Gov. BRIAN SANDOVAL,
NGA Chair.

Gov. STEVE BULLOCK,
NGA Vice Chair.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I want to ask Members to vote to defeat the previous question; and if we do, I will offer an amendment proposed by Representative SCHNEIDER that would prohibit any legislation from limiting or repealing the State and local tax deduction.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, to discuss this proposal and to discuss the importance of the State and local tax deduction, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), who has been outspoken on this issue on behalf of States and communities and middle class taxpayers.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, there are some real terrible parts to this budget, but this, to me, is the worst.

This deduction has been part of our tax system before there was an income tax, going back to the Civil War, for the very reasons that my friend from Massachusetts just talked about. It wasn't just picked off the shelf. People count on it. People count on this.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the rule, the previous question, the budget, the weather, whatever.

We know that this budget resolution paves the way for a tax reform bill done through reconciliation. I am sure that is interesting. Reconciliation on Governor Street in Paterson, New Jersey. I am sure they want to know reconciliation when we are talking about their pocketbooks; a dubious maneuver that blocks us Democrats completely out of the process and allows Republicans to pass a purely partisan, juiced-up bill.

Comprehensive tax reform is a goal we should all share, and lasting tax reform should be bipartisan. My friend from Georgia, I think, believes that, but this ain't it.

While they are cutting deals behind closed doors, what we are pushing is eliminating the State and local tax deduction, and that is in the Senate budget. They wrote it right out, the Capito amendment.

Republicans are so adamant about eliminating this middle class benefit

that they added an amendment to that budget before us today, the so-called Capito amendment.

Mr. Speaker, let me be clear. A vote for this rule is a vote for the budget, is a vote to repeal the State and local deduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, my colleagues representing New Jersey, New York, Illinois, California, Minnesota, and so many other States, including Georgia, including Lake Geneva, Wisconsin, better think long and hard about their vote today.

The American people are watching to see if they vote to raise their taxes. This amendment, the Capito amendment, in the budget falsely claims that the SALT only benefits high-income taxpayers. Let's take a look at that.

The fact is that repealing it would hurt the middle class and working families. At the same time, how do you justify—through the Speaker, how do you justify keeping the deduction still viable for corporations? They can deduct the State and local taxes, but the families of America can't? How can you justify that?

I want to hear your justification of that. That is going to be a good one.

Forty percent of taxpayers with incomes between \$50,000 and \$75,000, more than 70 percent of those making \$100,000 to \$200,000, claim the State and local tax deduction.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has again expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I will make it short, but I could stay here all afternoon on this because I feel it in my bone marrow.

We are talking about tax cuts. We are increasing the tax burden on the middle class, and you cannot deny it. There is no place in that budget that you can deny it. None whatsoever. You could say: Well, we are going to do this over here and this.

Look, I am tired of that walnut trick. Okay? Have you figured out which it is under?

Groups representing realtors, mayors, teachers, firefighters, sheriffs, et cetera, all support retaining the State and local tax deduction. It is bad policy, plain and simple.

Mr. Speaker, I appeal to you, we have enough ammunition. We don't need this ammunition for next year. Let's think about the budget of the American people in a nonpartisan way.

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

Mr. Speaker, if you have wondered what kind of passion we have on the Budget Committee, I will just once again recognize how much I enjoy serving with my friend from New Jersey on

the Budget Committee. Everything you just heard from him was from the heart. I get to hear it in committee day in and day out, and I will tell you, we end up with a better product as a result of that. It is a legitimate debate to have about the State and local tax deduction. It is perfectly legitimate.

There are those from low-tax jurisdictions that ask: Why would the Federal Government and the Federal taxpayer want to subsidize those States that are higher-tax jurisdictions? There are those jurisdictions that are low-tax jurisdictions.

Because the gentleman's constituency in New Jersey makes so much money, they pay so much more in Federal income taxes. And States like mine in Georgia, States like Alabama, States like Mississippi are the beneficiary of those dollars as the Federal Government distributes them. Undeniably, there is a case to be made on both sides of this issue.

The falsehood, Mr. Speaker, is to suggest that we are deciding that issue today. We are not. We are not.

I don't blame any of my colleagues for fighting for their constituency at the height of their ability, at the highest vocal point of their capability, because issues are, at their core, local and personal to each and every one of us.

We are going to have to have this conversation and we are going to have to sort it out, and I believe it is not going to be a partisan conversation. In fact, I know it is not going to be a partisan conversation.

I know Republicans who share my friend from New Jersey's opinion, and I know Democrats who share SHELLEY MOORE CAPITO's opinion on the Senate side. We know this to be true. We are going to sort this issue out, Mr. Speaker.

What I fear, though, is that emotions are going to run so high that we are going to miss an opportunity to figure these things out. For example, to conflate personal deductions with business deductions is to create confusion where there needn't be any.

Every business in America can deduct the meals that they serve throughout their day as a business expense. I will share with the gentleman that my family cannot deduct our meals from our income taxes.

Every business out there that has rented an apartment somewhere in order to conduct business, they can deduct that rent from their income taxes as a business expense. I will share with my friend, in the great State of Georgia, I am unable to deduct my rent as a business expense from my income tax.

There is just a fundamental difference between families and businesses, and that fundamental difference goes back to what I said at the very beginning, and that is there is only one taxpayer in this country. It is not Walmart, it is not Apple, it is not Microsoft. It is the American con-

sumer. We are the only ones. At the end of the day, the buck stops with each and every American family.

The debate over how to structure a corporate income Tax Code, Mr. Speaker, is perfectly legitimate. To suggest that the fact that the personal code and the business code look different and that is somehow nefarious is to deny what is just now over 100 years of income tax policy in this country.

□ 1300

Mr. PASCARELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. WOODALL. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCARELL. So, now that you have agreed to the fact the families are going to get shafted but corporations will continue to be able to deduct their local and State taxes, this is pertinent to the budget, my friend, through the Speaker.

Right in the bill, the budget bill we are talking about right now, the rule, previous question, related to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing the Federal deduction such as this—this is right from the budget. Why do you say we are not discussing this?

Mr. WOODALL. Reclaiming my time from my friend, Mr. Speaker, what you hear is absolutely right. I want to make that clear. Everybody is entitled to their own opinion; they are not entitled to their own facts. The words my friend is reading are absolutely accurate. What they are not are absolutely binding. That is what they are not.

What this is is such a personal and important issue to folks on both sides of it that it got its own personal line out of the United States Senate.

I can't even get nominations out of the United States Senate, Mr. Speaker. I am sitting here trying to staff out region four down in the great State of Georgia. Folks are delaying debate. Folks won't let me get my people in place.

This is so important to the United States Senate that it came with its own line.

Mr. Speaker, I don't want to diminish the importance of this issue on either side. What I do want to insist upon, though, is that it will not be decided during this hour today; and I want to insist, Mr. Speaker, that it will not be decided on partisan lines.

I would just ask of you, Mr. Speaker, and of my friends here on the floor, we have two things we can do with our voices: we can either sow consensus, or we can sow discontent.

I know that we are passionate about these things in which we believe, but to suggest, Mr. Speaker, that we are not going to come together and sort it out and do the very best we can for Americans is to sell this institution short and is to further the misunderstanding, the misimpression, the misinformation that the media sends out about us every day. I know we are better than that, and I am proud to be a voice say-

ing that here on the floor today, Mr. Speaker.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCARELL) to respond.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, families in my friend's State, the great State of Georgia, will lose a tax deduction of \$9,000, those families, on average. I think you are concerned about that. You cannot fib that you are not.

And the fact of the matter is you used the words—through the Speaker, you used the words that your States are subsidizing the donor States? Well, let me give you an idea of New Jersey.

States like West Virginia, the average SALT deduction claim is \$9,463 per household; in Ohio, it is \$10,445; in Wisconsin, it is \$11,653.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds, and this will probably have to be it because, unfortunately, we have so many speakers over here. I wish I could enjoy the loneliness that my colleague from Georgia enjoys that nobody wants to speak to defend this budget.

Mr. PASCARELL. Mr. Speaker, 48th, 49th State, that is where New Jersey is in getting back the money we send down to Washington. Who subsidizes whom?

And Mnuchin, go back and tell the Secretary of the Treasury he doesn't know what he is talking about. He says New Jersey is being subsidized? Not these numbers; the numbers don't show that.

You can't defend this. You can't defend it under any circumstances whatsoever, and you have admitted that we are talking facts here today.

I rest my case.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU).

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong opposition to the underlying rule that would allow for consideration of the Senate-passed Republican Budget. If passed, this budget would allow Republicans to fast-track their tax plan through Congress without Democratic support.

Now, I stand in support of a tax plan to help the middle class, but that is not the tax plan we are seeing proposed by Republicans. Instead, we see that 80 percent of the benefits will go to the richest 1 percent in this country. The problem? Somebody has to pay for it, and it looks like it could be the middle class.

I have heard from workers worried that cuts of contributions to their 401(k) plans will ruin their retirement. I have heard from seniors worried that losing homeowners' incentives will make it harder for them to stay in their homes. And I have heard from families worried that a repeal of the State and local tax deduction will increase their tax burden.

In fact, we know that one-third of the middle class will see their taxes increase under this plan. And the numbers show that, as our constituents begin to learn more, they are realizing that this plan only cuts taxes for the wealthy and corporate interests and leaves middle class families behind. That is why a Reuters poll released yesterday found that fewer than a third of Americans support the Republican tax plan at all.

This tax plan for the rich will increase the deficit by \$2.2 trillion. And who will pay for it? Your children and their grandchildren. They will have to suffer from the cuts made down along the line to education, to Medicaid, to Medicare.

And for what? To make the rich richer? To line the pockets of Washington special interests? That is not right.

Reject this budget. Most importantly, reject this tax plan.

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

We have heard a lot about the distributional analysis of tax reform, and, as I have suggested, it is hard to do. Folks who make a whole lot of money, like my friend from New Jersey's constituency, they pay a whole lot more in taxes. I hope that one day my constituency makes as much money as my friend from New Jersey's constituency, and if we can stimulate the economy the way that I believe that this tax proposal will, we are going to have a shot at getting that done.

But we have to have these conversations about limiting tax deductions for the wealthiest Americans if we are going to solve the issues that my friends have raised. And reading right out of that Senate budget report, the whole purpose of considering the State and local tax deduction and considering modifying it, capping it, eliminating it, whatever you want to insert there, Mr. Speaker, is designed around limiting those tax deductions that only benefit the wealthiest among us—that only benefit the wealthiest among us. That is the conversation that folks are trying to have.

Again, Mr. Speaker, there is so much more that we agree on than that we disagree on in this Chamber. But it appears, time and time again, we come to the House floor and focus, in the most shrill voices, on the 20 percent of those things that divide us instead of the 80 percent of those things that we could come together and deliver on for our constituency.

Tax reform doesn't have to pass with 51 votes in the Senate. We move reconciliation bills through the Senate with 60 votes. We have moved them through the Senate with 70 votes. We have moved them through the Senate with 80 votes.

Growing the American economy, Mr. Speaker, is a commonsense goal that is shared in every single region and in every single political quarter. Let's not make this about us here. Let's make this about our bosses back home. We

can, and we should, and I believe that we will.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the ranking member on the Tax Policy Subcommittee of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this bill is truly about one thing and one thing only. It is about lavishing tax breaks on Donald Trump personally, his family, and all of his billionaire buddies. It is about lavishing tax breaks and incentives on the very same giant multinational corporations that have shipped away so many American jobs, that have refused to pay their fair share of our national security by hiding their profits in offshore island tax havens.

It is about doing all that and hoping that, at this time of the year, here at Halloween, that they can trick American middle-class families into believing that a little of those tax benefits will trickle down to them. Because if they can do that, if they can pass this bill, they will treat themselves, the billionaires, and the job exporters, to tax benefits of almost astronomical proportions.

To suggest that there is anything bipartisan about this bill or anything bipartisan about the tax proposal that Republicans will unveil next week is truly a farce. There is no bipartisanship here.

They learned nothing from their failed healthcare repeal efforts. No, they plan to use surprise, jack-in-the-box tactics to pop out a bill at the last minute, force it through this House, through our Ways and Means Committee, and foist it off on the American people.

With Halloween coming, there is a simple "trick or treat" test that you, as an American family, can use. If you are in the top 1 percent, you get 80 percent of the individual benefits out of this bill.

So just look at your income. If you are not up there in the \$700,000 or \$900,000 range, don't count on getting much benefit out of this bill. In fact, a number of studies show your taxes may actually go up while others see a significant decline in the revenue the richest few are asked to pay to finance our country.

And what about the idea of growing jobs? After all, growing our economy is what we should all be about and what is claimed for this bill. Well, I turned to that objective source, Goldman Sachs, the home of the Treasury Secretary and top economic advisers. Goldman Sachs, within the last month, has advised its own investors: Don't expect much out of this tax bill because any momentary growth at the beginning will be offset by the trillions of dollars of additional debt from the same people who have been telling us for years we can't afford another dollar for abused children, and we can't afford dollars for children's healthcare be-

cause we are so very worried about the national debt.

Well, there is reason to be worried about the national debt and not to explode it by trillions of dollars with this giant unpaid tax bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HOLDING). The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MCGOVERN. I yield the gentleman an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. A zombie of supply-side economics is returning from the dead. We know it didn't work for President Bush. We know it didn't work in the Reagan era. They are bringing it back again, saying, if you just give a little more to those who have so much already, it will benefit everyone else. The data does not show that.

This is a tax bill that needs to be rejected because it is so unfair and inequitable to the American people. This is much worse than the healthcare repeal because its ramifications in leading to cutting Medicare and Social Security will be far-reaching. There will not be a family in America that goes untouched.

Reject this budget. Reject this awful tax bill.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume to agree with some of what my friend had to say.

There will be absolutely no family that goes untouched. If you would like to go to the Council of Economic Advisers web page, Mr. Speaker, you can see their most recent report, which suggests, on average, \$4,000 in additional wages for every wage earner in this country, every family in this country, making a difference for economic growth.

We all know that economic growth matters. More jobs mean more pressure on labor. More pressure on labor means higher wages. Higher wages mean more income for the Federal Government in taxes and more income for families to put into their pocket.

We are hearing about zombies and surprises and tricks. You can tell that Halloween is right around the corner, and scaring folks is kind of the tagline of Halloween, Mr. Speaker; and, sadly, that is what we see going on here today.

I promise you, you have not heard a single bipartisan word about this tax plan from my friends on the other side, so I am going to provide those words for my friends. I will read from yesterday's Wall Street Journal, Mr. Speaker: "In 2012, President Obama and his advisers proposed lowering the corporate tax rate because it 'creates good jobs and good wages for the middle class folks who work at those businesses.'"

□ 1315

We can argue about what the tax reform ought to look like. What we can't argue about is the benefit for American families of tax reform.

In 2013, Lawrence Summers, President Clinton's Treasury Secretary and

Chairman of President Obama's Economic Council, argued that the tax on corporate profit creates a burden without commensurate revenues for the government, and that changing it is as close to a free lunch for the American taxpayer as reformers will ever get. That was President Obama's Treasury Secretary.

Again, we can argue about what it looks like. What we can't argue about is what it is intended to do and what leading experts believe it will do. In 2015, Democrat CHUCK SCHUMER and Republican ROB PORTMAN cosponsored a Senate bill to reduce the top corporate tax rate, which is the highest of the 35 countries in the OECD today.

As CHUCK SCHUMER says: "Our international tax system creates incentives to send jobs and stash profits overseas, rather than creating jobs and economic growth here in the United States." We can fix that together, and we will fix that together.

Bill Clinton, in 2016, said he regretted raising the corporate tax rate to its current level for exactly those reasons.

Who is advantaged by trying to persuade the American people that something nefarious is going on here? Who is advantaged by that? I don't know about my friend's constituencies, Mr. Speaker, but my constituency wants to believe we are making things work together. My constituency wants to believe in rolling up our sleeves and sorting things out together. My constituency wants to believe that we are united in making a difference for them together.

We have this opportunity. If we pass this rule and we concur in the underlying Senate amendment, we will move forward on tax reform that will leave no American family behind.

The best government program we have in this country is the program that allows jobs to develop so folks can have one. The best program we have in this country, Mr. Speaker, is one that allows wages to rise so that folks can earn more. My constituency is not looking for anything from the other side of the aisle except cooperation on freeing up the marketplace so that my constituency can go to work, so that folks can go and make their own pathway and future forward. We can do it in ways we haven't done together since 1986, Mr. Speaker.

Who is advantaged by convincing folks that cooperation, consensus, making a difference together is dead? I don't believe anyone. In fact, I would tell you that not just the debate but the body politic is damaged by those concerns, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I hope we will join together and refute those. I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I would just say to the gentleman from Georgia, we don't need lectures on cooperation and bipartisanship. We have offered to work with Republicans on tax reform. We have offered to work

with Republicans on improving the Affordable Care Act. Every time the Republicans talk about rolling up their sleeves, we are not there. We are not invited.

So if you want bipartisanship, open up this process. Go back to regular order. Hold hearings. Listen to our ideas. Don't write bills in the back room and rush them to the floor and force the Members up here to vote up or down on them. Yes, we want cooperation. We want bipartisanship, but we don't need any lectures from anybody on the other side of the aisle.

This has been the most closed Congress in history. We don't need any lectures on the importance of cooperation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. KIND).

Mr. KIND. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Massachusetts for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to this rule because I rise in opposition to the underlying budget—a budget which is really a budget buster that could be before the full House for consideration tomorrow.

It calls for an additional \$1.5 trillion worth of debt accumulated over the next 10 years. They call for that, I fear, in order to clear the path for unpaid-for tax cuts. There is a bipartisan path to move forward on tax reform. It has been 31 years since we have taken a serious run at the Federal code. It is long overdue. It is one that would simplify the code, that would broaden the base and lower the rates and make us more competitive at home, but especially abroad, in light of what the rest of the world has done.

That can also help promote economic growth, but I fear that that is not the direction that the opposing party is taking with their tax reform proposal. I say fear because we haven't seen the details yet. So we can't say with certainty just what exactly will be offered over the next couple of weeks. But if history is any guide, there is a proclivity to pass large tax cuts that are not paid for.

If history is a guide, we have been down this road before, in the 1981 tax cuts, the 2001, the 2003, that promised to bring a boon of economic growth that would offset and pay for the lost revenue. It didn't materialize. Instead, we had huge budget deficits. Unfortunately, today, we don't have the luxury of time to help us recover from a huge fiscal mistake. Because today, 70 million baby boomers are beginning their massive retirement and joining Social Security and Medicare—10,000 a day.

If we go down this route of going with massive tax breaks that aren't paid for, we are going to jeopardize the long-term solvency of Social Security and Medicare at exactly the wrong moment in our Nation's history. The folks back home tell me they would like to see tax reform along the lines that I just described, but they are not telling me that they are more interested in

trickle-down economics where the predominant relief goes to the most wealthy, hoping that it somehow benefits everyone else.

Now, they would like to see it a little fairer for working families, for small businesses, for family farmers so that they can share in the economic growth and the prosperity that could be offered if we do this the correct way in a bipartisan fashion.

But instead, I fear that we are going to be witnessing history repeat itself. But unlike the time of the past, we don't have the luxury of time going forward without jeopardizing Social Security and Medicare, and without leaving a legacy of debt once again for our children and grandchildren to inherit.

So let's regroup. Let's do a budget that makes sense for the long-term fiscal solvency of important programs, but especially our children's future. This budget doesn't get us there.

Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to reject the rule and reject the budget if it comes up tomorrow.

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

I actually want to associate myself to my friend from Wisconsin's comments. I can't disagree with a word he said right up until it got to the end where he said to vote against the budget. Right up until there, we were on the same page.

There is so much that we could do together. My friend spoke out on behalf of small businesses and family farmers. As the Tax Code exists today, when you see my friends put up charts about tax benefits going to the top 1 percent, they are talking about those small business and family farmers. They are talking about that small business in my district that has plowed every single penny back into the business—back into the business for new technology to make their employees more productive, back into the business to open up a new facility, back into the business to add more distribution, because they have got 350 families who depend on them to make that business successful so that those 350 families can put food on their table.

But when the Tax Code is analyzed, Mr. Speaker, when the IRS sends back the statistics, that small business in my district that sends every single penny back into the business, they look rich. They look like they are the wealthiest, and they are not. They are those small family farmers. They are those small family businesses that are trying to make a difference.

I want to say, because my friend from Wisconsin had a very significant concern about blowing holes in deficits, Mr. Speaker, as you know from your experience, one cannot pass tax reform that is permanent through reconciliation if it adds to deficits in the out years. That is what is so wonderful about this process, Mr. Speaker. I support what my friend from Wisconsin said about keeping an eye on deficits. I

support what my friend said about making sure Medicare and Social Security are growing, which they do when people go back to work and when folks earn more money.

I don't want to be in the business of lecturing my colleagues, Mr. Speaker. I want to be in the business of working with my colleagues. But folks have a choice when they show up to work every day. Are we going to make this a day about arguing with one another? Are we going to tear something down today? Are we going to build something up today? I stand for building something today, Mr. Speaker. Unabashedly, let's build something together today.

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

Mr. MCGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, certainly, my constituents in Texas would like to see the same spirit of togetherness that we have just heard about. How has that been handled in our Ways and Means Committee, and why do I call the claims of bipartisanship here a farce?

Well, people in Texas would like to know: What is the effect of being taxed on our payment of property taxes? People in Michigan want to know: What is the effect of putting a cap on how much we can contribute to our retirement savings? Other people were concerned about adding \$0.20 and a border adjustment tax to every purchase made from Mexico, or Canada, or elsewhere.

Since May, I have been asking for hearings on these matters. I have been asking for one single Trump administration official to have the courage to come in front of our committee and answer questions about their proposal and the great gap between what President Trump says one day, and what they do the next.

They have refused every day. We have been here all of September. We have been here all of October. They have refused to have a single hearing with a single Trump official because they plan to jam through—while they yell “kumbaya,” they plan to jam through a gift to the superrich and the multinationals that keep shipping these jobs offshore. And they don't want any accountability for it.

They don't want any public involvement either. They want the public to know as little about the details of their sham as possible. That is why they will have it introduced next week, passed in committee the following week, forced onto this floor and into the Senate, and the American people have to understand and speak up and say “no.”

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 15 seconds to say I don't want to sneak anything past anybody. I want to claim full and total credit for what we are about to do together. I don't want anybody to be confused about whose fault it is. It is my fault.

When we get tax reform and get this economy growing again, blame me. When we can see wages rising in this country again, blame me. When we have an opportunity to go from worst to first in the international business community, blame me.

I don't want anybody to believe there is anybody hiding here, Mr. Speaker.

I share with my friend from Massachusetts that I do not have any speakers remaining, and I am prepared to close when he is. Truth needs no defense, I would say to my friend.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, today we are considering a budget that will basically pave the way so we can bring up a massive tax cut for billionaires. Again, the gentleman from Georgia mentioned the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center in his opening remarks, and this chart is based on their analysis. Basically, let me repeat, the top 1 percent get 80 percent of all the benefits.

If you think that that is fair, if you think that that is representing your constituents, then go ahead and vote for this budget, because it is paving the way for a tax cut that will do just this.

I don't think it is fair. I don't think anybody on the Democratic side of the aisle thinks it is fair, and I am hoping that there are some on the Republican side of the aisle who think that that is not fair as well.

The gentleman from Georgia talks about cooperation and about we need to get along. I mean, who disagrees with that? But actions speak louder than words. You can't talk about open, transparent processes and then, as we just heard from the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), have the Ways and Means Committee which is writing this tax bill behind closed doors without any help from the Democrats, but having no hearings—not allowing any administration official to come up and testify.

How is that an open and transparent process? How does that encourage the spirit of cooperation and bipartisanship? I mean, I thought my friends would have learned from their terrible experience with their repeal and replace of the Affordable Care Act what happens when you write bills behind closed doors without bipartisan input, without even the committees of jurisdiction, by the way, in that case, deliberating on what the final product should be.

I thought you would have learned from that process, and you ended up failing at the end of the day. I hope that this effort that my Republican friends are now undertaking for tax cuts for wealthy people in this country, I hope that that fails as well.

A lousy process usually leads to a lousy product. My friends on the other side of the aisle have mastered the art of lousy processes. In the Rules Committee, almost virtually everything is

closed. Everything is shut down. German amendments routinely deny the ability for Members to offer them on the House floor because the Republicans don't want to deal with them. They are afraid they might lose. They don't want to have the debate.

If you want cooperation, if you want a bipartisan tax reform bill, then you just can't say it; you have to do something. In 1986, the last time Congress did a comprehensive tax reform, we had 30 days of full committee hearings spanning over a year. There were 26 days of markup between September and December. This time, the timelines being reported in the press are maybe just a week, or a little bit more, if that.

□ 1330

Again, if recent history is any indication, we might not even get that. A bill might just miraculously appear one day and be rushed to the floor so that no one has time to read it or analyze it and so that none of our constituents have time to understand what is really happening here.

So I go back to that chart. One percent—1 percent—of the wealthiest interests in this country get 80 percent of the tax breaks.

If you think that that is fair, then vote for this budget, because this budget paves the way for that tax bill to move forward.

If you care about a balanced budget and if you care about deficits and debt, please vote “no” on this budget, because this allows us to increase the deficit by \$1.5 trillion.

Whatever happened to deficits matter? I guess it is inconvenient because tax cuts for billionaires matter more than deficits and passing on that debt to our kids.

So I urge my colleagues to vote “no” on the previous question, to vote “no” on the rule, to vote “no” on this budget, and to fight like hell against this horrendous tax cut plan that my friends on the Republican side are pushing. This is bad policy. This is bad for our country. This is bad for middle class families. This is bad for not only my constituents, I would argue it is bad for your constituents.

It is about time that the people's House starts enacting legislation that benefits the people of this country, not just a few who are well off and well connected.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, sometimes I wish I could bring school groups down here onto the House floor just to help the next generation understand why we face some of the challenges that we face. We are down here today confronted with a tax bill that folks are certain is going to give away everything to everybody whom they don't want it to go to, and we are down here confronted with the fact that there is

no tax bill whatsoever to look at and it is going to get sprung on folks with absolutely no notice and no ability to read it.

Now, either one of those things could be true. It happens to be that neither of those things is true. But how in the world do folks listening to this debate think that we are advancing the cause of reform?

Deficits do matter, to my friend's point. They do matter, and the strangest hold that the Obama regulatory economy created here in America on economic growth reduced economic GDP growth by a full one-third—by a full one-third.

For every 0.1 percent of GDP growth, we talk about 200 billion additional dollars coming in to the Treasury over the 10-year window. So a full percentage point that we have lost is \$2 trillion coming in to the Treasury.

Mr. Speaker, if we had Bush-era growth instead of Obama-era growth over these last 5 years, the budget would be balanced today. But we are where we are, and the question is: Can we do better tomorrow? We can.

Now, before I talk about that, Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize some of the folks who helped to get us here. My friend from Massachusetts and I come down here and carry the debate, but the work goes on behind every single one of these committee rooms.

I serve on the Budget Committee, Mr. Speaker, and our staff director over there, Rick May, has done an amazing job shepherding this process, standing up for the House's work product.

Jenna Spealman, Andy Morton, Tim Flynn, Robert Cogan, Patrick Louis Knudsen, Jim Bates, Mary Popadiuk, Jonathan Romito, and Elise Anderson are all working day and night—and weekends, many times—to get this product to the floor.

Steve Gonzalez, Eric Davis, Robert Yeakel, Ellen Johnson, Emily Goff, Brad Watson, Brittany Madni, and Steve Waskiewicz are folks, Mr. Speaker, who don't come here because they have political passion; they come here because they have policy passion. They want to do those things that matter. They could go anywhere they want to in town and make more money, but they stay here working for the American people because they believe they can make a difference, and they are right.

Mr. Speaker, they are right. They can make a difference. We can make a difference. This rule—this rule—if we pass it today, Mr. Speaker, will allow us to concur in the Senate amendment. Concurring in the Senate amendment does not bind us to the Senate process, but it enables us to move a bill that direction that they can process.

We have seen the holdups in the Senate, Mr. Speaker. I am not happy about that. That is just the way Senate process is. We can do better. Reconciliation allows us to do better, and passing this rule enables us to do better.

Vote “yes,” Mr. Speaker. Vote “yes” on this rule, and vote “yes” on the underlying budget and open yourself up to doing together what has not been done together in 31 years. I don't just believe we can, I believe that we will. I am excited about it, I am proud of it, and I am ready to get to it, Mr. Speaker.

Vote “yes.”

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong opposition to Rule governing debate on the Senate Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018, and the underlying resolution.

Let us be very clear and direct: the resolution before us is not intended to reconcile tax and spending priorities to reflect the priorities of the American people or to reduce the deficit and national debt or to put our fiscal house on a sustainable path to economic growth.

Rather the sole purpose of Republicans bringing this job-killing budget to the floor today is to fast-track their “Billionaires First” tax plan, which will cause significant harm to working and middle class families, especially to my constituents in the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

The McConnell-Ryan tax plan, which this budget resolution is designed to grease the skids for, would raise taxes on about 1.5 million Texas households, or 12.4 percent of households next year.

On average, families earning up to \$86,000 annually would see a \$794 increase in their tax liability, a significant burden on families struggling to afford child care and balance their checkbook.

An estimated 2.8 million Texas households deduct state and local taxes with an average deduction of \$7,823 in 2015.

The McConnell-Ryan plan eliminates this deduction, which would lower home values and put pressure on states and towns to collect revenues they depend on to fund schools, roads, and vital public resources.

The proposed elimination of the personal exemption will harm millions of Texans by taking away the \$4,050 deduction for each taxpayer and claimed dependent; in 2015, roughly 9.3 million dependent exemptions were claimed in the Lone Star State.

Equally terrible is that the McConnell-Ryan tax plan drastically reduces the Earned Income Tax Credit, which encourages work for 2.7 million low-income individuals in Texas, helping them make ends meet with an average credit of \$2,689.

The EITC and the Child Tax Credit lift about 1.2 million Texans, including 663,000 children, out of poverty each year.

This reckless and irresponsible GOP tax plan is made all the more obscene by the fact that 80 percent of the GOP's tax cuts go to the wealthiest 1 percent.

To achieve this goal of giving more and more to the haves and the “have mores,” the GOP budget betrays seniors, children, the most vulnerable, and needy, and working and middle-class families.

For example, the Republican budget steals hundreds of billions of dollars from critical job-creating investments in infrastructure, job training, clean energy and research and development.

It devastates Medicare and Medicaid by cutting \$500 billion from Medicare and \$1.3 tril-

lion from Medicaid, hurting veterans, seniors with long-term care needs, children and rural communities.

The GOP budget's steep cuts in program investments fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

This 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 \$1.8 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

This 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.

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

The values expressed by this Republican budget are not the values of my constituents, the people of Texas, or the American people as a whole.

For these reasons, I oppose the Rule and the underlying budget resolution.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 580 OFFERED BY
MR. MCGOVERN

Strike all after the resolved clause and insert:

That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to take from the Speaker's table 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 the Senate amendment thereto, and to consider in the House, without intervention of any point of order, a motion offered by the chair of the Committee on the Budget or her designee that the House concur in the Senate amendment with the amendment specified in section 2 of this resolution. The Senate amendment and the motion shall be considered as read. The motion shall be debatable for one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the motion to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question.

SEC. 2. The amendment referred to in section 1 is as follows: At the end of the Senate amendment, add the following new section:

“SEC. ____ . POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives or the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction (26 U.S.C. 164).

(b) WAIVER AND APPEAL.—Subsection (a) may be waived or suspended in the Senate only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members of the Senate, duly chosen and sworn, shall be required to sustain an appeal of the ruling of the Chair on a point of order raised under subsection (a).

(c) WAIVER IN THE HOUSE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this subsection, the Chair shall put the question of consideration with respect to the rule or order, as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn.”

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

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

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

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

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

or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon.”

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

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

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on adopting the resolution, if ordered; and agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 229, nays 188, not voting 15, as follows:

[Roll No. 582]

YEAS—229

Abraham	Duncan (SC)	Kelly (PA)
Aderholt	Duncan (TN)	King (IA)
Allen	Dunn	King (NY)
Amash	Emmer	Kinzing
Arrington	Estes (KS)	Knight
Babin	Farenthold	Kustoff (TN)
Bacon	Faso	Labrador
Banks (IN)	Ferguson	LaHood
Barletta	Fitzpatrick	LaMalfa
Barr	Fleischmann	Lamborn
Barton	Flores	Lance
Bergman	Fortenberry	Latta
Biggs	Fox	Lewis (MN)
Billirakis	Franks (AZ)	LoBiondo
Bishop (MI)	Frelinghuysen	Loudermilk
Black	Gaetz	Love
Blackburn	Gallagher	Lucas
Blum	Gianforte	Luetkemeyer
Bost	Gibbs	MacArthur
Brady (TX)	Gohmert	Marchant
Brat	Goodlatte	Marino
Brooks (AL)	Gosar	Marshall
Brooks (IN)	Gowdy	Massie
Buchanan	Granger	Mast
Buck	Graves (GA)	McCarthy
Bucshon	Graves (LA)	McCaul
Budd	Graves (MO)	McClintock
Burgess	Griffith	McHenry
Byrne	Grothman	McKinley
Calvert	Guthrie	McMorris
Carter (GA)	Handel	Rodgers
Carter (TX)	Harper	McSally
Chabot	Harris	Meadows
Cheney	Hartzler	Meehan
Coffman	Hensarling	Messer
Cole	Herrera Beutler	Mitchell
Collins (GA)	Hice, Jody B.	Mooleenaar
Collins (NY)	Higgins (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Comer	Hill	Mullin
Constock	Holding	Newhouse
Conaway	Hollingsworth	Noem
Cook	Hudson	Norman
Costello (PA)	Huizenga	Nunes
Cramer	Hultgren	Olson
Crawford	Hunter	Palazzo
Culberson	Hurd	Palmer
Curbelo (FL)	Issa	Paulsen
Davidson	Jenkins (KS)	Pearce
Davis, Rodney	Jenkins (WV)	Perry
Denham	Johnson (LA)	Pittenger
Dent	Johnson (OH)	Poe (TX)
DeSantis	Johnson, Sam	Poliquin
DesJarlais	Jordan	Posey
Diaz-Balart	Joyce (OH)	Ratcliffe
Donovan	Katko	Reed
Duffy	Kelly (MS)	Reichert

Renacci	Scott, Austin	Upton
Rice (SC)	Sensenbrenner	Valadao
Roby	Sessions	Wagner
Roe (TN)	Shimkus	Walberg
Rogers (AL)	Shuster	Walden
Rogers (KY)	Simpson	Walker
Rohrabacher	Smith (MO)	Walorski
Rokita	Smith (NJ)	Walters, Mimi
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (TX)	Weber (TX)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smucker	Wenstrup
Roskam	Stefanik	Westerman
Ross	Stewart	Williams
Rothfus	Stivers	Wilson (SC)
Rouzer	Taylor	Wittman
Royce (CA)	Tenney	Womack
Russell	Thompson (PA)	Woodall
Rutherford	Thornberry	Yoder
Sanford	Tiberi	Yoho
Scalise	Tipton	Young (AK)
Schweikert	Trott	Young (IA)
	Turner	Zeldin

NAYS—188

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

NOT VOTING—15

□ 1357

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

So the previous question was ordered.
The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

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

RECORDED VOTE

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

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 233, noes 188, not voting 11, as follows:

[Roll No. 583]

AYES—233

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

Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Wenstrup
Westerman

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder

Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—188

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.

Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)

Bustos
Butterfield

Capuano
Carbajal

Cárdenas
Carson (IN)

Cartwright
Castor (FL)

Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy

Cielline
Clark (MA)

Clarke (NY)
Clay

Cleaver
Clyburn

Cohen
Connolly

Conyers
Cooper

Correa
Costa

Courtney
Crist

Crowley
Cuellar

Cummings
Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny
DeFazio

DeGette
DeLaney

DeLauro
DelBene

Demings
DeSaulnier

Deutch
Dingell

Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.

Ellison
Engel

Eshoo
Espallat

Esty (CT)
Evans

Foster
Frankel (FL)

Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings

Heck
Higgins (NY)

Himes
Hoyer

Huffman
Jackson Lee

Jayapal
Jeffries

Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E.B.

Jones
Kaptur

Keating
Kelly (IL)

Kennedy
Khanna

Kihuen
Kildee

Kilmer
Kind

Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)

Langevin
Larsen (WA)

Lawrence
Lee

Levin
Lewis (GA)

Lieu, Ted
Lipinski

Loeb sack
Lofgren

Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.

Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch

Maloney,
Carolyn B.

Maloney, Sean
Matsui

McCollum
McEachin

McGovern
McNerney

Meeks
Meng

Moore
Moulton

Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Neal

Nolan
Norcross

O'Halloran
O'Rourke

Pallone
Panetta

Pascarell
Payne

Pelosi
Perlmutter

Peters
Peterson

Pingree
Pocan

Polis
Price (NC)

Quigley
Raskin

Rice (NY)
Rosen

Roybal-Allard
Ruiz

Ruppersberger
Rush

Ryan (OH)
Sanchez

Sánchez
Sarbanes

Schakowsky
Schiff

Schneider
Scott (VA)

Scott, David
Serrano

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter

Sherman
Sinema

Sires
Slaughter

Smith (WA)
Soto

Speier
Suozi

Swalwell (CA)
Takano

Thompson (MS)
Titus

Tonko
Torres

Tsongas
Vargas

Veasey
Vela

Velázquez
Visclosky

Walz
Wasserman

Schultz
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman
Welch

Yarmuth
Thompson (CA)

Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

Abraham

Adams

Aderholt

Allen

Amodei

Arrington

Bacon

Banks (IN)

Barletta

Barr

Beatty

Bilirakis

Bishop (UT)

Black

Blackburn

Blumenauer

Bonamici

Brady (TX)

Brat

Brooks (AL)

Brooks (IN)

Brown (MD)

Buchanan

Budd

Butterfield

Byrne

Calvert

Carson (IN)

Carter (TX)

Cartwright

Castro (TX)

Chabot

Chu, Judy

Cielline

Clay

Cleaver

Cohen

Cole

Collins (NY)

Comstock

Conaway

Conyers

Cook

Cooper

Cramer

Crawford

Cuellar

Culberson

Davidson

Davis (CA)

Davis, Danny

DeGette

DelBene

Demings

Dent

DeSaulnier

DesJarlais

Deutch

Dingell

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

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

This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 230, nays 180, answered “present” 2, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 584]

YEAS—230

Abraham	Gibbs	Newhouse
Adams	Goodlatte	Noem
Aderholt	Gowdy	Norman
Allen	Granger	Nunes
Amodei	Griffith	O'Rourke
Arrington	Grothman	Olson
Bacon	Guthrie	Palazzo
Banks (IN)	Hanabusa	Palmer
Barletta	Handel	Pascarell
Barr	Harper	Pearce
Beatty	Harris	Pelosi
Bilirakis	Hastings	Perlmutter
Bishop (UT)	Heck	Pingree
Black	Hensarling	Pocan
Blackburn	Herrera Beutler	Polis
Blumenauer	Higgins (LA)	Ratcliffe
Bonamici	Hill	Reichert
Brady (TX)	Himes	Roby
Brat	Hollingsworth	Roe (TN)
Brooks (AL)	Huffman	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (IN)	Huizenga	Rokita
Brown (MD)	Hultgren	Rooney, Thomas J.
Buchanan	Hunter	Roskam
Budd	Issa	Ross
Butterfield	Johnson (GA)	Rothfus
Byrne	Johnson (LA)	Royce (CA)
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Russell
Carson (IN)	Kaptur	Sanford
Carter (TX)	Katko	Scalise
Cartwright	Keating	Schiff
Castro (TX)	Kelly (MS)	Schneider
Chabot	Kelly (PA)	Schweikert
Chu, Judy	Kennedy	Scott (VA)
Cielline	Kildee	Scott, Austin
Clay	King (IA)	Scott, David
Cleaver	King (NY)	Sensenbrenner
Cohen	Krishnamoorthi	Sessions
Cole	Kuster (NH)	Shea-Porter
Collins (NY)	Kustoff (TN)	Sherman
Comstock	Labrador	Shimkus
Conaway	LaMalfa	Shuster
Conyers	Lamborn	Simpson
Cook	Larsen (WA)	Smith (MO)
Cooper	Latta	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lawson (FL)	Smith (TX)
Crawford	Lewis (MN)	Smith (WA)
Cuellar	Lipinski	Speier
Culberson	Loudermilk	Stefanik
Davidson	Love	Stewart
Davis (CA)	Lucas	Takano
Davis, Danny	Luetkemeyer	Taylor
DeGette	Lujan Grisham, M.	Tenney
DelBene	Maloney, Carolyn B.	Thornberry
Demings	Marchant	Tiberi
Dent	Marino	Titus
DeSaulnier	Marshall	Trott
DesJarlais	Massie	Tsongas
Deutch	McCarthy	Vela
Dingell	McCaul	Wagner
Doggett	McClintock	Walden
Donovan	McCollum	Walker
Duncan (SC)	McEachin	Walorski
Duncan (TN)	McHenry	Walters, Mimi
Dunn	McMorris	Walz
Emmer	Rodgers	Wasserman
Engel	McNerney	Schultz
Eshoo	Meadows	Waters, Maxine
Espallat	Meehan	Welch
Estes (KS)	Meeks	Westerman
Evans	Messer	Williams
Ferguson	Moolenaar	Wilson (SC)
Fortenberry	Mooney (WV)	Womack
Foster	Moulton	Yarmuth
Frankel (FL)	Mullin	Yoho
Gabbard	Murphy (FL)	Young (IA)
Gallego	Nadler	Zeldin
Garamendi	Napolitano	
Gianforte		

NOT VOTING—11

Bridenstine
Larson (CT)
Lawson (FL)
Long

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1405

Mr. RUSH changed his vote from “aye” to “no.”

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.