

bill (H.R. 693) to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. SCHRADER) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 333, nays 96, not voting 3, as follows:

[Roll No. 510]

YEAS—333

Adams	Dean	Johnson (TX)
Aguilar	DeFazio	Joyce (OH)
Allred	DeGette	Joyce (PA)
Amodel	DeLauro	Kaptur
Arrington	DelBene	Katko
Axne	Delgado	Keating
Babin	Demings	Keller
Bacon	DeSaulnier	Kelly (IL)
Banks	Deutch	Kelly (PA)
Barragán	Diaz-Balart	Kennedy
Bass	Dingell	Khan
Beatty	Doggett	Kildee
Bera	Doyle, Michael	Kilmer
Beyer	F.	Kim
Bilirakis	Engel	Kind
Bishop (GA)	Escobar	King (NY)
Blumenauer	Eshoo	Kinziger
Blunt Rochester	Español	Kirkpatrick
Bonamici	Estes	Krishnamoorthi
Bost	Evans	Kuster (NH)
Boyle, Brendan	Finkenauer	LaHood
F.	Fitzpatrick	Lamb
Brindisi	Fletcher	Langevin
Brooks (IN)	Flores	Larsen (WA)
Brown (MD)	Fortenberry	Larson (CT)
Brownley (CA)	Foster	Latta
Buchanan	Frankel	Lawrence
Buck	Fudge	Lawson (FL)
Budd	Fulcher	Lee (CA)
Burchett	Gabbard	Lee (NV)
Burgess	Gallagher	Levin (CA)
Bustos	Gallego	Levin (MI)
Butterfield	Garamendi	Lewis
Calvert	Garcia (IL)	Lieu, Ted
Carbajal	Garcia (TX)	Lipinski
Cárdenas	Gianforte	Loeb
Carson (IN)	Golden	Lofgren
Carter (GA)	Gomez	Long
Cartwright	Gonzalez (OH)	Lowenthal
Case	Gonzalez (TX)	Lowe
Casten (IL)	Gooden	Luetkemeyer
Castor (FL)	Gottheimer	Lujan
Castro (TX)	Granger	Luria
Chabot	Green, Al (TX)	Lynch
Chu, Judy	Griffith	Malinowski
Ciçilline	Grijalva	Maloney
Cisneros	Grothman	Carolyn B.
Clark (MA)	Guest	Maloney, Sean
Clarke (NY)	Haaland	Marshall
Clay	Hagedorn	Mast
Cleaver	Harder (CA)	Matsui
Clyburn	Hastings	McAdams
Cohen	Hayes	McBath
Collins (NY)	Heck	McCaul
Connolly	Herrera Beutler	McCollum
Cook	Higgins (NY)	McEachin
Cooper	Hill (AR)	McGovern
Correa	Hill (CA)	McHenry
Costa	Himes	McKinley
Courtney	Horn, Kendra S.	McNerney
Cox (CA)	Horsford	Meeks
Craig	Houlahan	Meng
Crawford	Hoyer	Meuser
Crist	Hudson	Mitchell
Crow	Huffman	Moolenaar
Cuellar	Huizenga	Moore
Cummings	Hurd (TX)	Morelle
Cunningham	Jackson Lee	Moulton
Curtis	Jayapal	Mucarsel-Powell
Davids (KS)	Jeffries	Murphy
Davis (CA)	Johnson (GA)	Nadler
Davis, Danny K.	Johnson (LA)	Napolitano
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Neal

Neguse	Sarbanes
Norcross	Scanlon
O'Halleran	Schakowsky
Ocasio-Cortez	Schiff
Omar	Schneider
Pallone	Schrader
Panetta	Schrier
Pappas	Schweikert
Pascarell	Scott (VA)
Payne	Scott, David
Pence	Sensenbrenner
Perlmutter	Serrano
Perry	Sewell (AL)
Peters	Shalala
Peterson	Sherman
Phillips	Sherrill
Pingree	Shimkus
Pocan	Sires
Porter	Slotkin
Posey	Smith (NJ)
Pressley	Smith (WA)
Price (NC)	Smucker
Quigley	Soto
Raskin	Spanberger
Reed	Speier
Reschenthaler	Stanton
Rice (NY)	Staub
Rice (SC)	Stefanik
Richmond	Steil
Riggleman	Stevens
Rodgers (WA)	Stewart
Rooney (FL)	Stivers
Rose (NY)	Suozzi
Rouda	Swalwell (CA)
Roybal-Allard	Takano
Ruiz	Taylor
Ruppersberger	Thompson (CA)
Rush	Thompson (MS)
Ryan	Thompson (PA)
Sánchez	Tipton

NAYS—96

Abraham	Foxx (NC)	Mooney (WV)
Aderholt	Gibbs	Mullin
Allen	Gohmert	Newhouse
Amash	Gosar	Norman
Armstrong	Graves (GA)	Nunes
Baird	Graves (LA)	Olson
Balderson	Graves (MO)	Palazzo
Barr	Green (TN)	Palmer
Bergman	Guthrie	Ratcliffe
Biggs	Harris	Roby
Bishop (UT)	Hartzler	Roe, David P.
Brady	Hern, Kevin	Rogers (AL)
Brooks (AL)	Hice (GA)	Rogers (KY)
Buchson	Higgins (LA)	Rose, John W.
Byrne	Holding	Rouzer
Carter (TX)	Hollingsworth	Roy
Cheney	Hunter	Rutherford
Cline	Johnson (SD)	Scalise
Cloud	Jordan	Scott, Austin
Cole	Kelly (MS)	Simpson
Collins (GA)	King (IA)	Smith (MO)
Comer	Kustoff (TN)	Smith (NE)
Conaway	LaMalfa	Spano
Crenshaw	Lamborn	Steube
Davidson (OH)	Lesko	Thornberry
DesJarlais	Loudermilk	Timmons
Duffy	Lucas	Webster (FL)
Duncan	Marchant	Westerman
Dunn	Massie	Womack
Emmer	McCarthy	Woodall
Ferguson	Meadows	Wright
Fleischmann	Miller	Young

NOT VOTING—3

Gaetz	McClintock	Visclosky
-------	------------	-----------

□ 1358

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

#### REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of H.R. 962,

the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COURTNEY). Under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

Mr. CRENSHAW. Mr. Speaker, I urge the Speaker to immediately schedule this important bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

#### BIPARTISAN BUDGET ACT OF 2019

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 519, I call up the bill (H.R. 3877) to amend the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, to establish a congressional budget for fiscal years 2020 and 2021, to temporarily suspend the debt limit, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 519, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 3877

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019”.

#### TITLE I—BUDGET ENFORCEMENT

##### SEC. 101. AMENDMENTS TO THE BALANCED BUDGET AND EMERGENCY DEFICIT CONTROL ACT OF 1985.

(a) REVISED DISCRETIONARY SPENDING LIMITS.—Section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)) is amended by striking paragraphs (7) and (8) and inserting the following:

“(7) for fiscal year 2020—

“(A) for the revised security category, \$666,500,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, \$621,500,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(8) for fiscal year 2021—

“(A) for the revised security category, \$671,500,000,000 in new budget authority; and

“(B) for the revised nonsecurity category, \$626,500,000,000 in new budget authority.”

(b) OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS AMOUNTS.—In fiscal years 2020 and 2021, the adjustments under section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)) for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism appropriations will be as follows:

(1) For the revised nonsecurity category—

(A) for fiscal year 2020, \$8,000,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2021, \$8,000,000,000.

(2) For the revised security category—

(A) for fiscal year 2020, \$71,500,000,000; and

(B) for fiscal year 2021, \$69,000,000,000.

This subsection shall not affect the applicability of section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(c) NEW ADJUSTMENT FOR THE U.S. CENSUS FOR 2020.—Section 251(b)(2) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)) is amended by adding at the end the following new subparagraph:

“(G) THE 2020 CENSUS.—If, for fiscal year 2020, appropriations for the Periodic Censuses and Programs account of the Bureau of the Census of the Department of Commerce are enacted that the Congress designates in statute as being for the 2020 Census, then the adjustment for that fiscal year shall be the total of such appropriations for that fiscal year designated as being for the 2020 Census, but shall not exceed \$2,500,000,000.”.

(d) DIRECT SPENDING ADJUSTMENTS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2020 AND 2021.—Section 251A of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a), is amended—

(1) in paragraph (5)(B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “and (12)” and inserting “(12), and (13)”; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

“(13) IMPLEMENTING DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS FOR FISCAL YEARS 2020 AND 2021.—(A) OMB shall make the calculations necessary to implement the direct spending reductions calculated pursuant to paragraphs (3) and (4) without regard to the amendment made to section 251(c) revising the discretionary spending limits for fiscal years 2020 and 2021 by the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019.

“(B) Paragraph (5)(B) shall not be implemented for fiscal years 2020 and 2021.”.

#### SEC. 102. BALANCES ON THE PAYGO SCORECARDS.

Effective on the date of the enactment of this Act, the balances on the PAYGO scorecards established pursuant to paragraphs (4) and (5) of section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)) shall be zero.

### TITLE II—ESTABLISHING A CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET

#### SEC. 201. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

Upon the date of the enactment of this Act—

(1) the Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels included in the statement referred to in section 1(b) of House Resolution 293 (116th Congress) consistent with this Act; and

(2) subsections (e), (f), and (g) of section 1 of House Resolution 293 (116th Congress) shall have no force or effect through the remainder of the One Hundred Sixteenth Congress.

#### SEC. 202. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2021.—If a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 has not been adopted by April 15, 2020, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 for fiscal year 2021, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the House of Representatives after April 15, 2020, in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2021 and for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—In the House of Representatives, the Chair of the Committee on the Budget shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record after April 15, 2020, but not later than May 15, 2020, containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2021 consistent with discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c)(8) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, and the outlays flowing therefrom, and committee allocations for fiscal year 2021 for current

law mandatory budget authority and outlays, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(2) for all committees of the House of Representatives other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2021 and for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted, to the extent practicable, for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974;

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2021 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal year 2021 and for the period of fiscal years 2021 through 2030 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted, to the extent practicable, for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

(c) ADDITIONAL MATTER.—The statement referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2021 the matter contained in the provisions referred to in subsection (e).

(d) ADJUSTMENTS.—The Chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels included in the statement referred to in subsection (b)—

(1) to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's updates to its baseline for fiscal years 2021 through 2030; or

(2) for any bill, joint resolution, amendment, or conference report by the amounts provided in such measure if such measure would not increase the deficit for either of the following time periods: fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 2025 or fiscal year 2021 to fiscal year 2030.

(e) APPLICATION.—

(1) Upon submission of the statement referred to in subsection (b), all references to allocations, aggregates, or other appropriate levels in “this concurrent resolution” in sections 5201, 5202, and 5203 of the House Concurrent Resolution 71 (115th Congress), specified in section 30104(f)(1) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, and continued in effect by section 103(m) of House Resolution 6 (116th Congress) and section 1(h)(1) of House Resolution 293 (116th Congress), shall be treated for all purposes in the House of Representatives as references to the allocations, aggregates, or other appropriate levels contained in the statement referred to in subsection (b), as adjusted in accordance with this or any other Act.

(2) The provisions of House Concurrent Resolution 71 (115th Congress), specified in section 30104(f)(1) of the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2018, shall have no force or effect in the House of Representatives except for the sections of such concurrent resolution identified in paragraph (1).

(f) EXPIRATION.—Subsections (a) through (e) shall no longer apply if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 203. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) IN GENERAL.—In the House of Representatives, except as provided in sub-

section (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide an advance appropriation.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, activities or accounts identified in lists submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chair of the Committee on the Budget—

(1) for fiscal year 2022, under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority, and for fiscal year 2023, accounts separately identified under the same heading; and

(2) for fiscal year 2022, under the heading “Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) DEFINITION.—The term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2021, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available following fiscal year 2021.

(d) EXPIRATION.—The preceding subsections of this section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974.

#### SEC. 204. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.

(a) FISCAL YEAR 2020.—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2020 and for fiscal years 2021 through 2029.

(b) COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable after the date of enactment of this Act that includes—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, committee allocations for fiscal year 2020 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2020, 2020 through 2024, and 2020 through 2029 consistent with the May 2019 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2020 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2020, 2020 through 2024, and 2020 through 2029 consistent with the May 2019 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on

the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642); and

(5) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2020, 2020 through 2024, and 2020 through 2029 consistent with the May 2019 baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline was issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633, 642).

(c) **ADDITIONAL MATTER.**—The filing referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2020 the deficit-neutral reserve funds in title III of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, updated by two fiscal years.

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—This section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2020 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

#### **SEC. 205. AUTHORITY FOR FISCAL YEAR 2021 BUDGET RESOLUTION IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **FISCAL YEAR 2021.**—For the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.), after April 15, 2020, and enforcing budgetary points of order in prior concurrent resolutions on the budget, the allocations, aggregates, and levels provided for in subsection (b) shall apply in the Senate in the same manner as for a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 with appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal year 2021 and for fiscal years 2022 through 2030.

(b) **COMMITTEE ALLOCATIONS, AGGREGATES, AND LEVELS.**—After April 15, 2020, but not later than May 15, 2020, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall file—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate, committee allocations for fiscal year 2021 consistent with the discretionary spending limits set forth in section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, as amended by this Act, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633);

(2) for all committees other than the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal years 2021, 2021 through 2025, and 2021 through 2030 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(3) aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2021 in accordance with the allocations established under paragraphs (1) and (2), for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642);

(4) aggregate revenue levels for fiscal years 2021, 2021 through 2025, and 2021 through 2030 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing section 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 642); and

(5) levels of Social Security revenues and outlays for fiscal years 2021, 2021 through

2025, and 2021 through 2030 consistent with the most recent baseline of the Congressional Budget Office, as adjusted for the budgetary effects of any provision of law enacted during the period beginning on the date such baseline is issued and ending on the date of submission of such statement, for the purpose of enforcing sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633, 642).

(c) **ADDITIONAL MATTER.**—The filing referred to in subsection (b) may also include for fiscal year 2021 the deficit-neutral reserve funds in title III of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018, updated by three fiscal years.

(d) **EXPIRATION.**—This section shall expire if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 is agreed to by the Senate and the House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

#### **SEC. 206. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—

(A) **POINT OF ORDER.**—Except as provided in paragraph (2), it shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that would provide an advance appropriation for a discretionary account.

(B) **DEFINITION.**—In this subsection, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2020 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2020 or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2021 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2021.

(2) **EXCEPTIONS.**—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(A) for fiscal years 2021 and 2022 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in a statement submitted to the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate under the heading “Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations” in an aggregate amount not to exceed \$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority in each fiscal year;

(B) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(C) for the Department of Veterans Affairs for the Medical Services, Medical Support and Compliance, Veterans Medical Community Care, and Medical Facilities accounts of the Veterans Health Administration.

(3) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—

(A) **WAIVER.**—In the Senate, paragraph (1) may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn.

(B) **APPEAL.**—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 paragraph (1).

(4) **FORM OF POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under paragraph (1) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(5) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this subsection, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or amendment between the Houses shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the

question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this paragraph), no further amendment shall be in order.

(b) **SUNSET.**—Subsection (a) shall terminate on the date on which a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2021 is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives pursuant to section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632).

#### **SEC. 207. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “CHIMP” 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 (2 U.S.C. 902) (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision was included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

(2) results in a net decrease in budget authority in the budget year, but does not result in a net decrease in outlays over the period of the total of the current year, the budget year, and all fiscal years covered under the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget.

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, that includes a CHIMP that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such CHIMPs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (2).

(2) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is, for fiscal year 2021, \$15,000,000,000.

(c) **DETERMINATION.**—For purposes of this section, budgetary levels shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (b) may be waived or suspended 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 (b).

#### **SEC. 208. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision that designates funds for fiscal years 2020 or 2021 for overseas contingency operations, in accordance with section 251(b)(2)(A) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)(2)(A)), and the point of order is sustained by the Chair, that provision shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(b) **FORM OF THE POINT OF ORDER.**—A point of order under subsection (a) may be raised by a Senator as provided in section 313(e) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 644(e)).

(c) **CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—When the Senate is considering a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to, a bill or joint resolution, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to subsection (a), and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report or House amendment shall be stricken, and the Senate shall proceed to consider the question of whether the Senate shall recede from its amendment and concur with a further amendment, or concur in the House amendment with a further amendment, as the case may be, which further amendment shall consist of only that portion of the conference report or House amendment, as the case may be, not so stricken. Any such motion in the Senate shall be debatable. In any case in which such point of order is sustained against a conference report (or Senate amendment derived from such conference report by operation of this subsection), no further amendment shall be in order.

(d) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this section may be waived or suspended only by an affirmative vote of three-fifths of the Members, duly chosen and sworn. An affirmative vote of three-fifths of 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 this section.

(e) **SUSPENSION OF POINT OF ORDER.**—This section shall not apply if a declaration of war by Congress is in effect.

#### **SEC. 209. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The sections of this title are enacted by the Congress—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives and the Senate, respectively, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of each House, respectively, or of that House to which they specifically apply, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent therewith; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of either House to change such rules (so far as relating to such House) at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as in the case of any other rule of such House.

#### **TITLE III—TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT**

##### **SEC. 301. TEMPORARY EXTENSION OF PUBLIC DEBT LIMIT.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall not apply for the period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act and ending on July 31, 2021.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE RELATING TO OBLIGATIONS ISSUED DURING EXTENSION PERIOD.**—Effective on August 1, 2021, the limitation in effect under section 3101(b) of title 31, United States Code, shall be increased to the extent that—

(1) the face amount of obligations issued under chapter 31 of such title and the face amount of obligations whose principal and interest are guaranteed by the United States Government (except guaranteed obligations held by the Secretary of the Treasury) outstanding on August 1, 2021, exceeds

(2) the face amount of such obligations outstanding on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(c) **EXTENSION LIMITED TO NECESSARY OBLIGATIONS.**—An obligation shall not be taken into account under subsection (b)(1) unless the issuance of such obligation was necessary to fund a commitment incurred pur-

suant to law by the Federal Government that required payment before August 1, 2021.

#### **TITLE IV—OFFSETS**

##### **SEC. 401. CUSTOMS USER FEES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Section 13031(j)(3) of the Consolidated Omnibus Budget Reconciliation Act of 1985 (19 U.S.C. 58c(j)(3)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (A), by striking “October 20, 2027” and inserting “September 30, 2029”; and

(2) in subparagraph (B)(i), by striking “September 30, 2027” and inserting “September 30, 2029”.

(b) **RATE FOR MERCHANDISE PROCESSING FEES.**—Section 503 of the United States–Korea Free Trade Agreement Implementation Act (Public Law 112–41; 19 U.S.C. 3805 note) is amended by striking “May 26, 2027” and inserting “September 30, 2029”.

##### **SEC. 402. EXTENSION OF DIRECT SPENDING REDUCTIONS THROUGH FISCAL YEAR 2029.**

Section 251A(6) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901a(6)) is amended—

(1) in subparagraph (B), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “fiscal years 2022 through 2027” and inserting “fiscal years 2022 through 2029”; and

(2) in subparagraph (C), in the matter preceding clause (i), by striking “fiscal year 2027” and inserting “fiscal year 2029”.

#### **TITLE V—BUDGETARY EFFECTS**

##### **SEC. 501. BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on either PAYGO scorecard maintained pursuant to section 4(d) of the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010 (2 U.S.C. 933(d)).

(b) **SENATE PAYGO SCORECARDS.**—The budgetary effects of this Act shall not be entered on any PAYGO scorecard maintained for purposes of section 4106 of H. Con. Res. 71 (115th Congress).

The **SPEAKER** pro tempore. The bill shall be debatable for 1 hour, equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

#### **GENERAL LEAVE**

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and insert extraneous material into the RECORD on H.R. 3877.

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

There was no objection.

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

Mr. Speaker, today, we have an opportunity to advance bipartisan legislation that will help secure a stronger future for American families and our Nation's economy.

The 2-year budget caps deal we are now debating raises the debt ceiling and increases the budget caps for 2020 and 2021. It stops extreme sequestration cuts of \$125 billion from being implemented, helps us avoid another devastating government shutdown, and establishes a realistic budgetary frame-

work so that we can make critical investments in our Nation's people and prosperity.

This budget agreement represents a vast improvement over the harmful cuts contained in the President's 2020 budget proposal. It rejects the Trump budget's 9 percent cut to nondefense discretionary spending that would have weakened national and economic security, endangered public health, and crippled critical programs that support American families.

Instead, this bill will allow us to make strong investments in everything from K–12 education and infrastructure to research and development, clean energy, and veterans' healthcare.

This is about finally moving us past the threat of sequestration. It is about upholding the full faith and credit of the United States. And it is about providing much-needed certainty to our communities and for our economy.

This bipartisan agreement is a victory for the American people. In the most divisive and polarizing environment in our lifetimes, it is a much-needed example of Congress coming together to prioritize the American people over self-serving politics.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to fulfill our obligations to govern and ensure we meet the needs and priorities of the American people by passing this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, one of the most fundamental duties of Congress is to fund the government. I am pleased that, after months of uncertainty, a budget agreement has been reached, thanks to the work of the President, his Cabinet, and the Congress.

This 2-year funding deal ends the threat of sequestration and continues to improve our military strength. It doubles down on our commitment to serving and protecting the American people by enhancing the United States' defense capabilities and ensuring our courageous troops have the resources they need to deter, fight, and win.

It wasn't that long ago, Mr. Speaker, that our military was in the midst of a readiness crisis. It would be irresponsible, in my strong opinion, to retreat back to that point. This deal helps us prevent that.

The legislation averts a \$71 billion cut to defense that would have taken place early next year, absent an agreement.

Mr. Speaker, I am a 30-year veteran of the Arkansas National Guard, one deployment under my belt. I chair the Board of Visitors at the United States Military Academy at West Point, and I recognize the rise of the threat facing us around the globe. I also understand the devastation a sequester would cause.

It is not something that we can allow to happen, and I have seen the numbers floating around about what Congress is about to do.

Let me be clear, Mr. Speaker. The sequester numbers that would have taken place if this Congress didn't act were never going to happen. Anybody who suggests that we were going to cut \$71 billion from national defense is not being intellectually honest. We were not going to allow that to happen.

Mr. Speaker, this bill also takes the chaos that would ensue following another government shutdown off the table. Nobody in this room likes continuing resolutions or big omnibus packages. We take those off the table.

Now, I will be honest. This is not a perfect deal. It is not the bill I would have written if I were just a Congress of one. No compromise in any serious negotiation where there are two competing sides will ever result in a perfect outcome. But it does allow us to move forward with a measure of stability for our economy.

Again, I highlight that these negotiations brought forward an important agreement in which there will be no poison pills in the funding bills for this year or next and a concerted effort to strive toward no shutdowns and no large omnibus packages.

Any compromise involves hard choices. I don't know of a committee in the Congress, in the House of Representatives, that has to make more hard choices than the people who gather around that Committee on Appropriations markup room.

For our distinguished chairwoman, NITA LOWEY, and all of my fellow appropriators who have a lot of requests, there are never enough resources to meet all of them, but we have to make some very hard choices.

Then, let's not forget the real and practical impact of our current debt and the deficits that add to that debt. We need to put America back on a responsible fiscal path. While I support the progress we have made in this bill, I feel strongly that Congress must address the looming crisis of our debt for our children and our grandchildren.

But here is an inconvenient truth: Total discretionary spending, when I came to Congress, was almost \$1.3 trillion. That was what we spent on the discretionary budget of the U.S. Government. That is the part of government that most people identify with. Next year, under this caps agreement, discretionary spending is going to be just under \$1.4 trillion. That is not much of an increase over a 10-year period.

To put it in perspective, discretionary spending was 9 percent of GDP when I came to Congress. It is down to 6 percent now.

If you look at the CBO report that we highlighted earlier this year, CBO says—their words—as a percentage of the economy, discretionary spending is going down, and mandatory spending continues to skyrocket.

The year before I came to Congress, mandatory spending was 61 percent of the Federal budget. Today, it is about 70 percent of the Federal budget.

Mandatory spending is putting intense pressure on a lot of programs on the discretionary side that a lot of America relies on.

I think we have to fix that. I don't know what the answer is, but I do know this, Mr. Speaker. I know one of the answers is that we have to get back to regular order.

I can't say it any clearer. We haven't done the budget process that is enshrined in the 1974 Budget Act since I have been in Congress. In fact, most people in Congress look at how we do things now—CRs, omnibus, shutdowns, those kinds of things—as normal. It is anything but normal.

I know my friend, Mr. YARMUTH, and I worked very hard, as did Mrs. LOWEY, on the Joint Select Committee on Budget Process Reform last year. We got close. We made a few recommendations. We couldn't quite meet the threshold for reporting, but we took a stab at it. I hope we can elevate that discussion in the 116th Congress and have some success doing that.

Today, we are here to vote on a bipartisan bill, a bill that has been carefully negotiated over weeks with competing interests. The administration has been involved, with Mr. Mnuchin representing the President, and the four corners of leadership. Not the most ideal way to come up with an answer or a solution, but it is what we have today.

Mr. Speaker, with all the things that we have in front of us, let's take the chaos off the table, and let's pass this deal. Then, maybe—maybe—we can elevate the conversation to talk about the real drivers of the deficit and the debt in this country when we come back and as we move into the remainder of this year.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New York (Mrs. LOWEY), the chair of the Appropriations Committee.

Mrs. LOWEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 3877.

For months, House Democrats have insisted on raising unworkable budget caps so Congress can responsibly fund our government and uphold our commitments to American families.

Unless Congress and the President act, the United States will face \$125 billion in devastating cuts that will hurt American families and weaken our national security.

That is why this bipartisan legislation to avoid this fiscal cliff is so critical. It thoroughly rejects the President's slash-and-burn budget proposal, which would have pulled the rug out from under families and communities by decimating initiatives and services that make a real difference in people's lives.

Instead of reckless cuts, Democrats were successful in securing the largest-ever increase in base funding above sequestration levels. With these more

reasonable budget caps, we can undertake an orderly appropriations process to invest in critical domestic priorities for the people.

While this bipartisan deal represents a compromise, I am proud that it ends the senseless austerity of the Budget Control Act once and for all.

I urge support for this legislation, so that we can help give every American a better chance at a better life.

□ 1415

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), the distinguished Republican whip.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to associate myself with the remarks made by my friend, the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) who talked about the importance of what we need to do to get back into a position where we can get control over spending.

There are people that are running around right now trying to pit our Nation's defense against balancing the Federal budget.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, it is a false choice because if you zeroed out the entire Department of Defense's budget, which I hope no one would embrace, if you zeroed it out, you would still have a deficit. So, clearly, it is not the Department of Defense that is the problem. We need a strong national defense.

President Trump has been rebuilding our military. We need to keep rebuilding our military.

Mr. Speaker, we had more men and women die in training exercises than dying in combat over the last 3 years, by a 5-to-1 margin. It was less safe to train to be in the military in the United States of America than it was to go into combat, because they didn't have the tools they needed. Planes were falling out of the sky because they didn't have spare parts.

We have finally started to address that. The last thing we want to do is go backward on that success. And I don't think anybody in this building, voting "yes" or "no," understands or would agree with the idea that if a "no" vote were to be successful, we would have a \$71 billion cut to our Nation's defense, which is one of our prime constitutional responsibilities.

So we have got to get back to solving the real problems with deficits; and we all know where that is coming from, the mandatory side.

We had a bill just in the last Congress that would have cut over \$800 billion, while improving the healthcare of the people of our country. And if there are better ways to go and fix these broken programs, then please put those on the table. But we need to go back to that.

But in this bill, not only does it allow the President to keep rebuilding our military, it actually protects the pro-life gains that we have made. We have made incredible gains to protect innocent life.

That is why groups like National Right to Life have said such strong things about why this is so important; why President Trump needs this bill so that he can rebuild our military, and keep building wall and border security, which is so important. We have to secure our border. This bill includes the ability for the President to do that as well.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. MOULTON), the vice chair of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MOULTON. Mr. Speaker, this agreement is a good step forward; not a great step, but a good step.

As vice chairman of the Budget Committee, and a veteran who serves on the Armed Services Committee, I want to speak for a moment about its impact on our national security.

This bill turns our attention to confronting and out-competing our adversaries. And partly, it does so by ending the threat of sequestration.

Now, we all know that the Budget Control Act was established with the tool of sequestration in an effort to improve our budgeting process to, in fact, address our debt, which itself is a threat to our national security. But we also know that that hasn't worked. And in the meantime, our national security, our defense budgeting is at risk.

This bill not only ends that; it also creates parity in increased defense investments with domestic investments. That is a big deal, because it means we will spend as much on the dignity of Americans as we will on their defense.

But it is also important to note that a lot of defense functions, a lot of things that ensure our national security fall under nondefense discretionary spending; things like investing in veterans' healthcare, investing in embassy security. In fact, the entire investment we make in the Department of Homeland Security falls under nondefense discretionary spending, and we increase that significantly with this deal.

But let's not kid ourselves. This deal is not perfect. America is racking up a huge credit card bill which our kids will have to pay. It has skyrocketed under this President and his massive tax cut for the wealthiest few, and this bill does not address that.

And while I don't love that this bill was negotiated behind closed doors, it proves there is middle ground, and it strips Congress of those draconian tools in the Budget Control Act that made that middle ground hard to find.

Chairman YARMUTH and his team have done us a tremendous service. This deal buys us the time and the opportunity to fix the budgeting process, and I hope we will use it.

In the window this creates, where we aren't negotiating under gunpoint, let's fix Congress and create a next-generation budgeting process where there is thoughtful debate and, ultimately, consensus around a fiscally responsible bill. We can get there. We can

start today, and we can begin by passing this bill.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Fort Worth, Texas (Ms. GRANGER), the ranking member on the House Appropriations Committee and a former mayor. I believe mayors have a pretty good idea of what it takes to get things done when there are competing interests.

Ms. GRANGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3877. I am proud to support this 2-year budget agreement, because the alternative, not having an agreement, is simply not an option.

I want all Members to understand the importance of this bill in front of us. This deal keeps our economy on solid ground because the United States will avoid defaulting on our financial obligations. Think of that.

With this agreement, we continue to invest in rebuilding our Nation's defense and protecting our strategic interests around the world. The threat of terrorism continues, and Russian, Chinese, and Iranian aggression is on the rise. It is critical that our military is ready to meet and defeat all threats.

Unfortunately, unless we pass this bill, our military and our veterans would face arbitrary cuts that would be harmful to our security and that of our partners, like Israel and Jordan.

When I was the chairwoman of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I worked with the Secretary of Defense to put together a plan to rebuild our military. He said it would take 5 years.

We have only appropriated the funds that were needed for two of those years. We should continue that. If this bill does not pass, the impending cuts will have a devastating impact on our national security.

Our Constitution explicitly states that the Congress provides for the common defense. If we don't pass this bill, we have failed to live up to our Constitutional responsibilities, and I am not willing to do that.

Not only does this budget agreement stabilize funding for our Nation's military over the next 2 years, it also sets up a framework to prevent harmful "poison pill" riders from being included in must-pass funding bills.

Finally, this agreement sets us on a path to complete an orderly appropriations process and avoid a costly government shutdown.

Our President should be commended for negotiating with Congressional leaders to protect key conservative priorities, from maintaining our position as the most powerful military in the world, to protecting the life of the unborn.

I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for this bill and sending it to the President's desk quickly for a signature.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. SMITH), the chairman of the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. SMITH of Washington. Mr. Speaker, it is crucially important that

we pass this bill. The most fundamental responsibility of government is to fund the government and operate. And as simple as that may sound, over the course of the last 8 years, we have repeatedly failed to do that.

We have had several government shutdowns, countless other threatened government shutdowns, continuing resolutions, and a steady failure to even come close to meeting the October 1st deadline for funding the discretionary portion of the government; and that has had a devastating impact.

Certainly, we have heard on a number of occasions about the impact it has had on our national security. The Department of Defense has not been able to plan its budget for too many years. It has led to inconsistency and, as we have heard, it has led to a readiness crisis.

But this applies also to the non-defense discretionary portion of the budget; to infrastructure, and healthcare, and education, and housing. All of those items have been under uncertainty for too long over the course of the last 8 years.

This budget agreement, though not perfect, funds the government and, I believe, responsibly funds the government, both defense and nondefense.

I really want to commend both Secretary Mnuchin and Speaker PELOSI for coming together and negotiating this agreement. There is no secret that we have big differences between the Democratically controlled House and the White House and the Republican-controlled Senate. But despite those differences, we have to function. We have to be able to fund the government and meet our responsibilities to the American people.

They were able to transcend those differences, get this deal done, and fund the government in a responsible way.

Now, it is absolutely true that the debt and the deficit are still a problem. I know there are many people out there who say that it is not. I just don't see how those numbers add up. You cannot continually spend more money than you take in before it becomes a problem. We need to responsibly address that issue.

I don't think it was responsible to cut taxes by nearly \$2 trillion in the face of that. I certainly also think that defense has to be part of that conversation.

The gentleman earlier said, well, you could zero out the defense budget and it wouldn't make any difference. Well, the defense budget is 17 percent of the budget. If you are 17 percent of a budget that is massively in debt, you are at least part of the problem.

I mean, you can take any one piece of the budget and say, well, that is not the problem. In fact, that is kind of what we have been doing. We have been taking piece by piece and saying, well, we can't cut that; we can't raise that tax.

Meanwhile, we have been insisting on a dollar's worth of government for 80



cents worth of taxes. In the long run, people will pay the price for that. In the short term we have to responsibly fund the government. That is exactly what this bill does.

Again, I thank the leadership that brought this to be, and I urge support and passage of this bill.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Corona, California (Mr. CALVERT), who is the ranking member on the Appropriations Committee that funds the national defense of this country.

Mr. CALVERT. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bipartisan Budget Deal of 2019. Like many of my colleagues, there are parts of the deal I object to and parts I strongly support.

As ranking member of the Defense Appropriations Subcommittee, I would have preferred a higher top line for defense than \$738 billion. However, we will always choose certainty and on-time appropriations rather than another destructive CR.

Right now, our military is at an inflection point. As our military readiness returns to appropriate operational levels, we must continue to push forward on modernization efforts that will continue America's superiority on land, sea, air, and space into the next century.

Just as former Secretary Mattis woke Americans up to the dire circumstances of our readiness levels, Americans are now beginning to understand that our military superiority can no longer be assumed against near-peer adversaries such as Russia and China.

Whether it is hypersonics, low-yield nuclear weapons, artificial intelligence, or the militarization of space, the gap has closed.

The 2-year budget deal before us today provides the certainty for our military to do what they do best, prepare to win the next war in the hopes that our military might will deter any would-be competitor from ever starting that war.

I know many of my conservative friends are concerned about more deficit spending and adding to our \$22 trillion debt. I share that concern, but we need to look at the full budget picture. Mandatory spending, if you include interest on the debt, now consumes 72 percent of the Federal budget.

National defense actually accounts for 15.6 percent of the budget. That leaves only about 12 percent left in the pie. We cannot balance our budget on the back of 12 percent nondefense discretionary spending. The math does not work.

In fact, since 2010, because of the BCA, accounting for inflation, we have reduced nondefense discretionary spending by 4.65 percent, and we have reduced defense discretionary by 17.2 percent.

To my friends on the left, we cannot continue to ignore realities of mandatory spending and simply spend more on the discretionary side with no regard to the future. And the solutions need not be drastic.

Slowing the rate of growth and making commonsense reforms for future generations would relieve the pressure and allow us to finally have a plan to pay down the debt.

The bill before us is not perfect. That is the nature of compromise. But my "yes" vote is in support of the brave men and women who wear the uniform. It is our duty to support them and their missions.

However, I do not vote blind to our budget reality, which, if left unchecked, will consume our entire budget.

I urge my colleagues to support the bill, end the failed experiment of the BCA, and commit to true budget reform that will address our mounting debt.

□ 1430

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Ohio (Ms. KAPTUR), a distinguished member of the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I thank you so very much, Chairman YARMUTH, for yielding time to speak and rise to support this 2-year budget caps and debt ceiling agreement that is before us and urge all of our colleagues to do the same.

This agreement is not perfect. Frankly, it is a difficult vote, given the hard work that our Appropriations Committee has undertaken to diligently write, debate, mark up and pass 10 of our 12 fiscal year 2020 annual spending bills through this Chamber. The other two were written and reported out of committee.

We will have to make hard choices as we work with the Senate to allocate these funds among the 12 subcommittee bills, but as an appropriator, I intimately understand Congress' top responsibility is to keep the ship of state running, ensuring an open, funded, and fully functional government of the United States.

I also know from experience that the full faith and credit of our government can never be questioned. Every one of our constituents deserves this recognition from their elected Member, and this agreement moves Congress past the devastating threats imposed under the Budget Control Act of 2011. Thank goodness.

It avoids deep, automatic cuts that would devastate government's ability to help the American people and meet our obligations to them, including the most vulnerable.

This agreement rejects the devastating cuts the President's fiscal year 2020 budget proposed and maintains significant funding levels for domestic priorities and defense priorities alike.

Most importantly, this agreement moves us a step closer to finalizing appropriate allocation of all our Federal dollars responsibly.

Mr. Speaker, I commend our leadership efforts on both sides of the aisle to

reach a final consensus and bring this bipartisan agreement to the floor. This agreement reflects give-and-take from all sides of Congress and the White House, and it is deserving of a strong bipartisan showing of support from this body.

Let's govern.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, on occasion it is important to reach out to the rural areas of our country for wisdom, and we are going to reach out to west Texas, near Clarendon, Texas. I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. THORNBERRY), my friend, the Republican lead on the House Armed Services Committee.

Mr. THORNBERRY. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman yielding.

As the current occupant of the chair will remember, on February 6, 2018, just last year, Secretary of Defense Mattis testified: "Let me be clear, as hard as the last 16 years of war have been, no enemy in the field has done more harm to the readiness of the United States military than the combined impact of the Budget Control Act's defense spending caps, worsened by operating in 10 of the last 11 years under continuing resolutions of varied and unpredictable duration."

Mr. Speaker, this bill before us now fixes, finally, the problems that Secretary Mattis pointed to in his testimony last year, for, as members will recall, starting in 2010, with the responsibility of both Republicans and Democrats, both the White House and Congress, defense spending went down, in real terms, about 20 percent.

And we are not just talking numbers. We are talking increased aircraft accidents. We are talking tragic accidents at sea where sailors were killed. We are talking in all the services, a number of training accidents and malfunctions that had real consequences to the human beings who volunteer to protect our country.

Now, the last 2 years—again, on a bipartisan basis—we have begun to turn that around. We have begun to improve our readiness, begun to improve training, begun, as the gentleman from California was talking about, to narrow some of the gaps that have developed on key technologies with other adversaries. But the job is not done yet. We have to continue that momentum.

While the underlying bill before us does not provide for as much defense spending as I believe we should spend, the certainty of a 2-year deal having more money for defense than was originally in the underlying House budget, all of those things, to me, say the right thing to do is to pass this.

I know Members can find some excuse about what is in the bill they don't like or what is not in the bill that they wish it were. Any sort of legislation that is a result of compromise between two parties, two Houses of Congress, two branches of government, is going to yield that sort of result.

But, Mr. Speaker, we cannot forget that the first function of government is

to provide for the common defense; and the Nation and, especially, the men and women who serve and their families depend upon us doing our job under the Constitution.

Article I, section 8 says it is our job to raise and support, provide and maintain. This bill helps us fulfill that responsibility, and it should be passed.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), the majority leader of the House of Representatives.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished chairman, Mr. YARMUTH, the chairman of the Budget Committee, for yielding.

I thank Mr. WOMACK for his leadership, both as chairman, now as ranking member on the committee, as we look to pursue fiscally responsible paths, but also fiscal paths that will invest, knowing the national security from the defense standpoint, but the national security from the domestic standpoint.

Obviously, if we have a strong defense but our education system is wanting, our economic system is wanting, our healthcare system is wanting, we will have a national security problem.

Mr. Speaker, I rise, therefore, in support of this bipartisan legislation, which formalizes the agreement reached earlier this week by Speaker PELOSI and Secretary Mnuchin on behalf of the President. It has the support of Senators SCHUMER, MCCONNELL—the Republican leader—and the House Republican leader, Mr. MCCARTHY.

This is what we have been working toward for a very long time, and I am pleased that we are able to secure an agreement before the end of the July work period. This will provide certainty for the American people by providing the top-line guidance necessary for appropriators and the full House and Senate to complete work on funding the government for fiscal year 2020. Ideally, we would do that before September 30 of the coming months.

But this agreement was made possible by virtue of, in my view, the fact that we passed 10 appropriations bills to fund 96 percent of the government before the end of June. That hasn't been done before.

Now, there have been 10 bills passed back in 2006, 13 years ago, but it did not include Labor-Health, so it left out a very big chunk of government funding.

I am proud of the fact that we did that, but it also set a mark. It set an objective. It set, through the chairman's deeming, the numbers that the appropriators could mark up their bills, that we could mark them up in June. It set an expectation of what we could do and should do.

It was also achievable because Democrats were united in our determination to deliver our promise to end the constant brinksmanship that characterized the last several years and restore responsible government for the people.

It is also, in my view, a result of the fact that Secretary Mnuchin wanted to

have a fiscally responsible and knowable end to the differences between the two parties, which undermined our economic security and undermined the confidence of the American people and the international community in the financial stability of our country.

To that end, I am glad that this agreement also suspends the debt limit.

Very frankly, Mr. Speaker, we ought to do away with the debt limit. It is a phony issue. It bears no relation to reality. It is just a game. It is a political gimmick, an item of demagoguery for the Members.

Very frankly, we set a debt limit when we buy something or we borrow something. The United States is going to pay for what it buys, and it is going to pay back what it borrows. That is the debt limit.

This phony number that we are now suspending for a couple of years, I think that is what we should do. But, frankly, if it were up to me, I would do away with the debt limit, not because I don't want to see us bring down the debt, but because I think it bears no relationship to our needs, our challenges, our opportunities.

Those who would have held hostage the full faith and credit of the United States, as some have done in the past to demand partisan concessions, will be prevented from throwing the legislative process into chaos as they have done.

With the threat of default gone and the danger of sequester-level budget cuts removed—and thank goodness, we will see the end of the sequester, which, as I said, bore no relationship to needs and opportunities and responsibilities. With that threat gone, we can now move forward together to invest in fighting poverty, expanding opportunities, strengthening our communities, and, yes, defending our Nation and our allies.

I want to thank Chairman YARMUTH, Chairwoman LOWEY, Chairman NEAL, and Ranking Member WOMACK, who is my friend and who I think is a very responsible, constructive Member of the Congress of the United States trying to work toward fiscal responsibility.

Let there be no mistake: We are going to have to make some tough decisions in the years ahead to make sure that our fiscal house is in order.

Mr. Speaker, the American people ought to know we are receiving the lowest revenue in a very long time, I don't know whether in history—probably not in history—but a very low level of revenue to the government. But we are buying a lot of stuff, and we have got to bring those in balance, what we are willing to pay for and what we need to buy, whether it is in services, either on Social Security or Medicare or anything else, or on operating expenses, on an annual basis.

This is an example, Mr. Speaker, of how we can restore the faith of the American people in their government—

avoid a shutdown, act responsibly, reach agreements, create consensus—by showing them we can be responsible stewards of the economy, that we can advance our democratic values and priorities through bipartisan means, and that we can demonstrate that government can work for the people it serves.

I hope we can all come together today, Mr. Speaker, and approve it, sending a strong sign of support to encourage the Senate to do the same, and to do so quickly.

I urge the President, as he said today in a communication to his Republicans, he said House Republicans should support the 2-year budget agreement, which greatly helps our military and our vets. I am totally with him.

I am pleased that the President supports this agreement. I am pleased that we reached this agreement. I would hope that we could all vote for this agreement, not because as, so many have said, it is perfect, but because it is the result of honest negotiations and discussions between rational people who know that we have a job to do for America, and we are prepared to do it.

I urge a "yes" vote.

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

A constant theme on our side has been that of national security, a reason why we should support the agreement that has been hammered out between the administration and the four corners of leadership in the House and the Senate, and I stand by that.

We have had speakers from the House Armed Services Committee, the House Appropriations Committee, Defense Subcommittee and so on, and it is an important reason because of how much money it commands of Federal taxpayer money to actually protect, secure, and defend the United States of America.

But, Mr. Speaker, one of the discussions, one of the debates we are not having is about the true drivers of the deficit and the debt, and that is a conversation that I would like to introduce in these proceedings today. I brought a chart with me.

As I was preparing my remarks today, I got to thinking: What were the numbers back in 2010 when I first sought office in the House of Representatives versus what we are talking about today?

So we have a snapshot in time of 2010 and a snapshot in time of what we are debating today. Mr. Speaker, I direct your attention to this chart because, in 2010, discretionary spending, which is the spending that most of us kind of relate to the Federal Government, everything from keeping the lights on at this Capitol to paying for the men and women who are downrange defending our freedoms, was a little over \$1.2 trillion in 2010.

□ 1445

The number that we are debating today and that others have been critical of is just under \$1.4 trillion. It is



\$1.37 trillion. It represents an increase of \$114 billion in 10 years. Most people would probably say that, given 10 years—we had a couple of years there where we had trouble with our economy—a percentage increase like that might be within reason.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I want to direct your attention to the mandatory side of the spending. It has come up a couple of times in our discussion today, the true driver of the deficit and the debt.

When I came to Congress in 2011, the 2016 number was \$2.1 trillion. Today, not part of this discussion, mandatory spending is just under \$3.3 trillion. Mr. Speaker, that is an increase of almost \$1.2 trillion in 10 years. We are not having that discussion today.

I am reminded of the old Bronx-born bank robber, Willie Sutton, Mr. Speaker, who when captured, legend has it, was asked, “Why do you rob banks?” He said, “Because that’s where the money is.”

If we are going to have a meaningful discussion, a constructive discussion about how we put the balance sheet of the U.S. Government back in order, we cannot have an intellectually honest conversation if we are ignoring the bottom line here. In 10 years, mandatory spending has grown 10 times the rate of discretionary spending, yet we are not talking about that today.

Mr. Speaker, I am hoping that when this is all finished, and we pass this bill and put our country on a pretty solid budgetary framework for the next couple of years, that maybe we can sit down to talk about the true drivers of the deficit and the debt.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding, and I thank him for his great work as the chair of the Budget Committee. He knows better than all of us that our Federal budget should be a statement of our national values and that what is important to us as a Nation should be reflected in that budget. I thank Mr. YARMUTH for his leadership and thank his staff for bringing this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I also thank Chairwoman NITA LOWEY, the chair of the Appropriations Committee, and her staff for the important work that they did to help us get to the place we are today. That place is bipartisan legislation which reflects an agreement that is bold, bipartisan, and a victory for the American people.

I think we all agree, including the ranking member, that we all want to reduce the deficit, so let us work in a bipartisan way. The national debt, let’s work in a bipartisan way to do that.

While we are at it, we may want to eliminate the vote on lifting the debt ceiling each year as well because the

full faith and credit of the United States of America should never, ever be in question.

This agreement was reached, and it will meet the needs of the people whom we are honored to represent, investing in middle-class priorities that advance the health, financial security, and well-being of the American people, and enhancing our national security.

Democrats have achieved priorities that we set out from the start. Obviously, we have shared priorities.

We are permanently ending the threat of sequestration. That is a very important measure. The administration has joined us to end the devastating sequestration cuts that threaten our investments to keep America number one in the global economy and, again, ensure our national security.

We are also limiting offsets to half of what was originally proposed to those that were accepted in an earlier bipartisan agreement.

We are taking action to avoid another government shutdown, which is so harmful to meeting the needs of the American people and honoring the work of our important men and women in our Federal workforce, and also the collateral damage that a shutdown does to our economy.

We are securing robust funding for crucial domestic priorities, as I said. We have always insisted on parity in increases between defense and non-defense. We are pleased that our increase in the nondefense budget actually exceeds the parity number on defense by \$10 billion over the next 2 years.

We are pleased to be able to say that we have secured an increase of more than \$100 billion in the budget cap for domestic priorities since the President took office.

Finally, we are safeguarding the full faith and credit of the United States of America by achieving a lifting of the debt limit until July 31, 2021. Perhaps between now and then, we can work in a bipartisan way to address removing all doubt about whether the debt limit will be increased.

It is important to note that this is not about future spending. This is about paying for what we have invested in already.

It was essential that we reach agreement before the upcoming August district work period because we were informed by the Secretary of the Treasury that we might exhaust the full faith and credit during the district work period in August.

We are pleased to have done so with an agreement that meets the needs of America’s families and our national security and achieves so many of our priorities.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a strong vote for this bill. As I said, we can avoid the damage of sequestration and continue to advance progress for the American people. I urge a “yes” vote.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to read from a book that we are all very familiar with, the Constitution of the United States, for just a moment. One of my concerns about what we are doing today, though I support the outcome, is written in Section 8 of Article I of the Constitution: “The Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States; but all duties, imposts and excises shall be uniform throughout the United States.”

Article I, Section 8, it lays it out pretty simply that the Congress of the United States has the power of the purse.

While I support what we are doing today because I recognize the importance of getting chaos and uncertainty off the table for the reasons already stated in this debate, I am disappointed that the agreement was hammered out by basically four people, four plus one, the administration and four Members of the Congress referenced in Article I, Section 8.

That is our job. The only meaningful debate that has happened over discretionary spending in this country happened only in this Chamber during the debates on appropriations that Mr. HOYER referred to earlier. We have had those discussions.

I don’t agree with everything in those appropriations bills. I never have. But at least we have had that debate on the floor of the House. They have not had that debate on the floor of the Senate.

Here we are today, relying on an agreement hammered out by leaders of both parties in both Chambers with a representative from the administration. To me, Mr. Speaker, that flies in the face of what Article I, Section 8 says it should be like.

Again, I hope and pray that, over time, once we put this issue behind us, realizing that mandatory spending is growing at 10 times the rate of discretionary spending, the very fight that we are having today on this floor, maybe we can get back to regular order, do some legitimate budget process reform so Members like JOHN YARMUTH and myself can work together jointly to produce budgets, engage in debates on the floor of the people’s House, and arrive at outcomes that probably we are all going to agree has stuff in it we like and stuff in it we don’t like.

That is the way the Framers intended this Chamber to be. I am hopeful that we will get there eventually.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK) for his hand of conciliation, his reconciliation, and to acknowledge the work that he and the chairman of the Budget Committee have done and the tone in which the Budget Committee has conducted itself in 2019.

Let me, as the gentleman referred to Article I, Section 8, take note of the fact that it is a recognition of the power to lay and collect taxes and duties, to borrow money and regulate commerce, but in particular, I believe that there is an underlying responsibility that when we do lay taxes on the American people, or we cut taxes and give 1 percent of the population an enormous gift of paying no taxes, that we then have a responsibility to try to respond to the Americans who work every day and pay taxes and are wondering, "What is our government doing?" This budget is answering the question.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to join the gentleman and repeal the Trump tax cuts, as it burdens working Americans, as it denies nonprofits the ability to have deductions when gifts are given to them, but we are where we are today.

This bipartisan budget resolution, which I am grateful to have a combination of leadership and others, eliminates the risk of another costly and devastating government shutdown. There were government workers on food stamps who could not get to work.

It lifts the sequestration caps imposed under the Budget Control Act of 2011 to provide for increased investments in nondefense discretionary programs needed to keep America competitive.

I was in the midst of those discussions, as many of us were. They were devastating. They were cutting the needs of Americans.

We avoid default on the national debt.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Texas.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to the gentleman for yielding.

I want to bring to the attention of the American people what we will be able to do: public health and disease control, highways, waterway maintenance, hazardous waste.

I came from a community where Hurricane Harvey dumped 51 trillion gallons of water. We need infrastructure.

The Army Corps of Engineers, Federal courts, FBI, childcare, disaster assistance, economic development, all of that will now come about.

At the same time, we will ensure that the United States military will be strong.

We will not be competing against each other. By the time we get through, we are avoiding an 11 percent cut to defense and a 9 percent cut to

nondefense discretionary. We are making people whole.

As it relates to what the Budget Committee has done, we have had hearings on healthcare, climate change, education, Medicare, Social Security. We have been doing work in the Budget Committee on issues that are important, but we are seeking parity.

We are helping with domestic priorities. We are saying to the American people that we are not just taking your money and giving it to the top 1 percent of Americans. We are now balancing the budget, or working on the budget, paying down on the debt, and ensuring that we do not default on America's debt.

Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be able to support this bill to help America.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong support of H.R. 3877, the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019."

I support this agreement because it:

1. eliminates the risk of another costly and devastating government shutdown;
2. lifts the sequestration caps imposed under the Budget Control Act of 2011 to provide for increased investments in non-defense discretionary (NDD) programs needed to keep America strong and competitive; and
3. avoids default on the national debt and preserves America's standing as the world's most creditworthy nation.

I thank my Chairman YARMUTH of the Budget Committee and Chairman NEAL of the Ways and Means Committee, and the bipartisan and bicameral leadership of the Congress for their work in reaching this agreement and shepherding this legislation to the floor.

Mr. Speaker, I strongly support lifting the caps imposed by the Budget Control Act of 2011 and ending the awful policy of sequestration.

That is why I strongly supported the H.R. 2021, the "Investing For The People Act," when it was marked up by the Budget Committee earlier this year.

Mr. Speaker, without Congressional action, statutory caps on discretionary funding will force an 11 percent cut to defense and a 9 percent cut, about \$55 billion, to nondefense discretionary (NDD) programs for 2020 relative to the amounts provided for 2019.

The Balanced Budget Agreement of 2019 replaces these destructive cuts with a realistic budgetary framework so that Congress, through its annual appropriations bills, can make critical investments in our nation's infrastructure and people.

As we learned and documented in several Budget Committee hearings convened by Chairman YARMUTH, such deep cuts would have a devastating effect on U.S. national security and economic vitality.

Failure to lift the budget caps and leaves agencies that respond to public health threats and emergencies vulnerable to harmful cuts.

The National Institutes of Health and the Centers for Disease Control, along with the State Department and U.S. Agency for International Development, play unique roles in preparing for and responding to threats domestically and abroad.

At a time when there are numerous challenges—from outbreaks of Ebola and Zika, to the Flint water crisis, to chronic diseases like

Alzheimer's and cancer, to the opioid epidemic—it is clear we cannot neglect these investments.

Climate change threatens crop yields, infrastructure, water and energy supplies, and human health.

Climate change poses risks to federal property and resources, increases potential outlays from flood and crop insurance, and creates looming disaster assistance needs.

Under sequestration, agencies dealing with this threat would be dramatically underfunded and deprived of the resources needed to respond to this national and global challenge.

According to military experts, diplomacy and foreign aid are critical components of our national security.

Both Trump's own former Secretary of Defense, James Mattis, and former Secretary of Defense Robert Gates have stressed the importance of diplomacy and foreign aid:

"If you don't fully fund the State Department, then I need to buy more ammunition."—then Commander of U.S. Central Command, General James Mattis, 2013

"... based on my experience serving seven presidents, as a former director of C.I.A. and now as secretary of defense, I am here to make the case for strengthening our capacity to use 'soft power' and for better integrating it with 'hard power.'"—Secretary of Defense Robert Gates, 2007

Inadequate nondefense funding levels lead to State and Foreign Operations appropriations bills that:

1. slash embassy security funding by more than 21 percent; and
2. decrease assistance to multilateral organizations, including our UN contributions, signaling to the rest of the world that the U.S. no longer keeps its word.

Mr. Speaker, the sequestration regime created by the Budget Control Act of 2011 is an untenable state of affairs and must be corrected.

The Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019 is an important step in the right direction and represents a vast improvement over the harmful cuts contained in the President's 2020 budget, restores certainty to our budgeting and achieves the important priorities of the American people, including:

1. Permanently ends the threat of the sequester and preventing devastating funding cuts of 14 percent to defense spending and 13 percent to non-defense spending, and replaces years of reckless austerity budgeting with responsible budgeting;
2. Achieving parity between defense and non-defense discretionary spending; in fact, the increase in the non-defense budget authority that exceeds the defense number by \$10 billion.

3. Securing robust funding for critical domestic priorities, including an additional \$2.5 billion for a fair, accurate and timely Census; robust funding for veterans, Child Care Development Block Grants, and a strong increase in the National Institutes of Health budget to accelerate life-saving cancer and health research.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 75 years, since the end of World War II, the world has been impressed by examples of American power.

But what has inspired people the world over is the power of America's example.

To defend America and keep her great and strong, we need to pass the Bipartisan Budget Act of 2019, which ends sequestration and lifts

the budget caps and enable the Congress to invest in America and her people and restore their faith in their government.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY), the distinguished Republican leader of the United States House of Representatives; my friend and colleague from Bakersfield, California; and a man that I know has a great desire to see regular order played out on the floor of this House and an opportunity to go back to the budget process and appropriations process that we once knew in this great Chamber.

□ 1500

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the Republican leader of the Budget Committee for yielding. I also thank him for his work and his desire to see a budget in this Congress.

I wish we had a budget in this Congress; then we would probably be in a little stronger position. But we work in a government that is designed to have compromise, a divided government.

What we are talking about today is a compromise. It is not perfect by any means, but it secures important policy victories that no conservative can, or should, dismiss.

Consider these priorities in the final deal:

The Hyde amendment, perhaps the most important Federal protection for Americans' rights of conscience, cannot be attacked by Democrats' poison pills for 2 years. That means taxpayer money will not be used to fund abortions for the foreseeable future.

Likewise, the Trump administration's Protect Life rule, it will be unimpeded by legislative antics. This vital rule stops organizations like Planned Parenthood from using title X money as their personal piggy bank.

And here we build on what we started in the last Congress, rebuilding our military from the devastating cuts during sequestration. We watch a world that is more dangerous.

I just read an article this week that, in the last 28 months, China has visited more ports than in the last 28 years. I read another article where China and Russia military planes entered South Korean air, which they have never done before, where shots actually had to be fired. You turn the news on, and you look at the Persian Gulf and where Iran is going today.

To keep our men and women safe, you have got to make sure you have an investment, and that is exactly what we do. We build on the victory that we had before as we move forward.

We also make investments into the future. I am one who believes, and I know our Republican leader of the Budget Committee believes, too, that the greatest threat to America is the debt. That is why our budget is so important.

I understand the majority party can choose whether they want to do a budget or not. We chose to do budgets

when we were in the majority. I guess the decision is not this year, so we are ending up here in a compromise.

Now, I had wished in this compromise—but we are sitting in the minority, so, apparently, my vote does not count as much—we would want to offset any of this spending, find the savings in the waste, fraud, and abuse. It is not tough to find savings, so we offered more than \$500 billion in offsets.

Let that number sink in for one moment: \$500 billion.

Now, these were not draconian offsets that would have hurt the American public. I will give you one for an example.

We could have reduced fraud and refundable tax credits simply by requiring a Social Security number on the application. That would save \$38 billion itself. That is all we requested.

Now, just two spending cut ideas alone would double the amount of savings that we need. But, unfortunately, in a divided government, and the other side is in the majority, they decided not. Their refusal to discuss any long-term reforms to the programs that are actually driving the debt causes problems.

Now, as the gentleman knows, who is the leading Republican of the Budget Committee, when the Republicans took the majority in 2011 and we had to hand the gavel back—discretionary spending is what this body actually has the most control over, those 12 appropriations bills. When I had to hand the gavel back to the current Speaker, NANCY PELOSI, we were actually spending less than when she handed the gavel, in 2011, to John Boehner. That is a record I am proud of.

But the real driver of our debt is something that, in our majority, we tried to do something about. We passed it, but, unfortunately, it failed in the Senate. We still have that same desire.

When we were in the majority, we passed a budget that actually balanced. I know the first part was passing a budget. The law is actually to balance what we put forth. We said to the American public we were serious about this.

When I look today, this gives us stability for the next 2 years. This helps build the military, and it gives the protections for those that the Republicans would care most about that are sitting in law today.

So, no, it is not the bill I would write by myself—it is a compromise as we move forward—but it actually allows this process to work.

For too long, the American public has watched a continuing resolution, after a shutdown, after a continuing resolution. One of the biggest goals that we had being in the majority was actually to get the appropriations process working again, and we did. We are proud of the fact of moving that forward.

If I were to look at the appropriations process on the Democratic side, what they started to write without

having a budget first and without having an agreement first, I knew those bills would never become law. It was a lot of time wasted. But if I looked at those bills, what passed on the floor, and look at what is in this compromise deal, it is spending less money.

So did we succeed on turning it back some? Yes, we did, but not enough.

Today is a movement forward, but we have much more work to do, and given the opportunity, if our friend, who is the lead Republican of the Budget Committee, became the chair, I know we would have a budget; I know we would have an appropriations process; and I know that budget would be balanced. But until that day comes, we will continue to watch to make sure we spend less, we build our military, and we make tomorrow better than today.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Arkansas has 3½ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Speaker, it is not the most ideal situation to be in. As I reflect back on the many days I spent in my district—and I am about to go back there for the August recess, and I am going to circulate around my district and have some townhall meetings and engage in conversation. I know this subject is going to come up.

I already know that most people are going to say: Look, you guys have a spending problem up there in Washington. I hear that a lot, and I would agree with that. Very few people say that we have a revenue problem, but we do have a spending problem.

Mr. Speaker, you can bet your bottom dollar that I am going to be carrying this chart with me that I brought up earlier that shows the big difference between the mandatory side of Federal spending and what we are discussing here today about a \$1.37 trillion discretionary budget.

For all of the reasons that have been mentioned today by my colleagues, namely, national security, the ability to give our Pentagon certainty over the next 2 years as we continue to rebuild the readiness of the men and women who, on a voluntary basis, might I add, put their hand up and say, "I will go anywhere, anytime, to defend the principles of freedom"—they make that pledge willingly. They are not conscripted into the service. They make it on a voluntary basis.

The least that we should be able to do is to make sure that the resources are there that properly man the force, train the force, and equip the force so that we never, ever face a fight that is fair. We should always have the advantage.

So, for these reasons, Mr. Speaker, and with kind of a measure of hope that going through this process, as we have today, maybe it will inspire both sides of the aisle here and at the other

end of this building to work together to improve our processes so that it is the House and the Senate, collectively, doing the work that is prescribed as our fundamental duty in Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, Mr. Speaker, I encourage a “yes” vote on this bill.

Let’s put this issue behind us. Let’s move on to the more important things of our country, to include deficits and debt and the drivers that actually are making the situation much worse.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I think anyone watching this debate today, and certainly those of us who are here in the House, would say this is a very unusual moment.

We have a lot of debates in this body in which there is a great deal of unanimity and agreement, and usually that is over naming a post office or doing something that is totally non-controversial. But today is very different, because today we have truly, I think, respected the highest legacies of this body, that this body is supposed to be a Chamber where you bring very diverse opinions and perspectives to try and find common solutions to this country’s needs.

I think the compromise that we are hopefully going to approve today will serve as a model for what is possible in this body and in this Congress, because it truly is, in my 13 years, I think, a watershed moment. We are in a very, very divisive, polarized environment. We have come together to move this country forward.

I want to thank and commend the ranking member and my friend, Mr. WOMACK. I can’t imagine having a better relationship than I have with the ranking member, and I hope that he feels that, when he was chairman and I was ranking member, it was exactly the same way. Mr. WOMACK is a total class act and a distinguished Member, and it is an honor to work with him.

Mr. WOMACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. YARMUTH. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Speaker, let me say, for the record, that the feeling is mutual. I admire and appreciate the great relationship that Mr. YARMUTH and I have.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I also compliment and thank the Budget Committee staff, both majority and minority, for the work done on this very important piece of legislation.

Mr. Speaker, our country is facing an infrastructure deficit; we face a skills and education deficit; and we face a growing income inequality crisis. A failure by Congress to make the necessary investments to promote growth and opportunity will leave our communities and country vulnerable.

Instead of the extreme cuts outlined in the President’s 2020 budget proposal, we need to be making bold investments in research and development, educating and training a strong workforce, improving public health, caring for our veterans, ensuring an accurate 2020 Census, and protecting our homeland.

The United States did not become an economic powerhouse and world leader by accident. Throughout our history, we made strong investments in our people, our economy, and our security that have allowed us to innovate and grow, while promoting broad-based economic opportunity.

This agreement will build on that legacy by raising the caps and lifting the debt ceiling, allowing Congress to move our Nation forward without leaving our communities behind.

I look forward to passing this bill in the House, and I encourage both the Senate and the White House to join us in ensuring that we meet our obligations to our Nation and to the American people.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 519, the previous question is ordered on the bill.

The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

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

□ 1515

#### VENEZUELA TPS ACT OF 2019

Ms. LOFGREN. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 519, I call up the bill (H.R. 549) to designate Venezuela under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act to permit nationals of Venezuela to be eligible for temporary protected status under such section, and for other purposes, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 519, in lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on the Judiciary, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 116-28 is adopted, and the bill, as amended, is considered read.

The text of the bill, as amended, is as follows:

H.R. 549

*Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,*

#### SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

*This Act may be cited as the “Venezuela TPS Act of 2019”.*

#### SEC. 2. DESIGNATION FOR PURPOSES OF GRANTING TEMPORARY PROTECTED STATUS.

(a) DESIGNATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—For purposes of section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a), Venezuela shall be treated as if it had been designated under subsection (b)(1)(C) of that section, subject to the provisions of this section.

(2) PERIOD OF DESIGNATION.—The initial period of the designation referred to in paragraph (1) shall be for the 18-month period beginning on the date of the enactment of this Act.

(b) ALIENS ELIGIBLE.—As a result of the designation made under subsection (a), an alien who is a national of Venezuela is deemed to satisfy the requirements under paragraph (1) of section 244(c) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(c)), subject to paragraph (3) of such section, if the alien—

(1) has been continuously physically present in the United States since the date of the enactment of this Act;

(2) is admissible as an immigrant, except as otherwise provided in paragraph (2)(A) of such section, and is not ineligible for temporary protected status under paragraph (2)(B) of such section; and

(3) registers for temporary protected status in a manner established by the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(c) CONSENT TO TRAVEL ABROAD.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall give prior consent to travel abroad, in accordance with section 244(f)(3) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a(f)(3)), to an alien who is granted temporary protected status pursuant to the designation made under subsection (a) if the alien establishes to the satisfaction of the Secretary of Homeland Security that emergency and extenuating circumstances beyond the control of the alien require the alien to depart for a brief, temporary trip abroad.

(2) TREATMENT UPON RETURN.—An alien returning to the United States in accordance with an authorization described in paragraph (1) shall be treated as any other returning alien provided temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1254a).

(d) FEE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—In addition to any other fee authorized by law, the Secretary of Homeland Security is authorized to charge and collect a fee of \$360 for each application for temporary protected status under section 244 of the Immigration and Nationality Act by a person who is only eligible for such status by reason of subsection (a).

(2) WAIVER.—The Secretary of Homeland Security shall permit aliens to apply for a waiver of any fees associated with filing an application referred to in paragraph (1).

#### SEC. 3. DETERMINATION OF BUDGETARY EFFECTS.

The budgetary effects of this Act, for the purpose of complying with the Statutory Pay-As-You-Go Act of 2010, shall be determined by reference to the latest statement titled “Budgetary Effects of PAYGO Legislation” for this Act, submitted for printing in the Congressional Record by the Chairman of the House Budget Committee, provided that such statement has been submitted prior to the vote on passage.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The bill, as amended, shall be debatable for 30 minutes equally divided and controlled