



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, OCTOBER 26, 2017

No. 173

## House of Representatives

The House met at 9 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker.

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Eternal God, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

On this day, we ask Your blessing on the men and women, citizens all, whose votes have populated this people's House. Each Member of this House has been given the sacred duty of representing them.

O Lord, we pray that those with whom our Representatives might meet during this coming long weekend in their home districts be blessed with peace and an assurance that they have been listened to.

We ask Your blessing now on the Members of this House whose responsibility lies also beyond the local interests of constituents while honoring them. Give each Member the wisdom to represent both local and national interests, a responsibility calling for the wisdom of Solomon. Grant them, if You will, a double portion of such wisdom.

Bless us this day and every day, and may all that is done within the people's House be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

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

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

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

### ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER

The SPEAKER. The Chair will entertain up to five requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

### DUTY, HONOR, SERVICE TO GOD, FAMILY, AND COUNTRY

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

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, much has been said about the tumultuous times in which we live, and it is true, we do face enormous challenges. But I would like to remind the American people of the things that will get us through these times.

My parents were part of the Greatest Generation. My father was a pilot in World War II, and I am honored to wear his Air Force wings. My mother was a mother of 10 amazing children, many of which are with me today. They are the best friends that I have ever had.

Our parents taught us something that each of us has embroidered and now hangs on our individual family walls, and it is this: Our family's motto is duty, honor, service to God, family, and country.

We are, as Abraham Lincoln said: "The last best hope of Earth." That was true when he said it. It is still true today.

We created the miracle of the Constitution; we survived the catastrophe of the Civil War; we defeated communism, totalitarianism, fascism; we have the strength to get through the challenges that we face today. But it will only be true if we are true to that

principle: Duty, honor, service to God, family, and country.

### TAKE BACK HEALTHCARE FROM PHARMACEUTICAL COMPANIES

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, for far too long, Big Pharma has played by its own rules, benefiting from skyrocketing drug prices on the backs of our most vulnerable populations.

Back in 2003, legislation was passed establishing Medicare part D to make prescription drugs more affordable for people, but Big Pharma lobbyists influenced those policies and made it so there is a provision included that would ban the Secretary of Health and Human Services from negotiating lower prices directly with pharmaceutical companies, something that the VA can already do today.

Over 42 million Americans who are enrolled in Medicare part D continue to face rising costs on brand name drugs, fewer generic drugs, and higher premiums, making it difficult, if not impossible, for many to fill their prescriptions.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor the Medicare Prescription Drug Price Negotiation Act to take back our healthcare from pharmaceutical companies and allow the Secretary of HHS to negotiate drug prices directly with manufacturers to secure affordable, lifesaving medication for millions of Americans.

### E-VERIFY SAVES AMERICAN JOBS

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

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, the House Judiciary Committee approved the Legal Workforce

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

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



Printed on recycled paper.

H8229

Act, a bill I introduced that saves jobs for citizens and legal workers. It requires U.S. employers to use the E-Verify system to check the work eligibility of all future hires.

A September 2017 Washington Post-ABC News poll shows that 82 percent of voters favor requiring business owners to check the immigration status of prospective employees.

E-Verify is the most popular immigration reform that reduces illegal immigration. E-Verify is a free and quick system that already is used voluntarily by employers to cover one-third of the workforce.

The Legal Workforce Act has the backing of both national business organizations and immigration enforcement groups. This bill deserves the enthusiastic support of all Members of Congress who want to put the interest of American workers first.

#### OPPOSING THE BILLIONAIRES-FIRST TAX PLAN

(Mrs. BEATTY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. BEATTY. Mr. Speaker, today, House Republicans will move one step closer to giving a budget-busting \$2 trillion tax cut to the superwealthy on the backs of hardworking Americans, one step closer to increasing taxes on vulnerable Americans, one step closer to gutting Medicaid by \$1 trillion and slashing Medicare by \$500 billion, one step closer to decimating programs that help veterans, seniors, students, and families.

Many families in my home district in Ohio are struggling—struggling because they haven't had a pay increase in over a decade. That is why, instead of pushing Donald Trump's "Billionaire's First Tax Cut Plan," we need to ensure that all Americans have a chance to achieve an American Dream by expanding the earned income tax credit, child care tax credit, and low housing income tax credit, not capping retirement contributions, and eliminating tax loopholes that allow U.S. companies to profit from shipping jobs overseas.

Mr. Speaker, it is time that we provide a level playing field for all families to truly help them have a better life.

#### C.J. RUDOLPH INSPIRES WITH GRIT AND PERSEVERANCE

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

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of C.J. Rudolph of Sellersville, Pennsylvania. C.J. was born in December 2015, at Grand View hospital. Before he was born, he tested positive for the Trisomy-21 gene, meaning that he was going to be born with Down syndrome. But his parents, Chris and Donna, had faith he would be a fighter.

From day one, C.J. battled just to stay alive. He had two heart defects and was immediately put in the neonatal ICU. As the condition became more critical, he was transferred to the Children's Hospital of Philadelphia and ultimately ended up at the University of Pennsylvania hospital.

After 5 weeks at the University of Pennsylvania hospital, at the age of 58 days, C.J. underwent heart surgery performed by a miracle worker named Dr. Spray. Four days later, C.J. was finally able to come home with his parents.

Mr. Speaker, at almost 2 years old, C.J. has overcome more obstacles than many of us will face in a lifetime. Today, C.J. serves as the inspiration of the Sellersville Fire Department and continues to inspire all those he encounters with his grit and perseverance.

#### CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to House Resolution 580, I call up the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, with the Senate amendment thereto, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the concurrent resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia). The Clerk will designate the Senate amendment.

Senate amendment:

Strike all after the resolving clause and insert the following:

#### SECTION 1. CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018.

(a) *DECLARATION.*—Congress declares that this resolution is the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 and that this resolution sets forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027.

(b) *TABLE OF CONTENTS.*—The table of contents for this concurrent resolution is as follows:

Sec. 1. Concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018.

#### TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

Sec. 1101. Recommended levels and amounts.

Sec. 1102. Major functional categories.

Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

Sec. 1201. Social Security in the Senate.

Sec. 1202. Postal Service discretionary administrative expenses in the Senate.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

Sec. 2001. Reconciliation in the Senate.

Sec. 2002. Reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

#### TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

Sec. 3001. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect flexible and affordable health care for all.

Sec. 3002. Revenue-neutral reserve fund to reform the American tax system.

Sec. 3003. Reserve fund for reconciliation legislation.

Sec. 3004. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for extending the State Children's Health Insurance Program.

Sec. 3005. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to strengthen American families.

Sec. 3006. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote innovative educational and nutritional models and systems for American students.

Sec. 3007. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve the American banking system.

Sec. 3008. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote American agriculture, energy, transportation, and infrastructure improvements.

Sec. 3009. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to restore American military power.

Sec. 3010. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for veterans and service members.

Sec. 3011. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for public lands and the environment.

Sec. 3012. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to secure the American border.

Sec. 3013. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to promote economic growth, the private sector, and to enhance job creation.

Sec. 3014. Deficit-neutral reserve fund for legislation modifying statutory budgetary controls.

Sec. 3015. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to prevent the taxpayer bailout of pension plans.

Sec. 3016. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs.

Sec. 3017. Deficit-neutral reserve fund to protect Medicare and repeal the Independent Payment Advisory Board.

Sec. 3018. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to affordable child and dependent care.

Sec. 3019. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to worker training programs.

Sec. 3020. Reserve fund for legislation to provide disaster funds for relief and recovery efforts to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017.

Sec. 3021. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to protecting Medicare and Medicaid.

Sec. 3022. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the provision of tax relief for families with children.

Sec. 3023. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the provision of tax relief for small businesses.

Sec. 3024. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to tax relief for hard-working middle-class Americans.

Sec. 3025. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to making the American tax system simpler and fairer for all Americans.

Sec. 3026. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to tax cuts for working American families.

Sec. 3027. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to the provision of incentives for businesses to invest in America and create jobs in America.

Sec. 3028. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to eliminating tax breaks for companies that ship jobs to foreign countries.

Sec. 3029. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to providing full, permanent, and mandatory funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program.

Sec. 3030. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to tax reform which maintains the progressivity of the tax system.

Sec. 3031. Deficit-neutral reserve fund relating to significantly improving the budget process.

## TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS

## Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

- Sec. 4101. Point of order against advance appropriations in the Senate.
- Sec. 4102. Point of order against certain changes in mandatory programs.
- Sec. 4103. Point of order against provisions that constitute changes in mandatory programs affecting the Crime Victims Fund.
- Sec. 4104. Point of order against designation of funds for overseas contingency operations.
- Sec. 4105. Point of order against reconciliation amendments with unknown budgetary effects.
- Sec. 4106. Pay-As-You-Go point of order in the Senate.
- Sec. 4107. Honest accounting: cost estimates for major legislation to incorporate macroeconomic effects.
- Sec. 4108. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.
- Sec. 4109. Adjustment for wildfire suppression funding in the Senate.
- Sec. 4110. Adjustment for improved oversight of spending.
- Sec. 4111. Repeal of certain limitations.
- Sec. 4112. Emergency legislation.
- Sec. 4113. Enforcement filing in the Senate.

## Subtitle B—Other Provisions

- Sec. 4201. Oversight of Government performance.
- Sec. 4202. Budgetary treatment of certain discretionary administrative expenses.
- Sec. 4203. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 4204. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 4205. Adjustments to reflect legislation not included in the baseline.
- Sec. 4206. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

## TITLE V—BUDGET PROCESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

## Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement

- Sec. 5101. Point of order against increasing long-term direct spending.
- Sec. 5102. Allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism.
- Sec. 5103. Limitation on changes in certain mandatory programs.
- Sec. 5104. Limitation on advance appropriations.
- Sec. 5105. Estimates of debt service costs.
- Sec. 5106. Fair-value credit estimates.
- Sec. 5107. Estimates of macroeconomic effects of major legislation.
- Sec. 5108. Adjustments for improved control of budgetary resources.
- Sec. 5109. Scoring rule for Energy Savings Performance Contracts.
- Sec. 5110. Limitation on transfers from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund.
- Sec. 5111. Prohibition on use of Federal Reserve surpluses as an offset.
- Sec. 5112. Prohibition on use of guarantee fees as an offset.
- Sec. 5113. Modification of reconciliation in the House of Representatives.

## Subtitle B—Other Provisions

- Sec. 5201. Budgetary treatment of administrative expenses.
- Sec. 5202. Application and effect of changes in allocations and aggregates.
- Sec. 5203. Adjustments to reflect changes in concepts and definitions.
- Sec. 5204. Adjustment for changes in the baseline.
- Sec. 5205. Application of rule regarding limits on discretionary spending.
- Sec. 5206. Enforcement filing in the House.
- Sec. 5207. Exercise of rulemaking powers.

## Subtitle C—Adjustment Authority

- Sec. 5301. Adjustment authority for amendments to statutory caps.

## Subtitle D—Reserve Funds

- Sec. 5401. Reserve fund for investments in national infrastructure.
- Sec. 5402. Reserve fund for comprehensive tax reform.
- Sec. 5403. Reserve fund for the State Children's Health Insurance Program.
- Sec. 5404. Reserve fund for the repeal or replacement of President Obama's health care laws.

## TITLE I—RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS

## Subtitle A—Budgetary Levels in Both Houses

## SEC. 1101. RECOMMENDED LEVELS AND AMOUNTS.

The following budgetary levels are appropriate for each of fiscal years 2018 through 2027:

(1) FEDERAL REVENUES.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution:

(A) The recommended levels of Federal revenues are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$2,490,936,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$2,613,683,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$2,755,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$2,883,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,015,847,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,162,063,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,306,948,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,463,269,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,654,829,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,825,184,000,000.

(B) The amounts by which the aggregate levels of Federal revenues should be changed are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: —\$167,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: —\$169,500,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: —\$166,000,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: —\$165,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: —\$166,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: —\$167,700,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: —\$169,800,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: —\$172,200,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: —\$146,400,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: —\$145,000,000,000.

(2) NEW BUDGET AUTHORITY.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total new budget authority are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,136,721,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,220,542,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,319,687,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,344,861,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,501,231,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,563,762,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,607,752,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,753,919,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,851,463,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,942,710,000,000.

(3) BUDGET OUTLAYS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the appropriate levels of total budget outlays are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$3,131,688,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$3,233,119,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$3,310,579,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$3,370,283,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$3,486,230,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$3,532,290,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$3,561,834,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$3,710,120,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$3,810,435,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$3,903,041,000,000.

(4) DEFICITS.—For purposes of the enforcement of this resolution, the amounts of the deficits are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$640,752,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$619,436,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$555,198,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$486,902,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$470,383,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$370,227,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$254,886,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$246,851,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$155,606,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$77,857,000,000.

(5) PUBLIC DEBT.—Pursuant to section 301(a)(5) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(a)(5)), the appropriate levels of the public debt are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$21,278,691,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$22,063,363,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$22,760,763,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$23,396,024,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$23,992,408,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$24,508,029,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$24,953,195,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$25,375,994,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$25,777,513,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$25,999,469,000,000.

(6) DEBT HELD BY THE PUBLIC.—The appropriate levels of debt held by the public are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$15,595,294,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019: \$16,281,015,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020: \$16,933,381,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021: \$17,553,196,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022: \$18,188,386,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023: \$18,765,097,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024: \$19,269,019,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025: \$19,809,369,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026: \$20,307,841,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027: \$20,780,452,000,000.

## SEC. 1102. MAJOR FUNCTIONAL CATEGORIES.

Congress determines and declares that the appropriate levels of new budget authority and outlays for fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for each major functional category are:

(1) National Defense (050):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$557,253,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$569,287,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$570,316,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$568,721,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$584,504,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$574,347,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$598,730,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$584,706,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$613,707,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$601,894,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$629,014,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$611,538,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$644,732,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$621,649,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$660,854,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$641,891,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$678,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$658,658,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$695,076,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$675,108,000,000.

(2) International Affairs (150):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,157,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$44,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,978,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,114,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,042,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,992,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,702,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,161,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$42,743,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$44,183,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,045,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,222,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,511,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,283,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,062,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,394,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,844,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,467,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,676,000,000.  
 (3) General Science, Space, and Technology (250):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$32,565,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$31,909,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$32,561,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$33,908,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,191,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$34,637,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$33,864,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$35,401,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$34,666,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,165,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$35,427,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$36,940,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,167,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$37,775,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$36,956,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$38,617,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$37,773,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$39,464,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$38,597,000,000.  
 (4) Energy (270):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$762,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,686,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,392,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,869,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,737,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,529,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$4,615,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$3,558,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,363,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,268,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,069,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$1,994,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,090,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,085,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,106,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,168,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,153,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,264,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$3,238,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,442,000,000.  
 (5) Natural Resources and Environment (300):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,489,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$40,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$42,110,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,293,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,533,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$43,420,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$42,742,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$45,022,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,194,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$45,716,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$44,767,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$46,080,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$45,125,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$47,575,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$46,581,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$48,511,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$47,501,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$49,280,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$48,326,000,000.  
 (6) Agriculture (350):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$22,063,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,979,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,564,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,898,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,372,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,450,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,284,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,540,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,743,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,135,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$18,894,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,354,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,311,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,638,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,881,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,112,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,173,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,439,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,280,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,542,000,000.  
 (7) Commerce and Housing Credit (370):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$9,379,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$4,060,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$12,090,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$2,554,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,997,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$646,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$5,359,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$2,364,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$7,393,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$2,715,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$3,254,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$14,163,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,648,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$16,202,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$4,817,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$17,747,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,228,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$19,133,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, —\$6,816,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, —\$19,990,000,000.  
 (8) Transportation (400):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$89,125,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,875,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,538,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$92,393,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$84,687,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$93,064,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$40,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$81,597,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,003,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$69,791,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$71,930,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$74,521,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$73,370,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,450,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$74,843,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,523,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$76,345,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$76,895,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$77,831,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$78,001,000,000.  
 (9) Community and Regional Development (450):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,018,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$21,697,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,281,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$20,600,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,435,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,518,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,690,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,867,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$19,778,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,506,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,061,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,041,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,347,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,277,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,669,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$18,831,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$20,985,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,353,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$21,304,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$19,932,000,000.  
 (10) Education, Training, Employment, and Social Services (500):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$90,224,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$99,348,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$100,086,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$98,799,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2020:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$101,018,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$101,064,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2021:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,034,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$102,218,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2022:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,700,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,178,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2023:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$102,725,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,653,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2024:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,012,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$103,960,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2025:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$103,798,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$104,747,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2026:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$104,942,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$105,921,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2027:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$106,473,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$107,433,000,000.  
 (11) Health (550):  
 Fiscal year 2018:  
 (A) New budget authority, \$546,598,000,000.  
 (B) Outlays, \$558,311,000,000.  
 Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$560,622,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$563,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$578,838,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$570,311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$574,616,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$575,040,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,530,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$583,769,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$601,742,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$599,099,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$605,811,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$603,443,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$617,220,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$614,728,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$633,890,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$630,824,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$652,230,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$653,552,000,000.

(12) Medicare (570):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$586,239,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$585,962,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$643,592,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$643,374,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$687,119,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$686,926,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$734,446,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$734,241,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$819,300,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$819,073,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$833,885,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$833,669,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$845,578,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$845,355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$934,429,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$934,186,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,002,522,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,002,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$1,066,566,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$1,066,321,000,000.

(13) Income Security (600):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$491,978,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$477,537,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$490,106,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$479,627,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$493,118,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$482,945,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$494,706,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$485,536,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$497,021,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$494,507,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$506,711,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$499,405,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$515,692,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$502,742,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$531,668,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$520,169,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$544,483,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$538,620,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$557,641,000,000.  
(B) Outlays, \$548,723,000,000.

(14) Social Security (650):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$39,683,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$39,683,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$43,091,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,091,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$46,182,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$46,182,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$49,460,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$49,460,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$52,915,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$52,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$56,734,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$56,734,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$60,953,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$60,953,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$65,424,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$69,757,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,757,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,173,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$74,173,000,000.

(15) Veterans Benefits and Services (700):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$176,446,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$177,393,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$191,376,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$189,441,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$198,336,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$196,338,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$205,001,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$202,930,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$221,481,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$219,320,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$219,424,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$216,903,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$216,519,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$214,343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$234,741,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$232,535,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$242,559,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$240,210,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$251,142,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$248,884,000,000.

(16) Administration of Justice (750):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,038,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$61,006,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,244,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$64,504,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$64,377,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$66,523,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$65,866,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,272,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$67,069,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,488,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$68,813,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$69,657,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$70,592,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$70,232,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$72,432,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$71,865,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$74,233,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$73,500,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,093,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$75,382,000,000.

(17) General Government (800):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$24,675,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$24,889,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,518,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,642,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,989,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$25,994,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$26,649,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,358,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,311,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$26,973,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$27,972,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$27,608,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$28,485,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,134,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$29,255,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$28,830,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,052,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$29,610,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$30,827,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$30,382,000,000.

(18) Net Interest (900):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$388,767,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$388,767,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$441,158,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$441,158,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$497,893,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$497,893,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$546,206,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$546,206,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$589,086,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$589,086,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$630,179,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$630,179,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$664,060,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$664,060,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$691,250,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$691,250,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$716,494,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$716,494,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$736,146,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$736,146,000,000.

(19) Allowances (920):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, — \$68,576,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$51,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, — \$133,357,000,000.

(B) Outlays, — \$96,088,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$266,915,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$307,701,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$297,489,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$366,270,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$356,035,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$415,402,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$404,286,000,000.

(20) Undistributed Offsetting Receipts (950):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, —\$95,229,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$95,229,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, —\$93,401,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$93,401,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, —\$95,479,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$95,479,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, —\$98,956,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$98,956,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, —\$101,293,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$101,293,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, —\$102,309,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$102,309,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, —\$111,119,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$111,119,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, —\$124,766,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$124,766,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, —\$128,332,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$128,332,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, —\$141,303,000,000.

(B) Outlays, —\$141,303,000,000.

(21) Overseas Contingency Operations (970):

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$76,591,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$43,121,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$50,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$48,676,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$25,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$34,675,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$12,000,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$20,684,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$8,901,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$3,053,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$946,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$264,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$0.

(B) Outlays, \$0.

#### Subtitle B—Levels and Amounts in the Senate

##### SEC. 1201. SOCIAL SECURITY IN THE SENATE.

(a) SOCIAL SECURITY REVENUES.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of revenues of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$873,312,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$903,381,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$932,055,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$962,698,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$996,127,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$1,031,653,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$1,068,529,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,106,862,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,146,803,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$1,188,060,000,000.

(b) SOCIAL SECURITY OUTLAYS.—For purposes of Senate enforcement under sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), the amounts of outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018: \$849,609,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019: \$909,109,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020: \$972,776,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021: \$1,040,108,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022: \$1,111,446,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023: \$1,188,081,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024: \$1,266,786,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025: \$1,349,334,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026: \$1,437,032,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027: \$1,530,362,000,000.

(c) SOCIAL SECURITY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.—In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Federal Old-Age and Survivors Insurance Trust Fund and the Federal Disability Insurance Trust Fund for administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,553,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,584,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,716,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,713,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$5,888,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$5,856,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,062,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,029,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,241,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,207,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,426,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,392,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,617,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,581,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$6,816,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,779,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,024,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$6,985,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$7,233,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$7,194,000,000.

##### SEC. 1202. POSTAL SERVICE DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES IN THE SENATE.

In the Senate, the amounts of new budget authority and budget outlays of the Postal Service for discretionary administrative expenses are as follows:

Fiscal year 2018:

(A) New budget authority, \$281,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$281,000,000.

Fiscal year 2019:

(A) New budget authority, \$290,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$290,000,000.

Fiscal year 2020:

(A) New budget authority, \$301,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$301,000,000.

Fiscal year 2021:

(A) New budget authority, \$311,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$311,000,000.

Fiscal year 2022:

(A) New budget authority, \$322,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$322,000,000.

Fiscal year 2023:

(A) New budget authority, \$333,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$333,000,000.

Fiscal year 2024:

(A) New budget authority, \$344,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$343,000,000.

Fiscal year 2025:

(A) New budget authority, \$356,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$355,000,000.

Fiscal year 2026:

(A) New budget authority, \$369,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$368,000,000.

Fiscal year 2027:

(A) New budget authority, \$380,000,000.

(B) Outlays, \$379,000,000.

#### TITLE II—RECONCILIATION

##### SEC. 2001. RECONCILIATION IN THE SENATE.

(a) COMMITTEE ON FINANCE.—The Committee on Finance of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON ENERGY AND NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Energy and Natural Resources of the Senate shall report changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the Senate, not later than November 13, 2017, the Committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the Senate. Upon receiving such recommendations, the Committee on the Budget of the Senate shall report to the Senate a reconciliation bill carrying out all such recommendations without any substantive revision.

##### SEC. 2002. RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

(a) COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS.—The Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(b) COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES.—The Committee on Natural Resources of the House of Representatives shall submit changes in laws within its jurisdiction to reduce the deficit by not less than \$1,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

(c) SUBMISSIONS.—In the House of Representatives, not later than November 13, 2017, the committees named in subsections (a) and (b) shall submit their recommendations to the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives to carry out this section.

#### TITLE III—RESERVE FUNDS

##### SEC. 3001. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT FLEXIBLE AND AFFORDABLE HEALTH CARE FOR ALL.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to repealing or replacing the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act (Public Law 111–148; 124 Stat. 119) and the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 (Public Law 111–152; 124 Stat. 1029), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

##### SEC. 3002. REVENUE-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO REFORM THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM.

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to reforming the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, which may include—

(1) tax relief for middle-income working Americans;

(2) lowering taxes on families with children; or

(3) incentivizing companies to invest domestically and create jobs in the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation is revenue neutral and would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3003. RESERVE FUND FOR RECONCILIATION LEGISLATION.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for any bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 containing the recommendations of one or more committees, or for one or more amendments to, a conference report on, or an amendment between the Houses in relation to such a bill or joint resolution, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation, if the budgetary effects of the legislation comply with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution.

(b) **DETERMINATION OF COMPLIANCE.**—For purposes of this section, compliance with the reconciliation instructions under this concurrent resolution shall be determined by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

(c) **EXCEPTION FOR LEGISLATION.**—Section 404(a) of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall not apply to legislation for which the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate has exercised the authority under subsection (a).

**SEC. 3004. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR EXTENDING THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to an extension of the State Children's Health Insurance Program, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3005. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO STRENGTHEN AMERICAN FAMILIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) addressing the opioid and substance abuse crisis;
- (2) protecting and assisting victims of domestic abuse;
- (3) foster care, child care, marriage, and fatherhood programs;
- (4) making it easier to save for retirement;
- (5) reforming the American public housing system;
- (6) the Community Development Block Grant Program; or
- (7) extending expiring health care provisions,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3006. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE INNOVATIVE EDUCATIONAL AND NUTRITIONAL MODELS AND SYSTEMS FOR AMERICAN STUDENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a

committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) amending the Higher Education Act of 1965 (20 U.S.C. 1001 et seq.);
- (2) ensuring State flexibility in education;
- (3) enhancing outcomes with Federal workforce development, job training, and reemployment programs;
- (4) the consolidation and streamlining of overlapping early learning and child care programs;
- (5) educational programs for individuals with disabilities; or
- (6) child nutrition programs,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3007. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO IMPROVE THE AMERICAN BANKING SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the American banking system by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3008. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE AMERICAN AGRICULTURE, ENERGY, TRANSPORTATION, AND INFRASTRUCTURE IMPROVEMENTS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Farm Bill;
- (2) American energy policies;
- (3) the Nuclear Regulatory Commission;
- (4) North American energy development;
- (5) infrastructure, transportation, and water development;
- (6) the Federal Aviation Administration;
- (7) the National Flood Insurance Program;
- (8) State mineral royalty revenues; or
- (9) soda ash royalties,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3009. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO RESTORE AMERICAN MILITARY POWER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) improving military readiness, including deferred Facilities Sustainment Restoration and Modernization;
- (2) military technological superiority;
- (3) structural defense reforms; or
- (4) strengthening cybersecurity efforts,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation

would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3010. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR VETERANS AND SERVICE MEMBERS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to improving the delivery of benefits and services to veterans and service members by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3011. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR PUBLIC LANDS AND THE ENVIRONMENT.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) the Endangered Species Act of 1973 (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.);
- (2) forest health and wildfire prevention and control;
- (3) resources for wildland firefighting for the Forest Service and Department of Interior;
- (4) the payments in lieu of taxes program; or
- (5) the secure rural schools and community self-determination program,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3012. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO SECURE THE AMERICAN BORDER.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) securing the border of the United States;
- (2) ending human trafficking; or
- (3) stopping the transportation of narcotics into the United States,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3013. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROMOTE ECONOMIC GROWTH, THE PRIVATE SECTOR, AND TO ENHANCE JOB CREATION.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to—

- (1) reducing costs to businesses and individuals stemming from Federal regulations;
- (2) increasing commerce and economic growth; or
- (3) enhancing job creation,

by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022



or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3014. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION MODIFYING STATUTORY BUDGETARY CONTROLS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to modifying statutory budget controls, which may include adjustments to the discretionary spending limits and changes to the scope of sequestration as carried out by the Office of Management and Budget, such as for the Financial Accounting Standards Board, Public Company Accounting Oversight Board, Securities Investor Protection Corporation, and other similar entities, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3015. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PREVENT THE TAXPAYER BAILOUT OF PENSION PLANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to the prevention of taxpayer bailout of pension plans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3016. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO IMPLEMENTING WORK REQUIREMENTS IN ALL MEANS-TESTED FEDERAL WELFARE PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to implementing work requirements in all means-tested Federal welfare programs by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3017. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND TO PROTECT MEDICAID AND REPEAL THE INDEPENDENT PAYMENT ADVISORY BOARD.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicare program under title XVIII of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1395 et seq.), which may include repealing the Independent Payment Advisory Board established under section 1899A of such Act (42 U.S.C. 1395kkk), by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3018. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO AFFORDABLE CHILD AND DEPENDENT CARE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to making the cost of child and dependent care more affordable and useful for American families by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3019. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO WORKER TRAINING PROGRAMS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to worker training programs, such as training programs that target workers that need advanced skills to progress in their current profession or apprenticeship or certificate programs that provide retraining for a new industry, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3020. RESERVE FUND FOR LEGISLATION TO PROVIDE DISASTER FUNDS FOR RELIEF AND RECOVERY EFFORTS TO AREAS DEVASTATED BY HURRICANES AND FLOODING IN 2017.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing disaster funds for relief and recovery to areas devastated by hurricanes and flooding in 2017, by the amounts necessary to accommodate the budgetary effects of the legislation.

**SEC. 3021. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROTECTING MEDICAID AND MEDICAID.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to protecting the Medicaid program under title XIX of the Social Security Act (42 U.S.C. 1396 et seq.), which may include strengthening and improving Medicaid for the most vulnerable populations, and extending the life of the Federal Hospital Insurance Trust Fund by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3022. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR FAMILIES WITH CHILDREN.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one

or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include lowering taxes on families with children, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3023. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF TAX RELIEF FOR SMALL BUSINESSES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include the provision of tax relief for small businesses, along with provisions to prevent upper-income taxpayers from sheltering income from taxation at the appropriate rate, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3024. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX RELIEF FOR HARD-WORKING MIDDLE-CLASS AMERICANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include reducing federal deductions, such as the state and local tax deduction which disproportionately favors high-income individuals, to ensure relief for middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3025. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO MAKING THE AMERICAN TAX SYSTEM SIMPLER AND FAIRER FOR ALL AMERICANS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include provisions to make the American tax system simpler and fairer for all Americans, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3026. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX CUTS FOR WORKING AMERICAN FAMILIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to increasing per-child Federal tax relief, which may include amending the child tax credit, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.



**SEC. 3027. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO THE PROVISION OF INCENTIVES FOR BUSINESSES TO INVEST IN AMERICA AND CREATE JOBS IN AMERICA.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in federal tax laws, which may include international tax provisions that provide or enhance incentives for businesses to invest in America, generate American jobs, retain American jobs, and return jobs to America, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3028. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO ELIMINATING TAX BREAKS FOR COMPANIES THAT SHIP JOBS TO FOREIGN COUNTRIES.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to eliminating tax breaks for companies that outsource jobs to foreign countries, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3029. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO PROVIDING FULL, PERMANENT, AND MANDATORY FUNDING FOR THE PAYMENT IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to providing full, permanent, and mandatory funding for the payment in lieu of taxes program by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3030. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO TAX REFORM WHICH MAINTAINS THE PROGRESSIVITY OF THE TAX SYSTEM.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to changes in Federal tax laws, which may include tax reform proposals to ensure that the reformed tax code parallels the existing tax code with respect to relative burdens and does not shift the tax burden from high-income to lower- and middle-income taxpayers, by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 3031. DEFICIT-NEUTRAL RESERVE FUND RELATING TO SIGNIFICANTLY IMPROVING THE BUDGET PROCESS.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may revise the allocations of a

committee or committees, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this resolution, and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger, for one or more bills, joint resolutions, amendments, amendments between the Houses, motions, or conference reports relating to significantly improving the budget process by the amounts provided in such legislation for those purposes, provided that such legislation would not increase the deficit over either the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2022 or the period of the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**TITLE IV—BUDGET PROCESS**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

**SEC. 4101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS IN THE SENATE.**

(a) IN GENERAL.—

(1) POINT OF ORDER.—Except as provided in subsection (b), 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.

(2) DEFINITION.—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for fiscal year 2018 that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2018, or any new budget authority provided in a bill or joint resolution making general appropriations or continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2019, that first becomes available for any fiscal year after 2019.

(b) EXCEPTIONS.—Advance appropriations may be provided—

(1) for fiscal years 2019 and 2020 for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution 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;

(2) for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; and

(3) 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.

(c) SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.—

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

(2) 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 subsection (a).

(d) FORM OF 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)).

(e) 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 section, 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.

**SEC. 4102. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST CERTAIN CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.**

(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—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$17,000,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$15,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

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

(e) SENATE POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS OF APPROPRIATIONS LEGISLATION THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS WITH NET COSTS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 3103 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, is repealed.

(2) APPLICABILITY.—In the Senate, section 314 of S. Con. Res. 70 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2009, shall be applied and administered as if section 3103(e) of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, had not been enacted.

**SEC. 4103. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST PROVISIONS THAT CONSTITUTE CHANGES IN MANDATORY PROGRAMS AFFECTING THE CRIME VICTIMS FUND.**

(a) DEFINITION.—In this section—

(1) the term “CHIMP” has the meaning given such term in section 4102(a); and

(2) the term “Crime Victims Fund” means the Crime Victims Fund established under section 1402 of the Victims of Crime Act of 1984 (34 U.S.C. 20101).

(b) POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—When the Senate is considering a bill or joint resolution making full-year appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or an amendment thereto, amendment between the Houses in relation thereto, conference report thereon, or motion thereon, if a point of order is made by a Senator against a provision containing a CHIMP affecting the Crime Victims Fund that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all CHIMPs affecting the Crime Victims Fund in relation to fiscal year 2018 to be more than \$11,224,000,000, 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.

(2) **FORM OF THE 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)).

(3) **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 paragraph (1), 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.

(4) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL.**—In the Senate, this subsection 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 subsection.

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

(c) **REVIEW OF PROCEDURES REGARDING CHIMPS.**—The Committee on the Budget and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate shall review existing budget enforcement procedures regarding CHIMPs included in appropriations legislation. These committees of jurisdiction should consult with other relevant committees of jurisdiction and other interested parties to review such procedures, including for Crime Victims Fund spending, and include any agreed upon recommendations in subsequent concurrent resolutions on the budget.

**SEC. 4104. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST DESIGNATION OF FUNDS FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS.**

(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 year 2018 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. 4105. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST RECONCILIATION AMENDMENTS WITH UNKNOWN BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, it shall not be in order to consider an amendment to or motion on a bill or joint resolution considered pursuant to section 2001 if the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget submits a written statement for the Congressional Record indicating that the Chairman, after consultation with the Ranking Member of the Committee on the Budget, is unable to determine the effect the amendment or motion would have on budget authority, outlays, direct spending, entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, or surpluses.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEAL IN THE SENATE.**—In the Senate, subsection (a) 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 (a).

**SEC. 4106. PAY-AS-YOU-GO POINT OF ORDER IN THE SENATE.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—It shall not be in order in the Senate to consider any direct spending or revenue legislation that would increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit for any of the applicable time periods as measured in paragraphs (5) and (6).

(2) **APPLICABLE TIME PERIODS.**—For purposes of this subsection, the term “applicable time period” means any of—

- (A) the period of the current fiscal year;
- (B) the period of the budget year;
- (C) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 4 fiscal years following the budget year; or
- (D) the period of the current fiscal year, the budget year, and the ensuing 9 fiscal years following the budget year.

(3) **DIRECT SPENDING LEGISLATION.**—For purposes of this subsection and except as provided in paragraph (4), the term “direct spending legislation” means any bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, or conference report that affects direct spending as that term is defined by, and interpreted for purposes of, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(4) **EXCLUSION.**—For purposes of this subsection, the terms “direct spending legislation” and “revenue legislation” do not include—

- (A) any concurrent resolution on the budget; or
- (B) any provision of legislation that affects the full funding of, and continuation of, the deposit insurance guarantee commitment in effect on November 5, 1990.

(5) **BASELINE.**—Estimates prepared pursuant to this subsection shall—

(A) use the baseline surplus or deficit used for the most recently adopted concurrent resolution on the budget; and

(B) be calculated under the requirements of subsections (b) through (d) of section 257 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) for fiscal years beyond those covered by that concurrent resolution on the budget.

(6) **PRIOR SURPLUS.**—If direct spending or revenue legislation increases the on-budget deficit or causes an on-budget deficit when taken individually, it must also increase the on-budget deficit or cause an on-budget deficit when taken together with all direct spending and revenue legislation enacted since the beginning of the calendar year not accounted for in the baseline under paragraph (5)(A), except that direct spending or revenue effects resulting in net deficit reduction enacted in any bill pursuant to a reconciliation instruction since the beginning of that same calendar year shall never be made available on the pay-as-you-go ledger and shall be dedicated only for deficit reduction.

(b) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

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

(2) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this section shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. 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 this section.

(c) **DETERMINATION OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of new budget authority, outlays, and revenues for a fiscal year shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Senate Committee on the Budget.

(d) **REPEAL.**—In the Senate, section 201 of S. Con. Res. 21 (110th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2008, shall no longer apply.

**SEC. 4107. HONEST ACCOUNTING: COST ESTIMATES FOR MAJOR LEGISLATION TO INCORPORATE MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS.**

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act (2 U.S.C. 601(f)) for major legislation considered in the Senate shall, to the greatest extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632); and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DISTRIBUTIONAL EFFECTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include the distributional effects across income categories resulting from major legislation.

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill, joint resolution, conference report, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or treaty considered in the Senate—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than—

(i) 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(ii) for a treaty, equal to or greater than \$15,000,000,000 for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate for all direct spending and revenue legislation; or

(ii) the Senator who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

#### **SEC. 4108. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.**

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(c)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be \$640,000,000,000, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### **SEC. 4109. ADJUSTMENT FOR WILDFIRE SUPPRESSION FUNDING IN THE SENATE.**

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the adjustments to discretionary spending limits established under section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)) to provide for wildfire suppression funding, which may include criteria for making such an adjustment, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may adjust the allocation called for in section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the Senate, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this concurrent resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

#### **SEC. 4110. ADJUSTMENT FOR IMPROVED OVERSIGHT OF SPENDING.**

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—If a measure becomes law that decreases direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may decrease the allocation to the committee of the Senate with jurisdiction of the direct spending by an amount equal to the amount of the decrease in direct spending and may revise the aggregates

and other appropriate levels in this resolution and make adjustments to the pay-as-you-go ledger in the amounts necessary to accommodate the decrease in direct spending.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of budget authority and outlays shall be determined on the basis of estimates submitted by the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

#### **SEC. 4111. REPEAL OF CERTAIN LIMITATIONS.**

Sections 3205 and 3206 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, are repealed.

#### **SEC. 4112. EMERGENCY LEGISLATION.**

(a) **AUTHORITY TO DESIGNATE.**—In the Senate, with respect to a provision of direct spending or receipts legislation or appropriations for discretionary accounts that Congress designates as an emergency requirement in such measure, the amounts of new budget authority, outlays, and receipts in all fiscal years resulting from that provision shall be treated as an emergency requirement for the purpose of this section.

(b) **EXEMPTION OF EMERGENCY PROVISIONS.**—Any new budget authority, outlays, and receipts resulting from any provision designated as an emergency requirement, pursuant to this section, in any bill, joint resolution, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report shall not count for purposes of sections 302 and 311 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633 and 642), section 4106 of this resolution, section 3101 of S. Con. Res. 11 (114th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2016, and sections 401 and 404 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010. Designated emergency provisions shall not count for the purpose of revising allocations, aggregates, or other levels pursuant to procedures established under section 301(b)(7) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(b)(7)) for deficit-neutral reserve funds and revising discretionary spending limits set pursuant to section 301 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010.

(c) **DESIGNATIONS.**—If a provision of legislation is designated as an emergency requirement under this section, the committee report and any statement of managers accompanying that legislation shall include an explanation of the manner in which the provision meets the criteria in subsection (f).

(d) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section, the terms “direct spending”, “receipts”, and “appropriations for discretionary accounts” mean any provision of a bill, joint resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that affects direct spending, receipts, or appropriations as those terms have been defined and interpreted for purposes of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 900 et seq.).

(e) **POINT OF ORDER.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—When the Senate is considering a bill, resolution, amendment, motion, amendment between the Houses, or conference report, if a point of order is made by a Senator against an emergency designation in that measure, that provision making such a designation shall be stricken from the measure and may not be offered as an amendment from the floor.

(2) **SUPERMAJORITY WAIVER AND APPEALS.**—

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

(B) **APPEALS.**—Appeals in the Senate from the decisions of the Chair relating to any provision of this subsection shall be limited to 1 hour, to be equally divided between, and controlled by, the appellant and the manager of the bill or joint resolution, as the case may be. 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 this subsection.

(3) **DEFINITION OF AN EMERGENCY DESIGNATION.**—For purposes of paragraph (1), a provision shall be considered an emergency designation if it designates any item as an emergency requirement pursuant to this subsection.

(4) **FORM OF THE 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, upon a point of order being made by any Senator pursuant to this section, and such point of order being sustained, such material contained in such conference report 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.

(f) **CRITERIA.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—For purposes of this section, any provision is an emergency requirement if the situation addressed by such provision is—

(A) necessary, essential, or vital (not merely useful or beneficial);

(B) sudden, quickly coming into being, and not building up over time;

(C) an urgent, pressing, and compelling need requiring immediate action;

(D) subject to paragraph (2), unforeseen, unpredictable, and unanticipated; and

(E) not permanent, temporary in nature.

(2) **UNFORESEEN.**—An emergency that is part of an aggregate level of anticipated emergencies, particularly when normally estimated in advance, is not unforeseen.

(g) **INAPPLICABILITY.**—In the Senate, section 403 of S. Con. Res. 13 (111th Congress), the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2010, shall no longer apply.

#### **SEC. 4113. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE SENATE.**

If this concurrent resolution on the budget is agreed to by the Senate and House of Representatives without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with the levels in title I 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 2018, 2018 through 2022, and 2018 through 2027 consistent with the levels in title I for the purpose of enforcing section 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advanced appropriations that would have been identified in the joint explanatory statement of managers accompanying this concurrent resolution.

#### **Subtitle B—Other Provisions**

#### **SEC. 4201. OVERSIGHT OF GOVERNMENT PERFORMANCE.**

In the Senate, all committees are directed to review programs and tax expenditures within their jurisdiction to identify waste, fraud, abuse or duplication, and increase the use of performance data to inform committee work. Committees

are also directed to review the matters for congressional consideration identified in the Office of Inspector General semiannual reports and the Office of Inspector General's list of unimplemented recommendations and on the Government Accountability Office's High Risk list and the annual report to reduce program duplication. Based on these oversight efforts and performance reviews of programs within their jurisdiction, committees are directed to include recommendations for improved governmental performance in their annual views and estimates reports required under section 301(d) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 632(d)) to the Committees on the Budget.

**SEC. 4202. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF CERTAIN DISCRETIONARY ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the Senate, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)(1)), section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990 (2 U.S.C. 632 note), and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the joint explanatory statement accompanying the conference report on any concurrent resolution on the budget shall include in its allocations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the Committees on Appropriations amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and of the Postal Service.

(b) **SPECIAL RULE.**—In the Senate, for purposes of enforcing sections 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(f)), estimates of the level of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 4203. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) **APPLICATION.**—Any adjustments of allocations and aggregates made pursuant to this resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) **EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 621 et seq.) as allocations and aggregates contained in this resolution.

(c) **BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.**—For purposes of this resolution the levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, new entitlement authority, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the Committee on the Budget of the Senate.

**SEC. 4204. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.**

Upon the enactment of a bill or joint resolution providing for a change in concepts or definitions, the Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution in accordance with section 251(b) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(b)).

**SEC. 4205. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT LEGISLATION NOT INCLUDED IN THE BASELINE.**

The Chairman of the Committee on the Budget of the Senate may make adjustments to the levels and allocations in this resolution to reflect legislation enacted before the date on which this resolution is agreed to by Congress that is not incorporated in the baseline underlying the Congressional Budget Office's June 2017 update to the Budget and Economic Outlook: 2017 to 2027.

**SEC. 4206. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

Congress adopts the provisions of this title—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the Senate, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the Senate and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the Senate to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the Senate.

**TITLE V—BUDGET PROCESS IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES**

**Subtitle A—Budget Enforcement**

**SEC. 5101. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST INCREASING LONG-TERM DIRECT SPENDING.**

(a) **POINT OF ORDER.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that would cause a net increase in direct spending in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods described in subsection (b).

(b) **CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET OFFICE ANALYSIS OF PROPOSALS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall, to the extent practicable, prepare an estimate of whether a bill or joint resolution reported by a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations), or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, would cause, relative to current law, a net increase in direct spending in the House of Representatives, in excess of \$2,500,000,000 in any of the 4 consecutive 10-fiscal year periods beginning after the last fiscal year of this concurrent resolution.

(c) **LIMITATION.**—In the House of Representatives, the provisions of this section shall not apply to any bills or joint resolutions, or amendments thereto or conference reports thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget has made adjustments to the allocations, aggregates, or other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution.

(d) **DETERMINATIONS OF BUDGET LEVELS.**—For purposes of this section, the levels of net increases in direct spending shall be determined on the basis of estimates provided by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(e) **SUNSET.**—This section shall have no force or effect after September 30, 2018.

**SEC. 5102. ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**

(a) **SEPARATE ALLOCATION FOR OVERSEAS CONTINGENCY OPERATIONS/GLOBAL WAR ON TERRORISM.**—In the House of Representatives, there shall be a separate allocation of new budget authority and outlays provided to the Committee on Appropriations for the purposes of Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism, which shall be deemed to be an allocation under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. Section 302(a)(3) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(b) **SECTION 302 ALLOCATIONS.**—The separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) shall be the exclusive allocation for Overseas Contingency Operations/Global War on Terrorism under section 302(b) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974. The Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives may provide suballocations of such separate allocation under such section 302(b).

(c) **APPLICATION.**—For purposes of enforcing the separate allocation referred to in subsection (a) under section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the “first fiscal year” and the “total of fiscal years” shall be deemed to refer to fiscal year 2018. Section 302(c) of such Act shall not apply to such separate allocation.

(d) **DESIGNATIONS.**—New budget authority or outlays shall only be counted toward the allocation referred to in subsection (a) if designated

pursuant to section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

(e) **ADJUSTMENTS.**—For purposes of subsection (a) for fiscal year 2018, no adjustment shall be made under section 314(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 if any adjustment would be made under section 251(b)(2)(A)(ii) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 5103. LIMITATION ON CHANGES IN CERTAIN MANDATORY PROGRAMS.**

(a) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “change in mandatory programs” means a provision that—

(1) would have been estimated as affecting direct spending or receipts under section 252 of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (as in effect prior to September 30, 2002) if the provision were included in legislation other than appropriation Acts; and

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

(b) **POINT OF ORDER IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—

(1) **IN GENERAL.**—A provision in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year that proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3), shall not be in order in the House of Representatives.

(2) **AMENDMENTS AND CONFERENCE REPORTS.**—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider an amendment to, or a conference report on, a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for a full fiscal year if such amendment thereto or conference report thereon proposes a change in mandatory programs that, if enacted, would cause the absolute value of the total budget authority of all such changes in mandatory programs enacted in relation to a full fiscal year to be more than the amount specified in paragraph (3).

(3) **AMOUNT.**—The amount specified in this paragraph is—

(A) for fiscal year 2018, \$19,100,000,000;

(B) for fiscal year 2019, \$17,000,000,000; and

(C) for fiscal year 2020, \$15,000,000,000.

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

**SEC. 5104. LIMITATION ON ADVANCE APPROPRIATIONS.**

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—In the House of Representatives, except as provided for in subsection (b), any general appropriation bill or bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, may not provide advance appropriations.

(b) **EXCEPTIONS.**—An advance appropriation may be provided for programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified in the report or the joint explanatory statement of managers, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution under the following headings:

(1) **GENERAL.**—“Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(2) **VETERANS.**—“Veterans Accounts Identified for Advance Appropriations”.

(c) **LIMITATIONS.**—The aggregate level of advance appropriations shall not exceed the following:

(1) **GENERAL.**—\$28,852,000,000 in new budget authority for all programs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(1).

(2) **VETERANS.**—\$70,699,313,000 in new budget authority for programs in the Department of Veterans Affairs identified pursuant to subsection (b)(2).

(d) **DEFINITION.**—In this section, the term “advance appropriation” means any new discretionary budget authority provided in a general appropriation bill or joint resolution continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, or any amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that first becomes available for the first fiscal year following fiscal year 2018.

#### SEC. 5105. ESTIMATES OF DEBT SERVICE COSTS.

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may direct the Congressional Budget Office to include, in any estimate prepared under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 with respect to any bill or joint resolution, an estimate of any change in debt service costs resulting from carrying out such bill or resolution. Any estimate of debt service costs provided under this section shall be advisory and shall not be used for purposes of enforcement of such Act, the Rules of the House of Representatives, or this concurrent resolution. This section shall not apply to authorizations of programs funded by discretionary spending or to appropriation bills or joint resolutions, but shall apply to changes in the authorization level of appropriated entitlements.

#### SEC. 5106. FAIR-VALUE CREDIT ESTIMATES.

(a) **ALL CREDIT PROGRAMS.**—Whenever the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate of any measure that establishes or modifies any program providing loans or loan guarantees, the Director shall also, to the extent practicable, provide a fair-value estimate of such loan or loan guarantee program if requested by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(b) **STUDENT FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE AND HOUSING PROGRAMS.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall provide, to the extent practicable, a fair-value estimate as part of any estimate for any measure that establishes or modifies a loan or loan guarantee program for student financial assistance or housing (including residential mortgage).

(c) **BASELINE ESTIMATES.**—The Congressional Budget Office shall include estimates, on a fair-value and credit reform basis, of loan and loan guarantee programs for student financial assistance, housing (including residential mortgage), and such other major loan and loan guarantee programs, as practicable, in its *The Budget and Economic Outlook: 2018 to 2027*.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—If the Director of the Congressional Budget Office provides an estimate pursuant to subsection (a) or (b), the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may use such estimate to determine compliance with the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and other budget enforcement requirements.

#### SEC. 5107. ESTIMATES OF MACROECONOMIC EFFECTS OF MAJOR LEGISLATION.

(a) **CBO AND JCT ESTIMATES.**—During the 115th Congress, any estimate of major legislation considered in the House of Representatives provided by the Congressional Budget Office under section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 or by the Joint Committee on Taxation to the Congressional Budget Office under section 201(f) of such Act shall, to the extent practicable, incorporate the budgetary effects of changes in economic output, employment, capital stock, and other macroeconomic variables resulting from such major legislation.

(b) **CONTENTS.**—Any estimate referred to in subsection (a) shall, to the extent practicable, include—

(1) a qualitative assessment of the budgetary effects (including macroeconomic variables described in subsection (a)) of the major legislation in the 20-fiscal year period beginning after the last fiscal year of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget that sets forth budgetary levels required under section 301 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974; and

(2) an identification of the critical assumptions and the source of data underlying that estimate.

(c) **DEFINITIONS.**—In this section:

(1) **MAJOR LEGISLATION.**—The term “major legislation” means a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon—

(A) for which an estimate is required to be prepared pursuant to section 402 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 653) and that causes a gross budgetary effect (before incorporating macroeconomic effects and not including timing shifts) in a fiscal year in the period of years of the most recently agreed to concurrent resolution on the budget equal to or greater than 0.25 percent of the current projected gross domestic product of the United States for that fiscal year; or

(B) designated as such by—

(i) the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives for all direct spending legislation; or

(ii) the Member who is Chairman or Vice Chairman of the Joint Committee on Taxation for revenue legislation.

(2) **BUDGETARY EFFECTS.**—The term “budgetary effects” means changes in revenues, direct spending outlays, and deficits.

(3) **TIMING SHIFTS.**—The term “timing shifts” means—

(A) provisions that cause a delay of the date on which outlays flowing from direct spending would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the next fiscal year; or

(B) provisions that cause an acceleration of the date on which revenues would otherwise occur from one fiscal year to the prior fiscal year.

#### SEC. 5108. ADJUSTMENTS FOR IMPROVED CONTROL OF BUDGETARY RESOURCES.

(a) **ADJUSTMENTS OF DISCRETIONARY AND DIRECT SPENDING LEVELS.**—In the House of Representatives, if a committee (other than the Committee on Appropriations) reports a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto is offered or conference report thereon is submitted, providing for a decrease in direct spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) for any fiscal year and also provides for an authorization of appropriations for the same purpose, upon the enactment of such measure, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may decrease the allocation to the applicable authorizing committee that reports such measure and increase the allocation of discretionary spending (budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom) to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 by an amount equal to the new budget authority (and outlays flowing therefrom) provided for in a bill or joint resolution making appropriations for the same purpose.

(b) **DETERMINATIONS.**—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing this concurrent resolution, the allocations and aggregate levels of new budget authority, outlays, direct spending, revenues, deficits, and surpluses for fiscal year 2018 and the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget and such chair may adjust the applicable levels in this concurrent resolution.

#### SEC. 5109. SCORING RULE FOR ENERGY SAVINGS PERFORMANCE CONTRACTS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—The Director of the Congressional Budget Office shall estimate provisions of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that provides the authority to enter into or modify any covered energy savings contract on a net present value basis (NPV).

(b) **NPV CALCULATIONS.**—The net present value of any covered energy savings contract shall be calculated as follows:

(1) The discount rate shall reflect market risk.

(2) The cash flows shall include, whether classified as mandatory or discretionary, payments

to contractors under the terms of their contracts, payments to contractors for other services, and direct savings in energy and energy-related costs.

(3) The stream of payments shall cover the period covered by the contracts but not to exceed 25 years.

(c) **DEFINITION.**—As used in this section, the term “covered energy savings contract” means—

(1) an energy savings performance contract authorized under section 801 of the National Energy Conservation Policy Act; or

(2) a utility energy service contract, as described in the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on Federal Use of Energy Savings Performance Contracting, dated July 25, 1998 (M-98-13), and the Office of Management and Budget Memorandum on the Federal Use of Energy Saving Performance Contracts and Utility Energy Service Contracts, dated September 28, 2015 (M-12-21), or any successor to either memorandum.

(d) **ENFORCEMENT IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—In the House of Representatives, if any net present value of any covered energy savings contract calculated under subsection (b) results in a net savings, then the budgetary effects of such contract shall not be counted for purposes of titles III and IV of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

(e) **CLASSIFICATION OF SPENDING.**—For purposes of budget enforcement, the estimated net present value of the budget authority provided by the measure, and outlays flowing therefrom, shall be classified as direct spending.

(f) **SENSE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**—It is the sense of the House of Representatives that—

(1) the Director of the Office of Management and Budget, in consultation with the Director of the Congressional Budget Office, should separately identify the cash flows under subsection (b)(2) and include such information in the President’s annual budget submission under section 1105(a) of title 31, United States Code; and

(2) the scoring method used in this section should not be used to score any contracts other than covered energy savings contracts.

#### SEC. 5110. LIMITATION ON TRANSFERS FROM THE GENERAL FUND OF THE TREASURY TO THE HIGHWAY TRUST FUND.

In the House of Representatives, for purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985, and the rules or orders of the House of Representatives, a bill or joint resolution, or an amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers funds from the general fund of the Treasury to the Highway Trust Fund shall be counted as new budget authority and outlays equal to the amount of the transfer in the fiscal year the transfer occurs.

#### SEC. 5111. PROHIBITION ON USE OF FEDERAL RESERVE SURPLUSES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that transfers any portion of the net surplus of the Federal Reserve System to the general fund of the Treasury shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.

#### SEC. 5112. PROHIBITION ON USE OF GUARANTEE FEES AS AN OFFSET.

In the House of Representatives, any provision of a bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that increases, or extends the increase of, any guarantee fees of the Federal National Mortgage Association (Fannie Mae) or the Federal Home Loan Mortgage Corporation (Freddie Mac) shall not be counted for purposes of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, this concurrent resolution, or clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives.



**SEC. 5113. MODIFICATION OF RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—Section 2002 shall have no force or effect.

(b) *RECONCILIATION IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.*—Not later than November 13, 2017, the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives shall report to the House of Representatives changes in laws within its jurisdiction that increase the deficit by not more than \$1,500,000,000,000 for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**Subtitle B—Other Provisions**

**SEC. 5201. BUDGETARY TREATMENT OF ADMINISTRATIVE EXPENSES.**

(a) *IN GENERAL.*—In the House of Representatives, notwithstanding section 302(a)(1) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, section 13301 of the Budget Enforcement Act of 1990, and section 2009a of title 39, United States Code, the report or the joint explanatory statement, as applicable, accompanying this concurrent resolution shall include in its allocation to the Committee on Appropriations under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 amounts for the discretionary administrative expenses of the Social Security Administration and the United States Postal Service.

(b) *SPECIAL RULE.*—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of enforcing section 302(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974, estimates of the levels of total new budget authority and total outlays provided by a measure shall include any discretionary amounts described in subsection (a).

**SEC. 5202. APPLICATION AND EFFECT OF CHANGES IN ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.**

(a) *APPLICATION.*—In the House of Representatives, any adjustments of the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels made pursuant to this concurrent resolution shall—

(1) apply while that measure is under consideration;

(2) take effect upon the enactment of that measure; and

(3) be published in the Congressional Record as soon as practicable.

(b) *EFFECT OF CHANGED ALLOCATIONS AND AGGREGATES.*—Revised allocations and aggregates resulting from these adjustments shall be considered for the purposes of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 as the allocations and aggregates contained in this concurrent resolution.

(c) *BUDGET COMMITTEE DETERMINATIONS.*—For purposes of this concurrent resolution, the budgetary levels for a fiscal year or period of fiscal years shall be determined on the basis of estimates made by the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives.

(d) *AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS AND APPLICATION.*—In the House of Representatives, for purposes of this concurrent resolution and budget enforcement, the consideration of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, for which the chair of the Committee on the Budget makes adjustments or revisions in the allocations, aggregates, and other budgetary levels of this concurrent resolution shall not be subject to the points of order set forth in clause 10 of rule XXI of the Rules of the House of Representatives or section 5101 of this concurrent resolution.

(e) *OTHER ADJUSTMENTS.*—The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution depending on congressional action on pending reconciliation legislation.

**SEC. 5203. ADJUSTMENTS TO REFLECT CHANGES IN CONCEPTS AND DEFINITIONS.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the appropriate aggregates, allocations, and other budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for any change in budgetary concepts and definitions consistent with section 251(b)(1) of the

Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985.

**SEC. 5204. ADJUSTMENT FOR CHANGES IN THE BASELINE.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, reconciliation targets, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution to reflect changes resulting from the Congressional Budget Office's update to its baseline for fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 5205. APPLICATION OF RULE REGARDING LIMITS ON DISCRETIONARY SPENDING.**

Section 314(f) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 shall not apply in the House of Representatives to any bill, joint resolution, or amendment that provides new budget authority for a fiscal year or to any conference report on any such bill or resolution if—

(1) the enactment of that bill or resolution;

(2) the adoption and enactment of that amendment; or

(3) the enactment of that bill or resolution in the form recommended in that conference report, would not cause the 302(a) allocation to the Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2018 to be exceeded.

**SEC. 5206. ENFORCEMENT FILING IN THE HOUSE.**

In the House of Representatives, if a concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018 is adopted without the appointment of a committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses with respect to this concurrent resolution on the budget, for the purpose of enforcing the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 and applicable rules and requirements set forth in the concurrent resolution on the budget, the allocations and list provided for in this section shall apply in the House of Representatives in the same manner as if such allocations and list were in a joint explanatory statement accompanying a conference report on the budget for fiscal year 2018. The chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives shall submit a statement for publication in the Congressional Record containing—

(1) for the Committee on Appropriations, committee allocations for fiscal year 2018 consistent with title I 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 consistent with title I for fiscal year 2018 and for the period of fiscal years 2018 through 2027 for the purpose of enforcing 302 of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633); and

(3) a list of programs, projects, activities, or accounts identified for advance appropriations for the purpose of enforcing section 5104 of this concurrent resolution.

**SEC. 5207. EXERCISE OF RULEMAKING POWERS.**

The House of Representatives adopts the provisions of this title and section 2002—

(1) as an exercise of the rulemaking power of the House of Representatives, and as such they shall be considered as part of the rules of the House of Representatives, and such rules shall supersede other rules only to the extent that they are inconsistent with such other rules; and

(2) with full recognition of the constitutional right of the House of Representatives to change those rules at any time, in the same manner, and to the same extent as is the case of any other rule of the House of Representatives.

**Subtitle C—Adjustment Authority**

**SEC. 5301. ADJUSTMENT AUTHORITY FOR AMENDMENTS TO STATUTORY CAPS.**

During the 115th Congress, if a measure becomes law that amends the discretionary spending limits established under section 251(c) of the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (2 U.S.C. 901(e)), such as a measure increasing the limit for the revised security category for fiscal year 2018 to be

\$640,000,000,000, the chair of the Committee on the Budget of the House of Representatives may adjust the allocation called for under section 302(a) of the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (2 U.S.C. 633(a)) to the appropriate committee or committees of the House of Representatives, and may adjust all other budgetary aggregates, allocations, levels, and limits contained in this resolution, as necessary, consistent with such measure.

**Subtitle D—Reserve Funds**

**SEC. 5401. RESERVE FUND FOR INVESTMENTS IN NATIONAL INFRASTRUCTURE.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that invests in national infrastructure to the extent that such measure is deficit neutral for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 5402. RESERVE FUND FOR COMPREHENSIVE TAX REFORM.**

In the House of Representatives, if the Committee on Ways and Means reports a bill or joint resolution that provides for comprehensive tax reform, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any such bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 5403. RESERVE FUND FOR THE STATE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may adjust the allocations, budget aggregates and other appropriate levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that extends the State Children's Health Insurance Program allotments, if such measure would not increase the deficit for the total of fiscal years 2018 through 2027.

**SEC. 5404. RESERVE FUND FOR THE REPEAL OR REPLACEMENT OF PRESIDENT OBAMA'S HEALTH CARE LAWS.**

In the House of Representatives, the chair of the Committee on the Budget may revise the allocations, aggregates, and other appropriate budgetary levels in this concurrent resolution for the budgetary effects of any bill or joint resolution, or amendment thereto or conference report thereon, that repeals or replaces any provision of the Patient Protection and Affordable Care Act or title I or subtitle B of title II of the Health Care and Education Reconciliation Act of 2010 by the amount of budget authority and outlays flowing therefrom provided by such measure for such purpose.

**MOTION TO CONCUR**

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will designate the motion.

The text of the motion is as follows:

Mrs. Black moves that the House concur in the Senate amendment to House Concurrent Resolution 71.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the motion shall be debatable for 1 hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the Senate amendment to H. Con. Res. 71, the budget resolution for fiscal year 2018.

Passing a budget is never easy, and it has, once again, been a challenge this year. But I am encouraged with where we are now, and I am pleased that the Senate did its work by approving a budget, one that we can support in order to unlock tax reform for the American people.

Without question, there are plenty of things that I wish were included in what the Senate passed, ideas that the House put forward earlier this month when we approved our budget. For example, I still feel strongly about addressing unsustainable mandatory spending, and that hasn't changed. The growing burden of debt caused by mandatory spending is a real problem that cannot be ignored.

We owe it to the American people to do something, to offer serious reforms that ensure government programs are financially sustainable and working well for generations to come, and I think we will tackle this important issue in the future. Really, we don't have a choice.

But despite any shortcomings of the Senate-passed budget, I am encouraged that it does reflect the shared priorities of both Chambers. Moving forward with this budget is also supported by our President.

I want to remind my colleagues that before final passage last week, the Senate did include numerous provisions previously passed by the House, and I was proud to be involved in those negotiations with the leaders of the House, the Senate, and the White House.

For example, the Senate-passed budget creates a mechanism that would permit the Budget Committee chairman to adjust the budget allocations if there is future legislation signed into law that revises the BCA spending caps.

The Senate-passed budget also includes numerous improvements to the House budget's enforcement that are designed to strengthen fiscal discipline. Because we worked together to find a common ground, we can move ahead toward tax reform and expand upon the ideas in the conservative framework unveiled last month.

Throughout my nearly 7 years as a Member of the House, Republicans have talked about modernizing our outdated and overly complicated tax system, and today, we have the opportunity to take that next big step to unlock tax reform for the American people, fulfilling the promise that we made long ago to our constituents.

By advancing tax reform, we can help Americans keep more of their hard-earned paychecks; we can make it possible for most Americans to file their taxes on a simple postcard; we can level the playing field for business and help them compete better globally; and

we can empower entrepreneurs and small businesses, encouraging them to create more jobs.

This budget acknowledges that our economy is in desperate need of a jolt, and the tax cuts included in the Senate-passed budget hold that promise of doing just that. Put simply, we have the opportunity to make history by reforming our tax system for the first time in nearly three decades.

President Trump is with us on this, and I agree that we must move quickly, and that is why I urge my colleagues to pass this budget today.

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

□ 0915

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

Mr. Speaker, the bill we are debating today is not a real effort at responsible budgeting. It is a means to an end: a single-minded plan to make it easier to enact tax cuts for the wealthy and big corporations, regardless of the consequences for everyone else.

If approved by the House today, an irresponsible \$1.5 trillion tax bill will come to the floor in a matter of weeks. It is being rushed because Republicans don't want the American people to know what is in it. They don't want you to find out that it overwhelmingly benefits the wealthy while increasing taxes on millions of middle class families.

Rushing through legislation that impacts nearly every American family and business is reckless, and voting on a bill that rewrites our Nation's Tax Code a week or two after it is introduced without any real input from the people who will be impacted is negligent. But that is what you do when you can't defend your own policy.

And there are a lot of unjustifiable provisions in this budget. On top of massive tax cuts for the rich, it cuts vital national investments, threatening our economic progress and our national security. It cuts more than \$4 trillion in mandatory spending, including nearly \$2 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid alone.

The enormity of these cuts and the severity of the consequences for American families cannot be overstated. But more cuts will be coming once the Republican tax cuts blow an enormous hole in the budget. We will see a tax on Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, nutrition assistance—on important benefits that help American families get ahead.

I know my Republican colleagues desperately want to believe that the tax cuts in their budget will pay for themselves and usher in a new era of economic growth—or at least they want the American people to believe that. But the record is clear, this approach has failed time and time again.

And now, even though the evidence and experts have concluded that these tax cuts will not create an economic boom but will, instead, lead to a higher

concentration of wealth among the rich while dramatically increasing deficits and debt, my Republican colleagues are trying to do it again.

Everything we do in Congress should be about making the lives of American families better and more secure. We owe them a budget that invests in their future, a Tax Code that is fair, and a full and honest debate on both. This budget and the tax cuts that will follow are a failure on all fronts.

I, therefore, urge my Republican colleagues to abandon this dangerous budget and start addressing the needs and priorities of the American people.

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

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SMITH).

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to thank the chairwoman of the Budget Committee for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass this budget not only to rein in out-of-control spending, but also to give Congress the go-ahead on much-needed tax reform.

We need to reduce the tax burden on hardworking Americans. The typical household in the 21st Congressional District of Texas pays over \$15,700 in Federal taxes. Past experience shows that tax relief generates strong economic growth. It enables Americans to save, invest, create jobs, and spend more of their income.

Our vision of tax reform benefits families across America. For example, in my congressional district, one-sixth of households utilize the child tax credit. Increasing the child tax credit will help families keep more of their hard-earned money to use on child care or parental leave, school supplies, college savings, and other expenses associated with raising a child.

Let's help American families enjoy a more prosperous future rather than pay more of their hard-earned dollars to the Federal Government.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE), a distinguished Member of the House Budget Committee and Ways and Means Committee.

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

With many working families and businesses still struggling to adapt to a rapidly changing economy, our top priority in Congress should be helping expand opportunities, opportunities to sustain long-term economic growth



and security so no American is left behind.

Unfortunately, the bill we are voting on today is not a serious budget designed to help middle class families. Instead, this budget is simply a vehicle to rush through a partisan tax proposal using a process known as reconciliation.

And what is worse, the Ryan-McConnell tax plan would add trillions of dollars to the deficit, making our children foot the bill for tax cuts that disproportionately benefit the wealthiest. In fact, the Tax Policy Center has estimated that the Ryan-McConnell tax plan could raise taxes by an average of \$1,209 a year on families earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year. This is moving in the wrong direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote “no.”

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. NORMAN).

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution, which is a critical first step to achieving comprehensive tax reform and making the American economy great again. I also applaud Chairwoman DIANE BLACK for her leadership in producing this budget.

Our Nation has not significantly reformed our Tax Code in more than three decades, which has allowed the Tax Code to explode in complexity and unnecessary burden on hardworking American families and businesses. Moreover, while the United States is a world leader in innovation and entrepreneurship, we have failed to reduce our corporate tax rate, which stands at 35 percent, the highest in the developed world. And I would add, corporations don't pay tax; the American people pay tax.

The unified framework unveiled earlier this year will simplify the Tax Code for everyone, eliminate wasteful tax loopholes, and reduce taxes on businesses. I am also pleased to see that the plan eliminates the death tax on farmers and moves to full expensing. Under this plan, the average family will see an increase in income between \$4,000 and \$9,000, annually.

While I believe this budget is necessary to spur economic growth and increase wages, I am extremely disappointed that the Senate removed the \$203 billion of mandatory spending cuts, given the challenge the national debt poses to our great United States. However, we should not make the perfect the enemy of the good, and I understand that issues as complex as the budget and tax reform require compromise.

I appreciate the leadership of Speaker RYAN, Chairman BRADY, and the rest of the leadership team for their hard work on tax reform, and I look forward to working with my colleagues to moving tax reform over the finish line and to President Trump's desk.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. YARMUTH for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to this fiscal year 2018 budget resolution for a number of reasons, not the least of which is that the underlying assumptions are grossly misleading. It assumes fictions like hundreds of billions of dollars from the repeal of the Affordable Care Act, and it assumes an economic growth rate of 3 percent, which most economists on both sides do not believe is possible.

This budget is merely a vehicle for Republicans to fast-track tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and large corporations. Any assertion of cuts for working families is debunked by experts like Leonard Burman, cofounder of the nonpartisan Tax Policy Center, who has called this “utterly implausible.”

Mr. Speaker, the facts are these: 80 percent of the Republican tax cuts go to the top 1 percent by 2027; the average tax cut for the top 1 percent in 2027 will be \$207,000; and 42 million middle class households will face a tax increase, including those earning between \$50,000 and \$150,000, who will see a tax increase of one-third. That is what this budget lays the path for.

If we want to see where this will lead, let's just look at Kansas, a place where the Republican legislature has rolled back the tax cuts that they passed from several years ago because they simply didn't work and put Kansas' economy into a downward spiral.

We know who wins under this budget resolution. It simply paves the way for a huge tax cut for the wealthiest millionaires, billionaires, and corporations. That is wrong, and I urge a “no” vote on this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, unsustainable government spending drives both taxes and debt.

The budget resolution sets the spending architecture for the fiscal year. The House version provided for \$200 billion of enforceable mandatory spending reductions over 10 years and balanced within the decade. The Senate amendments gut these provisions, squandering the one opportunity Congress has each year to bring mandatory spending under control, taking us another year closer to a sovereign debt crisis. This is tragic, and I condemn it in the strongest terms.

The Senate, though, has retained just one key provision from the House budget. It makes tax reform possible this year. Tax reform is essential to economic growth, and economic growth is essential to confront our debt.

Many are alarmed that it provides for \$1.5 trillion of additional debt, but this is due solely to the Senate's rules that require tax cuts to be scored only as revenue losses without taking into account economic expansion.

During the Obama years, our economy grew at an average of 1½ percent, annually. That is about half the average rate since World War II. Reagan averaged 3½ percent. Reagan did this by reducing the tax burdens that were crushing our economy. He slashed the top income tax rate from 70 percent down to 28 percent, and income tax receipts nearly doubled because of the economic expansion he unleashed.

Taxes driven by spending are the greatest threat to our economy today, and debt driven by spending is the greatest threat to our future. Controlling spending is currently impossible in the Senate. So it is obvious that we can't balance the budget and reduce our debt without significantly increasing economic growth; we can't increase economic growth without tax relief; and we can't get tax relief without the provisions in the Senate budget.

Arthur Laffer, the architect of the Reagan tax policy, forecasts that the corporate tax reform alone will increase GDP growth at a rate that should generate a temporary bump of 5 percent, settling down to an average of 2.6 percent over the decade. This will add \$5 trillion to the American economy and directly increase revenues to all levels of government between \$1.8 trillion and \$2 trillion.

We have tried a static approach to tax policy during the Obama years. The economy stagnated and the debt doubled.

I remember what it was like in the Reagan era. Wages were rising and opportunities for better jobs were everywhere. There was a sense of optimism that comes with prosperity and abundance. When we abandoned these policies, we lost that prosperity to a decade of despair.

I want my kids to know what that sense of relief and optimism was like, what it feels like when morning dawns again on the American economy. This resolution starts that transformation, and I urge its adoption.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I remind the prior speaker, my friend from California, that Arthur Laffer was also the architect of the Kansas plan, which was disastrous for that State. So citing him as a source, I would be a little bit careful.

Mr. Speaker, I am happy to yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding and for his tremendous leadership.

And also, just very briefly, I want to mention to my colleague from California on the other side, I remember the Reagan-era tax cut period also, and there was a huge rise in homeless veterans as a result, unfortunately.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the so-called budget plan.

I know that our budget shapes our national priorities and values, but the Republicans have put forward a budget that I think is downright sinister. This budget is morally bankrupt. It is a Trojan horse that steals healthcare from children and rips food from the hungry just to fast-track \$1.5 trillion in tax breaks to billionaires and corporations.

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

□ 0930

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

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

With nearly 40 million Americans living in poverty, our budget should invest in communities of color and rural communities, which have higher rates of poverty.

Simply put, the House Republican budget would push more people into poverty. It slashes programs that help create good paying jobs for struggling families. It is a shame, it is immoral, it is un-American, and I hope we defeat it.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I just must make a comment on what went on in Kansas and the attribution that this was Mr. Laffer's idea.

I know Mr. Laffer personally and have had a conversation with him about his plan and suggestion. It was not followed. So I do want to lift up his good name and say that his plan was not followed.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. ALLEN).

Mr. ALLEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate Chairman BLACK on the markup of this important piece of legislation out of the Budget Committee.

As we all know, tax season is the worst. It evokes images of stress, accountants, lawyers, and American families sending hard-earned money to the Federal Government.

I, for one, have never been excited when it is tax season, and as a businessowner, it took on a whole new meaning.

Taxes affect all Americans, but tax season shouldn't include months and months of preparation, often required to hire tax professionals.

Our Tax Code is broken, and millions of Americans are looking to us to fix it. That is why Republicans have released the Unified Tax Reform Framework to provide relief for hardworking

Americans and jump-start our economy.

First, it lowers taxes at every income level, allowing Americans to keep more of their hard-earned paychecks. It delivers the lowest tax rates in modern history for job creators, allowing them to invest in growing their business. I will remind you that the small business community is responsible for 70 percent of all new jobs created.

The vast majority of taxpayers will no longer have to deal with the complexity of itemizing due to the increased standard deduction. Small businesses will no longer be taxed under the individual side of the code. Families will no longer be penalized for inheriting family property or businesses, when the death tax is removed. Finally, we will cut tax rates on personal savings and investment in half.

Americans should invest in their local economies and build towards a more financially secure future without exorbitant taxes.

Now is the time for tax reform, and today we take a big step towards action. We must pass this budget. Hardworking Americans across the Nation will have the same April 15 they always have if we don't, and that is unacceptable.

We cannot miss this opportunity. President Trump is with us on tax reform, and we must act for the American people. I urge all my colleagues to support this budget. It is critical to the American people.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the billionaires' budget. That is exactly what the Republican budget is. 79.7 percent of it goes to the richest 1 percent.

On top of that, who pays for it? The middle class and working class families of my district. Some 50 million Americans will be paying more in taxes, not less, as a result of this tax plan.

Now, I have nothing against the billionaires that my friends on the other side are so eager to help. I just don't think the working class and middle class families of my district should be paying for their tax cuts.

We should instead have a budget that focuses on building the middle class out, on lifting up those who have been working for the last 15 years and not getting a pay increase. This budget does absolutely nothing for those families, zero.

On top of all of this, it adds \$1.5 trillion to our national debt. It is wrong. It does not do anything to help the great American middle class, and it must be rejected.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BLACK for yielding time.

Mr. Speaker, I hear it all the time, and it is just a false narrative. This idea that the tax reform package presented by Republicans is only a tax relief for the wealthy and that the middle class and low-income families are not going to benefit from it is just absolutely untrue.

We are talking about doubling the standard deduction. Millions of Americans aren't even going to pay any taxes. That is particularly important in rural areas like I represent in Ohio.

So I would urge my colleagues, let's stop this false narrative that says that this is just a tax cut for the wealthy, because that is not true.

By the way, when you cut taxes on businesses and corporations, who pays those taxes, Mr. Speaker?

It is the American people who buy the products that pay those taxes. When they get a break, everybody wins.

Look, the adoption of the Senate amendment to the House-passed budget that we are going to vote on today paves the way for tax reform. It is going to establish a path of balance through restrained spending, reduced taxes, and economic growth. It is going to allow for higher defense spending contingent on future adjustments to discretionary spending caps for defense and national security, but it begins to address our national debt.

It reduces nondefense discretionary spending by over \$600 billion over 10 years. It assumes more than \$4 trillion in mandatory savings over 10 years. And it provides for budget enforcement in the House in order to strengthen fiscal discipline.

Mr. Speaker, this is a responsible path forward. The American people are screaming for a simpler, fairer, flatter Tax Code, one that makes American workers competitive, one that let's the American people keep more of what they earn in their pockets.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support today's vote, pass this budget amendment, and let's get on to tax reform.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), the assistant Democratic leader.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding me the time.

Mr. Speaker, the document before us is a partisan exercise to deliver large tax cuts to the wealthy. Working Americans will see their taxes go up, and our children and grandchildren will have to pay back the debt Republicans will create to finance these tax cuts.

While they promise the American people revenue neutral tax reform that will simplify the Tax Code and close costly loopholes, the budget they are ramming through will borrow \$1.5 trillion to finance these cuts. It will precipitate cuts to Medicare, Medicaid, and other safety net programs upon which middle-income families depend.

It proposes to eliminate the deduction for State and local taxes, increasing the tax burden on over 500,000 people in my home State of South Carolina.

This document threatens the earned income tax credit; lowers the ceiling on middle-income savings; and eliminates the inheritance tax, which only affects those with estates valued over \$11 million.

It creates a pass-through for businesses that pay zero corporate taxes, effectively giving the owners of these companies a lower individual rate than the people they employ.

If the Republicans would engage us, we could produce a bipartisan tax plan that would expand the earned income tax credit for single individuals and the child tax credit for working families.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, we could produce a bipartisan tax plan that would end the preferential treatment of investment income, which undermines working Americans while enriching wealthy investors.

We stand ready to engage with the other side. Until then, we will be resolute in our opposition to this unfair, immoral document.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART), a member of both our Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I want to first thank the chairwoman for a phenomenal job.

Look, our current fiscal environment, according to the CBO, they project that the growth of our economy will be 2 percent or less for the next decade.

I am reminded of what a good friend and Democratic colleague in the Budget Committee said one day: That 3 percent growth, that is just a dream, that is unrealistic.

Yet, before the storms hit, what did we see as far as our economic growth of the country: 3.1 percent economic growth, something that one of our colleagues, Democratic colleagues, said was a pipe dream.

This is, in large part, because excessive regulations have been curtailed by both the administration and by Congress; but to keep that momentum, we need to pass tax reform.

It will lead to a sustained strong economy. It will again lower the tax burden to our families. It will lead to increased wages for families, for the middle class, for individuals for the first time in such a long time, allowing the American people to keep more of their hard-earned money. It would make small-, mid-, and large-sized businesses more competitive so they can create millions of additional jobs here in the United States.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation will allow us to do real tax reform to keep the economy growing, to get the economy going, to get the American people working again, and this is an essential part.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everyone's support.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. CARBAJAL), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. CARBAJAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member YARMUTH for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, snake oil is all that this Republican budget will give to the American middle class and working families.

This Republican budget before Congress is squarely aimed at ramming through a tax plan without bipartisan consensus or input. This proposed tax plan will increase our deficit, adding \$1.5 trillion over the next decade, and it leaves the middle class stuck footing the bill, with an increase in their annual Federal taxes.

In fact, 80 percent of the tax cuts in this plan benefits only the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans. That means those benefits are geared towards those earning \$900,000 a year or more.

One in three middle class families making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 will see their taxes go up.

One proposal that Republicans have put forth to pay for their plan is eliminating the State and local tax deduction. This will cost central coast homeowners and families in my district over \$15,000 a year on average.

As a member of the Budget Committee, I encourage my colleagues to reject this plan and to get to work on bipartisan negotiations for lasting tax reform that benefits middle class families.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, there is an old saying that the Devil is in the details. And those details have not been released yet, so it is difficult for me to understand how my colleagues on the other side of the aisle make assumptions on just what this tax plan will do, calling it things such as snake oil, when I can assure you that, as a member of the Ways and Means Committee, it is our goal and intent that the people in the middle- and low-income categories will see tax relief.

I also want to remind them that what we know was the Devil in the details is the details given to the American people a number of years ago on the Affordable Care Act—which is neither affordable nor caring, in my opinion—was that people would see a return of about \$2,500 on the average in their pocket as a result of the Affordable Care Act's policies, and what we saw and what we are seeing now is a big increase in those premiums. Certainly they have not received \$2,500 in their pocket.

They were told they could keep their doctor, which we knew wasn't true, and

the other kinds of things that were done that caused people to lose their insurance in my very own State, because we had a plan the people liked and people wanted to keep but could not because of the mandates that were put on by the Affordable Care Act.

□ 0945

I want to remind my friends from the other side of the aisle that maybe the thing to do is to wait and see what really is in the plan, because the devil is in the detail, and I think you may like it enough that you perhaps will even vote for this tax plan that does give a jolt to the economy and does help the American people, especially in the lower- and middle-income, to keep more of their hard-earned dollars in their pockets.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, to my friend on the other side of the aisle, the gentlewoman from Tennessee, the reality is that the truth hurts. This budget resolution totally abandons America's most cherished values and betrays its highest ideals.

This extreme budget not only threatens programs for our veterans and hungry children, it makes drastic cuts to the Medicare and Medicaid programs that our seniors count on for survival.

As it doles out that budgetary cruelty, this resolution hands massive tax cuts to millionaires and powerful corporations all while adding \$2.4 trillion to the deficit over the next decade.

It also fails to protect our environment, neglects our children's education, and once more targets women's healthcare for severe cuts.

In short, the wealthy win, the middle class is ignored, and we all get saddled with more debt. Those are not values that this House should stand for. It is certainly not what veterans, children, seniors, or hardworking Americans deserve. This irresponsible budget rewards the rich and powerful and punishes everyone else, and that is the best thing that I can say about it.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, while House Democrats are focused on delivering better jobs, better wages, and a better future for the American people, House Republicans have once again presented a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible.

It is a "billionaire-first, middle class-last tax plan." It will not help the middle class. The House Republican budget and tax proposal will hurt the middle

class by raising taxes on working families and middle-income Americans.

The House Republican budget and tax plan is nothing more than a wolf in sheep's clothing. It will benefit the wealthiest and the well-off here in this country. Eighty percent of the tax cuts proposed in the Ryan-McConnell plan will go to the wealthiest 1 percent in America, to millionaires and billionaires, to the privileged few, to special interest corporations. It will not lead to economic growth. It will saddle this country with trillions of dollars in additional debt and deficit.

It is based on a phony, fraudulent, and failed theory of trickle-down economics, which I finally figured out what it relates to in terms of the middle class. You may get a trickle, but you are guaranteed to stay down. Stay down because they are going to undermine your Medicare, stay down because they are going to undermine Social Security, and stay down because they are going to saddle your children with trillions of dollars of additional debt.

Mr. Speaker, reject this plan. It is a bad deal for the American people. They deserve a better deal.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), a member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I am almost tempted to continue to yield time to my friend from the other side of the aisle. Just keep driving the expectations of any tax relief further and further into the ground, and I think people are going to be surprised and delighted with ultimately what the House ends up considering.

Mr. Speaker, this is why I am here. This is a prelude to tax reform. We vote on this. We then make it so that no single political party is able to deny a vote on tax reform, and both parties can come to the table and try and negotiate something that is thoughtful, because here is what we know: it is the current Tax Code that is benefiting people that everybody is scandalized that they are benefiting. It is the current Tax Code that allows corporations to lock trillions of dollars offshore. It is the current Tax Code that is really stifling and so difficult. And it is the current Tax Code that nobody can defend. There is not a single person on this floor that is going to say: Oh, the Internal Revenue Code? I love that, Mr. Speaker. Just leave it the way it is. It is a disaster, and nobody likes the IRS.

So rather than moaning and groaning and having posters and this and that, let's do this: let's dump the current Tax Code and let's have a transformational moment. Mr. Speaker, that is what our country and our constituents are yearning for, not old bumper stickers, not old shabby phrases from the past, but they are looking for us to lead and to bring people together, and that is what we are trying to do.

There is a meddlesome issue that affects my district as a high tax State,

and it affects a lot of other folks, and that is how we deal with State and local tax deductibility. I am of the view that tax reform does not mean simply the redistribution of a tax liability from one part of the country to another, but it means tax relief for everybody.

Mr. Speaker, I think what we are looking for is to create middle class tax relief. And if the gentleman's expectations are that low, I think he is going to be pleased with what we ultimately are able to come up with.

Mr. Speaker, I urge an "aye" vote. I thank the gentlewoman for the time, and I look forward to passing this resolution and moving forward to changing our Tax Code.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. LEVIN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican budget politically paving the way for their tax reform proposals can best be described as an elixir of growth, a magic cure-all. Instead, it is a fake, indeed dangerous, potion.

History has shown that a huge tax cut, primarily for the very wealthy and large corporations, does not promote growth, and will make life harder for the middle class and everyone else.

This budget calls dangerously for raising our debt by \$1.5 trillion, creating a future deficit tax for middle-income families; cutting Medicare by nearly \$500 billion; cutting Medicaid and other health programs by \$1.3 trillion; and assuming \$4 trillion in cuts to a broad range of programs, which could include education and health research.

Mr. Speaker, vote "no" on this budget.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. WALKER), who is the chair of our RSC.

Mr. WALKER. Mr. Speaker, I am torn as I rise today. First, there is no question I will vote in favor of the budget and encourage my colleagues to do so because there is no doubt this is the best way forward to achieve tax reform and unlock the promise of bigger paychecks, more jobs, and the return of investing in America.

However, I must also include that the Senate did not do its work. After months of hard work by Chairwoman BLACK and the Budget Committee, the House was able to get it done. Even acknowledging the difficult position of our country, they put us on a path to balance the budget in less than a decade.

The House's budget included reconciliation instructions to speed up the enactment of \$203 billion in mandatory savings, and the House budget included instructions that allowed us for the first time to stay on the path to repeal ObamaCare, to help those who continue to suffer with rising premiums in the individual market.

I would guess that nearly every Republican in the Chamber agrees that the House's budget is superior.

So why are we voting on the Senate's?

Because our Senate colleagues seem allergic sometimes to making tough choices.

But why will the Senate's budget pass?

Because the American people need tax relief. Families and small businesses wrestle with an outdated and complicated Tax Code every year. It is true, we do have a once-in-a-generation opportunity.

The specter of the IRS and devastating corporate rate mean that capital and resources are held outside of the United States and not invested here. Making our Tax Code fairer and simpler will bring this capital back to the market and jump-start investment and growth like we have rarely seen in the United States.

Despite my ongoing and deep frustration sometimes with the Senate, I encourage my colleagues to pass this budget and bring the promise of more jobs and bigger paychecks closer to reality.

I am pleased by the Speaker's commitment that the House will vote on important fiscal legislation in the form of balanced budget amendments, the Default Prevention Act, or some other deficit-reducing legislation.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line? It is vital that the House fulfill its promise to the American people.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I now yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me time.

Mr. Speaker, the American people will look forward to a Thanksgiving and a Christmas of which families come together, but they will also see a Halloween.

Today, on the floor of the House, the Republicans will vote for the worst Halloween of hobgoblins and ghosts and monsters that you can ever imagine. Monsters scare children, so today we will be voting on that monster that will scare children.

Let me let you listen to Senator Sykes from Kansas, her State offering a Republican tax cut that was going to boost the economy. Her words are: "With the benefit of hindsight, we can say with certainty this promise was unfulfilled. In the following 5 years, Kansas experienced nine rounds of budget cuts, stress on State agencies, and the inability to effectively provide the core functions of government for our citizens."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD Senator Sykes' message to Congress.

A MESSAGE TO CONGRESS: DON'T MAKE THE SAME MISTAKE WE DID IN KANSAS

(By Dinah Sykes, a Republican member of the Kansas State Senate)

Americans want efficient government, responsible spending and reasonable taxes. This is not difficult. Yet sometimes what

seems so simple becomes complicated when these concepts are turned into buzzwords and used as weapons for political gain.

In 2012, Republicans in Kansas enacted a “revolutionary” tax overhaul promised to be a “shot of adrenaline to the heart of the Kansas economy.” With the benefit of hindsight, we can say with certainty this promise was unfulfilled. In the following five years, Kansas experienced nine rounds of budget cuts, stress on state agencies and the inability to effectively provide the core functions of government for our citizens.

As Republicans in Congress begin working to modify the federal tax code, I worry that tax reform done poorly could lead to similar failure. I hope federal lawmakers learn from mistakes made at the state level.

This year, the Kansas legislature—including many Republicans like me—voted to partially restore income-tax rates and to repeal a provision that allowed independent business owners to pay almost no state taxes on their income. We also overrode our governor’s veto, who opposed rolling back the tax cuts he championed.

Critics of our vote claim that Kansas didn’t cut spending enough to accompany the tax cuts. In reality, we cut our budget through across-the-board cuts, targeted cuts, rescission bills and allotments. Roughly 3,000 state employee positions were cut, salaries were frozen, and road projects canceled. We delayed payments to the state employee retirement system and emptied our savings accounts. Even as we issued more than \$2 billion in new bonds to float our debt, Kansas received three credit downgrades, making that debt costlier.

In Kansas, we understand the allure of tax-cut promises. We want to believe promises of amazing growth or outcomes. In 2012, traditional budget forecast models accurately predicted the devastating effect the tax breaks would have on state revenue. Proponents of the plan used dynamic scoring predicting incredible economic growth and supporting their own preconceived ideas. Today, we know which forecasts were correct.

Across the state, citizens may have been paying less in income taxes, but those decreases were offset by increases in sales taxes, property taxes and fees. These changes alone were not enough to put the state on the right path. Education and infrastructure, key investments necessary for strong economic growth, were treated as the enemy. As we went through our 2017 legislative session, the “shot of economic adrenaline” still showed no signs of materializing. Our state functioned as though the Great Recession had never ended.

Kansas should serve as a cautionary tale illustrating the damage done when the normal order is shortchanged. America’s founders and countless generations of leaders embedded deliberative procedures into our legislative process for a reason. But in 2012, the governor’s tax proposal looked very different from the package he signed. A dispute between House and Senate versions should have gone to conference committee; however, the House cut short debate and rammed through a motion to concur with the Senate instead. I watch now as lawmakers in Congress use similar tactics, and I worry that backroom dealing and circumvention of process will lead to similar results.

I never anticipated entering public service. I was content raising my family, participating in the PTA and operating my business. However, I saw the impact that bad tax policy was having on the state. I felt the results of growing class sizes and shrinking programs in the schools my children attended. I witnessed a gradual erosion of the quality of life that makes Kansas such a great place to live.

There is a real temptation to let our frustration turn into anger. In our increasingly polarized world, we see what happens when we retreat to our ideological trenches. The antidote, it would seem to me, is listening carefully to those we disagree with and seeking common ground as a starting point. (We should also note that failing to listen to constituents while blindly holding to ideology can have consequences: About a third of Kansas legislators became ex-legislators in 2016.)

As our country looks at the key issues ahead of us, including tax policy and health-care reform, we face important questions: How can we as Americans work together to improve our tax policy? How can we work together to provide core government functions? Answering those questions requires having civil conversations, learning from our neighbors and sharing our experiences. We are better when we can work together to find compromise.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. What do you think will happen to this Nation if we vote for this budget plan, this Halloween of a plan?

The latest Republican budget mandates \$4.9 trillion in budget cuts.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot vote for this. I cannot vote for it because of the people in Texas after Hurricane Harvey; the people in Louisiana after Hurricane Nate; the people in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and Florida after Hurricanes Maria and Irma. I cannot vote for this. This will gut disaster relief, education, infrastructure, research, veterans benefits, and it will clearly provide tax cuts for the rich.

The Republican budget provides \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires, billionaires, wealthy corporations. It doesn’t give any money to the middle class.

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 15 seconds to the gentleman.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, it explodes the deficit.

How could this happen?

It demands higher cuts to Medicare, Social Security, and education. This is a Halloween that America will not tolerate.

My good friend from North Carolina, there will be over a million people that will lose benefits under this plan and the tax plan that they are planning. They will pay higher taxes. This is a bad bill. Vote it down.

Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong and unyielding opposition to the Senate Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71, the Congressional Budget Resolution for Fiscal Year 2018.

As senior member of the Homeland Security Committee, the Ranking Member of the Judiciary Subcommittee on Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations, I oppose this phony budget resolution, which is in reality nothing more than a smoke screen designed to pave the way for massive tax cuts for the top 1 percent, while exploding the debt and deficit by \$1.5 trillion over ten years.

Here are five reasons why every Member of this House should vote against this Republican budget resolution:

1. This Republican budget cuts nearly \$1.3 trillion from Medicaid and nearly \$500 million from Medicaid;

2. This Republican budget includes massive spending cuts to the priorities of the American people;

3. This Republican budget guts investment in areas critical to expanding economic opportunity;

4. This latest Republican budget uses fast track procedures to increase the debt and deficits by \$1.5 trillion, while showering tax cuts on billionaires, millionaires, and the wealthiest corporations; and

5. As we have learned from bitter and painful experience, tax cuts do not pay for themselves, notwithstanding the supply-side fairy tale claims that they do.

This latest Republican budget mandates \$4.9 trillion in spending cuts to top priorities like disaster relief, education, infrastructure, research, veteran benefits, and programs that expand opportunities for American families.

This Republican budget provides \$1.6 trillion in tax cuts to millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations, while raising taxes on working and middle class families by \$470 billion.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

Republican budget adopts Trumpcare but does even more damage because in addition to depriving more than 20 million Americans of healthcare, denying protection to persons with preexisting conditions, and raising costs for older and low-income adults, cuts more than \$1.8 trillion from Medicaid and Medicare.

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

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

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

Sadly, this latest Republican budget, just like the previous one and the President's “skinny budget,” fails this moral test of government.

America will not be made great by stealing another \$1.8 trillion from Medicare and Medicaid, abandoning seniors and families in need, depriving students of realizing a dream to attend college without drowning in debt, or disinvesting in the working families just to give unwanted tax breaks to wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent.

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

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

This Republican budget is not a budget for the real world that real Americans live in but is as much a fantasy budget as the Trump “Skinny Budget” in that it pretends to achieve balance by assuming that painless spending cuts can and will be made by the Congress.

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

The elimination of funding for Community Development Block Grants (CDBG) drains re-

sources from communities, even in times of disaster because CDBG provides flexible grants to local communities for a wide range of unique needs, including Meals on Wheels, housing programs, and community infrastructure improvements.

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

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

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

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

The Republican budget cuts at least \$150 billion from the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) over the next ten years by essentially converting it to a block grant, cutting off funding for eligible individuals and requiring cash-strapped states to either fill in the gap or take away food assistance from millions of working families, children, and seniors.

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

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

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

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

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

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

The Republican budget counts a dubious \$1.4 trillion “economic dividend” from cutting taxes and taking away consumer protections that is not backed up by any credible analysis or historical experience.

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

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

In evaluating the merits of a budget resolution, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

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

The Republican budget resolution fails both of these standards.

I strongly oppose the Senate Amendment to H. Con. Res. 71 and urge all Members to join me in voting against this reckless, cruel, and heartless budget resolution that will do nothing to improve the lives or well-being of middle and working class families, and the poor and vulnerable ‘caught in the tentacles of circumstance.’

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. FLORES).

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairwoman BLACK and her committee for all the great work that they have done in putting forth a budget that moves America in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I have been astounded by the rhetoric that we have heard from the other side for a plan that they haven't really seen. They are making up their facts as they go along to suit their wishes.

Mr. Speaker, I support the fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. While I think the Senate's version falls far short of the great work we did in the House and our budget, it is still the key thing that we need to have to move forward with tax reform for the American people.

Our tax reform plan includes tax cuts for the working class Americans who have been struggling for the last several years under a broken Tax Code.

It also makes America's businesses the most competitive in the world instead of having to struggle with the world's least competitive tax system.

Mr. Speaker, in summary, this budget provides a way for a tax plan that provides for bigger paychecks, more jobs, a stronger economy, and a balanced budget. I strongly urge our colleagues to support this budget.

□ 1000

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time remains.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 12¾ minutes remaining.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ half minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL), the ranking member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, it is getting time for Halloween, so they have put on the disguise on the other side. So what we are hearing today is, from the last two Republican speakers: This is a bad budget. Let's vote “yes.”



The gentleman from Ohio said a while ago, this is all about the middle class. The middle class does not pay an estate tax. The middle class, because of our efforts—and, I think, mine in particular—no longer pay the alternative minimum tax. And the people in the middle class are not locked into the 39.6 top rate in the Tax Code. This is a disguise.

They are adding \$1.5 trillion to the debt and, actually, over 10 years, when you borrow the money, they are adding \$2.3 trillion to the debt, all for a tax cut for people at the very top.

Now, let me say this: I am happy to negotiate a tax reform package that we can all live with. I am happy to sit down with the other side and acknowledge some parts of the Code that clearly don't work any longer for the American people.

This is being done by one party, exclusively. They have not negotiated with us. They have not given us the opening. They have not said to us: "Where do you want to proceed on this?"

Instead, if you pass this budget today, they suggest you are going to see their plan on November 1, and you are going to vote for it sometime around November 6. That is not negotiation.

The Congress I signed up for actually negotiated these agreements, and if you couldn't love the final passage, at least you could like it because you had sufficient input. That is not what has happened, Mr. Speaker, in this process.

This process is one-sided. It is one-dimensional. They interchangeably use the words "tax cut" and "tax reform." This is about a tax cut.

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

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I have been here—this is my 37th year. This is the most reckless and irresponsible budget that I have seen in the 37 years that I have been here.

Today, we are considering the Senate's budget resolution, not because the House supports it, but because it is just a vehicle to get partisan tax reform—strike that—tax cuts.

On an issue as consequential as tax reform, the Congress should not be rushing to meet self-imposed political deadlines without enough time to read and analyze the effects.

More importantly, we should not be considering a bill to cut taxes that is partisan and that is as terrible as we are hearing the majority's proposal will be. I say that because we still haven't seen the full details of a bill that this resolution provides for Republicans to jam through on an expedited process; one they will reportedly introduce, mark up, and bring to the floor in the few legislative days we have left before Thanksgiving.

Is the sunshine too bright for you?

Even my friends on the other side of the aisle don't know exactly how bad it will be for their constituents. When asked about the details of the Republican bill, Representative CHRIS COLLINS, a Republican from New York, said: "We don't know, we don't know, we don't know, we don't know, we don't know."

That is a Republican Member of Congress who is saying he has no idea what this bill is empowering.

But we do know that, based on a non-partisan analysis of their framework, it will raise taxes on 47 million Americans.

We know that 80 percent of the tax cuts—80 percent of the tax cuts—will go to the top 1 percent.

And we know, as well, that nearly half of all taxpayers with children, 44.5 percent, will see their taxes go up. Those same children will be on the hook for a \$2.4 trillion cost. This is the biggest debt explosion of any bill that I have seen.

Republican Representative MATT GAETZ of Florida summed up today's vote as being for a budget—hear this, my friends on both sides of the aisle. This is MATT GAETZ, Republican, Florida, summed up today's vote as being for a budget that "nobody believes in so that we have a chance to vote for a tax bill that nobody's read."

That is not what we should be doing. We ought to be working together to craft a bipartisan tax reform package that is revenue neutral.

It will be the height of hypocrisy to say that you are for fiscal discipline and to vote for this budget. Let's not risk our fiscal future and the economic security of our people. Defeat this resolution.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. FERGUSON), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. FERGUSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the FY18 budget. I think that this is a very important step in doing something that this Nation needs, and that is for the United States Congress and the President to pass tax reform.

For way too long, our national economy has languished at a GDP growth that is far below historical averages. One of the most important things that we have got to do is to grow our economy because that leads to families being successful, rising wages, being able to have careers for themselves and their family members, and I believe that tax reform unlocks the American economy in a way that we haven't seen in decades.

For far too long, we have looked at our Tax Code only through a set of domestic lenses and only looked at the rates; and we get into these ridiculous debates about the top bracket versus the lowest bracket, and we divide our Nation. But, for the first time, we are approaching our Tax Code through a set of global lenses that really give our American economy a chance to be competitive on the world stage.

It is not simply about cutting rates. It is not simply about giving a break to one group or another and to get away from this rhetoric. It is about creating the most vibrant place in the world to do business by reforming the Code and creating fairness.

If we do that and our American families succeed, and we see people moving from poverty into the middle class, and from the middle class up, and we see entrepreneurs, and we see new businesses and innovation, we are going to see growth in our economy like we have not seen in a generation.

The importance of that is it will give us the tools that we need to address the single biggest driver of our debt, and that is mandatory spending. And this body must have the political courage and integrity, along with the Senate, to address mandatory spending, to have an honest conversation about Social Security, about Medicare, about Medicaid, and, most importantly, about welfare entitlement reform, because we can no longer trap generation after generation in poverty. We must create pathways out of poverty into the middle class for our fellow Americans.

We can do this. We can be committed to it.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, regardless of what the Republicans say, their budget paves the way for trillions of dollars in tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy corporations. And who would pay for it?

It would be the middle class families, children, seniors, and people with disabilities. It would slash Medicaid by \$1 trillion, threaten healthcare for one in four Americans. It would slash Medicare by \$470 billion. And this budget proposes, yet again, to repeal the Affordable Care Act.

Under the Republican tax plan, 1.9 million Illinoisans would no longer be able to claim State and local tax deductions; and nationwide, 47 million people in middle class households making between \$50,000 and \$150,000 a year would pay more in taxes.

So I ask my colleagues: Did you really come to Congress to take away healthcare and reduce income for middle class families?

If you care about anyone other than millionaires and billionaires, you need to vote "no."

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

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a distinguished member of the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I want to say three things about this budget:

First, deficits matter. Deficits matter. This budget explicitly raises the deficit. It admits to \$1.5 trillion, more likely \$2.5 trillion. That means that



our children and our grandchildren are going to be the ones paying for the deficit that is added.

Second, process matters. We are hearing a lot of talk about tax reform, but there has been no process. There is no bill, and we are about to vote on a so-called tax reform package that has not been explicitly printed to paper. This is no way to do any business. We are making it up as we go along, and it is the same process that was used on healthcare. We went into committee with no bill and came out, 27 hours later, with 24 million people losing healthcare. There has been no process on this.

And third, details matter, and the details that are leaking out are very punishing to the middle class. Anybody who is an income tax payer in a State, a property tax payer in a State, is going to lose that deduction.

It is very tough on middle class efforts to save for retirement. That is in play. Folks' deductions on their Keogh plans, their 401(k) plans, are very much a part of the process that is going to lower this.

Reject this plan.

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

I almost can't sit here and not make a comment on my colleagues' budget on the other side of the aisle. All of a sudden, they seem to be very concerned about deficits when, as a matter of fact, their budget assumed almost \$1 trillion worth of deficits in their budget.

I want to also say that our committee did a really good job in having a balanced budget, and we are, obviously, looking at a budget from the Senate that we are going to be taking up so that we can do tax reform.

But they also, in addition to that, had \$2 trillion worth of new taxes that they placed on the American people. So all of a sudden, this purity of worrying about these deficits just makes me scratch my head, and about raising taxes on the people when their own plan did the very opposite of what we are trying to do is cut taxes. They added \$2 trillion worth of taxes.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time we have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Kentucky has 5¾ minutes remaining. The gentleman from Tennessee has 5¼ minutes remaining.

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

As we wind down our arguments here, once again, we have had a very fascinating discussion and, once again, we seem to disagree on virtually everything.

For instance, I have heard from the other side many times over the last few days and today that we really can't say what the impact is, the claims that we are making about whether this bill will help the rich or help the middle class or help lower income individuals, be-

cause we don't have the details. Well, that is absolutely correct; we don't have the details.

But then, if we don't have the details, how can the other side talk about the huge benefits that this proposal, this tax proposal that is yet unwritten, will provide for the middle class? And how can they deny that it will benefit the wealthy disproportionately?

We know from the outline that was released by the other side in recent weeks that they intend to eliminate the estate tax. The estate tax only benefits wealthy Americans, people with estates over \$11 million for a couple.

They want to eliminate the alternative minimum tax. We know the alternative minimum tax only affects wealthy individuals. There was one estimate that the one year of President Trump's tax return that we have, that in that year alone, the alternative minimum tax, if it were repealed, would have saved him \$30 million. So we know that affects very wealthy people.

□ 1015

We know that if you reduce the top rate from 39.6 percent to 35 percent, that benefits very high-income people. So we do have enough information to draw some pretty definite conclusions about the impact that the released outline, at least, will have on wealthy Americans, and we can draw some of the same conclusions about how it will hurt middle class Americans.

If, in fact, the Republican tax bill repeals the deduction for State and local taxes. In my State, there will be half a million people who will lose an average of \$9,900 of deductions every year. So we absolutely know the impact that the proposal, as we know it now, will have, and I think it is fair—given that there will be no hearings on this bill—it is fair to raise the alarms about what the potential for this bill is.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is my extreme honor to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Louisiana (Mr. SCALISE), our majority whip, who is a wonderful member of our Conference.

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Chairwoman BLACK for her leadership on this budget. It is important that we do a budget—and it is always difficult to bring a budget forward because it represents the views that we have, and, of course, we in the House passed a budget that shows the country how we can get back to a balanced Federal budget, how we can get our economy moving again, and how we can finally rebuild the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, that is really what is at heart with this budget vote. This budget starts the process of actually going out and cutting taxes across the board so that middle class families can have a better opportunity for the American Dream. If you look over the last 10 years, we have seen our middle class evaporate in this country.

So many times, we have seen company after company move jobs over-

seas. And anybody who has complained about that—and I sure have been angry about it—the first thing you do is you go ask them: Why did you move the jobs overseas? And they say: Because America is not competitive again.

We have the highest corporate tax rate in the world, in the entire industrial world. And what it means is, middle class jobs are being shipped to other countries. We can complain about it all day, Mr. Speaker, but how about we actually do something about it? This bill starts that process—working with President Trump who wants to bring those middle class jobs back to America.

We are talking about high-paying jobs, \$60,000- to \$150,000-a-year jobs that left our country. We can bring those jobs back. That is what this vote is about. That is what this budget is about: starting the process to finally rebuild our middle class, to finally bring those jobs back, and to finally give a tax break to families who have been struggling for so long under slow economic growth.

Let's actually grow our economy. Growing our economy is not just good for rebuilding the middle class and for those hardworking taxpayers who will get real relief under this bill, but also to our ability to reduce the deficit and finally get back to balanced Federal budgets so that we can create a healthier economy and a healthier America.

Mr. Speaker, I urge everybody to vote "yes" on this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Speaker, I now have the distinct honor of yielding 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the Democratic leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Kentucky for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I particularly want to recognize Mr. YARMUTH's extraordinary leadership as the ranking member on the Budget Committee. As we all know, budget should be a statement of our national values. What is important to us as a nation should be reflected in how we allocate our resources.

Again, it is a statement of values, and who better to manage all of that in this Congress of the United States than Mr. YARMUTH, who brings his values and his heartland priorities to the budget process, and I thank him for the leadership he has provided.

Sadly though, I rise in opposition to what the Republicans have proposed which is a devastating Republican budget. The first step in the GOP's dangerous plan to fast track their immoral tax framework is to hand trillions of dollars to the wealthy while raising taxes on working American families.

The Republican budget and tax plan cruelly rig an unfair system even further against hardworking Americans. It cuts a raw deal for families in every corner of our country. Democrats have a better deal, better jobs, better pay, better future.

But right here, before our eyes in this House, Republicans are replacing the great American ladders of opportunity with the silver spoons of plutocracy and aristocracy. Their agenda raises taxes on the middle class. That is a fact. Tens of millions of middle class families will pay higher taxes, including a heavier burden for State and local taxes.

It might be interesting to our distinguished colleague, Mr. SCALISE—and isn't it a joy to see him in debate on the floor—in his State of Louisiana, 458,000 people will pay an average of nearly \$7,000 more by losing their deduction.

And Congresswoman BLACK, from the great State of Tennessee, in her State, 573,960 people will lose their deduction, around \$5,600 a filer.

Not only that, if that isn't bad enough for assailing the dream of homeownership in our country by attacking the deduction, this plan that the Republicans propose has been estimated to reduce the value of people's homes by 10 percent. You not only are paying more money in order to give a tax break to the wealthy and to big corporations, you are reducing the value of your home, and, by the way, your neighbors' homes as well.

So with all of the unfairness in it, the one that is most understandable to people directly is how it affects them. And in that case, 44 million Americans will pay more because of what the Republicans have in their plan.

So it raises taxes on middle class, particularly with the State and local tax deduction removed. And by the way—another by the way—if you are a corporation, your deduction is not removed, just if you are an individual filer, so again, an advantage to corporate America at the expense of America's working families.

Next, it borrows trillions from the future to give tax cuts to the wealthiest. Eighty percent of the tax cuts in this Republican proposal goes to the wealthiest 1 percent; 80 percent goes to the wealthiest 1 percent at the expense of America's working families and children. The budget on the floor today reveals the true cruelty behind the Republican's tax plan. What words would be best to use it? It is looting the middle class, massive looting of the middle class; rip-off of the middle class, because there are many middle class people.

So you take some money from all of those middle class people and those who aspire to it so that you can give a lot of money to the few. That is a big sucking up of assets from the middle class to the wealthy. That is what they are here for. It is in their DNA: trickle-down economics. It is in their DNA. That is what the Republicans come here to do, and that causes a deep addition to the national debt.

They are supposed to be deficit hawks, but I think they have become an endangered species because they don't seem to care that, with the cuts

that they are taking, the tax breaks they are giving to corporate and wealthy America will cost over \$2 trillion—not counting service on the national debt which would take it closer to \$3 trillion additional.

That is a very hard road to come back from. And as our distinguished ranking member has pointed out, the opportunity cost in the budget, whether it is a trillion dollars from Medicaid, half a trillion dollars from Medicare, funds taken from education, the seed corn of America's preeminence in the world. Why? To give a tax cut to the high end.

And they will say: Oh, well, the growth will come from this. We will pay for that.

It never has; never has. Don't take it from me. Bruce Bartlett, who was one of the orchestrators of the supply-side economics said: We never said it paid for itself. Anyone who says it does, it is not true. It is nonsense.

He went even further to call it BS.

As I said, it ransacks Medicare and Medicaid, adding trillions to the debt in tax breaks for corporations and the wealthy, looting the middle class, shaking down the middle class, ripping off the middle class, increasing the taxes of the middle class.

It devastates vital investments, as our distinguished ranking member said, in good-paying jobs with higher wages for working families, the education of our children, the health of our working families. It really is a good example of what they say that Medicare should wither on the vine. In keeping with their trickle-down economics, Medicare should wither on the vine because they will take half a trillion dollars from Medicare in their budget that will follow.

So Republicans will harm veterans, rural America, seniors, and children, again, all in the name of fast-tracking trillion-dollar tax breaks for the wealthiest 1 percent. What more do you need to know? Eighty percent goes to the wealthiest 1 percent.

Again and again on the floor, the Republicans have tried to tilt the playing field against hardworking families. This is really quite remarkable though. This is a great transformative moment for America where we can reject this assault on the middle class, this addition to the national debt, and instead, say: Let's go to the table and work in a bipartisan way to truly reform our Tax Code so that we can be competitive in the world; so that families can thrive, and that they can have the deductions that are fair for them and needed, and not taken away from them, but not taken away from corporate America. So we stand ready to go in a bipartisan way to work to do this.

Any tax cuts, because this isn't just tax cuts to the rich—that is not tax reform—any tax cuts, any agenda like that has to be bipartisan in order for it to be sustainable. So let's come to our senses here. Common sense says—well, mathematics says, if you take a lot of

money from many people to give it to a few, you are exacerbating the disparity of opportunity equity income in our country.

This is the wrong thing to do. It is not what our values are about. It is really a shame that they would even bring such a document to the floor. Anybody who lives in a district where their deductions, the tax deductions for State and local taxes, are taken away from individual filers, but not for corporations, as the bill determines, to the tune—and I can read you all of the statistics across the country about how devastating this is—as our own Governor said: How could they do that to our State or any State without the department of finance of our States saying: Wait a minute. Understand what this does to the economy of our State. Understand what this does to our individual filers in our State.

Who said that this document that came over from the Senate should have such a devastating impact on States and Members coming to the floor and endorsing it. Some say: Oh, I am just voting for the budget, but it really isn't what it—no. No. You are putting your name next to taking the deduction of homeownership and of State and local taxes away from your constituents. They are going to know that. I would rather you reject this. We don't want a political argument. We want to protect the American people.

That is why I hope everyone here would come down in favor of the middle class and reject this assault, this rip-off, this shakedown of the middle class that the Republicans have on the floor.

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is now my honor to yield 1 minute to the gentleman from West Virginia (Mr. MOONEY).

Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia. Mr. Speaker, we had a Democratic President, John F. Kennedy, who cut taxes when he was President. I think he would take issue with a lot of the things that have been said by his own party.

It has been 30 years since we addressed taxes in this country. President Ronald Reagan addressed it 30 years ago. We are way overdue for tax cuts in the United States of America.

Everybody knows that the 35 percent tax rate on corporations has driven companies overseas. West Virginia saw, just a couple of years ago, one of our largest remaining corporate headquarters, Mylan Pharmaceuticals, relocate overseas to avoid the taxes that are too high in this country. We all know that is a problem. We have a plan we are putting forward to try to solve it.

I say to my friends on the other side of the aisle: Where is your plan?

You have no plan. This is all political. All you do is make political attacks. You have had meetings recently and said: Don't offer a plan. Let's just attack the Republicans for their plan.

At least we have a plan to address this because hardworking taxpayers in West Virginia and America need and expect us to deliver on these tax cuts. So I rise in strong support of the budget today so we can move forward with our tax cut plan.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, it is now my delight to yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY), who is the chairman of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, with this budget, we have an opportunity to move forward on a major priority for the American people, which is delivering the first overhaul of America's broken Tax Code in more than three decades.

When you look, today, at the way America is taxed, it doesn't take long to recognize this is completely and utterly broken. You can see that it is so complex it forces millions of families and job creators to spend billions of hours and dollars each year just filing their taxes.

It is unfair. It gives wasteful Washington lobbyists loopholes and carve-outs to special interests by giving hardworking Americans nothing but frustration.

You can see that our Tax Code is miserably uncompetitive. That is why more and more of our American businesses and good-paying jobs are going overseas to countries with more modern and more competitive tax systems.

By passing this budget today, we can send a clear message to the American people: real tax reform is on the way. A "no" vote, as we heard from our Democratic colleagues, is to block tax reform and defend the status quo.

We are all working closely with President Trump as he leads this charge. Together, we have bold ideas to deliver more jobs, fairer taxes, and bigger paychecks for all Americans this year.

I want to thank Chairman BLACK and the Budget Committee for all their hard work. I want to encourage my colleagues to vote "yes"—vote "yes"—on tax reform, and join me in taking an important historic step forward to deliver on our tax reform promise.

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

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I would just like to say that, for anyone watching this debate or watching any of our discussions out there in the country, I know it often appears that we don't get along, that we hate each other, and that we are at each other's throat, but nothing could be further from the truth.

It has been such an honor to work with Chairman BLACK as a member of the Budget Committee and all the Members. We do all respect each other and get along. We just have some very serious disagreements about policy. That is fair. That is what this country is about.

Once again, since I may not get to do it again as Chairman BLACK pursues another office and probably won't appear with me on the same program anymore, I just want to wish her the best and say what a joy it has been to work with her.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 30 seconds remaining.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Speaker, in 30 seconds, I want to once again say thank you to my colleague from the other side. I have enjoyed working with him. This is history. We are going to make history.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in their support of the budget because doing so means that we can truly benefit the American people, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Pursuant to House Resolution 580, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the motion offered by the gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK).

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the yeas 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, this 15-minute vote on the motion to concur will be followed by a 5-minute vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 1698.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 216, nays 212, not voting 5, as follows:

[Roll No. 589]

YEAS—216

Abraham	Cheney	Gallagher
Aderholt	Coffman	Garrett
Allen	Cole	Gianforte
Amodei	Collins (GA)	Gibbs
Arrington	Collins (NY)	Gohmert
Babin	Comer	Goodlatte
Bacon	Comstock	Gosar
Banks (IN)	Conaway	Gowdy
Barletta	Cook	Granger
Barr	Costello (PA)	Graves (GA)
Barton	Cramer	Graves (LA)
Bergman	Crawford	Graves (MO)
Biggs	Culberson	Griffith
Bilirakis	Curbelo (FL)	Grothman
Bishop (MI)	Davidson	Guthrie
Bishop (UT)	Davis, Rodney	Handel
Black	Denham	Harper
Blackburn	Dent	Harris
Blum	DeSantis	Hartzler
Bost	DesJarlais	Hensarling
Brady (TX)	Diaz-Balart	Herrera Beutler
Brat	Duffy	Hice, Jody B.
Bridenstine	Duncan (SC)	Higgins (LA)
Brooks (AL)	Dunn	Hill
Brooks (IN)	Emmer	Holding
Buchanan	Estes (KS)	Hollingsworth
Bucshon	Farenthold	Hudson
Budd	Ferguson	Huizenga
Burgess	Fleischmann	Hultgren
Byrne	Flores	Hunter
Calvert	Fortenberry	Hurd
Carter (GA)	Fox	Issa
Carter (TX)	Franks (AZ)	Jenkins (WV)
Chabot	Frelinghuysen	Johnson (LA)

Johnson (OH)  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
King (IA)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Latta  
Lewis (MN)  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Mast  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Mullin

Newhouse  
Noem  
Norman  
Nunes  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Palmer  
Paulsen  
Pearce  
Perry  
Pittenger  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Posey  
Ratcliffe  
Reed  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (SC)  
Roby  
Roe (TN)  
Rogers (AL)  
Rogers (KY)  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Royce (CA)  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (WI)  
Scalise  
Schweikert

Scott, Austin  
Sensenbrenner  
Sessions  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (TX)  
Smucker  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Taylor  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Trott  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Wagner  
Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Weber (TX)  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack  
Woodall  
Yoder  
Yoho  
Young (AK)  
Young (IA)

NAYS—212

Adams	Doyle, Michael	Lee
Aguilar	F.	Levin
Amash	Duncan (TN)	Lewis (GA)
Barragán	Ellison	Lieu, Ted
Bass	Engel	Lipinski
Beatty	Eshoo	LoBiondo
Bera	Espallat	Loebach
Beyer	Esty (CT)	Loftis
Bishop (GA)	Evans	Lowenthal
Blumenauer	Faso	Lowey
Blunt Rochester	Fitzpatrick	Lujan Grisham,
Bonamici	Foster	M.
Boyle, Brendan	Frankel (FL)	Luján, Ben Ray
F.	Fudge	Lynch
Brady (PA)	Gabbard	MacArthur
Brown (MD)	Gaetz	Maloney,
Brownley (CA)	Galleo	Carolyn B.
Buck	Garamendi	Maloney, Sean
Bustos	Gomez	Masie
Butterfield	Gonzalez (TX)	Matsui
Capuano	Gottheimer	McCollum
Carbajal	Green, Al	McEachin
Cárdenas	Green, Gene	McGovern
Carson (IN)	Grijalva	McNerney
Cartwright	Gutiérrez	Meeks
Castor (FL)	Hanabusa	Meng
Castro (TX)	Hastings	Moore
Chu, Judy	Heck	Moulton
Cicilline	Higgins (NY)	Murphy (FL)
Clark (MA)	Himes	Nadler
Clarke (NY)	Hoyer	Napolitano
Clay	Huffman	Neal
Cleaver	Jackson Lee	Nolan
Clyburn	Jayapal	Norcross
Cohen	Jeffries	O'Halleran
Connolly	Jenkins (KS)	O'Rourke
Conyers	Johnson (GA)	Pallone
Cooper	Johnson, E. B.	Panetta
Correa	Jones	Pascarelli
Costa	Kaptur	Payne
Courtney	Katko	Pelosi
Crist	Keating	Perlmutter
Crowley	Kelly (IL)	Peters
Cuellar	Kennedy	Peterson
Cummings	Khanna	Pingree
Davis (CA)	Kihuen	Pocan
Davis, Danny	Kildee	Polis
DeFazio	Kilmer	Price (NC)
DeGette	Kind	Quigley
Delaney	King (NY)	Raskin
DeLauro	Krishnamoorthi	Rice (NY)
DelBene	Kuster (NH)	Richmond
Demings	Lance	Rosen
DeSaulnier	Langevin	Roybal-Allard
Deutch	Larsen (WA)	Ruiz
Dingell	Larson (CT)	Ruppersberger
Doggett	Lawrence	Rush
Donovan	Lawson (FL)	Ryan (OH)

Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, David  
Serrano  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Sinema  
Sires

Slaughter  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (WA)  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Tenney  
Thompson (MS)  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Tsongas

Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine  
Watson Coleman  
Welch  
Yarmuth  
Zeldin

## NOT VOTING—5

Johnson, Sam  
Smith (NE)

Thompson (CA)  
Webster (FL)

Wilson (FL)

□ 1059

So the motion to concur was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

# IRAN BALLISTIC MISSILES AND INTERNATIONAL SANCTIONS ENFORCEMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HULTGREN). The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 1698) to expand sanctions against Iran with respect to the ballistic missile program of Iran, 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 California (Mr. ROYCE) 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 423, nays 2, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 590]

YEAS—423

Abraham  
Adams  
Aderholt  
Aguilar  
Allen  
Amash  
Amodei  
Arrington  
Babin  
Bacon  
Banks (IN)  
Barletta  
Barr  
Barragán  
Barton  
Bass  
Beatty  
Bera  
Bergman  
Beyer  
Biggs  
Bilirakis  
Bishop (GA)  
Bishop (MI)  
Bishop (UT)  
Black  
Blackburn  
Blum  
Blumenauer  
Blunt Rochester  
Bonamici  
Bost  
Boyle, Brendan  
F.  
Brady (PA)  
Brady (TX)

Brat  
Brooks (AL)  
Brooks (IN)  
Brown (MD)  
Brownley (CA)  
Buchanan  
Buck  
Bucshon  
Budd  
Burgess  
Bustos  
Butterfield  
Byrne  
Calvert  
Capuano  
Carbajal  
Cárdenas  
Carson (IN)  
Carter (GA)  
Carter (TX)  
Cartwright  
Castor (FL)  
Castro (TX)  
Chabot  
Cheney  
Chu, Judy  
Clark (MA)  
Clarke (NY)  
Clay  
Cleaver  
Clyburn  
Coffman  
Cohen  
Cole  
Collins (GA)  
Collins (NY)

Comer  
Comstock  
Conaway  
Connolly  
Conyers  
Cook  
Cooper  
Correa  
Costa  
Costello (PA)  
Courtney  
Cramer  
Crawford  
Crist  
Crowley  
Cuellar  
Culberson  
Cummings  
Curbelo (FL)  
Davidson  
Davis (CA)  
Davis, Danny  
Davis, Rodney  
DeFazio  
DeGette  
Delaney  
DeLauro  
DeBene  
Demings  
Denham  
Dent  
DeSantis  
DeSaulnier  
DesJarlais  
Deutch  
Diaz-Balart

Dingell  
Doggett  
Donovan  
Doyle, Michael  
F.  
Duffy  
Duncan (SC)  
Dunn  
Ellison  
Emmer  
Engel  
Eshoo  
Español  
Estes (KS)  
Esty (CT)  
Evans  
Farenthold  
Faso  
Ferguson  
Fitzpatrick  
Fleischmann  
Flores  
Fortenberry  
Foster  
Foxy  
Frankel (FL)  
Franks (AZ)  
Frelinghuysen  
Fudge  
Gabbard  
Gaetz  
Gallagher  
Gallego  
Garamendi  
Garrett  
Gianforte  
Gibbs  
Gohmert  
Gomez  
Gonzalez (TX)  
Goodlatte  
Gosar  
Gottheimer  
Gowdy  
Granger  
Graves (GA)  
Graves (LA)  
Graves (MO)  
Green, Al  
Green, Gene  
Griffith  
Grijalva  
Grothman  
Guthrie  
Gutiérrez  
Hanabusa  
Handel  
Harper  
Harris  
Hartzler  
Hastings  
Heck  
Hensarling  
Herrera Beutler  
Hice, Jody B.  
Higgins (LA)  
Higgins (NY)  
Hill  
Himes  
Holding  
Hollingsworth  
Hoyer  
Hudson  
Huffman  
Huizenga  
Hultgren  
Hunter  
Hurd  
Issa  
Jackson Lee  
Jayapal  
Jeffries  
Jenkins (KS)  
Jenkins (WV)  
Johnson (GA)  
Johnson (LA)  
Johnson (OH)  
Johnson, E. B.  
Jones  
Jordan  
Joyce (OH)  
Kaptur  
Katko  
Keating  
Kelly (IL)  
Kelly (MS)  
Kelly (PA)  
Kennedy  
Khanna

Kihuen  
Kildee  
Kilmer  
Kind  
King (IA)  
King (NY)  
Kinzinger  
Knight  
Krishnamoorthi  
Kuster (NH)  
Kustoff (TN)  
Labrador  
LaHood  
LaMalfa  
Lamborn  
Lance  
Langevin  
Larsen (WA)  
Larson (CT)  
Latta  
Lawrence  
Lawson (FL)  
Lee  
Levin  
Lewis (GA)  
Lewis (MN)  
Lieu, Ted  
Lipinski  
LoBiondo  
Loebback  
Lofgren  
Long  
Loudermilk  
Love  
Lowenthal  
Lowe  
Lucas  
Luetkemeyer  
Lujan Grisham, M.  
Luján, Ben Ray  
Lynch  
MacArthur  
Maloney,  
Carolyn B.  
Maloney, Sean  
Marchant  
Marino  
Marshall  
Mast  
Matsui  
McCarthy  
McCaul  
McClintock  
McCollum  
McEachin  
McGovern  
McHenry  
McKinley  
McMorris  
Rodgers  
McNerney  
McSally  
Meadows  
Meehan  
Meeks  
Meng  
Messer  
Mitchell  
Moolenaar  
Mooney (WV)  
Moore  
Moulton  
Mullin  
Murphy (FL)  
Nadler  
Napolitano  
Neal  
Newhouse  
Noem  
Nolan  
Norcross  
Norman  
Nunes  
O'Halleran  
O'Rourke  
Olson  
Palazzo  
Pallone  
Palmer  
Panetta  
Pascarell  
Paulsen  
Payne  
Pearce  
Pelosi  
Perlmutter  
Perry  
Peters

Peterson  
Pingree  
Pittenger  
Pocan  
Poe (TX)  
Poliquin  
Polis  
Posey  
Price (NC)  
Reichert  
Renacci  
Rice (NY)  
Rice (SC)  
Richmond  
Rohrabacher  
Rokita  
Rooney, Francis  
Rooney, Thomas  
J.  
Ros-Lehtinen  
Rosen  
Roskam  
Ross  
Rothfus  
Rouzer  
Roybal-Allard  
Royce (CA)  
Ruiz  
Ruppersberger  
Rush  
Russell  
Rutherford  
Ryan (OH)  
Sánchez  
Sanford  
Sarbanes  
Scalise  
Schakowsky  
Schiff  
Schneider  
Schrader  
Schweikert  
Scott (VA)  
Scott, Austin  
Scott, David  
Sensenbrenner  
Serrano  
Sessions  
Sewell (AL)  
Shea-Porter  
Sherman  
Shimkus  
Shuster  
Simpson  
Sinema  
Sires  
Slaughter  
Smith (MO)  
Smith (NJ)  
Smith (TX)  
Smith (WA)  
Smucker  
Soto  
Speier  
Stefanik  
Stewart  
Stivers  
Suozi  
Swalwell (CA)  
Takano  
Taylor  
Tenney  
Thompson (MS)  
Thompson (PA)  
Thornberry  
Tiberi  
Tipton  
Titus  
Tonko  
Torres  
Trott  
Tsongas  
Turner  
Upton  
Valadao  
Vargas  
Veasey  
Vela  
Velázquez  
Visclosky  
Wagner

Walberg  
Walden  
Walker  
Walorski  
Walters, Mimi  
Walz  
Wasserman  
Schultz  
Waters, Maxine

Watson Coleman  
Weber (TX)  
Welch  
Wenstrup  
Westerman  
Williams  
Wilson (SC)  
Wittman  
Womack

## NAYS—2

Duncan (TN)

Massie

## NOT VOTING—7

Bridenstine  
Cicilline  
Johnson, Sam

Smith (NE)  
Thompson (CA)  
Webster (FL)

Wilson (FL)

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

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

□ 1106

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.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WEBSTER of Florida. Mr. Speaker, due to a family medical emergency, I had to return to my district in the early afternoon on Wednesday October 25. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 589 and "yea" on rollcall No. 590.

# REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H. RES. 220

Ms. CLARKE of New York. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to be removed from H. Res. 220.

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

There was no objection.

## LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

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

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider H.R. 2936, the Resilient Federal Forests

Act sponsored by Representative BRUCE WESTERMAN.

We have all seen the devastating effects of wildfires, especially this year. Unfortunately, the U.S. Forest Service estimates there are still nearly 58 million acres of forest at high or very high risk of wildfire. The bipartisan legislation builds on our recovery efforts by giving the Forest Service and Bureau of Land Management the tools necessary to better manage our public lands.

The House will also consider H.R. 849, the Protecting Seniors' Access to Medicare Act, sponsored by Representative PHIL ROE. Supported by both Republicans and Democrats, this bill repeals ObamaCare's Independent Payment Advisory Board—or, as most know it as, IPAB—and gives patients more control over their healthcare and not Washington.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, the House will consider legislation to extend funding for the Children's Health Insurance Program and other important public health priorities. Now, this was marked up earlier this month by the Energy and Commerce Committee. This package will help low-income children get health coverage, continue funding important health priorities like community health centers, and do so in a fiscally responsible manner.

I look forward to the House passing these commonsense bills next week without delay.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the majority leader announced that the CHIP bill will be on the floor next week. CHIP and community health centers have always been, as the majority leader points out, a bipartisan priority.

Unfortunately, this bill did not come out of the committee as a bipartisan bill, and negotiations were essentially not fruitful, and the committee reported out legislation to extend these important programs that included billions of dollars in partisan offsets.

Mr. Speaker, I want to ask the majority leader, does the gentleman know whether the \$8.2 billion reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program, which serves nearly 9 million children from low-income working families, will be offset?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

□ 1115

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

First, let me set the record straight. Yes, it did come out of committee, and, yes, we did hold it up three times because your side of the aisle asked us to. But the reason why we are bringing it up next week is not because next week was the date we wanted. We wanted to get this done long ago. But the reason why we are doing it next week is because Minnesota is about to run out of money. And my dear friend knows because I sat with him, even this week, trying to work something out.

Now, we know of these health centers, and in this bill we doubled the

money for them. Of course, this bill is offset. We do it in a fiscally responsible manner. But this is not something to play political games with because some leadership Member wants to hold it up and go into December. We believe committees should be able to do their work.

Now, we started out, and Committee Chair GREG WALDEN, three times, was asked to delay by the ranking Democrat of the committee, even though we know the timeline is about to hit a number of States that cannot wait for a lack of action here.

So, yes, I am upset by this, but I am more upset about the number of times we sat down to try to work something out. And it was only yesterday I was told, Democrats said, no, they don't want to do anything, so we should just go forward. That is not the way this place should work.

If you look at this bill, I believe, if the committee had the freedom on the other side without the leadership telling them they had to vote "no," it would have come out of the committee with a much different vote.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

First, let me say, as far as I know, the leadership didn't give any direction to the committee. The committee decided on its own that it thought that the cuts that were being proposed by the Republicans are very harmful to some very important programs in healthcare for seniors that the gentleman, in his previous remarks telling us what the schedule was, said were very important.

So the reason that we have concerns is we believe the offsets being proposed, Mr. Speaker, by the Republicans, and why we don't agree with the bill that is being brought forward is because we think it hurts the healthcare of millions of Americans.

Let me ask another question, Mr. Speaker, of the majority leader, and let me preface it with Mr. MCCARTHY said in response to my question about the CHIP program: Of course, it is offset.

Let me ask him a follow-up question.

Does the gentleman know whether the \$7.2 billion for community health centers that provide primary care services to 26 million medically underserved Americans will be offset?

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to my friend from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Right before your question, you said you had concerns with the offsets. The gentleman knows that I reached out to him, I don't know how many months ago, before a break, numerous times, right over on the floor on his side of the aisle, and I said: I am very concerned with what I am hearing on the Democratic side in the committee; I would like to get CHIP done early. And I asked for your assistance, and you helped.

There is one higher position on your side of the aisle who called the Speaker

numerous times and pretty much shut down your committee. So three times we were asked to delay, and we did.

That is why, this week, I went back to all of you and said: Let's work out if you have a difference of opinion in pay-fors.

It was not us who walked away from the table. It was the message I was delivered from the other side of the aisle.

So I don't know why we are having this discussion. I don't know why you are asking these questions. It is you and your side of the aisle that have said no. It is us who said: Let's sit down and work this out.

But let me walk through a few of the pay-fors so you understand them and so the American public can understand them, because I don't think they are controversial.

We require health insurance companies to pay claims when they cover Medicaid enrollees while keeping Medicaid as the payor of last resort. Now, that saves \$4 billion.

We say that individuals can't skip on their premium for 90 days and get free coverage. That saves \$5 billion.

We say if somebody wins a high-dollar lottery, those winners should not be eligible for Medicaid.

Now, your side of the aisle voted against that in committee. So the argument that you are making that it is not bipartisan is true. Your side of the aisle believes that if someone wins millions of dollars in the lottery, they should still be eligible for Medicaid.

That will save \$600 million that will actually go to the disabled, those who need this.

And what is more important, these States should not have to wait. These States should not be put in this position. Colorado has just announced that it will freeze enrollment. It will freeze enrollment because you guys walked away from the table. It will freeze enrollment because you say high-dollar millionaire lottery winners should still stay on Medicaid.

I don't think that is where the American public believes this debate should go. I believe that is common sense. I believe that is an area that we can get to. Let's care for the individuals, and let's stop playing politics with this. I am personally stunned you are even asking about this because you know what has gone on.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I am chagrined that I have stunned my friend, the majority leader.

Yes, we don't agree with some of those pay-fors. I happen to, by the way, agree. There is no reason why a lottery winner of millions of dollars ought to be on Medicaid.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Nobody did on your side of the aisle in the committee. They all voted against that.

Mr. HOYER. I didn't yield yet.

I simply say to my friend, had I instructed or the leader instructed, that outcome may have been different. However, there are some really substantive issues that we had, we had for a long

time, we negotiated for a long time, and we didn't reach agreement.

My question to you was: Are they offset? I think your answer was, yes, they were offset, and then you proceeded to tell me what the offsets were.

Now, let me ask you a follow-up question to that.

Does the gentleman know whether the repeal of IPAB is offset? That is a \$17 billion deficit creation item. Is it offset?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. If the gentleman's question is if IPAB is offset, it doesn't need to be.

Mr. HOYER. Offset.

Mr. MCCARTHY. No, and it doesn't need to be.

Mr. HOYER. I thank the gentleman for that answer. Perhaps now he knows why I asked the first two questions.

Apparently, it is not the debt that is of concern, because if the debt were of concern, the \$17 billion would be of concern.

That was put in the bill, as the gentleman knows, to try to pay for, as we paid for every nickel of the Affordable Care Act, and that was one of the larger pay-fors.

Now, many Members on your side of the aisle don't like that pay-for, and many Members on my side of the aisle don't like that pay-for. That pay-for said that we are going to decide, if we are exceeding expenditure caps, what needs to be cut.

As the gentleman knows, that board has never been appointed. But if it had been appointed, we would have had 30 days—30 legislative days or calendar days—30 calendar days in which to say, no, we don't agree with that. So the representatives of the people would have had that.

But my point is we are selective in what we want to pay for, and I think that is a concern certainly to me, and I am sure it is to others.

And the gentleman said: Of course, it is offset. The gentleman, here, says this is not offset.

Can I ask the gentleman, why is this not offset? Why is this \$17 billion apparently not a worry for the debt and the other dollars for children are necessary to be offset?

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I appreciate the roundabout way of trying to get around why you are not involved in the CHIP program, but let me explain very easily.

Mr. HOYER. Reclaiming my time, the gentleman is correct. The gentleman has come to me. We tried to work on getting it bipartisan. We didn't reach that conclusion, and I regret that we didn't reach that conclusion.

The majority leader did, in fact, come to me in, I think, absolute good faith, and I wanted to try to get to a resolution. We didn't get there, and I regret that. We are where we are. But I want to tell my friend that I am going to continue to try to work towards that objective.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. I look forward to that.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

CHIP is in effect; IPAB is not. It hasn't even created a board yet. So what you are saying to me is let's offset something that hasn't even been created.

What I am saying is the last time we had this bill on the floor, it was bipartisan votes. Democrats voted for it as well; 43 cosponsors on your side of the aisle.

So I don't think this question is just to me; it is probably for the whole body. But I think the reason the majority of the body wants to get rid of it is it hasn't even been created, and the majority of the people think it is a bad idea. So let's get rid of it now.

And do you know what? CHIP is already in effect. What is even worse on this process is it is in effect, but now people are freezing enrollments.

So, if your argument why Democrats can't help us on CHIP and why they want to defend millionaire lottery winners is somewhere that something not created has to be offset, I don't think that is really a fair argument.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his response. I was going to respond later, but let me respond now.

This bill was not marked up in committee prior to its expiring, prior to the authorization ending. So when the gentleman talks to me about time, with all due respect, had it been an item of importance—which it is a bipartisan bill. We both want to see this get done. The gentleman is correct, this program exists. The gentleman is also correct that, until we fix this, there will be States that will be running out of money. That is a great concern to us. It will adversely affect millions of children.

We ought to get this done. We ought to get it done in a bipartisan fashion, and I am sorry that we didn't. I am sorry the committee didn't get it done so it didn't have to come to the majority leader or come to my attention or the leader's attention.

But having said that, that does not answer the question of the gentleman says IPAB doesn't exist. It certainly exists in scoring. As the gentleman surely knows, this is a \$17 billion item that will have to be paid for at some point in time, and it will add to the debt if we don't pay for it. It may not exist right now. It may not exist for reasons that the gentleman probably points out, correctly, that a large number on his side and a large number on my side are not for it.

I want to tell the gentleman that I am for it. I voted that way. But a large number of the majority of my party, I think, are not for it. I agree with that.

But the fact of the matter is repealing this is not paid for, and, as a result, the costs will have to come from somewhere; but on CHIP we had to pay for

it, and on community health centers we had to pay for it.

I agree with that, by the way, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HOYER. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Did I hear correctly that you voted to repeal IPAB?

Mr. HOYER. I believe I did. No? I am checking on it.

But I am saying here, publicly, I voted for the ACA. I think the ACA was good for the country, and one of the pay-fors we said we would pay for, and we did, one of the pay-fors was IPAB.

If we want to substitute some other way to pay for the healthcare that we are giving, fine. That will not increase the debt. But if we don't pay for repeal of this IPAB, it is going to increase the debt.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. My question to the gentleman is: We have brought to the floor, twice, the repeal of IPAB. Am I understanding correctly that you voted to repeal that?

Mr. HOYER. I thought I said, and let me reiterate, I voted against repealing IPAB. I am for IPAB. I will say it again. I know it is politically very controversial. It is a tough thing to do, but it helps pay for what we buy. And the problem in this House and the problem that we just did on the tax bill is we are not paying for what we buy. It is not spend-spend or tax-tax. We do not pay for what we buy. It is easy to buy and it is hard to pay. Here we are with another example.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Let me repeat what happened on this floor in history.

Twice, this bill has come to the floor. Neither time—the repealing of IPAB—has it been offset. And do you know what? Forty-three Members on your side of the aisle joined with us. So it was the will of this House, a majority.

But if your argument is why we cannot fund children's health, why we cannot say that millionaires winning a lottery have to stay on Medicaid, if that is the defense from the other side of the aisle why they walk away from the table, I am ashamed. We are better than that, and this House is better than that.

I told you each time—and I tell the gentleman, I know it is not you, but there are other people on your side of the aisle who won't even release their Members from committee.

□ 1130

I know your members on the Energy and Commerce Committee did not want to vote "no" on that amendment. They don't want to defend those millionaires for being on Medicaid and taking away from the disabled and children. I know, in your heart, you don't want to sit back and make CHIP have problems for States, that maybe

Minnesota and Colorado can't increase enrollment, that they have to freeze it today.

We are better than this. If twice it has come to the floor without an offset, and it is the majority of the House that voted on it and it is 43 of your members doing it, I think we should move on now. Let's get back to the table. Let's solve this problem.

Mr. HOYER. I appreciate the gentleman's remarks and I appreciate the premise for which he stood. I look forward to having the Dream Act brought to the floor, which a majority of Members are for on this floor and will vote for. I believe my friend knows that to be the case, and I hope we would bring it to the floor.

Let me go to this, if I can. The majority leader did not mention whether Alexander-Murray was going to be on the floor next week. Obviously, as the gentleman knows, there is an extraordinary disruption of the marketplace in the healthcare insurance field.

Alexander-Murray, at the request of President Trump, was an effort by Senator ALEXANDER, a Republican from Tennessee, a former Secretary of Education, and a former Governor of Tennessee, to respond to the President's request and, as the gentleman has just noted, working in a bipartisan fashion to come to an agreement to stabilize markets to ensure that people are going to have healthcare and particularly to ensure that the poorest among us can afford their healthcare. Alexander-Murray is bipartisan and has over 60 Senators supporting it.

Do you believe that that will be brought to the floor at any time in the near future?

Mr. MCCARTHY. I thank the gentleman for the question, but, as the gentleman knows, for a bill to come to the floor here, it first has to get out of the Senate. The Senate has not voted on that bill.

I know the gentleman quotes a certain number, but I would wait to see how many votes there are for the bill to see where it goes.

As the gentleman knows, this House has passed a bill that repealed ObamaCare, reformed it, got us a new bill, but made those payments as it went forward. So there is a bill sitting in the Senate that they can take up and solve this problem at the same time.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman, my friend, the majority leader, with whom I work in a constructive way on many, many items mentioned earlier about how children may lose their health insurance or some of our less well-off citizens who rely on Community Health Centers will lose access, and that, therefore, we need to get this bill done soon.

Millions, I suggest to the majority leader, Mr. Speaker, will be adversely affected if we don't pass a bill stabilizing it.

Yes, I understand you introduced a bill to repeal. You control the House,

the Senate, and the Presidency. We are now 10 months into the year. That bill hasn't passed.

So what we implore, Mr. Speaker, the administration and the majority party to do is not to do indirectly, that is, destroy access to affordable, quality healthcare for millions of Americans, that which they cannot do directly, and they haven't done it directly.

So I would hope that we could bring at least a bipartisan bill, in light of the failure to pass a partisan bill, which has, I am told, 60 Senators who have indicated they support it, maybe more.

I would hope when it comes from the Senate, if Senator MCCONNELL will put it on the floor, that we will consider it forthwith, because the instability that grips the system now is hurting millions, costing them millions, perhaps billions. So I hope that would be a priority item for us, along with the bill that we call the Dream Act.

We need to redeem the dream, Mr. Speaker, and continue a policy which the Speaker has indicated he thought was erroneously repealed by the President of the United States, which I think many Republicans with whom I have talked to think is a policy that ought to be pursued. I hope we can bring that to the floor as soon as possible, and certainly before Thanksgiving.

Mr. Speaker, unless the majority leader has anything further to say, I yield back the balance of my time.

#### --- HOUR OF MEETING ON TOMORROW, AND ADJOURNMENT FROM FRIDAY, OCTOBER 27, 2017, TO TUESDAY, OCTOBER 31, 2017

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet at 10 a.m. tomorrow, and further, when the House adjourns on that day, it adjourn to meet on Tuesday, October 31, 2017, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

#### --- 75TH ANNIVERSARY OF INDIAN ROCK DAM

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

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to honor the 75th anniversary of Indian Rock Dam in York County, Pennsylvania.

Indian Rock Dam was completed by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers in 1942 as part of an unprecedented boom of water resource infrastructure construction across America that stemmed from the Flood Control Act of 1936.

It is an earth and rock structure measuring 1,000 feet long, rising 83 feet

above the streambed that dams up to 9.1 billion gallons of water that otherwise would inundate downstream communities.

While impossible to prevent all floods, we can limit the damage and risk. Since Indian Rock Dam was completed in 1942, it has prevented more than \$55 million in potential flood damage to our community of York, Pennsylvania.

Managed by the Corps' Baltimore District, Indian Rock Dam is one of the 13 Corps dam projects in the Susquehanna River watershed.

For 75 years, Indian Rock Dam has been a silent protector for our citizens. For that and its continued benefit of reducing risks to Americans downstream, I am proud to recognize the 75th anniversary of Indian Rock Dam.

#### --- HONORING SERGEANT BRYAN BLACK

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

Mr. HECK. Mr. Speaker, Bryan Black was the kid in Puyallup, Washington, with boundless potential, always striving to do more. He excelled in the classroom and, get this, both on the wrestling mat and at State chess tournaments. Go figure.

When he grew up, he took his potential to the United States Army, where Staff Sergeant Bryan Black conquered Ranger School and Special Forces Selection.

Sergeant Black was not just a warrior and a protector, he was a healer. As a Green Beret in the elite 3rd Group, he served as a medic, always encouraging and caring for those around him.

On October 4, Sergeant Black was killed in Niger.

Our hearts ache for his wife, Michelle; for his sons, Ezekiel and Isaac; and for his parents, Hank and Karen. Their son, husband, father, friend, and patriot will be remembered.

Precious few among us dedicate our God-given ability to protection of our country, but as Sergeant Black's father, Hank, so eloquently said: Some people could, would, should. Others do. Bryan did.

#### --- HONORING TROOPS ON DAY OF THE DEPLOYED

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today on the Day of the Deployed to honor the men and women of our Armed Forces who are serving overseas.

Today we salute them for their service on behalf of the United States of America. We also acknowledge the sacrifice of their families, who are separated from their loved ones during deployment.



Mr. Speaker, serving one's country is a noble and selfless act. These men and women have answered the call of duty, and today we honor their dedication, service, and courage.

In 2016, there were nearly 1.3 million Active Duty military personnel. Nearly 200,000 of those Active Duty members are deployed overseas. From Japan to Germany, and from South Korea to Afghanistan, our American men and women serve with distinction.

In the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, more than 50 airmen from the 193rd Special Operations Wing are scheduled to return home this week following an overseas deployment in support of Operation Inherent Resolve.

Mr. Speaker, I would like all of our deployed troops to know that we are proud of their efforts and are grateful for their service.

#### THE BUDGET AND TAX REFORM

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

Mr. SCHNEIDER. Mr. Speaker, just a month after the U.S. national debt surpassed \$20 trillion for the very first time, today this House passed an irresponsible budget that will add a shocking additional \$1.5 trillion to that sum.

This additional debt threatens our future prosperity and constricts our ability to respond to the challenges we face today.

The cynical purpose of today's budget is to pave the way so partisan tax reform can be fast tracked through the Senate, but financing tax cuts that overwhelmingly benefit those at the very top by ballooning our Nation's budget deficits is exactly the wrong approach.

We all agree our Tax Code is broken and needs reform, but true tax reform needs to be fiscally responsible.

Rather than crafting plans behind closed doors, I urge my colleagues to reach across the aisle. Together, we can pursue reform of our Tax Code that focuses on the middle class, promotes entrepreneurship, job creation, and private investment, and supports public investment in our infrastructure.

Let's bring this tax reform debate into the open and get this done for the American people.

#### BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize October as Breast Cancer Awareness Month, as well as all of the men, women, and families that have been affected by this devastating disease.

Breast cancer is the most commonly diagnosed cancer in women. Research, early diagnosis, and modern treat-

ments are raising survival rates, but it remains the second leading cause of cancer mortality for women.

During the month of October, we reflect on the lives lost and the families affected by this cancer, including my own family and my own beautiful wife, Carol, who we just lost this last spring, but we also bring light to the actions that we can take to fight against it.

I encourage all women to talk to your doctor about breast cancer screenings for early detection.

I admire the unmatched courage of the survivors and those currently suffering from this disease.

#### DOMESTIC VIOLENCE AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, it is the 30th anniversary of Domestic Violence Awareness Month.

Domestic violence is a crime that impacts every race, gender, class, and sex.

In my home State, 33 percent of California women and 28 percent of California men will experience domestic violence. Nevertheless, since this month was recognized for the first time in 1987, much progress has been made.

I began my professional career as a prosecutor back in 1996, and I can tell you, back then it was tough to get a jury to understand and even listen to the circumstances behind domestic violence, and it was tough to convince jurors that domestic violence is not a private issue that should be kept in the bedroom, but instead, it is a righteous issue that needed to be brought out in our courtrooms.

Fortunately, there were police officers to make arrests, there were prosecutors to try the cases, and there were advocates to give the victims the confidence they need to come forward.

So this month we recognize those who support domestic violence victims, we vow to hold abusers accountable, and we strive to create and to update legislation that not only protects, but emboldens victims of domestic violence so that they can embrace living their lives.

#### LOCK HIM UP

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, when Derrick Harper stood in front of a Pittsburgh judge a few months ago, it was clear the defendant was a special kind of evil person.

For years, Harper and his crew of deviants ran the city's most brutal and ruthless sex trafficking ring. The traffickers lined their pockets by forcing young women to have sex with countless men every day. Any woman who attempted to escape their custody was tortured and gang raped.

To degrade and dehumanize them, Harper shaved the women's heads with butcher knives and branded them with hot irons.

Harper was the ring leader of this massive trafficking organization, but it wasn't until four of his young victims bravely escaped and testified against him that justice was served.

His attempts to rob these women of their dignity had failed, and his reign of terror was finally over. Seeing the true depravity, the judge sentenced the defendant to 289 years in the penitentiary.

As a former judge, I applaud this judge. Criminals need to be locked up, not victims. America must track down and prosecute these slave traders and rescue the victims from this scourge.

And that is just the way it is.

#### MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1329. An ACT to increase, effective as of December 1, 2017, the rates of compensation for veterans with service-connected disabilities and the rates of dependency and indemnity compensation for the survivors of certain disabled veterans, and for other purposes.

#### THE HURRICANE AND OPIOID CRISES

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, first of all, I want to urgently have set up an appeal process on an expedited basis for my constituents and those across the disaster-impacted areas of a FEMA denial appeal system. Thousands of my constituents have been denied FEMA assistance.

Pictures just came to my phone last evening, and I am urging the FEMA Director and all who can do so, including the President, we are not a 10. We are in desperate need of help. People do not have their lives restored.

I also want to make mention of the fact that today there will be some statement made on this horrific opioid crisis, which we as Members of Congress have been dealing with for over a year. We understand that this may be called a public health service emergency versus a catastrophic emergency, using the Public Service Act or the Stafford Act. The Stafford Act funds are almost completely diminished because of wildfires and hurricanes.

The casualties of opioid abuse are 142 per day, which is like an airplane crash every single day. With this amazing and unbelievable budget that has been passed, the Halloween budget of 2017, there will be trillions of dollars cut away from the budget. It is imperative that the President call this an emergency and begin to use emergency funds to deal with the opioid crisis.

The only thing you can say today, Mr. Trump, is that you are committed to an emergency both for Hurricane disasters and others, but as well as the opioid crisis.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD my letter to the President:

Mr. President, thank you for the invitation for Members of Congress to attend the unveiling of your emergency declaration on combatting the opioid epidemic.

This is indeed an epidemic that I agree must be addressed immediately. This problem has claimed many lives throughout our country, including my state of Texas and my home district of Houston.

It is imperative that we act. It is equally imperative that we act responsibly and intelligently.

We cannot merely make promises on which the American people are waiting for us to deliver, if we know that those promises will not come right away.

We must have a clear goal and long-term commitment to truly combatting this devastating problem in the opioid crisis.

Mr. President, where will this money come from, as this is a very costly endeavor?

New funding streams would be required, and thus, making such a declaration without forethought relative to significant funding will prove to be a futile effort.

There must be a strategy which we can realistically and effectively execute without causing harm to equally important and urgent areas.

Despite your previous promise to address the opioid crisis, at a Commission meeting last week, no real solution was developed.

Instead, the Commission suggested that funding be taken out of the Public Health Service Act or the Stafford Act, both of which are problematic.

First, I believe the nation's public health emergency fund is empty.

Second, the Stafford Act funds disaster relief for hurricanes and wildfires, which are under the jurisdiction of FEMA.

As a Member of Congress that recently watched the fatal devastation inflicted upon my city of Houston, I can tell you firsthand, that we are still trying to wrap our minds around the catastrophic loss and how to now rebuild.

America has experienced mass casualties due to recent hurricanes that occurred within the span of a month period, with approximate death tolls of 82 in Texas and Louisiana, 72 in Florida, 51 in Puerto Rico and countless disruptions and damages.

The loss of lives, businesses and properties is astronomical as we continue to assess the damage in TX, LA, FL, VI and P.R.

Therefore, I must caution the administration, to responsibly bear these facts in mind, as it attempts to combat the opioid epidemic, which is undoubtedly a very important issue.

#### THE 71ST RESCUE SQUADRON IS RECOGNIZED FOR ITS RESCUE EFFORTS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 71st

Rescue Squadron of the United States Air Force, which is stationed at Moody Air Force Base in the first District of Georgia.

They responded as part of the 23rd Wing effort by mobilizing their personnel and equipment in order to help the victims of Hurricane Harvey in Texas.

The 71st Rescue Squadron successfully evacuated 308 flood victims and 38 family pets. They repositioned 15 rescue crafts and teams to access difficult areas, saving 1,100 lives.

In addition, they moved 83 tons of cargo and delivered 23,000 gallons of fuel, which was used to conduct helicopter search and rescues.

Because of their dedication to this country, this group received the That Others May Live Squadron of the Year Award for the Air Force.

Thank you, 71st Rescue Squadron, for your extensive efforts to help the citizens of this country.

#### HANNAH AHLERS WAS THE "COOL" MOM

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, as I mentioned a couple of weeks ago, I plan to speak on this floor about each victim who lost their life during the terrible shooting on October 1 in Las Vegas. My goal is to honor their lives and to ensure that they will never be forgotten.

Today I rise to remember Hannah Ahlers, a loving wife, mother, daughter, sister, and friend, whose life was taken far too soon.

Hannah lived in Beaumont, California, and had traveled to Las Vegas with her husband, Brian, and three other couples to attend the Route 91 Harvest music festival.

Friends and family have described Hannah as a beautiful person inside and out, who was full of joy, and always went out of her way to help her friends and family.

Her commitment to her friends, family, and community was felt by everyone. She could light up the room at any moment she walked in. Her father-in-law described her as a young Mary Tyler Moore.

She was also an amazing and devoted mother to her three children, Briannah, Brice, and Hailey. Her kids' friends thought she was the cool mom, and they loved to be around her. She lived her life to the fullest, and enjoyed both the simple pleasures and outdoor thrills, like the skydiving community she was a part of.

I would like to extend my deepest condolences to Hannah's friends and family. Please know that the city of Las Vegas in Nevada and the whole country grieve with you. This is a tragedy that should have never happened.

#### OFFICER CRAIG LEHNER LIVED A LIFE OF HEROISM

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

Mr. COLLINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Officer Craig Lehner, a Buffalo police officer who lived a life of heroism and who tragically died during a recent training exercise on the Niagara River.

Officer Lehner was a 9-year veteran of the Buffalo Police Department, serving on the underwater recovery team, and also serving as a K-9 officer. His partner, a 4-year-old German Shepherd named Shield, served alongside him.

Officer Lehner served our country for 16 years as an Army National Guard military police officer. Having served in Iraq and Guantanamo Bay, he was a well-decorated staff sergeant, awarded more than a dozen medals for his bravery and military achievements.

Officer Lehner made the ultimate sacrifice, and we will be forever grateful for his service. He will be remembered for his bravery and keeping Americans safe both abroad and in western New York.

I offer condolences to his mother, Kathleen, and all of his surviving family during this very difficult time.

#### HONORING BERTHA WATSON HENRY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the hard work and esteemed career of Broward County Administrator Bertha Watson Henry.

This week, Bertha is being honored at the International City and County Management Association's annual conference in San Antonio as the recipient of the Mark E. Keane Memorial Award for Excellence. I could not think of a more deserving recipient for this prestigious award.

Under Henry's leadership, Broward County successfully navigated the 2008 recession with stable finances and a strong recovery. She has helped Broward maintain a triple A bond rating since 2014, something only three other Florida counties have accomplished.

She has led construction of a new 714,000-square-foot county courthouse, a 40,000-square-foot animal adoption center, and she renegotiated financial agreements to protect Broward's interest in the fourth largest National Hockey League venue in the U.S.

Administrator Henry's recognition at ICMA is also historic, as Bertha is the first-ever African-American woman to receive the Keane Award for Excellence. Most importantly, this achievement is a reflection of Bertha's commitment to her neighbors, the 1.9 million Floridians who called Broward County home.

As she continues to steer Broward County's 60 agencies and a budget of nearly \$5 billion, Bertha Henry deserves this award because of the way she has made Broward County a better place to live, to work, to play, and to visit.

Bertha, thank you for your outstanding service, and congratulations on the well-deserved honor.

#### HERKIMER CENTRAL SCHOOL DISTRICT SUPERINTENDENT ROBERT MILLER TURNS AROUND GRADUATION RATES

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Robert Miller, superintendent of the Herkimer Central School District.

When Robert Miller became superintendent of the Herkimer Central School District in 2013, he was facing a problem that many superintendents across this country are facing: a low and decreasing graduation rate.

However, in the 4 years since Mr. Miller began in his new role, Herkimer has seen a drastic turnaround. The graduation rate has increased 11 percent, from 69 to 80 percent.

However, in 2006, Herkimer's graduation rates were at 87 percent. Mr. Miller has made it his mission to ensure that Herkimer Central School District reaches that number again.

Mr. Miller noted that it was the dedication of both teachers and administrators that led to the significant increase. Their ability and willingness to intervene with students at risk has helped these students successfully move to the next stage of their lives with the skills they need to contribute positively to our community.

Thank you to Superintendent Miller and the dedicated staff at Herkimer Central School District for your tremendous work and commitment to our next generation of leaders. I know your effort will continue inspiring our students for years to come.

#### BOY SCOUT TROOP 728 CELEBRATES 70 YEARS

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

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to rise today to celebrate the 70th anniversary of Boy Scout Troop 728.

This troop's longstanding commitment to instilling positive social values and building self-esteem and self-reliance in young men has provided a great benefit to our community.

Opened in 1947, Troop 728 has produced a tradition of excellence. It has been led by many dedicated Scoutmasters over its 70-year history, each of whom has contributed to the legacy of the troop. These passionate,

active leaders allow the memories of past leaders to continue to flourish in the troop's culture today.

Traditions of Troop 728 include Scout breakfasts, hiking, camping trips, and summer camp. Additionally, Scoutmasters focus instilling leadership skills in troop members and developing leaders for the 21st century.

Troop 728 has produced over 30 Eagle Scouts, the most prestigious award that any young man can earn in Scouting. This demonstrates their continued commitment to their long legacy of service throughout the community.

On this special anniversary, I would like to congratulate the leaders and members of Troop 728 for all of their successes.

#### HALLE THOMPSON LIVES AMONGST THE HEAVENLY HOST

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

Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana. Mr. Speaker, the image beside me is of a young lady named Halle Thompson, who was tragically killed in a car crash in my district. I penned this letter to her parents:

"Dear Mr. and Mrs. Thompson, "Ryan, Janna, my own heart is rended as I pen this letter of encouragement and condolence.

"Your beautiful daughter Halle is, no doubt, in the presence of our beloved lady and our loving, forgiving Savior. You are each, no doubt, surrounded by the angels of Christ, as you endeavor each day to endure the grief of your loss, even as you present a strong and determined front to honor the life and spirit of your daughter.

"I have personal insight relative to your pain, having lost my own first-born, my beautiful Daniela, long ago on the 10th day of November 1990.

"I wish to compassionately convey it has come onto my heart that your Halle is present at this moment with my own Daniela, looking upon you both with adoration as you prayerfully honor and respect our Lord's mysterious will.

"Please know that my prayers are with you and that my own quiet service to America and our fellow man is dedicated this day to the beautiful Halle, angelic now, as she lives amongst the Heavenly Host.

"Respectfully, I remain, your humble servant."

#### NATIONAL FOREST PRODUCTS WEEK

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the House Paper and Packaging Caucus, I rise today to recognize the 57th anniversary of National Forest Products Week.

As an Oregonian, this week takes on special significance for me and my con-

stituents. Oregon is home to over 174 wood products, paper, and packaging manufacturing facilities that make nearly \$11 billion in products annually and contribute over \$2 billion to the State and local economies through wages and compensation.

I would like to recognize and thank the nearly 38,000 hardworking men and women employed by the forest products industry in my State. Your contributions to our State and your local communities are greatly appreciated.

In this country, we are fortunate to have the renewable natural resources and domestic manufacturing to be able to provide Americans with the paper or packaging tissue and wood products that are central to modern life and the modern economy.

I want to thank and congratulate the people and employees in the forest products industry for the valuable role they play in the economy not only in my State and district, but to rural communities across this country.

□ 1200

#### LET'S WORK ON BIPARTISAN TAX REFORM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, we cannot allow the Republican majority to trade away creating jobs here in America for doling out massive tax breaks to wealthy corporations that have no intention of investing here in the United States of America. The Republican plan will actually fuel more job outsourcing and move benefits to shareholders and overpaid CEOs, not the workers of our country.

We can't allow Republicans to cut education, cut Medicare, cut Social Security, cut Medicaid, which serve the elderly and the ill. Eighty percent of the tax giveaways in their plan go to the top 1 percent.

Untargeted tax cuts don't create jobs. In fact, when Congress, during the 1980s, passed a tax cut, companies couldn't outsource middle class jobs fast enough. It was a bad deal then, and it is a bad deal now.

Our country can't afford to balloon the deficit by \$1.5 trillion so Wall Street can appease their shareholders a little more and stack the decks against American workers. Tax reform should not result in the outsourcing of our jobs. It should result in investing here in the United States of America, and that begins with real tax reform, not scam tax reform.

#### COUNTRY BEFORE PARTY AND PATRIOTISM BEFORE POLITICS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. GAETZ). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 60th anniversary of the publication of "Profiles in Courage." John F. Kennedy's famous volume tells the stories of eight American leaders who put country before party and patriotism before politics, men for whom personal integrity was more important than personal popularity or power.

Unfortunately, the kind of political and moral courage that is described in Kennedy's book is in tragically short supply within the modern Republican Party.

Faced by a President intent on undermining the values and norms that sustain our democracy, frighteningly few Republicans have been willing to do more than wring their hands and roll their eyes. While Senator CORKER and Senator FLAKE have been boldly denouncing Donald Trump, they are exceptions to a well-established rule.

Indeed, when a new "Profiles in Courage" is written for the 21st century, we can be certain that no one from the current House Republican leadership is going to be featured in its pages.

When questioned about Trump's attacks on women, minorities, the disabled, and Gold Star families, Speaker RYAN has been equivocal and evasive.

When called upon to condemn Trump's outrageous embrace of the White nationalists, Speaker RYAN has deferred and deflected.

When asked to defend Trump's reckless rhetoric on North Korea, Speaker RYAN has done so enthusiastically.

Earlier this week, on the Senate floor, Senator FLAKE complained that "reckless, outrageous, and undignified behavior has become excused and countenanced."

Mr. Speaker, PAUL RYAN and the GOP leadership are the very people who are doing that excusing. They are normalizing and condoning actions that should shock us as Americans and shame us as a body.

But don't take my word for it, Mr. Speaker. With the help of my good friend, Congressman LIEU of California, we will now read for you, in chronological order, Speaker RYAN's responses to Donald Trump's most outrageous and abusive behavior.

Congressman LIEU, let's get started.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, before we do, let me just first say that today is Thursday. That means we all need to ask: Why do Ivanka Trump and Jared Kushner still have their security clearances?

But I digress. We are now going to read into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD outrageous and stupid things the President of the United States has done or said, and then Representative GALLEGO is going to give you Speaker RYAN's response. So I am going to start.

On May 11, Donald Trump fired FBI Director James Comey, and this is what Donald Trump said:

"Regardless of recommendation, I was going to fire Comey, knowing there was no good time to do it. And, in fact, when I decided to just do it, I said

to myself, 'You know, this Russia thing with Trump and Russia is a made-up story.'"

Mr. GALLEGO. Speaker RYAN's response: Trump "acted and that's what a President should do." Real profile in courage there.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On May 16, it was revealed that Donald Trump asked Director Comey to drop an investigation into General Flynn's collusion with the Russians before he was fired.

Trump said to Comey: Flynn "is a good guy. I hope you can let this go."

Mr. GALLEGO. The Speaker's response: Trump's "new to government, and so he probably wasn't steeped in the long-running protocols that establish the relationships between DOJ, FBI, and the White Houses. He's just new to this."

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On May 22, Donald Trump confirmed he leaked classified information to Russian officials at a meeting in the Oval Office.

Mr. GALLEGO. The response from RYAN's office is, "The Speaker hopes for a full explanation of the facts from the administration," an explanation that the American people are still waiting for, by the way, 5 months later. There has been no explanation, and I am pretty sure there was no follow-up.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On July 17, Donald Trump defended his son, Don, Jr., for holding a highly inappropriate and likely illegal meeting with agents of the Russian Government.

Donald Trump said: "Most politicians would have gone to a meeting like the one Don, Jr., attended in order to get info on an opponent. That's politics!"

Mr. GALLEGO. Speaker RYAN was then asked whether he would have taken a meeting with a Russian official who offered opposition research on a political opponent. His evasive answer, of course, is: "I am not going into hypotheticals."

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On July 26, Trump announced a ban on transgender Americans serving our Nation in uniform.

Let me just digress for a moment. Representative GALLEGO is a combat veteran. I served on Active Duty. We know that to have our strong, all-volunteer military, the best in the world, we need to recruit the best and the brightest. To discriminate against an entire class of people is not only wrong, it is harming our military readiness.

This is what Donald Trump said: Our military "cannot be burdened with the tremendous medical costs and disruption that transgender in the military would entail."

Mr. GALLEGO. And to respond, and I will riff a little, the cost is minimal in terms of the medical costs. It is just an excuse for the President to be homophobic.

But Speaker RYAN's condemnation of this, or renouncement, did not exist. He responded by pleading for more time, and said: "The DOD is reviewing

this with the White House. I want to see what it is that they actually produce."

And, of course, that is another non-answer.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. And we are still waiting.

On August 8, Donald Trump reacted to escalating tensions with North Korea by irresponsibly threatening military action.

Trump said: "North Korea best not make any more threats to the United States. They will be met with fire and fury like the world has never seen."

Mr. GALLEGO. Speaker RYAN's response, in regard to a potential nuclear war: "I think the President, in my own view of it, he likes the unpredictability side of this."

That is right. Speaker RYAN thinks our Commander-in-Chief enjoys the unpredictability of bringing the world to the brink of a nuclear war.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On August 16, Donald Trump repeatedly refused to condemn a White supremacist rally in Virginia. Trump said: "I think there is blame on both sides. But you also had people that were very fine people, on both sides."

Mr. GALLEGO. Speaker RYAN's response: "I do believe that he messed up in his comments on Tuesday . . . he has since then cleared that up."

But Trump never clears up anything. He certainly did not in this case.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On September 5, Trump announced his intention to terminate the DACA program, a move that will expose 800,000 undocumented young people, Americans in every respect except on paper, to deportation from the United States.

Mr. GALLEGO. Before that decision was made, RYAN had said: "Actually, I don't think he should do that."

However, after the announcement was said, RYAN pulled an embarrassing U-turn so fast it would cause whiplash, saying: "President Obama was wrong to do it in the first place. . . . So President Trump was right in his decision. He made the right call."

Shameless.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. On October 3, with millions in Puerto Rico without electricity or basic necessities, Donald Trump congratulated the people of the island on not losing hundreds of lives like in "a real catastrophe" like Hurricane Katrina.

Despite massive flooding and overwhelming devastation, Trump called his administration's response "unbelievable" and "incredible."

He attacked the mayor of San Juan and other local leaders who had pleaded with his administration for additional resources. Trump even criticized the brave people of Puerto Rico, claiming they are "throwing our budget out of whack."

And I would just also note that Trump was kind enough to dedicate a golf trophy cup to Puerto Rico.

Mr. GALLEGO. Speaker RYAN's response: President Trump "has tremendous compassion."

You can see the compassion.

"He is flying to these emergencies as soon as he can . . . it shows me that the people who are suffering from these tragedies are in his mind, front and center."

I am pretty sure the millions in Puerto Rico who still lack electricity and running water do not feel that way. They don't feel that way about Trump, and they don't feel that he has any compassion for them. And they definitely aren't "front and center" for this President or his incompetent administration.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Finally, beginning October 17, President Trump repeatedly attacked one of our colleagues, Congresswoman WILSON from Florida, and he essentially said that a Gold Star widow was lying.

Mr. GALLEGGO. So what was Speaker RYAN's response? Actually, we are still waiting to hear from him. He hasn't commented or issued a statement. When Trump repeatedly denigrates the personal integrity of a Member of this body, Speaker RYAN says nothing.

When Trump demeans a grieving widow whose husband has made the ultimate sacrifice for our Nation, Speaker RYAN stays silent. Frankly, it is embarrassing.

Congressman LIEU, what do you think these responses from Speaker RYAN say about the House Republican leadership and the state of the Republican Party?

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative GALLEGGO. There are really only two choices here. Either all of us in Congress can follow the leadership of Republican Senators JOHN MCCAIN, BOB CORKER, and JEFF FLAKE and tell the truth, or we can be complicit.

Senator JEFF FLAKE is unwilling to be complicit. We are unwilling to be complicit.

And keep in mind, when Senator BOB CORKER, who is not a flamethrower, he is the chair of the Senate Foreign Relations Committee, and he comes out and says that he is concerned that the President of the United States could lead us to world war III, Americans need to listen.

So we call on Speaker RYAN to not be complicit and enable the reckless and dangerous behavior of our President, and that he have the courage to stand up and tell the truth and to really make sure that our President does not take our country off the rails.

Mr. GALLEGGO. Our Founding Fathers knew that there was danger in putting so much power in one person. They knew that giving too much power to one person, an irresponsible and immature leader, could use that to both effect democracy or enrich themselves.

There is a reason why we have what we call the checks and balances. But one of those checks needs to be the U.S. House of Representatives. Under that, the person who is in charge of the U.S. House of Representatives is Speaker RYAN. He is not providing that

check. He is only helping this administration carry on with their abuse and with the destruction of what we understand are the norms of this democracy.

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

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

Members are also reminded to formally yield and reclaim time when under recognition.

□ 1215

#### ISSUES OF THE WEEK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting, when I am watching the news or looking at a newspaper, I can see what kind of pictures are there in the news story, and having been at press conferences where print media that is extremely slanted will come up, the photographer from such media source will come up and get right in front and then start taking pictures and have their camera on nonstop, just click, click, click, second after second. So you know they have got 100, 200 pictures.

It is easy to know what they are doing. They are taking as many pictures as fast as they can. And you know that they are going to go through and they are going to take the picture in which your mouth is in the most contorted position, or where it looks like you are saying a word that would be inappropriate for an elected official to say. You know that is the picture they are going to put up, trying to make you look as stupid as possible before you ever read the article.

For some of us, it is not difficult to make us look stupid. We can't help our looks. But you just know before you ever read the article, when you look at the picture, whether it is going to be a fair and objective article, or whether it is going to be totally skewed and totally subjective.

I notice that, too, sometimes when friends across the aisle come with blown-up pictures. I can look at the pictures and tell whether it is going to be a fair and objective dissertation I am going to hear from my fellow Representatives across the aisle. But it is true of Republicans as well. I just don't see those type of skewed pictures very often at all, if at all, from the Republicans. But, anyway, it seems to be a good rule of thumb. You look at the pictures and you can tell whether it is going to be fair or it is going to be a total hit piece.

I have been very interested, though, to watch during the course of this last 9, 10 months as we come through 2017, the story nonstop from Representa-

tives across the aisle has been about Russia, Russia, Russia. It sounds a bit like Sean Hannity, Russia, Russia, Russia, yes, but I don't mind sounding like somebody I greatly admire.

But isn't it interesting that in the revelations that have been coming out in the last few days, our friends across the aisle have not been as anxious to run down and talk about Russia?

But somebody needs to talk about it. I have been talking about it for quite some time, and for most of this year I have been pointing out that we actually need a special prosecutor, a special counsel to investigate former FBI Director Comey and to investigate the Clinton ties to Russia and the over \$100 million in contributions that came from stakeholders, apparently, of Uranium One. It is just absolutely incredible.

What is amazing, though, there are bound to be so many fingers going out emanating from that deal that we have not seen or heard of. We didn't know what was going on, and now we know that the FBI headed by Director Robert Mueller, at the same time that he was purging the FBI training materials of anything that offended radical Islamists that want to kill us, at the same time he was not investigating properly tips about the older Tsarnaev being radicalized that he was going to kill people. Let's face it, when we get a tip that somebody has been radicalized as an Islamist, it means they are likely going to commit a terrorist act and try to take innocent lives, as Tsarnaev and his brother did.

The FBI didn't properly investigate. They didn't know what to ask. They didn't know how to investigate whether or not somebody had been radicalized because Robert Mueller had purged the training materials so they couldn't know what to ask, how to know if somebody has been radicalized, or they are a peace-loving Muslim, or they are radical Islamist.

Mueller prevented that from happening because he was so taken up with the idea of being friendly and neighborly, he called it his outreach program. He even testified before our Judiciary Committee years ago after I was there about—he kept wanting to make the point that the Muslim community is exactly like every other community. Again, the Muslim community is just like every other community.

He kept making that point over and over as Democrats asked him questions. And then he talked about his lovely outreach program with CAIR—the Council on American-Islamic Relations—that has ties that were named as codefendants supporting terrorism with those who were actually convicted of supporting terrorism.

Yet, even though the FBI had the evidence that convicted these supporting terrorists, and even though there was plenty of evidence that the people who he was trying to be friends with had radical terrorist ties, he continued his so-called outreach program

as people were plotting to kill Americans among those that he was trying to have meals with and be friendly with.

But I asked him the question: You keep saying that the Muslim community here in America is just like every other community, and you keep bragging about your outreach program with the Muslim community. So I would like to ask you, Director Mueller, how was your outreach program going with Jews, Catholics, Baptists, and other religious groups? How is that outreach going? How is your outreach going with the Buddhists and the Confucianists?

Anyway, that was the basic question I asked. Of course, he was taken aback and he couldn't explain because eventually we got the truth. There is no outreach program like that that the FBI had with any other religious group.

So it is kind of disingenuous, if not to say dishonest, to say that a group that requires special attention and coddling is somehow exactly like every other group in America. No, they require special attention, at least that is what Robert Mueller thought.

I don't think any religious group that believes in our Constitution and supports our Constitution requires any such special attention, as Robert Mueller was giving the outreach partner CAIR that has done so much damage to America and continues to undermine evidence to find, arrest, and convict radical Islamists.

It is normally like clockwork. As soon as a radical Islamist has committed a terrorist act, it really is like clockwork. You can count on CAIR—C-A-I-R; not the kind that actually helps people around the world, but CAIR—to be out there with the news conference saying: This guy was not one of us.

But at some point, I hope that people who are Muslims will quit listening to CAIR and will listen to the words of a much wiser individual, President el-Sisi in Egypt, who stood in a room with imams and told them: We have got to get our religion back away from the radicals, or they are going to destroy it.

That is a courageous man, and I don't find that kind of courage among the people who have these press conferences to deflect instead of helping us find and capture the radical Islamists before they kill too many people. They are out there trying to make it appear that they are not really radical Islamists; that they are something else. No, they are radical Islamists. They clearly are.

I was kind of saddened that General Kelly ended up being the chief of staff for President Trump because I thought he was starting out to do a superb job as Secretary of Homeland Security.

It turns out, as some of us had warned, that during the Obama administration, all of this blather about countering violent extremism, CVE, that found its way into legislation that this body passed: Oh, let's don't call it

"fighting radical Islamists." Call it, "countering violent extremism."

Well, some of us had figured out the game, and Michele Bachmann was one of those people. Yes, it is not countering violent extremism. It is fighting radical Islam. Thank God President Trump is now occupying the Oval Office. He understood that ISIS was not just a JV team. They are people who are radical Islamists and they would love to kill as many Americans as possible. They didn't need to have their groups denigrated. They needed to have their groups destroyed.

These were not people who were going to be rehabilitated. They were radical extremists that actually believe with all of their heart that they win a place in paradise by killing innocent people.

If you really want to go back to why there is an English translation copy of the Koran in the Library of Congress that was purchased, owned by Thomas Jefferson, it was because he was negotiating with the radical Islamists, the Barbary pirates in North Africa. He was so well-educated, so well-read, he couldn't understand why the Barbary pirates, who were radical Islamists, kept attacking American ships.

As he indicated: We are not a threat to you. We don't even have a Navy to speak of. We are not your enemy. We don't understand why you keep attacking American ships.

And he was told that, under their belief system, those Islamists believed they went to paradise if they died killing what we would consider innocent people and they consider people worthy of death; they would go to paradise.

Jefferson, as well-read as he was, he couldn't believe that there was any religion anywhere in the world that believed you could go to Heaven or paradise if you are killed while you are killing innocent, unsuspecting people who are not military. They are not a threat to the radical Islamists's life, yet they thought they were going to go to paradise and have 70-some-odd virgins or so waiting for them. He couldn't believe it. So that is when he got his own copy of the Koran, because he just couldn't believe there was a religion that believed you could go to paradise if you are killing innocent people.

Hopefully that will set the record straight with some folks who thought it showed how open-minded Thomas Jefferson was. Actually, he was quite open-minded. Some have tried to denigrate him because he had slaves. The man made plenty of mistakes, and one of them was an egregious wrong he did upon John Adams.

□ 1230

They had been friends for years. It was Adams who asked him to do the first draft of the Declaration of Independence. Jefferson was wise enough that, when he did the first draft of the Declaration of Independence, if you look at the different grievances that he

set out as to why they should be independent from England, the longest paragraph of the grievance was about how King George allowed slavery to ever start in America.

At the time, Virginia had a law making it illegal to free your own slaves, so he was law-abiding. But he believed that one of the worst things that ever happened to America was King George's allowing slavery to start and exist in this country and that it was going to cause massive problems that would be very difficult to cure. He was exactly right on all fronts.

There are some even claiming that George Washington should have his name removed from schools or public places when the fact is there would be no free America without George Washington having lived at the time he did. I believe with all my heart that George Washington was the man for such a time as that. There has never been a man in all of history who led a military in a revolution, won the revolution, and then tendered his resignation, as we see down the Hall, his outreached hand. I think it is the most important scene in all of the Capitol. It is a massive mural. He is handing in his resignation. He sought no further power.

He could have been king of America or an emperor. There were a couple of coups they tried to involve him in. He stopped them. Anybody else in the world we know from history would not have done what he did. He was reluctant to take any power, yet because of his humility and his focus on creating a free and independent land, we have a free and independent land.

Yes, he had slaves, but he was dealing with a Virginia where there was a law against freeing the slaves. But even so, he put in his will that their slaves would be free upon the death of his wife. Certainly, there are better ways to have done that. He was trying to abide by the law.

We have such an incredible history with people like Washington. Some of us were attending an address by an author who had researched and done a biography on Benjamin Franklin, over at the Library of Congress, we were hearing. Someone asked him: Is there anybody you can think of in modern America who reminds you of Ben Franklin? He said: Actually, we have got many people who are witty, clever, and very inventive. Yes, Ben Franklin was an absolutely incredible man.

Of course, I am paraphrasing. But he said: It wasn't like he was George Washington. There was only one of those, just only one of those.

We had the director of The Society of the Cincinnati speak at the Library of Congress on one occasion. He was asked—since most biographers, the more they dig into the background of an individual, and he had studied Washington every year of his adult life—did he come to a point where he had less respect for Washington because of all of the details he discerned about Washington's life.



He indicated that he could honestly say that, in addition to knowing more about Washington every year of his adult life, that he had more respect, admiration, and awe of George Washington with each passing year, with every bit of information he learned. That is the kind of incredible history we have, the kind of selflessness.

People say, oh, yeah, but Washington, look at the big payoff he got. He didn't take a salary, but, boy, did he take a lot of money after the Revolution.

Actually, he didn't take a salary. He didn't take a payoff. He was reimbursed some of his out-of-pocket expenses. He had been paying for spies to work for the country. He had paid so much out of his own pocket, and he was only seeking part of what had come out of pocket knowing that, if the Revolution failed, not only would he have been killed, but, obviously, his family would not have had all that money he spent.

So I think that kind of puts in perspective, when we start looking at people who are willing to sell off America's national security for millions of dollars—well, you have to admire their appreciation for large amounts of money, but not at the price of selling our safety.

So, for all this year, I have been saying that Robert Mueller should never have accepted the role of special counsel because we knew that James Comey was such a close and dear friend of his, and Comey was a witness central to this investigation. He could not be a fair arbiter, a fair investigator. If he had been properly morally inclined, he should have said: I can't be the special counsel because I am too close—especially to Comey—to these people.

Comey, himself, testified that, before he testified up here at Congress, he talked to Mueller. There is a 2013 Washingtonian article that was just a long, glowing piece on Comey that, in effect, if the world were burning down, the one person Comey would know would be right there with him would be Robert Mueller standing with him. These guys were so close. He looked at Mueller as a mentor. They were really tight.

The question in my mind, because of that tightness, since we know Comey leaked in order to, as he said, try to get a special counsel, that Mueller encouraged him to do that: Was Mueller behind this setup to get a special counsel so he could be appointed and start making massive amounts of money and hire all of these Republican-hating Democrats, contributors to Hillary Clinton, some of them?

Wow, what a great setup for a guy who obviously held grudges against some Republicans. This is somebody who should not have been appointed, even though he was appointed to be Director of the FBI by George W. Bush.

Obviously, George W. Bush was trying hard to pick the right people and taking other advice like his father's

mistake in appointing David Souter. Wow, what a disaster that appointment turned out to be. He turned out to be a wolf in sheep's clothing, appearing to act as one thing when we saw his teeth as he went to the Supreme Court.

Edith Jones and David Souter came under consideration. I have been told they were both sitting in the White House as President H.W. Bush tried to figure out which one to appoint. If he had appointed Edith Jones, history would be totally different, and we would not have either Justice Kagan or Justice Sotomayor because whom he appointed would never have resigned during President Obama's Presidency. So those kinds of mistakes have long-reaching effects.

But President Bush appointed Mueller. And the more I find out, unlike the director of The Society of the Cincinnati finding out about Washington and growing in awe and admiration, the more I find out about Robert Mueller, the more concerned I am. The disclosures this week about what this man knew, what this man was involved in, and what he did—I thought he was accepting the role of special counsel because of some possible revenge motive: he had a dislike for some Republicans, loved the idea of doing what Patrick Fitzgerald did, who happened to be not just a friend of James Comey; he was the godfather of a Comey child.

Of course, we found out later that Comey recommended to Attorney General Ashcroft he should recuse himself so that he could appoint the godfather of his child, Patrick Fitzgerald, to be the special counsel. We found out this year, well, Comey leaked information—which may or may not have been a crime; it needs to be investigated—in order to get a special counsel appointed.

So he is using the same type of manipulative behavior as he did to get the godfather of his child appointed special counsel in order to get the one guy who would be with him through thick and thin, no matter how bad things got, Robert Mueller, get him appointed special counsel.

I had no idea that Robert Mueller had been involved and been Director of the FBI as they investigated Russia's efforts to corner the market on uranium and to spend millions and millions of dollars to acquire United States uranium. He is Director of the FBI. They are investigating this.

Even knowing that, it appears that he and now-Deputy Attorney General Rosenstein actually covered up their investigation so that people would not get upset with Secretary Hillary Clinton for being an approver of the deal of selling America's uranium to an enemy of the United States.

According to all the Democrats, for all this year, Russia, Russia, Russia is this big horrible enemy, and how dare anybody do business with them. It turns out that, actually, they were the ones who were involved in this terribly sordid business of selling our national security to the Russians.

The FBI had investigated. They had all of this information, and they even had an FBI informant, as Mueller knew as Director of the FBI. The informant had been working with the Russians. It was an undercover operation, perhaps the most important one the FBI had going on at that time.

They did have the operation going on under Director Mueller of creating a fictitious case against Senator Ted Stevens, Republican from Alaska, in which they created evidence. They conspired to hide evidence that completely didn't just exonerate Ted Stevens; it showed that he was law abiding. They hid that evidence, and they manufactured a case that would cost him his Senate seat.

The loss of his Senate seat ended up putting him on a small plane that crashed, and he lost his life. As far as I know, there were no ties of the plane crash to Mueller, but Mueller was the FBI Director.

Thank God that there was an FBI agent involved in that investigation and that, after Ted Stevens was convicted, he couldn't stand it. His conscience would not allow him to sit quietly by after the FBI and the U.S. Attorney—but this FBI lead agent, under Director Mueller as Director, just fabricated a case.

It turns out not only did Ted Stevens not accept hundreds of thousands of dollars of improvements to his home without paying for them, he paid more, hundreds of thousands more, than the improvements were worth. Apparently, there was even evidence that they covered up where the contractor is saying: Look, Ted, you are paying more than we are charging you.

Stevens would say: Look, I am constantly being watched. People don't like my political positions, so I have got to be so far above and beyond ethical and moral that I have got to pay more. Just accept the checks for overpayment.

The guy is overpaying, and yet they came after him knowing that this was an innocent man. They prosecuted him and convicted him.

So after the whistleblower FBI agent comes forward under Director Mueller's leadership, what happened? The informant was ordered to be kept from investigating any criminal cases, which meant he had no job at the FBI. He went ahead and did as he was being pushed to do.

□ 1245

He went ahead and resigned. Thank God for a man with a conscience like that.

His affidavit made clear that the lead agent had manufactured evidence and hid evidence from the defense counsel, because they had come in with warrants and taken everything: computer drives, thumb drives, documentary evidence, and gone to the bank and gotten his documents. He did not have any evidence to show you how innocent he was, because the FBI had taken it.



I know FBI agents who are the most honest people I have ever met. We have thousands of them in this country. Thank God for them.

But what happened under Director Mueller's leadership?

Well, the whistleblower that exposed the fraudulent misconduct gets run out of the FBI, under Director Mueller.

And what happened to the one who fabricated the evidence, fabricated the case, hid evidence that showed Ted Stevens' innocence?

When Mueller is Director, that FBI agent continued to get accolades and be moved on to investigate some of the most important cases the FBI had. That was Director Mueller.

He also had a policy he created called the 5-year up-or-out policy, which an article in *The Wall Street Journal* pointed out years ago. It ended up destroying or running off thousands and thousands of years of experience from the FBI, weakening this incredible investigative body that, until Mueller got there, was the best investigative body in all of America.

But after running off thousands of thousands of years of experienced FBI agents so that he could have less experienced agents—agents who would not have the experience to say: But, Mr. Director, that would be a mistake, which was done in 1985 or 1992, and it didn't work out—no, he had people with no experience.

I know from being a prosecutor that right out of law school you are ready to put the bad guys away. You are going to push the line to the limit. You are going to do your job, salute the flag, and it always helps to have experienced people around to say: Look, I know you mean well. That is not a good idea.

Mueller liked to run those people off. He spent millions of dollars that some agents pointed out was being wasted on programs that were wasteful and ineffective.

Now that we know what is coming out this week, I am surprised how naive I continue to be. I thought Mueller accepted the job of special counsel to investigate the Russia-Trump alleged relationship because it would be a great job and he could carry out vendettas that he might have. That was so naive.

Now we know that he had an investigation of Russia. He had an undercover informant for years working on the case and that he covered up that investigation, along with Rod Rosenstein, so that Hillary Clinton could make this deal, approve the deal.

And yes, there were other people who approved the deal. I believe that Attorney General Eric Holder also approved the deal and also helped covered up the investigation to show the investigation would show, from all the indications, that Russia was committing crimes in America to get ahold of our uranium.

Knowing that, if that investigation were made public, there is no way Hillary Clinton and Eric Holder could

have approved the deal that was selling off 20, 25 percent of America's uranium to Russia. She could never have done that.

If she hadn't done that, there is not any doubt in some of our minds that the investors, the stockholders, ultimately, of Uranium One certainly would not have contributed over \$100 million to the Clinton Foundation, and Russia would not have been paying half a million dollars for one short speech—remarkably, it is hard to believe from the State of the Union Addresses he gave, but he actually could give a short speech and get half a million dollars for one short speech.

He didn't get paid that much for other speeches. What was so special? Could it be that Hillary Clinton was so critical in persuading others to sign onto allowing Uranium One to get so much of our uranium? Gee, perhaps that is why Russia was so emboldened?

Then we find out there is more than that. The Democratic National Committee, we are told, were helping pay for this dossier that just created the most lurid, ridiculous allegations against Donald Trump as a candidate, trying to destroy his Presidency.

Not only that, the DNC was involved, and the Clinton campaign may have been involved, and the FBI gets involved with that, and it appears they may have used the DNC to pay for manufactured evidence that was absolutely false and that could be used to get the FBI, under Mueller's control and the U.S. Attorney's Office, under Rosenstein's control, to go after the Trump campaign and possibly get wiretaps, based on the DNC Fusion GPS manufactured evidence.

So going back to Mueller accepting the appointment as special counsel and Comey possibly committing a crime the way he went about leaking private information to *The New York Times*, it appears, if you look at his contacts and who reported what from *The New York Times* and what could have only been known by James Comey—it is possible he did it six other times—it is possible James Comey committed crimes in one or all of those six other leaking occasions, if he was the source, as it appears he may very well have been.

Now, it becomes more clear in my naivety in thinking Mueller had personal motivation, including getting paid for a job he would love to do to go after people he didn't like in the Republican Party, including Donald Trump. But now it is becoming more clear. Comey needed Mueller to be a special counsel, and he admitted it in testimony here. He leaked information, which may have been a crime, in order to get a special counsel that he had to have known was going to be Robert Mueller, his friend joined at the hip, and that his other friend, Robert Rosenstein, would certainly appoint Mueller, because Rosenstein and Mueller were involved in covering up the FBI's investigation of Russia and their efforts to get uranium.

If Mueller and Rosenstein hadn't covered up that and helped seal that information and gotten the informant to agree to a nondisclosure agreement, then Hillary Clinton and the Clinton Foundation would be short megamillions that they received as a result—it certainly appears—of the uranium transfer from the U.S. to Russia.

So, Mueller and Rosenstein and Comey all needed Mueller to be appointed, and Mueller needed to accept appointment as special counsel, because he had to cover up the cover-up that he and Rosenstein had been involved in years earlier in order to facilitate the deal that was made to sell off our national security.

President Trump had this great plank in his platform as he ran for President that we need to bring in money that Americans have earned overseas back into the United States. Well, it has never been here, but bring it into the United States.

But these American citizens and American companies have had to leave it in foreign banks and in foreign businesses in foreign countries because, in some countries, they pay 50, 60, 70 percent tax on it. If they bring it into the United States, they will be required to pay probably 40 percent, plus penalty and interest. So 35, 39 percent, plus penalty and interest. They can't afford to do that or they would be paying more tax than the money they earned. So they had to leave it in foreign countries and in foreign banks.

Former FDIC Chairman Isaacs came to the Hill back when this doofus named Henry Paulson was telling us we had to give him \$700 billion so he could buy mortgage-backed securities and save our economy.

In our private conference call—I will never forget—he said: I have got to have \$700 billion to buy these mortgage-backed securities because nobody knows what they are worth and only the government has the wherewithal to buy those. Hold them until they get value back, and that will save all these banks and keep them from going under, which would destroy the United States economy and take us back to a day worse than September of 1929. So you have got to give me \$700 billion to buy these mortgage-backed securities.

When we were allowed to punch in and ask a question, somebody in my party beat me to the question, and it was this: Secretary Paulson, if nobody knows what these mortgage-backed securities are worth, how do you know you need \$700 billion to buy them?

I will never forget his answer: "We just needed a really big number."

When I heard that, I knew that this bozo did not need \$700 billion. We shouldn't have trusted him as Secretary of Treasury. But he got his \$700 billion. Between him and Geithner, they bailed out their friends, they bailed out the big banks while the community banks were being punished. They had to borrow money at regular

rate, and they made sure that their friends, the investment banks that brought us to the brink of ruin, got money for nothing. In fact, they got big bailouts. That was a bad day in American history.

Isaacs had the idea that you don't need to take taxpayer money. If you will just say the United States Congress should pass a bill that says anything we declare to be a troubled company or a troubled asset, if that is invested in by American companies, American individuals who have earned money overseas, never brought it into the country, if they will bring that money from those foreign countries and invest it in what Congress labels as troubled, they will pay no tax on bringing that money into the country. Then we will probably have a trillion dollars come in. You won't need the \$700 billion in taxpayer money or borrowed money from China to bail out the banks. You will have Americans who will invest in those with money they earned overseas. You don't need TARP. It won't be the government getting into bed with the big banks and the terrible precedent that will set. That was a great idea.

But Paulson was so determined to let his enemies like Lehman Brothers go bankrupt without help and to allow his company Goldman Sachs to be the big dog, that he didn't want to do Isaacs' idea, and he convinced enough Members of the House, both Republican and Democrat, to give him \$700 billion, because he needed a really big number.

Well, President Trump had that similar idea: let's allow American money to come into America that is earned overseas, and that will get our economy going. Americans will bring this money in, and it will be great for the economy. That is what we need to get the economy going.

Well, little did we know that, years before, candidate Donald Trump had the idea of bringing in American-earned money from foreign countries to get our economy going. Yet Hillary Clinton had the idea of selling off our national security to get megamillions to go to the Clinton Foundation, her and her husband's bank account, to get the economy going in America.

□ 1300

Wow, that was a great idea, wasn't it?

We sell off some of our national security to bring in foreign money, specifically, Russian money to get our economy going. And if she had been elected President, then the cover up that Mueller and Rosenstein did of the original investigation into Russia's efforts to corruptly buy American uranium and corner the market, that would continue to be covered up.

Wow, what a great deal. Even though Hillary Clinton did not win the election, Donald Trump did. And they got Donald Trump's Attorney General to recuse himself so that Rosenstein, a guy that participated in covering up

the original FBI investigation, could appoint someone else who helped cover up that original uranium investigation with the Russians and make him special counsel so that not only would he make a lot of money and get to work with lots of people he liked that hated Trump and loved Hillary, but he could also cover up the prior coverup, even though Hillary didn't get elected. Amazing the kind of stuff that is coming out now.

The work that John Solomon and The Hill have done has been extraordinary. I have got an article from October 25: "FBI informant in Obama-era Russian nuclear bribery was cleared to testify before Congress."

That is great news. Despite Mueller and Rosenstein's efforts to keep their prior Russian investigation that they covered up so that the Russia uranium deal could go through, wow, we may actually get to find out about that now that the FBI informant has been cleared under the current Justice Department, under Jeff Sessions. We will get to find out more about that Russia effort to corner the market using U.S. uranium.

An article from FOX News: "Gag order lifted: DOJ says informant can speak to Congress on Uranium One, Russia bribery case with Clinton links."

And then I was glad to see a friend down the hall, CHUCK GRASSLEY, a senator there from Iowa. He is calling for special counsel in the Uranium One scandal. Of course, that is appropriate.

The FOX News article: "Clinton mum on Fusion GPS scandal as Dems' dossier denials pile up." That is from October 26.

So now there are indications the Democrat National Committee, a Member actually paid for this fictitious dossier that could be used to get warrants to investigate political opponents in a Presidential race. This is incredible. Absolutely incredible.

Even going back to Tammany Hall, as far as I can recall, they didn't have an FBI Director and an Attorney General or Deputy Attorney General that had helped cover up a prior investigation so that their friends could make millions of dollars.

Let's see. There is an article in The New York Times from Jo Becker and Don Van Natta, Jr. This goes back January 31 of 2008. It indicates: "Late on September 6, 2005, a private plane carrying the Canadian mining financier, Frank Giustra, touched down in Almaty, a ruggedly picturesque city in southeast Kazakhstan. Several hundred miles to the west, a fortune awaited: highly coveted deposits of uranium that could fuel nuclear reactors around the world. And Mr. Giustra was in hot pursuit of an exclusive deal to tap them."

"Unlike more established competitors, Mr. Giustra"—I will just say "Mr. G"—"was a newcomer to uranium mining in Kazakhstan, a former Soviet republic. But what his fledgling company

lacked in experience, it made up for in connections. Accompanying Mr. G on his luxuriously appointed MD-87 jet that day was a former President of the United States, Bill Clinton.

"Upon landing on the first stop of the three-country philanthropic tour, the two men were whisked off to share a sumptuous midnight banquet with Kazakhstan's President . . . whose 19-year stranglehold on the country had all but quashed political dissent."

Another man "walked away from the table with a propaganda coup after Mr. Clinton expressed enthusiastic support for the Kazakh leader's bid to head an international organization that monitors elections and supports democracy. Mr. Clinton's public declaration undercut both American foreign policy and sharp criticism of Kazakhstan's poor human rights record by, among others, Mr. Clinton's wife, Senator Hillary Rodham Clinton of New York.

"Within 2 days, corporate records show that Mr. G also came up with a winner when his company signed preliminary agreements giving it the right to buy into three uranium projects controlled by Kazakhstan's state-owned uranium agency. . . ."

So it is just incredible. The deeper you get in this stuff, the more it smells.

A Wall Street Journal article written by Holman Jenkins, Jr.: "The FBI's Political Meddling." Interesting story. I like the way it starts because it starts referencing a movie, I believe. "Let's give plausible accounts of the known facts, then explain why demands that Robert Mueller recuse himself from the Russia investigation may not be the fanciful partisan grandstanding you imagine."

"Here's a story consistent with what has been reported in the press—how reliably reported is uncertain. Democratic political opponents of Donald Trump financed a British former spook who spread money among contacts in Russia, who, in turn, over drinks, solicited stories from their supposedly 'connected' sources in Moscow. If these people were really connected in any meaningful sense, then they made sure the stories they spun were consistent with the interests of the regime, if not actually scripted by the regime."

"The resulting Trump dossier then became a factor in Obama administration decisions to launch an FBI counterintelligence investigation of the Trump campaign, and after the election to trumpet suspicions of Trump collusion with Russia."

"We know of a second, possibly even more consequential way the FBI was effectively a vehicle for Russian meddling in U.S. politics. Authoritative news reports say FBI Chief James Comey's intervention in the Hillary Clinton email matter was prompted by a Russian intelligence document that his colleagues suspected was a Russian plant."

"Okay, Mr. Mueller was a former close colleague and leader but no

longer part of the FBI when these events occurred. This may or may not make him a questionable person to lead a Russian-meddling investigation in which the FBI's own actions are necessarily a concern.

"But now we come to the Rosatom disclosures last week in The Hill. . . .

"Here's another story as plausible as we can make it based on credible reporting. After the Cold War, in its own interest, the U.S. wanted to build bridges to the Russian nuclear establishment. The Putin government, for national or commercial purposes, agreed and sought to expand its nuclear business in the U.S.

"The purchase and consolidation of certain assets were facilitated by Canadian entrepreneurs who gave large sums to"—drum roll—"the Clinton Foundation, and perhaps arranged a Bill Clinton speech in Moscow for \$500,000. A key transaction had to be approved by Hillary Clinton's State Department."

How about that?

"Now we learn that, before and during these transactions, the FBI had uncovered a bribery and kickback scheme involving Russia's nuclear business, and also received reports of Russian officials seeking to curry favor through donations to the Clinton Foundation.

"This criminal activity was apparently not disclosed to agencies vetting the 2010 transfer of U.S. commercial nuclear assets to Russia."

That is why, Mr. Speaker, I refer to the original FBI and DOJ coverup involving Mr. Rosenstein and Mr. Mueller, which was going to be able to be covered up. That is, so we understand the plot here, Mueller as FBI Director, and Rosenstein working as U.S. Attorney or deputy U.S. Attorney, whatever he was at the time. It is interesting, I hear a rumor that he may have even signed on part of this sealing documents to help cover up the original investigation. It would be interesting to see if he did that. Wow. If it turns out he signed off to get the FBI investigation document sealed, and Mueller, as FBI Director, was charting the course to get this thing sealed, covered up, well, the guys that did the coverup are in charge of the investigation, which would allow them to cover up their prior coverup, which would look bad since they covered it up to allow the Hillary Clinton approved deal selling United States security via our uranium to Russia.

I didn't realize how bad Russia was until my friends across the aisle and Secretary Clinton—candidate Clinton—defeated candidate Clinton kept talking about how bad Russia was. Well, they about convinced me.

But this article says: "The criminal activity was apparently not disclosed to agencies vetting the 2010 transfer of U.S. commercial nuclear assets to Russia. The FBI made no move to break up the scheme until long after the transaction closed. Only 5 years later, the Justice Department, in 2015, disclosed a

plea deal with the Russian perpetrator so quietly that its significance was missed until The Hill reported on the FBI investigation last week."

They almost, if not for the good work of Mr. Solomon and I think somebody else at The Hill, might have been missed entirely. So good work. There are some potential Woodwards and Bernsteins out there, in addition to the hardworking news investigators with places like The Daily Caller and Judicial Watch, Conservative Review, and others.

The article goes on to say: "The agency, when Mr. Mueller headed it, soft-pedaled an investigation highly embarrassing to Mrs. Clinton as well as the Obama Russia reset policy."

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

□ 1315

#### BREAST CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 30 minutes.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today during Breast Cancer Awareness Month to call attention to this topic that is so important throughout our Nation.

With one in eight U.S. women, or 12 percent, developing breast cancer over the course of their lives, too many of us know someone who has been diagnosed with this tragic disease.

I lost my mother as a result of breast cancer, and my friend and former district director, Jill Cox, was diagnosed with breast cancer in 2015. She attributes her strides in recovery to early detection and self-examinations.

Many women with breast cancer have no symptoms, underscoring the importance of how regular breast cancer screenings and self-examinations can save lives. No test is too early.

We all must continue to work together and move forward addressing breast cancer, and I urge my colleagues to continue their focus on this critical issue.

CODY HILAND APPOINTMENT AS U.S. ATTORNEY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend Cody Hiland's appointment as the U.S. attorney for the Eastern District of Arkansas.

A native of Conway, Arkansas, Cody graduated from the University of Central Arkansas and the William H. Bowen School of Law in Little Rock. He served as the prosecuting attorney for the 20th Judicial District of Arkansas since 2010.

Before beginning his career in law enforcement, Cody was a partner at his own firm, a staff attorney and rural communication liaison for the Arkansas Public Service Commission, and the program director for the Arkansas Transitional Employment Board.

His experience and activism truly embody all that communities need in the fight against crime.

I am proud of this leader and consummate professional. He is devoted to law and order. He will be a great voice in reducing crime throughout central Arkansas.

I congratulate my friend, Cody Hiland.

ARKANSAS ADVOCATES FOR CHILDREN AND FAMILIES 40TH ANNIVERSARY

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate Arkansas Advocates for Children and Families on the occasion of their 40th anniversary.

AACF was established in 1977 by 10 Arkansans, including our former First Lady, Betty Bumpers, who were passionate about the status of children in our State.

Over the past four decades, AACF has helped families throughout Arkansas to ensure that they have the resources and opportunities to lead healthy and productive lives.

Working to promote good public policy that makes kids' lives better, AACF played an integral role in the creation of ARKids First and the expansion of quality pre-K for at-risk 3- and 4-year-olds.

I would like to extend my congratulations to AACF and wish it much continued success for generations to come.

SPRINGFIELD-DES ARC BRIDGE DEDICATION

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the joint efforts of the city of Conway, Faulkner County, the Faulkner County Historical Society, and Workin' Bridges, a nonprofit organization, that are collaborating to restore a historic bridge in Faulkner County, Arkansas.

The Springfield-Des Arc Bridge, an iron bowstring arc bridge, is the oldest bridge in Arkansas and one of the oldest of its type in the country. The bridge was placed on the National Register of Historic Places in 1988.

This bridge was originally constructed back in 1874 to facilitate travel between Faulkner and Conway Counties in the Second Congressional District.

Over the years, the bridge faced continued operational wear and tear, three major floods, and lost its flooring to a fire. The bridge was decommissioned when the road was rerouted to a new and better concrete bridge.

Faulkner County Historical Society and the city of Conway worked together to establish a restoration plan for the bridge and proposed to relocate it to Beaverfork Lake Park. The 146-foot structure was dismantled and transported to North Little Rock for cleaning and refinishing. The bridge now sits at Beaverfork Lake Park as a link between the swimming area and the fishing pier.

Mr. Speaker, I thank all those who have worked so diligently over the years to preserve this historic bridge and give it a new use for a new generation.

50TH ANNIVERSARY OF THEODORE ROOSEVELT ISLAND

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, tomorrow is certainly a historic day, as it is the

159th anniversary of our 26th President's birthday—Theodore Roosevelt—October 27, 1858.

The National Park Service is also celebrating the birthday anniversary weekend with the 50th anniversary of the dedication of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial on Theodore Roosevelt Island in the Potomac River across from Georgetown. That family-friendly program will be on October 29 from 9 a.m. to 4 p.m.

The event will include addresses at 2 p.m. by President Roosevelt's great-grandson, Tweed Roosevelt, and other academics, who will talk about the amazing legacy of our 26th President, Theodore Roosevelt.

I thank, also, the National Park Service for their outstanding work on Theodore Roosevelt Island, restoring the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial that is out on the island. It is one of the best places to visit when families come to Washington, D.C., on its very peaceful and tranquil island location in the Potomac River.

The National Park Service, on this restoration work, collaborated with the Friends of Theodore Roosevelt Island and the Theodore Roosevelt Association. I congratulate them for their work; I congratulate them on the 50th anniversary of the Theodore Roosevelt Memorial on Theodore Roosevelt Island; and, of course, my hat is off to Teddy on the anniversary of his birth.

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

#### A BILL AND JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on October 25, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bill and joint resolution:

H.R. 2266. Making additional supplemental appropriations for disaster relief requirements for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

H.J. Res. 111. Providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the rule submitted by Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection relating to "Arbitration Agreements".

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 21 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, October 27, 2017, at 10 a.m.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

2958. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's interim final rule — Student Assistance General Provisions, Federal Perkins

Loan Program, Federal Family Education Loan Program, William D. Ford Federal Direct Loan Program, and Teacher Education Assistance for College and Higher Education Grant Program [Docket ID: ED-2017-OPE-0108] (RIN: 1840-AD25) received October 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2959. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a Declaration of a Public Health Emergency and Waiver and/or Modification of Certain HIPAA, and Medicare, Medicaid, and Children's Health Insurance Program Requirements (wildfires in the State of California), pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 247d(a); July 1, 1944, ch. 373, title III, Sec. 319(a) (as amended by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 144(a)); (116 Stat. 630) and 42 U.S.C. 1320b-5(d); Aug. 14, 1935, ch. 531, title XI, Sec. 1135(d) (as added by Public Law 107-188, Sec. 143(a)); (116 Stat. 628); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2960. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Removal of Nalmedine From Control [Docket No.: DEA-468] received October 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2961. A letter from the Acting Assistant Administrator, Diversion Control Division, Drug Enforcement Administration, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Schedules of Controlled Substances: Placement of AB-CHMINACA, AB-PINACA and THJ-2201 Into Schedule I [Docket No.: DEA-402] received October 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2962. A letter from the Program Analyst, National Highway Transportation Safety Administration, Department of Transportation, transmitting The Department's Major final rule — Federal Motor Vehicle Safety Standards: Minimum Sound Requirements for Hybrid and Electric Vehicles [Docket No.: NHTSA-2016-0125] (RIN: 2127-AK93) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2963. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval and Promulgation of Air Quality Implementation Plans; Nevada; Rescission of Visibility Protection Federal Implementation Plan for the Mo-have Generating Station [EPA-R09-OAR-2017-0271; FRL-9969-85-Region 9] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2964. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Wisconsin; Regional Haze Progress Report [EPA-R05-OAR-2017-0157; FRL-9969-87-Region 5] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2965. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; North Carolina; Open Burning and Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0085; FRL-9969-78-Region 4] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C.

801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2966. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; NC; Open Burning and Miscellaneous Revisions [EPA-R04-OAR-2007-0085; FRL-9969-77-Region 4] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2967. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — Air Plan Approval; Illinois; Redesignation of the Chicago and Granite City Areas to Attainment of the 2008 Lead Standard [EPA-R05-OAR-2016-0593; FRL-9969-69-Region 5] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2968. A letter from the Division Chief, Competition Policy Division, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modernizing Common Carrier Rules [WC Docket No.: 15-33] received October 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

2969. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Burundi that was declared in Executive Order 13712 of November 22, 2015, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

2970. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting a draft of the Department's Strategic Plan for FY 2018-2022, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 306(a); Public Law 111-352, Sec. 2; (124 Stat. 3866); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

2971. A letter from the Librarian, Library of Congress, transmitting the Annual Report of the Librarian of Congress for FY 2016; to the Committee on House Administration.

2972. A letter from the Rules Administrator, Office of General Counsel, Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, transmitting the Department's final rule — Communications Management Units [BOP Docket No.: 1148-F] (RIN: 1120-AB48) received October 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

2973. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; New Bern, NC [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0230; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-8] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2974. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Hot Springs, VA [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9453; Airspace Docket No.: 16-AEA-12] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2975. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wellsboro, PA [Docket No.: FAA-

2017-0289; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-4] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2976. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Windsor Locks, CT [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0398; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANE-2] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2977. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Ellendale, ND [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0646; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-17] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2978. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Wellington, KS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0177; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-4] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2979. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Temporary Restricted Area R-5602; Fort Sill, OK [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9591; Airspace Docket No.: 16-ASW-21] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2980. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Columbia, MS [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0277; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ASO-9] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2981. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — IFR Altitudes; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31156; Amdt. No.: 535] received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2982. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9301; Product Identifier 2015-NM-193-AD; Amendment 39-19056; AD 2017-19-26] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received October 18, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

2983. A letter from the Director, Office of Regulation Policy and Management, Office of the Secretary (OOREG), Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's final rule — Veterans' Mortgage Life Insurance — Coverage Amendment (RIN: 2900-AP49) received October 23, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

2984. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue

Service, transmitting the Service's IRB only rule — 2017 National Pool (Rev. Proc. 2017-54) received October 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2985. A letter from the Chief, Publications and Regulations Branch, Internal Revenue Service, transmitting the Service's final regulations — Treatment of Transactions in which Federal Financial Assistance is Provided [TD 9825] (RIN: 1545-BJ08) received October 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Ways and Means.

2986. A letter from the Assistant Director for Legislative Affairs, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting an updated annual report of the Student Loan Ombudsman, pursuant to Sec. 1035 of the Dodd-Frank Wall Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act of 2010; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Education and the Workforce.

## REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CONAWAY: Committee on Agriculture. H.R. 3567. A bill to authorize the purchase of a small parcel of Natural Resources Conservation Service property in Riverside, California, by the Riverside Corona Resource Conservation District, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-372). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

## PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. CUMMINGS (for himself, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. WELCH, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. NADLER, Ms. DELAURO, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Ms. SHEA-POR-TER):

H.R. 4138. A bill to amend title XVIII of the Social Security Act to provide for the negotiation of lower covered part D drug prices on behalf of Medicare beneficiaries and the establishment and application of a formula by the Secretary of Health and Human Services under Medicare part D, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POCAN (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Ms. KAPTUR, Ms. NORTON, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. WILSON of Florida, and Ms. LEE):

H.R. 4139. A bill to provide incentives for businesses to keep jobs in America; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Armed Services, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such pro-

visions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. CONYERS (for himself, Mr. MASSIE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. JONES, Mr. POCAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. LEE, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Ms. NORTON, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. NOLAN, Mr. WELCH, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. PALLONE, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. BEYER, Mr. NADLER, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. COHEN, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. MOORE, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUSH, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. GABBARD, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. PINGREE, Ms. LOFGREEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. PAYNE, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. GARAMENDI, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Ms. BONAMICI, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. SERRANO, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. ESHOO, and Ms. DELAURO):

H.R. 4140. A bill to prohibit the introduction of the Armed Forces into hostilities in North Korea without a declaration of war or explicit statutory authorization, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE (for herself and Mr. PAYNE):

H.R. 4141. A bill to amend the Military Selective Service Act to ensure that the records of persons registered pursuant to that Act are updated to remove persons who are deceased, receiving supplemental security income benefits due to a disability, or otherwise no longer eligible for induction, and to permit the induction of persons who have been convicted of nonviolent offenses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself and Mr. PERLMUTTER):

H.R. 4142. A bill to protect individuals by strengthening the Nation's mental health infrastructure, improving the understanding of violence, strengthening firearm prohibitions and protections for at-risk individuals, and improving and expanding the reporting of mental health records to the National Instant Criminal Background Check System; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri (for himself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, and Mr. CÁRDENAS):

H.R. 4143. A bill to establish a demonstration program to provide integrated care for Medicare beneficiaries with end-stage renal disease, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined

by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO (for herself, Mr. NADLER, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BARRAGAN, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. TAKANO, and Ms. NORTON):

H.R. 4144. A bill to establish a task force on truck leasing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California (for herself, Ms. MENG, Ms. LOFGREN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mrs. TORRES, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. POLIS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. SCHIFF, and Ms. ROSEN):

H.R. 4145. A bill to increase the number of aliens who may be issued visas or otherwise provided status as nonimmigrants under section 101(a)(15)(U) of the Immigration and Nationality Act for a fiscal year, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4146. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to improve service disabled veterans' insurance; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. NADLER (for himself, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia):

H.R. 4147. A bill to amend title 49, United States Code, to provide certain port authorities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California (for himself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. CRIST, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KING of New York, and Mr. HUFFMAN):

H.R. 4148. A bill to provide disaster relief to small businesses, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Small Business, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 4149. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to make certain improvements to the use of educational assistance provided by the Department of Veterans Affairs for flight training programs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT (for himself, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio):

H.R. 4150. A bill to support innovation, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, Energy and Commerce, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK (for herself and Ms. ESTY of Connecticut):

H.R. 4151. A bill to promote the use of smart technologies and systems in communities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. POCAN, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. LEE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, and Mr. LANGEVIN):

H.R. 4152. A bill to amend title VII of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and other statutes to clarify appropriate liability standards for Federal antidiscrimination claims; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4153. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to improve safety and security for service weapons used by Federal law enforcement officers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Armed Services, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4154. A bill to delay any increase in flood insurance premium rates under the National Flood Insurance Program on properties located in flood hazard areas during any re-mapping of such areas by the Federal Emergency Management Agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE (for herself, Ms. BASS, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLAY, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. ELLISON, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mrs. BEATTY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. DEMINGS, Ms. LEE, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. EVANS, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. JACKSON LEE, and Ms. CLARKE of New York):

H.R. 4155. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to require employing offices under such Act to enroll the employees of such offices every two years in the program carried out by the Office of Compliance to train employees in the protections against sexual harassment provided under the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Ms. SPEIER (for herself, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mrs. NAPOLITANO):

H.R. 4156. A bill to amend the Fair Labor Standards Act of 1938 to provide that over-the-road bus drivers are covered under the maximum hours requirements; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. TAKANO (for himself, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. EVANS):

H.R. 4157. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to require that Bureau of Prisons help Federal prisoners who are being released to obtain appropriate ID to facilitate their reentry into society, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALBERG (for himself and Mr. SABLAN):

H.R. 4158. A bill to increase the amount of accrued benefit which a pension plan may distribute without consent; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4159. A bill to limit the collection of annual premiums under the FHA program for mortgage insurance for single family housing, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California (for herself and Mr. HECK):

H.R. 4160. A bill to revise the FHA program for home equity conversion mortgages for elderly homeowners to add safeguards to prevent the displacement of homeowners, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. BONAMICI (for herself, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. SCHRAEDER, Mr. WALDEN, and Mr. DEFAZIO):

H. Res. 589. A resolution honoring the Portland Thorns FC, the 2017 champions of the National Women's Soccer League; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CORREA:

H. Res. 590. A resolution calling on the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to conduct a clinical study assessing the effectiveness of treating chronic pain in veterans with cannabis in comparison to opioids; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. HASTINGS:

H. Res. 591. A resolution denouncing the ongoing violence against the Rohingya people of Burma; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. KILDEE:

H. Res. 592. A resolution condemning the violent attack at Flint Bishop International Airport on a police officer and offering thoughts and prayers to the victim and the victim's family, and commending the efforts of law enforcement and airport personnel in their response; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. NORTON, Mr. EVANS, Mr. COHEN, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. BORDALLO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California):

H. Res. 593. A resolution recognizing the importance of a continued commitment to ending pediatric HIV/AIDS worldwide; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, and in addition to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

## MEMORIALS

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

140. The SPEAKER presented a memorial of the Legislature of the State of Texas, relative to Senate Joint Resolution No. 38, rescinding all previous requests that the Congress of the United States call a convention of the states to propose amendments to the Constitution of the United States; which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.



# CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. CUMMINGS:

H.R. 4138.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clauses 1 and 18 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. POCAN:

H.R. 4139.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The Congress shall have Power . . . To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes.

By Mr. CONYERS:

H.R. 4140.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Ms. JACKSON LEE:

H.R. 4141.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article I, Section 8, Clauses 12 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4142.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 1

By Mr. SMITH of Missouri:

H.R. 4143.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority on which this bill rests is the power of Congress to make rules for the government and regulation of the land and naval forces, as enumerated in Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. NAPOLITANO:

H.R. 4144.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Ms. BROWNLEY of California:

H.R. 4145.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 4, to establish an uniform Rule of Naturalization

By Mr. PEARCE:

H.R. 4146.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Mr. NADLER:

H.R. 4147.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

clause 3 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution and clause 18 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution.

By Mr. THOMPSON of California:

H.R. 4148.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. CONST. art. I, §1

By Mr. WENSTRUP:

H.R. 4149.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. CARTWRIGHT:

H.R. 4150.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4151.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Interstate Commerce Clause). The United States Congress shall have the power "To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes."

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4152.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution and Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DESAULNIER:

H.R. 4153.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4154.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mrs. LAWRENCE:

H.R. 4155.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 5, clause 2 provides that each house of Congress "may determine the Rules of its Proceedings."

Fourteenth Amendment, Section 5 provides Congress the power "to enforce" the substantive guarantees of the amendment, including the Due Process and Equal Protection Clauses, by enacting "appropriate legislation." The Supreme Court has recognized that, under Section 5, Congress may both proscribe unconstitutional conduct, as well as enact legislation that remedies and deters violations of rights guaranteed under the Fourteenth Amendment.

By Ms. SPEIER:

H.R. 4156.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

This bill is enacted pursuant to the power granted to Congress under Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. TAKANO:

H.R. 4157.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. WALBERG:

H.R. 4158.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 of the Constitution

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4159.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

By Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California:

H.R. 4160.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 5 and Clause 18 of the United States Constitution

## ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 15: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 233: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 392: Mr. TAYLOR and Mr. SCHWEIKERT.

H.R. 444: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 592: Mr. FASO, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. ROSKAM.

H.R. 620: Mr. YOHO, Mr. HILL, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. BABIN, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 785: Mrs. HARTZLER.

H.R. 807: Mr. YODER.

H.R. 828: Ms. ESTY of Connecticut.

H.R. 848: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.

H.R. 849: Ms. FOXX.

H.R. 909: Mr. TIPTON, Ms. FUDGE, and Mr. GOMEZ.

H.R. 930: Mr. COMER and Mr. MARSHALL.

H.R. 1046: Mr. POSEY, Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida, Mr. YARMUTH, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, and Ms. WILSON of Florida.

H.R. 1098: Mr. MESSER, Mr. GRAVES of Louisiana, and Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 1137: Mr. LUETKEMEYER.

H.R. 1144: Mr. MCNERNEY.

H.R. 1153: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. ROSS, Mr. ROTHFUS, Mr. PITTENGER, and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 1155: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 1171: Mr. COSTA.

H.R. 1201: Mr. PAULSEN.

H.R. 1229: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. CONYERS.

H.R. 1279: Mr. RUIZ.

H.R. 1315: Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 1406: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.

H.R. 1456: Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Ms. ADAMS, and Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 1478: Mr. O'HALLERAN.

H.R. 1578: Mr. LANCE and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 1661: Mrs. LOVE, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Mr. KING of New York.

H.R. 1697: Mr. FRANKS of Arizona and Mrs. HANDEL.

H.R. 1739: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1784: Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 1836: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.

H.R. 1898: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi.

H.R. 1953: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2181: Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 2232: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 2234: Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. COHEN, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2267: Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2285: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 2366: Mr. NOLAN.

H.R. 2375: Mr. CONNOLLY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. HASTINGS.

H.R. 2431: Mr. CHABOT, Mr. BUCK, and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 2460: Mr. BOST.

H.R. 2475: Mr. QUIGLEY, Mr. TONKO, Ms. MATSUI, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. HECK, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. WALZ, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.

H.R. 2589: Mr. VALADAO and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 2670: Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 2723: Mr. CARTER of Texas.

H.R. 2803: Mr. RUTHERFORD.

H.R. 2840: Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 2862: Ms. LOFGREN.

H.R. 2929: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

H.R. 2933: Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 2946: Mr. DUNN.

H.R. 3034: Mr. HECK, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. NOLAN, and Mr. CLYBURN.

H.R. 3035: Ms. TITUS.

H.R. 3079: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3124: Ms. ESHOO.  
 H.R. 3129: Ms. JACKSON LEE.  
 H.R. 3144: Mr. AMODEI.  
 H.R. 3184: Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. WITTMAN, and Mr. CONNOLLY.  
 H.R. 3274: Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. O'ROURKE, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.  
 H.R. 3316: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Miss RICE of New York.  
 H.R. 3324: Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. KING of New York, and Ms. BORDALLO.  
 H.R. 3395: Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. POCAN, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. MITCHELL, Mr. KILMER, and Mr. REED.  
 H.R. 3424: Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3513: Mr. CURBELO of Florida.  
 H.R. 3530: Mr. WELCH.  
 H.R. 3566: Mr. BOST.  
 H.R. 3602: Ms. MCCOLLUM.  
 H.R. 3638: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida and Mr. GAETZ.  
 H.R. 3670: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN.  
 H.R. 3712: Mr. KIHUEN, Ms. ROSEN, and Mr. GRAVES of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3738: Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico and Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.  
 H.R. 3757: Mr. BLUMENAUER.  
 H.R. 3759: Ms. SINEMA, Mr. GROTHMAN, and Mr. YARMUTH.  
 H.R. 3768: Mr. BLUMENAUER and Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H.R. 3769: Mr. MCNERNEY.  
 H.R. 3773: Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. EVANS.

H.R. 3848: Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. ELLISON, and Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts.  
 H.R. 3924: Ms. LOFGREN and Mr. MEEHAN.  
 H.R. 3947: Mr. HOYER and Mr. NEAL.  
 H.R. 3962: Ms. JAYAPAL and Ms. SLAUGHTER.  
 H.R. 3966: Mr. WILLIAMS.  
 H.R. 3985: Mr. PAULSEN.  
 H.R. 4012: Mrs. BROOKS of Indiana.  
 H.R. 4014: Mr. WELCH and Mr. COHEN.  
 H.R. 4022: Mr. BOST, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. WEBER of Texas, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COFFMAN, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. YOUNG of Alaska, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. EMMER, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. SENSENBRENNER, Mr. BERA, Mr. ZELDIN, and Mr. RUSH.  
 H.R. 4030: Mr. KHANNA.  
 H.R. 4036: Mrs. MURPHY of Florida and Mr. CUELLAR.  
 H.R. 4044: Mrs. MCMORRIS RODGERS, Mr. DELANEY, Mr. EVANS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. WESTERMAN, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. GOWDY, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, and Mr. COOK.  
 H.R. 4052: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.  
 H.R. 4058: Mr. BOST, Mr. YODER, Mr. HURD, Mr. COLE, Mr. BACON, Mr. KELLY of Mississippi, Mr. VALADAO, Mr. MULLIN, Mr. LOEBSACK, and Mrs. NOEM.  
 H.R. 4067: Mr. HUDSON and Mr. WEBER of Texas.  
 H.R. 4075: Ms. SHEA-PORTER and Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico.  
 H.R. 4082: Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. TITUS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. CROWLEY, Ms. DELAURO, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mrs. DEMINGS.

H.R. 4090: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. TURNER, and Mr. MARINO.  
 H.R. 4093: Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. LEE, Mr. RASKIN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. BASS, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CLAY, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. RUSH, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. CUMMINGS, and Mr. TAKANO.  
 H.R. 4112: Ms. MOORE.  
 H.R. 4131: Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Mr. SMITH of Texas.  
 H. Con. Res. 60: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.  
 H. Con. Res. 81: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN and Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.  
 H. Res. 58: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ and Mr. SIRES.  
 H. Res. 274: Ms. JUDY CHU of California.  
 H. Res. 345: Mr. TAKANO.  
 H. Res. 393: Ms. LOFGREN.  
 H. Res. 401: Ms. CASTOR of Florida and Mr. ENGEL.  
 H. Res. 466: Mr. ZELDIN.

---

#### DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H. Res. 220: Ms. CLARKE of New York.