

1 NATIONAL CAPITOL CONTRACTING

2 RPTS AVERETT/HASKELL

HBU200000

3 MARKUP OF THE CONCURRENT

4 RESOLUTION FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

5 WEDNESDAY, JULY 19, 2017

6 House of Representatives,

7 Committee on the Budget,

8 Washington, D.C.

9 The committee met, pursuant to call, at 10:00 a.m., in
10 Room 1334 Longworth House Office Building, Hon. Diane Black
11 [chairman of the committee] presiding.

12 Present: Representatives Black, Rokita, Diaz-Balart,
13 Cole, McClintock, Woodall, Sanford, Womack, Brat, Grothman,
14 Palmer, Westerman, Renacci, Johnson, Smith, Lewis, Bergman,
15 Faso, Smucker, Arrington, Ferguson, Yarmuth, Barbara Lee,
16 Lujan Grisham, Moulton, Jeffries, Higgins, DelBene,
17 Wasserman Schultz, Boyle, Khanna, Jayapal, Carbajal, Jackson
18 Lee, and Schakowsky.

19 Chairman Black. The committee will now come to order,
20 and we will proceed with consideration of fiscal year 2018
21 concurrent resolution of the budget. I want to thank the
22 ranking member, Mr. Yarmuth, for working with me to develop
23 a structure for this markup that closely resembles and
24 follows what has been done here in the past.

25 Our goal is to have an open markup, which both sides
26 will have an opportunity to debate the framework for the
27 fiscal year 2018 concurrent budget resolution.

28 We have a long day ahead of us, and I thank everyone
29 for their cooperation. We will complete our work by
30 midnight, and hopefully well before then. But if we all can
31 work together, that may be possible.

32 I would like to begin by recognizing the distinguished
33 member from Indiana, Mr. Rokita.

34 Mr. Rokita. Good morning, everyone, and thank you,
35 Madam Chairman. With several floor votes expected later
36 today in other committee markups, I would ask unanimous
37 consent that, consistent with clause 4 of rule XVI, the
38 chairman would be authorized to declare a recess at any time
39 today.

40 Chairman Black. Without objection, so ordered.
41 Consistent with the agreement that I have reached with Mr.
42 Yarmuth, I ask unanimous consent that each side be allocated
43 45 minutes to make presentations in lieu of opening

44 comments.

45 The ranking member, Mr. Yarmuth, and I each will make
46 an opening statement out of that allotted time. Each side
47 then makes presentations out of the remaining time. Members
48 have 7 days to submit additional statements for the record,
49 and after these presentations, we proceed to opening
50 presentations on the budget resolution. Without objection,
51 so ordered.

52 Once the opening presentations have concluded, we will
53 have a 1-hour staff walkthrough, during which the majority
54 staff will briefly summarize the chairman's mark. Members
55 will then have the opportunity to ask questions. After the
56 staff walkthrough, we will consider amendments, according to
57 the structure that I have worked out with the ranking
58 member.

59 Today, we have decided to roll votes. We will debate
60 seven amendments and then hold a series of roll call votes,
61 if requested, on each of these amendments. I will describe
62 this process in more detail when we get to that point. Once
63 the staff walkthrough concludes, we will recess to
64 accommodate markups in other committees and floor votes.

65 Once again, good morning. Welcome to our markup of the
66 fiscal year 2018 budget resolution. Our budget is called
67 Building a Better America, because we take real, tangible
68 steps to balance the budget; build a stronger military; and

69 support an economy that creates opportunity for all
70 Americans. In the past years, our budget resolution was a
71 vision document, but this year is different. With the
72 election of President Trump, our budget goes from being a
73 vision document to being a governing document that outlines
74 how we build America for our children and grandchildren.
75 The time is over. Now is the time for action. Excuse me:
76 the time for talking is over. Now is the time for action.

77 When I came to Congress 6 years ago, I had three
78 priorities: repeal and replace Obamacare, balance the
79 budget, and reform our tax code. This year, we have already
80 taken the largest step yet to accomplish these first of
81 these priorities, and I was proud to sponsor the American
82 Health care Act to bring patient-centered reforms to our
83 healthcare system. This markup begins the process of
84 tackling a balanced budget by 2027 and progrowth reform.

85 Balancing the budget by 2027 is a top priority. Our
86 national debt stands at \$20 trillion, with \$9 trillion added
87 over just the last 8 years. Both parties in Washington have
88 failed to abide by a simple principle that all American
89 families and small businesses do, and that is that we must
90 live within our means. The Congressional Budget Office and
91 outside experts all agree our current fiscal path is
92 unsustainable.

93 As United States Comptroller General Gene Dodaro put it

94 in a recent House Budget Committee hearing, "If we fail to
95 get control of debt and deficits, we are putting our country
96 at risk of fiscal and economic crisis." Balancing the
97 budget requires us to make tough choices, but the
98 consequences of inaction far outweigh any political risks
99 that we may face. Doing nothing and continuing the status
100 quo of more spending and more debt jeopardizes this American
101 experiment of 250 years in the making.

102 The budget resolution before us takes real steps to put
103 our country on a sound fiscal path that balances in 10 years
104 and will allow us to start paying down our national debt.
105 Building a Better America makes a bold reform to strengthen
106 programs that our seniors and most vulnerable citizens rely
107 on and ensures that we can continue to serve them for
108 generations to come.

109 While our budget includes reforms to discretionary
110 spending, we also strongly believe that mandatory spending
111 must be addressed in this budget resolution and in the
112 budget resolutions to come. Mandatory spending is already
113 more than two-thirds of our Federal spending, and that
114 number will continue to grow.

115 We address mandatory spending in two ways. First, our
116 budget outlines various reforms to mandatory spending
117 programs that we believe reflect a responsible vision for
118 reforming and saving these programs. These programs would

119 require further legislation and political will to make the
120 tough choices needed to benefit the American people.

121 Second, our budget includes reconciliation instructions
122 requiring savings and reforms in mandatory spending
123 programs. These savings would go toward deficit reduction
124 and cannot be used to pay for tax reform. Our
125 reconciliation instructions require 11 authorizing
126 committees to find a minimum of \$203 billion in savings and
127 reforms over the 10-year window, with the expectation that
128 the reforms will result in significantly higher savings.
129 This package of mandatory reforms is the largest since the
130 1990s through reconciliation and is the first step to change
131 the culture of the spending here in Washington.

132 The goal of the Budget Committee is to return to the
133 traditional budget process and the true purpose of
134 reconciliation, deficit reduction through mandatory spending
135 reforms. This is the first step, but it is an important
136 one. Our budget also promotes tax and regulatory reform to
137 get the Federal Government out of the way and to allow our
138 free market economy to thrive. The larger the government,
139 the less freedom for individuals and businesses to thrive,
140 grow, hire, and innovate.

141 The Obama economy left millions of people behind with
142 over 14 million people leaving the labor workforce in just
143 the last 8 years. Through reconciliation, our budget

144 specifically paves the way to progrowth tax reform that will
145 be deficit-neutral and independent of reconciliation
146 instructions for mandatory spending and reforms. This
147 progrowth reform will reduce taxes; it will simplify the tax
148 code; and unleash the potential of the American economy to
149 help those who have been left behind.

150 Many of our friends across the aisle and in the media
151 have said that a 1.9 percent economic growth is the new
152 normal, that we are doomed to continue the economic
153 stagnation of the Obama years. They have a pessimistic view
154 of our Nation's ability to create jobs and to build a
155 foundation of greater opportunity for all.

156 America has the greatest workers, the greatest
157 innovators, and entrepreneurial ethos to far surpass the
158 economic growth of the last 8 years, if only the Federal
159 Government would get out of their way. We believe that the
160 progrowth policies recommended in our budget will result in
161 higher economic growth, averaging 2.6 percent over the 10-
162 year window, because we put our trust in the potential of
163 the American people.

164 But a stronger economy is not enough. We must also
165 strengthen our military. The number one job of the Federal
166 Government is to protect its citizens. Over the last eight
167 years, the weak foreign policy of President Obama has led to
168 increased threats from all corners of the globe, while the

169 funding of our men and women in uniform has failed to keep
170 pace. Building a Better America invests \$621.5 billion in
171 our military and \$75 billion specifically for the global war
172 on terrorism for the fiscal year of 2018. These resources
173 will help our men and women in uniform complete the mission
174 with which they have been tasked.

175 We also must rethink how government runs. We have to
176 measure success in government, not by how much money we put
177 in, but by the results that are created for the American
178 people. We on the Budget Committee and in the full Congress
179 have been tasked to be good stewards of the taxpayer
180 dollars. As OMB Director Mulvaney outlined in his most
181 recent hearing, this means considering the interests, not
182 just of those that are receiving government benefits, but
183 also those that are paying the taxes that fund these
184 benefits.

185 The Federal Government does not just spend too much
186 money; it simply does too much, as decade after decade, the
187 slow creep of government has encroached on the
188 responsibilities of States, local governments, local
189 communities, families, and charitable organizations.
190 Returning power back to the States and other components of
191 civil society will allow them to provide services more
192 effectively and efficiently.

193 Our budget also takes serious steps to address improper

194 payments, which the U.S. Government Accountability Office
195 estimated to be \$140 billion last year alone. Building a
196 Better America presents us with an opportunity to change the
197 trajectory of our country forever. The election of
198 President Trump was a signal to all of us that the American
199 people will no longer accept the status quo.

200 Taped to the back of my voting card is a picture of my
201 six grandchildren. I was a nurse for over 40 years and
202 still have my license. Government and public service was
203 never an ambition of mine, but when I saw what was happening
204 in my State and this country, I could not sit back and do
205 nothing. And every time I put my voting card in that slot,
206 I am reminded of how I left a career that I loved to join
207 the political fray. It is for them. It is for my children
208 and grandchildren and for yours, as well.

209 I grew up in an America where a poor girl like me,
210 whose parents only had an ambition for me to finish high
211 school, could graduate from college, become a nurse, and
212 eventually become a member of the United States' House of
213 Representatives. I grew up in an America that was a land of
214 opportunity, of strength, and compassion. But that America
215 is slipping away from us.

216 For too many people in this country, the opportunity to
217 live the American Dream is out of reach. Our government
218 that was supposed to be of, by, and for the people has left

219 too many behind, and Building a Better America requires a
220 government that spends within its means, a military with the
221 resources to complete its mission, an economy that creates
222 opportunity for all, and a Federal bureaucracy that respects
223 the taxpayer. But it also requires an understanding that
224 the greatness of America does not lie in the grand buildings
225 and the stone pillars here in Washington, D.C.

226 The greatness of America lives in the spirit and the
227 tenacity of people. We designed Building a Better America
228 to put that vision in practice to empower individuals to
229 live their version of the American Dream.

230 Again, I welcome everyone here to our markup for this
231 budget resolution. And with that, I yield to the ranking
232 member, Mr. Yarmuth.

233 [The prepared statement of Diane Black follows:]

234 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

235 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Chairman Black. Nearly 2
236 months ago in this same room, we debated President Trump's
237 budget. It was a shockingly extreme document that gave to
238 the rich and took from everyone else. I urged my Republican
239 colleagues to see the harm it would bring to American
240 families, the damage it would cause to our chances for a
241 better future, and to choose a different path when crafting
242 their own budget. But here we are today with a budget that
243 again displays total indifference to the challenges
244 Americans face.

245 The House budget embraces the worst extremes of the
246 Trump proposal: tax cuts for millionaires and billionaires
247 at the expense of American families, our economic progress,
248 and our national security. The budget includes \$5.4
249 trillion in mandatory and discretionary spending cuts, and
250 it ultimately reduces nondefense discretionary investments
251 to the lowest level, relative to the size of the economy,
252 since the 1960s. My Republican colleagues are proud to talk
253 about those cuts in Washington, but what they do not want to
254 talk about is how these cuts hurt the American people, so we
255 will.

256 The enormity of these cuts and the severity of the
257 consequences for American families cannot be overstated.
258 Education, job training, transportation, infrastructure,
259 medical research, and veterans' services are all at risk.

260 This budget cuts nearly \$1 trillion from mandatory spending
261 that helps provide basic living standards for struggling
262 families. Then it cuts nearly half a trillion dollars from
263 Medicare and ends the fundamental guarantee of Medicare
264 coverage. It then embraces the overwhelmingly unpopular
265 TrumpCare, which would strip more than 20 million Americans
266 of health coverage and makes nearly \$1 trillion in cuts to
267 Medicaid.

268 These are not just programs. They represent people.
269 They are families that have never had a chance to get ahead,
270 and they are individuals like the woman I met at my town
271 hall last week. She told me, "I think there is a
272 misconception that Medicaid is just for the poor. In 2014,
273 my husband lost his job of 25 years, and we were suddenly
274 without health insurance or income. But we were covered for
275 the 11 months leading up to him finding a new job through
276 the Medicaid expansion."

277 Medicaid was a lifeline for this woman and her family,
278 as it has been for millions of Americans all across the
279 country. But all of that is at risk for them and millions
280 of other families because of the drastic cuts in this
281 budget. It is an incredibly cold document that willfully
282 ignores the needs and priorities of the American people.

283 But it is not just the economic security of millions of
284 families that is at risk in this budget. It is also our

285 Nation's security. My Republican colleagues have put on
286 display a narrow worldview, one where our country's security
287 is only about the size of our military. The Republican
288 budget increases defense spending by an astonishing \$72
289 billion above the current cap and more than \$18 billion
290 above even what President Trump requested.

291 We have a responsibility to ensure our men and women in
292 uniform have every tool and resource needed to safely and
293 successfully execute their mission, and we will do that.
294 But military experts across the board have also stated that
295 diplomacy, foreign aid, and environmental factors like
296 climate change are key components of our national security,
297 yet my Republican colleagues ignore these facts and
298 recklessly cut funding for the State Department and foreign
299 aid agencies by over \$11 billion, and environmental and
300 natural resource protection by over \$6 billion.

301 Funding our military at the expense of critical,
302 national priorities is not a choice my Republican colleagues
303 have to make, and it is certainly not a choice the American
304 people want them to make, which begs the question: why are
305 they making it? The answer is as simple as it is
306 disgraceful: so that millionaires, billionaires, and wealthy
307 corporations can get a tax cut.

308 They have made the choice to give everyone at the top 1
309 percent a \$240,000 annual tax cut while taking breakfast and

310 lunch away from hungry schoolchildren. They have made the
311 choice to give everyone in the top one-tenth of 1 percent of
312 income a \$1.4 million tax cut, while cutting health care for
313 seniors and nursing homes, low-income children, and the
314 disabled. These are not choices my Democratic colleagues or
315 I would make.

316 The list of upside-down priorities and irresponsible
317 policies in this document is lengthy, and we will do our
318 best to go through as many of them as we can today. We will
319 show a different vision of our country and for the American
320 people. We want to invest in the future of American
321 families, create good jobs, and help grow our economy.

322 Democrats support investments in education, health
323 care, national security, job training, innovation, and
324 infrastructure. We support programs that help individuals
325 with nowhere left to turn and a tax code that helps families
326 get ahead. Those are American priorities, and they should
327 be the priorities of this Congress and our committee. With
328 that, I am sorry, Chairman Black, I yield back the balance
329 of my time.

330 [The prepared statement of John Yarmuth follows:]

331 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

332 Chairman Black. I thank the gentleman, and I now yield
333 2 minutes to the vice chair of the committee, the gentleman
334 from Indiana, Mr. Rokita.

335 Mr. Rokita. Thank you, Chairman Black. I want to
336 thank you for your commitment to produce a responsible
337 Federal budget. I appreciate your leadership and the
338 efforts of our committee members, especially the new ones
339 and our new staff, as well.

340 You know, to get to this budget, our committee had to
341 make some tough decisions, and we had to create priorities
342 that elevated those of our fellow citizens who are the most
343 vulnerable, who truly needed help. And that was President
344 Trump's request and Vice President Pence's request, and they
345 did their job admirably, as well. In short, they led. And
346 in short, this committee, at least this budget proposal, is
347 leading.

348 Here, on the committee, we are familiar with the kind
349 of tough choices, and we will continue to make more of these
350 today, so that we are protected; the citizens that are most
351 vulnerable are protected; and that the future generations,
352 who should be highest on our list, are protected from what
353 is now a \$20 trillion debt going to \$100 trillion.

354 It is critical that we continue our dedication to push
355 this budget through committee, then onto the House floor,
356 because, without a balanced budget, the American Dream will

357 continue to slip away.

358 You know, under President Obama, we were not able to
359 make substantial changes, and because of it, we saw slow
360 economic growth, stagnant wages, and millions of Americans
361 choosing not even to look for a job anymore. We cannot let
362 that mentality that opportunity has been lost continue to
363 fester under our watch now. We cannot accept the new normal
364 caused by the failed policies of the past spending that goes
365 way beyond our Nation's needs and borrowing too much from
366 China. This budget will help bring opportunity back to
367 American families by opening the door for economic growth
368 and tax reform.

369 This budget also addresses our Nation's growing fiscal
370 crisis by reforming antiquated, bloated government programs
371 that are not serving us well anymore. \$203 billion worth of
372 mandatory spending has been addressed here, so that these
373 programs can remain, not only for those who need it most,
374 Madam Chairman, but for future generations; these programs
375 might still be around to serve those who need them. I yield
376 back.

377 Chairman Black. The gentleman's time has expired. I
378 now recognize the gentleman from California, Mr. McClintock,
379 for 2 minutes.

380 Mr. McClintock. Thank you, Madam Chairman. On our
381 current trajectory, the CBO warns that just four fiscal

382 years from now, 2022, our annual deficits will surpass a
383 trillion dollars. That is where economists warn we run the
384 risk or even loss of our access to credit, a sovereign debt
385 crisis. Venezuela is going through that right now. Even
386 within our own territory, the Commonwealth of Puerto Rico is
387 going through that. Pension systems implode; basic services
388 falter; and the economy collapses. We will begin running
389 that risk in 4 years on the path we are on.

390 Two years after that, in 2024, the CBO tells us that
391 the annual interest cost on our debt, simply renting the
392 money we have already spent, will reach \$654 billion. That
393 is more than we currently spend on our entire defense
394 establishment. You cannot provide for the common defense or
395 promote the general welfare if you cannot pay for it.

396 We are at the upper limits of tax revenues that our
397 economy can generate. When tax rates rise above this
398 natural limit, tax avoidance activity increases; capital
399 moves offshore; the economy falters; and revenues fall. We
400 have no choice but to change the spending trajectory, and we
401 are running out of time.

402 This budget barely restrains spending growth over the
403 next decade and begins to change that trajectory by using
404 reconciliation for its intended purpose. Every year we
405 delay, the danger gets closer, and our options become more
406 difficult. I hope everyone will think about this carefully

407 as we begin our work on the budget today. I yield back.

408 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. I now
409 recognize the gentleman from Wisconsin, Mr. Grothman, for 2
410 minutes.

411 Mr. Grothman. Well, every budget document is a
412 compromise. Obviously, this is a big committee with diverse
413 members. First of all, I want to correct, and maybe we will
414 get other information, the ranking member, Yarmuth, I think
415 he talked about an \$18 billion increase on defense over what
416 President Trump promised. Including an OCO, I think it is a
417 \$28 billion increase over what President Trump requested,
418 which is frustrating.

419 Like I said, it is a compromise document. I think
420 President Trump proposed a very fiscally responsible budget
421 in which he tried to hold discretionary spending even.
422 There were increases in this document on nondefense of
423 almost \$50 billion, and I just mentioned the \$28 billion
424 increase in defense, which makes it a very difficult budget
425 to vote for, though I understand this is a compromise
426 budget. This is not the last step on the process. There is
427 going to be a floor vote on this budget, there is going to
428 be appropriation bills coming out, and we are going to
429 eventually see whether those appropriation bills appropriate
430 to the max or whether somewhat less than the max.

431 But I would like to thank the chairman for having so

432 many committee meetings. I think this is the third year
433 that I have been part of the budget process, and I think she
434 has brought us in and worked harder than the last 2 years.
435 So I would like to thank you for that, and look forward to
436 taking the votes on the amendments today.

437 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
438 of his time. I now recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr.
439 Renacci.

440 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Madam Chairman. As someone
441 who has come to Congress with 30 years of business
442 experience, I have always been a strong advocate for the
443 need for Washington to pass a budget and stick to it. That
444 is something that this Federal Government has far too often
445 failed to do, yet people back home are required to do it
446 every day. I applaud this committee for putting forward a
447 budget that actually balances over the next 10 years and
448 which outlines policy proposals that may lead to economic
449 growth and begin to address the long-term financial
450 obligations of the United States.

451 However, as our Nation sits here today, saddled with
452 more than \$20 trillion in debt, there is no question that we
453 have a moral obligation as a Congress to take meaningful
454 action to tackle our long-term debt by addressing its most
455 serious driver, mandatory spending. And while I am
456 encouraged that our committee has expressed a serious

457 commitment to advancing these badly-needed reforms, I am
458 concerned that through this budget, we might fail to
459 adequately bring about the savings, particularly in
460 mandatory spending, that are needed to set our country back
461 on a sustainable and responsible fiscal course.

462 In addition, as a member of the Ways and Means
463 Committee, I am concerned that the instructions tied to this
464 package may make it difficult for Congress to pass a tax
465 reform package in the near future. With that said, I enter
466 today's hearing with an open mind and look forward to its
467 hearing and the process and merits of this budget blueprint.
468 I am someone who believes in the process, and many times, a
469 process requires moving bills knowing that this is not the
470 final vote.

471 But ultimately, it remains vital that this Congress
472 advance a budget that is able to pass both the House and
473 Senate and allows for Congress to move forward with these
474 vital policy changes we need. I sincerely hope that today's
475 hearing demonstrates that is what this bill entails. Thank
476 you, and I yield back.

477 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
478 of his time. I now recognize the gentleman from Ohio, Mr.
479 Johnson, for 2 minutes.

480 Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I, too, am
481 proud of this committee's work to present a budget that will

482 put America back on a path of fiscal responsibility. Not
483 only does this budget proposal balance within 10 years
484 without raising taxes on hardworking Americans, but also
485 achieves \$6.5 trillion in deficit reduction.

486 Furthermore, for the first time in decades, this budget
487 proposal requires reconciliation instructions to achieve at
488 least \$203 billion in mandatory savings and reforms.

489 American families have to balance their budgets and live
490 within their means. It is time for Washington to do the
491 same. It is unacceptable and irresponsible to risk our
492 children's and grandchildren's financial security with
493 crushing debt.

494 While improving America's economic security, this
495 budget also emphasizes our commitment to our national
496 security by providing \$621 and a half billion in defense
497 discretionary spending. We are living in a dangerous time,
498 with gathering threats to our homeland, our allies, and our
499 interests abroad.

500 It is essential that Congress provide the men and women
501 who wear our uniform in defense of our country the resources
502 they need to be successful in their mission. Doing so will
503 also provide needed assurance to our allies and send a
504 strong message to our enemies that America will not lead
505 from behind. Rather, we will remain the global force for
506 peace and stability.

507 At home, this budget calls for increased accountability
508 at the Department of Veterans Affairs and works to ensure
509 that our Nation's heroes receive the care, the benefits, and
510 the services that they have earned and are entitled to. So
511 I encourage my colleagues to support this budget, and I
512 yield back the balance of my time.

513 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
514 of his time. I now recognize the gentleman, Mr. Lewis, from
515 Missouri.

516 Mr. Lewis. Thank you, Chairman Black, and thank you
517 for your leadership on this very, very tough issue. You
518 know, since the recession, our Nation has faced an anemic
519 recovery, with only 1 to 2 percent growth. This economic
520 malaise has made it harder for families in Minnesota, my
521 home State, and all across the United States to succeed. I
522 would argue that this poor growth is due to policies that
523 have overspent, overregulated, and underdelivered.

524 In fact, we are at record levels of budget outlays and
525 tax revenue right now. Stimulus plan to stimulus plan have
526 failed to deliver on economic growth. It is time for
527 Washington to refocus on the significant policy changes that
528 will restore economic prosperity, a rising tide of income,
529 heighten the standard of living, and lead to sustainable and
530 responsible budgets.

531 The bottom line is, we can have family incomes that

532 grow and an economy that grows that 3, 4, 5 percent, because
533 we have before: in the 1960s, in the 1980s, and in the
534 1990s. But if we do not begin to seriously address the debt
535 that has doubled over the past 8 years, we will hinder any
536 attempts at recovery. We will also hurt our future
537 generations' ability to achieve the American dream, because
538 you cannot grow family budgets by increasing, massively
539 increasing, Federal budgets.

540 Just as important, I would argue, while this budget is
541 not perfect -- in many ways, it still spends too much -- it
542 takes a significant step in the right direction by balancing
543 in 10 years and addressing the largest driver of our
544 spending problem, mandatory spending. Just as important,
545 our budget provides reconciliation instructions that puts us
546 on a path for significant tax reform that will make America
547 more globally competitive and drive the growth I just spoke
548 about, including job creation and rising median incomes. I
549 urge all of my colleagues to support this budget, and I
550 yield back.

551 Chairman Black. The gentleman from Minnesota yields
552 back. The gentleman from Missouri, Mr. Smith, is now
553 recognized.

554 Mr. Smith. Thank you, Chairman Black. And thank you
555 for your hard work and dedication over the last several
556 months for this budget. The American people are tired of

557 business as usual, and last year, they sent this message to
558 Washington loud and clear. Well, this budget certainly is
559 not business as usual.

560 With this budget, we begin rebuilding our military. We
561 bring balance in 10 years by reducing spending and calling
562 for common-sense reforms to government and welfare programs.
563 We promote progrowth policies that will energize our economy
564 and bring back jobs, and we are moving forward with the
565 largest cut to mandatory spending in 20 years.

566 The American people want us to change the culture in
567 Washington. Our country is \$20 trillion in debt, and
568 projected to be \$30 trillion in debt by 2027. Everyone in
569 this room knows these numbers. Everyone in this room knows
570 we cannot tax our way out of the problem.

571 There is no question our current fiscal state weakens
572 this Nation. We have to take action now to get our spending
573 under control, to promote economic growth, and to remove the
574 government regulations that are holding America back. That
575 is why the work we are doing today is so important. I look
576 forward to moving this budget out of committee, and I look
577 forward to us moving future budgets like this in the future.
578 Thank you, Chairman Black, and I yield back.

579 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
580 of his time. I now recognize the gentleman from Michigan,
581 Mr. Bergman.

582 Mr. Bergman. Thank you, Madam Chair, for your
583 proactive leadership. I am thankful to be here today as a
584 freshman member of the House fulfilling our constitutional
585 duty. What we are considering today sets a strong marker
586 for the Republican agenda, a budget that stands in stark
587 contrast to the past 8 years of shortsighted proposals that
588 never balanced and kept us on a treacherous fiscal path.

589 I decided to run for Congress because I was deeply
590 concerned about the kind of world we were leaving my
591 grandchildren. The trillions of dollars of debt, misguided
592 spending priorities, national security issues at home and
593 around the world; the list goes on.

594 I proudly represent the folks from Michigan's First
595 District who sent me to Washington to make tough decisions
596 and get wasteful spending under control. This budget is a
597 next first step to accomplish that. It also includes
598 important reconciliation instructions for tax reform and
599 deficit reduction, two issues that have not been
600 meaningfully addressed for far too long. Two-hundred-plus
601 billion dollars in mandatory savings, that is what the
602 Republicans on this committee and in our conference are
603 calling for today.

604 And that is just a floor; not a ceiling, a floor. I
605 believe we can do more, but I am encouraged by the
606 commitment made in this budget to begin to change our

607 current path.

608 Wasteful spending can no longer be the prescription for
609 this country's ills, its problems. The time is now for us
610 as a Congress to make these difficult decisions to keep
611 Washington accountable to and produce results for the
612 American taxpayer. Let's empower our constituents in our
613 communities, make economic opportunity a top priority for
614 this country, and ultimately build a better America for all
615 of our grandchildren. I yield back.

616 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. I now
617 recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Smucker.

618 Mr. Smucker. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to
619 start by just extending my appreciation to you, Madam Chair,
620 for your leadership on this committee, and to my colleagues
621 as well for the countless hours of work that went into
622 developing this budget.

623 Our national debt is spiraling out of control. We are
624 a staggering \$20 trillion in debt, a number we are quickly
625 approaching, and the spending policies of recent years just
626 simply did not work for hardworking American families and
627 for the small businesses that employ them. This budget
628 fulfills our commitment to the American people to balance
629 the budget and to rein in our spending. It puts us on a
630 sustainable fiscal path while at the same time ensuring that
631 our military has the resources it needs to keep our homeland

632 safe.

633 It is also an important first step towards
634 comprehensive tax reform, one of the main priorities of many
635 of my colleagues and a priority of mine on this committee
636 and in the House. I ran a small business for 25 years, and
637 one of the main reason I wanted to serve the community I
638 grew up in was because I saw firsthand how our tax system
639 was holding back job creation, holding back economic growth.
640 It is past time for Congress to enact progrowth policies
641 that will improve the lives of the people that we are all
642 here to represent.

643 For far too long, we have been governing from one
644 funding crisis to the next, and I am glad that the Budget
645 Committee, with this budget, is beginning to restore regular
646 order. This budget is a step towards fiscal sanity. It
647 will grow our economy, create more opportunity for working
648 families, and reignite the American dream. Thank you, Madam
649 Chair. I yield back.

650 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
651 of his time. The gentleman from Florida, Mr. Gaetz, is
652 recognized for 2 minutes.

653 Mr. Gaetz. Thank you, Madam Chair. My previous public
654 service was in the Florida legislature, where each and every
655 year, we balanced our budget, we cut spending, and we
656 returned any extra money that we collected to the taxpayers

657 of our State. In many ways, this was really terrible
658 preparation for coming to Washington, D.C., because in this
659 town, we spend too much, our focus is often disjointed, and
660 we continue to drive our country deeper into debt.

661 There have been millions of pages written about the
662 fall of the Roman Empire. They spent too much, had too many
663 interventionist wars. And I wonder how history will judge
664 us with a \$19 trillion debt, heading to a \$28 trillion debt
665 with what I fear is the lack of a strategy to constrain the
666 spending that will cripple our country.

667 I believe that history will judge most harshly the
668 young people in the Congress today who should be doing more
669 to ensure that we are meeting the fiscal obligations that we
670 need to without unnecessarily spending on wasteful programs
671 that are converting a needed safety net into an
672 economically-destructive hammock for far too many Americans.

673 I am grateful that in this budget, we have the historic
674 opportunity to reduce entitlement spending, because in the
675 absence of those reforms, in the absence of curtailing the
676 unfunded liabilities that we have in this country, we will
677 hollow out America from the inside, and it will be deeply
678 tragic. So I am grateful for the chair's leadership in
679 setting some of those initial markers, and I would simply
680 say to those who want to keep spending, who think that only
681 modest reductions in our entitlement outlays are sufficient,

682 I would suggest that my comments are not partisan rhetoric.
683 They are not rightwing or Tea Party driven. They are simply
684 driven by math, math that will ultimately overcome us and
685 swallow our country whole if we do not enact bold
686 conservative reform the likes of which I begin to see in
687 this budget. And I yield back.

688 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
689 of his time. I now recognize the gentleman from Georgia,
690 Mr. Ferguson.

691 Mr. Ferguson. I would like to thank the chair, as
692 others have, for your dedication and hard work. This has
693 really been an enlightening process, and thank you for your
694 leadership. When I came to Washington, I knew we had a
695 serious debt problem, and we had to get serious about
696 solving it. What I did not appreciate was the full extent
697 of the fiscal challenges that we face. Once I joined this
698 committee and looked at the Federal budget, its processes,
699 and future projections, it did not take me long to
700 understand that the most dire issue facing us is our \$19.8
701 trillion in debt and the looming debt crisis of trillions
702 more.

703 As a lot of us know, the cause of this crisis is our
704 unchecked mandatory spending. Without reforms, mandatory
705 spending will soon consume nearly all Federal revenue, which
706 compromises every other government promise like national

707 defense, veterans' health, education, transportation, and
708 research that will have to be financed on borrowed money.
709 And every dollar we borrow to cover our out-of-control
710 spending will cost us \$1.27 to pay back. And when I say
711 "us," I really should say future generations.

712 Now, I do not want to seem like this conversation is
713 only about dollars and cents. It is not. It is actually a
714 conversation about people. There are many Americans that
715 count on these programs. These essential entitlement
716 programs provide a safety net for our Nation's elderly and
717 our vulnerable populations. They represent decades of
718 promises to Americans.

719 But to keep these promises in the future, these
720 programs must be reformed. This is why we have approached
721 this entire budget with the intent of fiscal discipline. We
722 achieve this by prioritizing a budget that balances in 10
723 years and obtains \$200 billion in mandatory savings, and it
724 provides our military with a much-needed and long-overdue
725 plus-up in defense spending.

726 A lot of tough work has been done by this committee.
727 This resolution lays the groundwork to begin the tough
728 conversations that we will have to have to keep the promises
729 for future generations. We must consider the future of our
730 children, grandchildren, and our actions here today will
731 lead us to that. Madam Chairman, I yield back.

732 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back, and the
733 gentleman from Virginia, Mr. Brat, is recognized for 2
734 minutes.

735 Mr. Brat. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would also like
736 to compliment your great work in this entire process and the
737 colleagues here today who have done hard work. You, for the
738 first time, have delved into going around to all committee
739 chairs looking for savings, finding and creating new ways of
740 looking at mandatory spending, and have made tremendous
741 progress on that. And I, throughout this process, have said
742 that I would be flexible on the top-line number, and I think
743 we have done solid work on that.

744 My major concern in this budget process has always been
745 the linkage between the top-line number that we are
746 discussing today with a couple other trillion-dollar pieces
747 that transcend the power of this committee in some ways, but
748 that are definitely related to our budget outlook. Of
749 course, yesterday, we got staggering news on the healthcare
750 piece, that's a trillion-dollar piece linked to the
751 Obamacare tax increases.

752 There is also the issue of the border adjustable piece.
753 We have sought resolution on that and clarity on that, and
754 we have not received clarity on that trillion-dollar piece
755 in how we should move forward.

756 The major issue and anxiety I have had is the

757 relationship between those \$2 trillion pieces and the
758 progrowth policies that everyone around this table have just
759 brought up. We need those progrowth policies to get us out
760 of \$20 trillion in debt and out of the \$100 trillion in
761 unfunded liabilities.

762 And so my fears today, unfortunately, have been
763 confirmed a little bit. The Trump administration just sent
764 out news that instead of the corporate rate going down to
765 15, now they are looking at the corporate rate being in the
766 20 to 25 range, and I hope that is the end of the movement
767 up on tax rates.

768 So my worst fears about our ability to reach consensus
769 on the healthcare bill and border adjustable look like they
770 are coming to fruition in today's news. I am struggling
771 with how we get those rates back down. Without that, the
772 American people will not be able to find jobs for their kids
773 after high school and college, wage rates will not go up as
774 we need them to do.

775 And so while I applaud the top-line number and the hard
776 work this committee has done, I still am asking our
777 leadership to give us clarity on a connection between the
778 healthcare trillion-dollar piece, the border adjustable
779 piece, and the work of this committee. Thank you, and I
780 yield back.

781 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance

782 of his time. The gentleman from South Carolina, Mr.
783 Sanford, is recognized for 2 minutes.

784 Mr. Sanford. I thank the chair, and I would echo my
785 colleague from Virginia's comments with regard to kudos for
786 your hard work and for that of the committee. I guess the
787 saying is that a journey of 1,000 miles begins with the
788 first step, and I think that to his point, he raised a very
789 important point in pushing this issue of mandatory savings.
790 And I think that until we get our arms around that issue, we
791 are going to have profound budgetary problems.

792 That having been said, I remain concerned about scale
793 on the reconciliation front there. If you annualize the
794 numbers, we are looking at \$20 billion a year in the
795 framework of deficits that are roughly \$750 billion a year.
796 And you will not solve this \$100 trillion contingent
797 liability or the \$20 trillion debt problem that we have with
798 those kinds of numbers.

799 I remain concerned about economic growth. I think that
800 some of the forecasts are still rosy, and I do not think you
801 ever build a household or a business budget on rosy
802 assumptions. But I am ultimately voting for this based on
803 it being a vehicle for tax reform which we have not seen in
804 30 years. I think it to be incredibly important.

805 That having been said, I remain concerned about what
806 tax reform will look like, and what I would hate to do is to

807 sign off on this as a vehicle for tax reform, but we are
808 going to get a form of tax reform that I do not believe in.
809 And for me, that would include the border adjustment tax. I
810 represent Charleston. We see a tremendous amount of import
811 and export out of that city and out of the port.

812 I remain concerned about the idea of, in essence, a
813 trillion-dollar tax. So I will probably have more to say on
814 that later, but I just want to say thank you, overall, for
815 your hard work and what you have done in bringing the
816 committee together.

817 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
818 of his time, and the gentleman from Texas, Mr. Arrington, is
819 recognized for 2 minutes.

820 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Madam Chair. First, I want
821 to say what an honor it has been to serve under your
822 leadership and with my colleagues on this committee.
823 Budgets reflect priorities, and I believe this budget
824 appropriately reflects the priorities of the majority of the
825 American people. These priorities are to do the following:
826 number one, rebuild our military and strengthen our national
827 security.

828 As the world has become increasingly dangerous and
829 unstable, the last administration decreased defense spending
830 by over \$170 billion. Let's give our men and women in
831 uniform the resources they need to be safe and successful as

832 they prepare to confront these real and imminent threats.

833 Number two, ensure sufficient funding for our national
834 priorities like a safe and abundant food supply, like
835 investment in R&D and the United States global
836 competitiveness, like infrastructure, especially in rural
837 America where we produce the food, fuel, and fiber for our
838 fellow Americans.

839 Number three, this will pave the way for reforming our
840 complicated and burdensome tax code so we can grow our
841 economy and get our people back to work.

842 Number four, and finally -- and I believe most
843 importantly -- reduce the national debt. One of the main
844 reasons the American people are so frustrated and have lost
845 confidence in the United States Congress is because
846 Washington plays by a different set of rules. Nowhere is
847 that more prominently displayed than in the budget process.
848 For too long, we have operated as if we have unlimited
849 resources, when in reality, we are just spending our
850 children's inheritance. The American people have to live
851 within their means, and their government ought to do the
852 same. I yield back.

853 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
854 of his time. And I again recognize the ranking member and
855 ask that he be allowed to yield time from the minority's
856 presentation. Without objection, so ordered.

857 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Chairman Black. I would like
858 to yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts, Mr.
859 Moulton.

860 Mr. Moulton. Thank you, and thank you, Madam Chairman.
861 In addition to the massive cuts to programs that keep
862 Americans healthy and prosperous, this budget resolution
863 puts our national security in jeopardy by making
864 shortsighted investments in defense spending that set up a
865 false choice between the military and other sources of
866 national strength and security such as economic opportunity,
867 safe communities, and vigorous diplomacy.

868 Diplomacy and foreign aid help keep the country out of
869 conflict and facilitate stability around the world. They
870 help address the root causes of religious and political
871 extremism. That is why I am deeply troubled by the budget
872 resolution we will be marking up today.

873 I can tell you that the budget proposed by both the
874 Trump administration and by my Republican colleagues will
875 undoubtedly put young service members at greater risk. This
876 budget resolution cuts the International Affairs accounts by
877 more than a billion more than what the House appropriators
878 passed. For context, that is \$11 billion below the total
879 enacted in fiscal year 2017.

880 Adequately funding our diplomatic efforts saves
881 American lives. It helps prevent people from being

882 radicalized into terrorists, protects Americans at home, and
883 it ensures that critical assets to the military are
884 protected overseas. The country's investment in diplomatic
885 operations and foreign aid together currently make up only
886 1.6 percent of the entire Federal budget. It is a small
887 price to pay compared to sending our servicemen and
888 servicewomen into harm's way. With that, I yield back.

889 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentleman yields back. I now yield 3
890 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. Carbajal.

891 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Ranking Member Yarmuth.
892 Today's Republican budget proposal is full of dangerous
893 revenue gimmicks and draconian cuts to critical programs
894 like Medicaid and SNAP. While defense funding rises from
895 \$622 billion in 2018 to \$740 billion in 2027, today's
896 proposal simultaneously cuts nondefense funding for the
897 domestic programs including education and food security by
898 over \$100 billion over the next 10 years. This budget
899 simply walks away from investments promoting economic
900 security, job creation, and innovation.

901 Not only are we funding defense at an even higher level
902 than the President requested, but we are doing so with such
903 a narrow view of our national security. One source of
904 national security we leave out is the environment. I also
905 sit on the House Armed Services Committee, and I have heard
906 from many military leaders, including Secretary Mattis

907 himself, about the threat climate change poses to our
908 military operations and institutions. Over 30 military
909 sites in the United States are already at risk, facing
910 elevated risks because of sea level rise.

911 On the West Coast, wildfire season continues to grow
912 longer and more intense. In my district, we have
913 experienced over four significant fires in the last week
914 alone. Last year in California, fires threatened Camp
915 Pendleton as well as Vandenberg Air Force Base in my
916 district.

917 There is no question climate change will increasingly
918 impact our Nation's military infrastructure here and abroad,
919 ultimately making it more difficult to defend America's
920 interests. This budget resolution dramatically underfunds
921 agencies dealing with this threat. This is irresponsible
922 with the threats that we face, and I encourage my colleagues
923 to reexamine their priorities. Mr. Yarmuth, I yield back.

924 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentleman yields back. I now yield 3
925 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee.

926 Ms. Jackson Lee. I thank the ranking member. I have
927 no doubt of the commitment of the chair of this committee,
928 but I have to embrace the comments of the ranking member
929 that says that this budget embraces the worst, the worst of
930 the extreme of the Trump budget. Yes, we are stewards of
931 the American people's tax dollars. But this is what this

932 budget simply wants to do. It wants to have massive tax
933 cuts for millionaires while increasing tax increases for
934 millions of working families.

935 These are the working families that depend upon
936 national security, and the fiscal year 2018 budget endangers
937 national security by narrowly focusing on defense funding.
938 You do not make America great if you do not put Americans
939 first.

940 Everyday Americans in this budget are an afterthought.
941 From the horrible elimination of the fight against climate
942 change to the decreasing of the Homeland Security budget by
943 \$3 billion, and as well by including moneys for a border
944 wall of which no one needs or does not provide any form of
945 security.

946 A growing economy is key to our national security.
947 Foreign policy experts from both sides of the aisle agree
948 that our national power begins with a strong economy. But
949 it also means we must have a healthy population, and as
950 Michael Morell, the former Acting Director and Deputy
951 Director of the CIA, stated on February 28, 2016, the health
952 of a nation's economy is the single most important
953 determinant in the ability to protect itself. The single
954 most important determinant is an ability to project power.
955 The single most important determinant is its national
956 security.

957 National security involves diplomacy. It involves
958 engagement. But yet the Republican budget increases defense
959 spending \$72 billion more than the President's budget, but
960 it decreases the ability for diplomacy, its ability to
961 engage with foreign countries and help in humanitarian aid.
962 This budget ignores the experts and cuts budgets for the
963 State Department and U.S. Agency for International
964 Development.

965 This is not a budget that supports and embraces
966 national security. This is not a budget that puts American
967 first. This is a budget that is simply focused on one
968 thing: of, well, cutting Medicare and Medicaid, we know,
969 drastically, but giving those massive tax cuts for
970 billionaires, millionaires who do not ask for it and leave
971 the working people of America dragging themselves through
972 the streets, looking for good jobs that were promised by
973 this President and this administration, looking for good
974 health care, and looking for the men and women who serve in
975 the United States military to be comforted as they go to
976 foreign places, that their families here in the United
977 States will be taken care of with housing, and health care,
978 and education.

979 National security is more than pumping up a \$72 billion
980 budget that now is overbloated, if you will. It is taking
981 care of the American people. With that, I yield back.

982 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentlewoman yields back. I now yield
983 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Higgins.

984 Mr. Higgins. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The proposed
985 budget seeks to spent \$621 billion in defense and \$511
986 billion domestically. It proposes to voucherize the
987 Medicare program, which would put the Medicare program back
988 to pre-Medicare area, when private insurance companies did
989 not want to write policies for older Americans; 56 percent
990 of older Americans did not have insurance. Today, because
991 of Medicare, 97 percent of Americans now have insurance.
992 Older Americans, in the vast majority, like the coverage
993 they get. But a lot of this is predicated on trying to grow
994 the American economy.

995 I would remind my colleagues that, in the first quarter
996 of this year, China's economy grew up by 7 percent. India's
997 economy grew by 6 percent. Turkey's economy grew by 5
998 percent. The U.S. economy grew by under 2 percent. The
999 United States' economy has collapsed for a lot of Americans.
1000 Since 2000, we have lost 6 million manufacturing jobs, and
1001 70,000 factories have closed. This seems to dismiss the
1002 whole notion of investing in the growth of the American
1003 economy.

1004 And record spending is proposed in this budget for
1005 Afghanistan, Iraq, and our great ally in that region,
1006 Pakistan. It does not make any sense. Fact of the matter

1007 is, since we engaged in these wars, Americans have spent
1008 \$4.8 trillion for Iraq, Afghanistan, and Pakistan. We have
1009 lost 6,800 U.S. soldiers and have spent \$170 billion
1010 rebuilding the roads and bridges of Afghanistan and Iraq.

1011 Where is the budget that we were promised for a robust
1012 investment in American infrastructure? Our infrastructure
1013 is an embarrassment. We were once number one, according to
1014 the World Economic Forum. We are at about number 23 today
1015 in the world in the quality of our infrastructure.

1016 Infrastructure creates jobs in the construction trades
1017 and supply and materials industry. But it also, we
1018 recognize, unleashes the resources and the creativity of the
1019 private sector. If you really want to grow this economy
1020 beyond the anemic 2 percent, which we have experienced over
1021 the past 17 years, each year, we need to invest in the
1022 growth of the economy. China understands that by investing
1023 a trillion dollars to open up 27 Asian markets to that
1024 economy.

1025 We, on the other hand, seek \$1.6 billion for a wall
1026 that we were told somebody else was going to pay for. We
1027 need to get our priorities straight; invest in the growth of
1028 the American economy through infrastructure, education, and
1029 scientific research. I yield back.

1030 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentleman yields back. I now yield 3
1031 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington, Ms. DelBene.

1032 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Madam
1033 Chair. Thank you, Mr. Ranking Member. With many working
1034 families and businesses still struggling in a rapidly-
1035 changing economy, our top priority in Congress should be
1036 helping to ensure that every American can succeed in the
1037 21st century and invest in the foundations we need to
1038 sustain long-term economic growth and security.

1039 To spur robust job growth, we must expand access to
1040 opportunity and build an economy in which anyone willing to
1041 work hard can get ahead and build a better future for the
1042 next generation.

1043 We should make investments in our education system to
1044 provide the training and skills that workers need to be
1045 prepared for the jobs of today and tomorrow. We should also
1046 support our colleges and technical schools that can help
1047 prepare the next generation of farmers, manufacturers, and
1048 innovators. That is why I strongly oppose this destructive
1049 budget resolution.

1050 The majority had an opportunity to work in a bipartisan
1051 way to create jobs, build an economy that works for
1052 everyone, and invest in our communities. Instead, this
1053 budget leaves the middle class behind by gutting funding for
1054 basic necessities like health care and education. This
1055 reckless budget cuts investment in early childhood, K
1056 through 12, and higher education programs. But it is our

1057 responsibility to ensure that every child in the United
1058 States has access to a world-class education, no matter
1059 where they live or how much money their family makes.

1060 That is why I strongly support increasing Federal
1061 funding for core education programs like Head Start. We all
1062 benefit when every child gets the opportunity to succeed.
1063 And we must invest to give our most vulnerable children that
1064 chance.

1065 This budget also continues the destructive cycle of
1066 neglecting our already crumbling infrastructure. This
1067 budget would cut transportation spending by over \$250
1068 billion over 10 years, a 25 percent cut. We know our roads,
1069 bridges, and transit systems are in disrepair and fail to
1070 move as many goods and people as the economy demands. At a
1071 time when so many Americans are ready to work, it makes no
1072 sense to defer these investments any longer.

1073 The longer we wait, the more costly the repairs will be
1074 in the future and the more economic opportunities we forgo
1075 that our communities desperately need. Every dollar we
1076 spend is a reflection of our values.

1077 I am deeply disappointed that this partisan, extreme
1078 budget demonstrates utter disregard for middle class
1079 Americans and a complete lack of vision for what our future
1080 could look like with smart, targeted investments in the
1081 people and projects that truly lift up hardworking Americans

1082 that we should be helping.

1083 Slashing programs that help families trying to get
1084 ahead in order to slash taxes for the wealthy has never led
1085 to jobs or economic growth, and it never will.

1086 Thank you, and I yield back.

1087 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentlewoman yields back. I now yield
1088 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York, Mr. Jeffries.

1089 Mr. Jeffries. Thank you. Thank you to the
1090 distinguished gentleman from Kentucky. The House Republican
1091 budget is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It seeks
1092 to balance itself on the backs of working families, middle-
1093 class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the
1094 afflicted, and rural America, all to promote a deep tax cut
1095 for the wealthy and for the well-off.

1096 Instead of trying to advance the interests of the
1097 middle class, the House Republican budget simply promotes
1098 the lifestyles of the rich and shameless. The Republican
1099 budget fast tracks massive tax cuts to the wealthy, shifting
1100 the burden to the middle class and working families. The
1101 budget clearly shows that House Republicans are not
1102 interested in working on behalf of everyday Americans.

1103 Like the Trump budget, the Republican version here in
1104 the House shamelessly takes away hope and opportunity from
1105 millions of families while showering millionaires,
1106 billionaires, wealthy corporations with unnecessary and

1107 counterproductive tax cuts that will do nothing to help
1108 average, everyday Americans pursue the American Dream.

1109 Instead of bringing jobs back to communities that have
1110 fallen on hard times, in inner city America, suburban
1111 America, rural America, the heartland of America, the
1112 Republican budget hollows out these investments that are
1113 necessary to build a strong, competitive economy, again,
1114 simply to provide tax cuts to the wealthy and the well-off.

1115 The budget recycles the stale, repeatedly-discredited
1116 myth that tax cuts for the wealthy will somehow magically
1117 generate an economic boom that will solve all of our
1118 Nation's programs. There is no evidence that this failed,
1119 discredited trickle-down economic theory will result in
1120 helping average, everyday, middle-class Americans and those
1121 who aspire to be part of the middle class achieve the
1122 American Dream. And yet, we continue to return, time and
1123 again, to the effort promoted in this budget: simply to
1124 advance tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-off. It is
1125 reckless. It is regressive. It is irresponsible, and it
1126 should be rejected by this committee.

1127 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentleman yields back. I now yield 3
1128 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, Mr. Boyle.

1129 Mr. Boyle. I thank the gentleman from a fellow
1130 commonwealth, Commonwealth of Kentucky. You know, we are
1131 obviously going to be spending a lot of time with one

1132 another today. And in all of that time we will be spending
1133 today, we will hear a lot of numbers and a lot statistics
1134 thrown around. I really think the most important number
1135 that you will hear today is 99.6. That is, 99.6 percent of
1136 the benefit of the House Republican tax plan goes to the
1137 wealthiest 1 percent: 99.6 percent. Not to be outdone, the
1138 House Republican blueprint for tax reform provides a \$3
1139 trillion tax cut to the wealthy and almost nothing to
1140 everyone else.

1141 The average person in the wealthiest 1/10 of 1 percent
1142 will get a \$1.5 million tax cut. And the middle-income
1143 household, not the very poor, not the very rich, the median
1144 household in this country will get 60 bucks. But it is
1145 actually worse than that, because this budget also raises
1146 taxes on low-income, working families, and it does that in
1147 two ways. This budget cuts the child tax credit and the
1148 EITC, the Earned Income Tax Credit, by a combined \$40
1149 billion, by changing requirements on who is eligible.

1150 The refundable tax credits help millions of Americans
1151 support their families and lifts millions of children out of
1152 poverty every year. So, a cut to these is a tax increase on
1153 low-income, working families. An analysis of a similar
1154 proposal by House Republicans, on cutting just the child tax
1155 credit, found that 3 million children will be harmed. And
1156 this is such a betrayal of past accepted economic theory on

1157 the Republican side.

1158 It is a fact that one of the greatest evangelists for
1159 the Earned Income Tax Credit was President Ronald Reagan.
1160 He called it the single best antipoverty program in
1161 government today. And here we are with a budget, in 2017,
1162 99.6 percent of which goes to the wealthiest 1 percent and a
1163 massive tax increase on the working poor.

1164 It is wrong. I will oppose this budget. And with
1165 that, I yield back.

1166 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentleman yields back. I now yield 3
1167 minutes to the gentleman from California, Mr. Khanna.

1168 Mr. Khanna. Thank you, Ranking Member Yarmuth. Thank
1169 you, Madam Chair. The colleagues on the other side,
1170 Republicans, have said that we Democrats are pessimistic,
1171 that somehow we do not believe in economic growth or 3
1172 percent growth. And that is simply not the case. We just
1173 have a very different view about how you grow the economy.

1174 If you believe that the challenge of growing the
1175 economy is the investor class, that the people who need
1176 people to help to grow this economy are people who are
1177 speculating on Wall Street or CEOs of hospitals making \$3
1178 million, \$6 million, and that corporations, which have
1179 record profits, need more tax credits and that is how we are
1180 going to grow the economy, then I suppose you should vote
1181 for the Republican budget.

1182 If you believe, as colleagues on our side do, Mr.
1183 Jeffries, and Mr. Higgins, Mr. Boyle, Ms. DelBene, that the
1184 way you grow the economy is by putting your faith in
1185 ordinary Americans who start small businesses, who are
1186 manufacturers, who are nurses, who do the hard work that has
1187 built this country, then you would have a view that you get
1188 to economic growth by helping middle class; that the tax
1189 cuts should not be geared towards people who already
1190 invested in the stock market; that the problem is not our
1191 DOW is not growing fast enough. The problem is that 50
1192 percent of Americans are working harder, and wages have
1193 stagnated for the last 30 years.

1194 Our believe is we can have that economic growth if we
1195 provide tax relief for the working families who deserve it,
1196 and not the speculators; if we invest in their job training
1197 programs; if we invest in programs like Medicaid and
1198 Medicare, which, by the way, are not just moral programs,
1199 but according to McKinsey, are going to lead to the most
1200 jobs in the 21st century on elder care, on child care, and
1201 jobs for the middle class.

1202 So, that is the philosophical difference. Do you
1203 believe that America's greatness lies with Wall Street
1204 speculators and CEOs? Or do you believe America's greatness
1205 lies with ordinary, hardworking Americans, small business
1206 owners, and people who actually do the jobs? Democrats are

1207 for the belief that we are great because of ordinary
1208 individuals, and the Republican budget says, "Let's put all
1209 our faith in the executive investor class." That is the
1210 real difference.

1211 My final point is I want commend Congressman Sanford
1212 for really indicating what is at stake because, if you want
1213 revenue neutrality, as the Republican budget says, on the
1214 tax proposal, their only way of getting there is a border
1215 adjustment tax. A border adjustment tax would be the
1216 largest tax increase on the middle class probably in the
1217 last 50 years.

1218 And I would urge this committee to join Congressman
1219 Sanford on a bipartisan basis and say no to the largest tax
1220 increase in the last 50 years. Let's make it clear we are
1221 against a border adjustment tax.

1222 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentleman yields back. I now yield 3
1223 minutes to the gentlewoman from Washington and the vice
1224 ranking member of the committee, Ms. Jayapal.

1225 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you to the gentleman from Kentucky
1226 and our ranking member for your leadership and for yielding.

1227 Madam Chair, I agree with some of our colleagues who
1228 have said that our budget is a document of our priorities.
1229 And unfortunately, though, I am disappointed that this
1230 budget resolution does not invest in working families. And
1231 it does so little to help millions across our country who

1232 are struggling.

1233 Why? As you have heard from many of my colleagues,
1234 this budget prioritizes putting millions of dollars towards
1235 tax cuts for the very wealthiest in our country, the 1
1236 percent, the wealthiest corporations. And it does not have
1237 to be like this. We, in the Budget Committee, have the
1238 obligation to define the spending priorities that lead to
1239 robust economic growth that reaches all Americans.

1240 But the blind ideological pursuit of tax cuts for the
1241 wealthiest that are contained within this budget, and
1242 honestly, all of us know that these are failed policies of
1243 the past; they are not the kinds of tax cuts that lead to
1244 the growth of the economy; that is going to cost the
1245 American taxpayers greatly. This budget slashes corporate
1246 tax rates from 35 to 15 percent, costing American taxpayers
1247 \$2.4 trillion in revenue over the next 10 years.

1248 What could you pay for with those dollars? That is
1249 equivalent to the 5-year cost of Medicaid and the Children's
1250 Health Insurance Program that serve nearly 75 million
1251 seniors, people with disabilities, and families in need.

1252 We know that large American companies hold \$2.6
1253 trillion in offshore profits, and I believe that there is
1254 bipartisan consensus that we should bring those dollars back
1255 into America. But unfortunately, this budget promises a big
1256 tax break for the companies to bring those profits back, and

1257 it forgoes 600 billion of the \$760 billion owed in U.S.
1258 taxes by corporations that have taken their profits outside.

1259 Madam Chair, these are policies that put the interests
1260 of the corporations and the wealthiest 1 percent ahead of
1261 working families, and they just do not work. Just most
1262 recently, in the State of Kansas, this is a State where
1263 Republicans put forward tax cuts for the wealthiest, and
1264 they have had to roll those tax cuts back; those were 2012
1265 tax cuts. They were not working. They did not provide
1266 enough for the people of Kansas.

1267 And the Brookings Institution, they said, "led to an
1268 anemic level of revenues, which led to ballooning
1269 shortfalls, causing significant cutbacks in vital programs,
1270 such as Medicaid, education, TANF, court funding, and
1271 infrastructure."

1272 So, Madam Chair, we cannot pass this budget if we want
1273 to take care of working families in this country. I urge my
1274 colleagues to reject this budget resolution and work across
1275 the aisle to actually put together a budget that increases
1276 opportunity for all Americans. I yield back.

1277 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentlewoman yields back, and I now
1278 yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from New Mexico, Ms.
1279 Lujan Grisham.

1280 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you, Ranking Member Yarmuth,
1281 and thank you, Chairwoman Black. What you have heard from

1282 all of my colleagues is, while our job is to figure out a
1283 balanced approach to a Federal budget that is meaningful and
1284 makes the most sense for all Americans, what we have, again,
1285 is a budget that is imbalanced and, frankly, inappropriate.
1286 The really tough part for me is that it is not surprising.
1287 And since I have been on this committee, it is certainly
1288 nothing new.

1289 It is a reflection now of both the President's budget
1290 and the now-defeated ACA repeal, in that it undermines our
1291 commitment to every single middle-class priority. So,
1292 instead of investing in education, and job training,
1293 transportation, veterans' care, medical research, or the
1294 healthcare system, this budget signs a massive check, again,
1295 as you have heard, to the wealthiest Americans and
1296 corporations.

1297 And I have constituents in New Mexico who do not know
1298 where their next meal is coming from, who do not know how
1299 they are going to pay for college, and who right now, still,
1300 cannot afford to go to the doctor. Twenty percent of New
1301 Mexicans live in poverty. One out of every 4 New Mexico
1302 children are food insecure. And my State has the second
1303 highest unemployment rate in the Nation.

1304 This budget prioritized benefits for the richest
1305 Americans instead of these constituents, who are working
1306 hard every day to provide for their families and make ends

1307 meet. I want to introduce you to a constituent of mine,
1308 Layne Havens. She is a single mother of a young son,
1309 Connor, who is working full-time, and most recently, in
1310 describing to me about how she manages a childcare benefit
1311 or a SNAP benefit to make ends meet so that she can continue
1312 to work full-time because she is doing everything right to
1313 care and support her family. She was recently offered a 53
1314 cents an hour wage increase.

1315 Now, her choice is to take that wage increase, to
1316 continue to try to move into the middle class, to get out of
1317 poverty. But in doing so, she will lose approximately \$600
1318 in public benefits. And the most notable is she will lose
1319 that food assistance, SNAP. These are the choices that this
1320 budget not only endorses, but it exacerbates by even
1321 removing the safety net, so that my constituent would have
1322 no housing, no SNAP, no childcare, and no hope for the
1323 future of her family.

1324 This is fundamentally unjust, and, quite frankly, it is
1325 bad policy if we are trying to get America working. This is
1326 an America-first budget only for Americans that are already
1327 well-connected, wealthy, and powerful. I understand the
1328 goal of my colleagues, to enact, I think, a fiscally-
1329 responsible budget. But the record-setting cuts to
1330 Medicaid, Medicare, SNAP, and other programs that provide
1331 basic living standards to some of the most vulnerable

1332 constituents in my district and yours is a devastating
1333 effort to a system that is already stretched too thin.

1334 This is short-sighted, arrogant, and it is an insult to
1335 my constituents, who struggle to find jobs, pay their bills,
1336 and provide their kids with a better future. I urge my
1337 colleagues to oppose this incredibly irresponsible budget,
1338 and I yield back.

1339 Mr. Yarmuth. The gentlewoman yields back. I now yield
1340 myself 3 minutes.

1341 The theme is unmistakable on the Democratic side. We
1342 look at this budget and see a total list of backward
1343 priorities. Now, I have a brother who is in the barbecue
1344 restaurant business, and he has done very, very well in the
1345 restaurant business for a number of years; and he always
1346 tended to vote Republican because he thought Republicans
1347 would have him pay less tax.

1348 Back in 2008, in the middle of the Presidential
1349 campaign, he called me, and he said, "John, I have some
1350 interesting news for you. Judy and I," Judy is his wife;
1351 "Judy and I are voting for Obama this year, and all
1352 Democrats." And I said, "That is great, Bob. What was your
1353 epiphany?" He said, "Well, I finally figured out that, if
1354 nobody could afford barbecue, it does not matter what my tax
1355 rate is."

1356 And I think that says a lot about where we are as a

1357 country. We have far too many people in this country who
1358 cannot afford to support the economy the way we have
1359 traditionally had it. One percent of the people in this
1360 country cannot support a robust economy. And I think this
1361 budget goes in, I think, a completely wrong direction of
1362 giving more and more to that 1 percent and less and less to
1363 the people we really need to have better lives.

1364 So, thank my Democratic colleagues for their
1365 participation. As you can see, the Republican budget, in
1366 our opinion, can do irreparable damage to our security, to
1367 our economy, and to the health and happiness of millions of
1368 American families. This is not what the American people
1369 asked for. They did not ask for tax cuts for millionaires
1370 and wealthy corporations. They did not ask for the dramatic
1371 cuts in programs to support basic living standards. They
1372 did not ask to see our country left behind by a lack of
1373 investment in infrastructure and science. They did not ask
1374 to see our security imperiled by the Republican's narrow
1375 worldview.

1376 What they want is to see real improvement in their
1377 lives. And this Republican budget just does not do that.
1378 My Democratic colleagues and I will shortly offer amendments
1379 that moves this budget towards a better place. And I
1380 encourage my Republican colleagues to accept them.

1381 But even these amendments cannot undo the rot at the

1382 core of this budget, that it embraces the worst extremes of
1383 the Trump budget, and is an immoral document that displays
1384 an utter indifference to the challenges Americans face
1385 today. I hope that my Republican colleagues will abandon
1386 this path. And with that, we yield the balance of our time.

1387 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields the balance of
1388 his time. And we will now proceed with the staff
1389 walkthrough for the fiscal year 2018 concurrent budget
1390 resolution.

1391 We have the witness at the table: Rick May, our staff
1392 director; Jenna Spealman, our policy director; and Andy
1393 Morton, our chief economist. The staff will briefly
1394 summarize the chairman's mark and then will be available to
1395 answer questions members may have. I would urge members to
1396 ask factual questions.

1397 Mr. May. Madam Chair, we are waiting for the policy
1398 director, Jenna, to come, so bear with us.

1399 Chairman Black. Thank you, Mr. May. And you may begin
1400 when you are ready.

1401 STATEMENTS OF RICK MAY, STAFF DIRECTOR; JENNA SPEALMAN,
1402 POLICY DIRECTOR; AND ANDY MORTON, CHIEF ECONOMIST

1403 STATEMENT OF RICK MAY

1404 Mr. May. Madam Chairman and Mr. Yarmuth, it is our
1405 honor and pleasure to provide to you a walkthrough for the
1406 next 60 minutes regarding the provisions of the chairman's
1407 mark.

1408 Before we get started, I would like to address my
1409 appreciation and I know the chairman's appreciation to the
1410 staff on both sides of the aisle for working on the markup.
1411 It is a lot of work. And we would like to thank and commend
1412 the staff for their hard work, particularly on the
1413 Republican side. We have been working on this budget since
1414 last October. I think no one is more thrilled than we are
1415 that we are in this markup today. So, we will try and move
1416 forward.

1417 I also would like to start out by providing a little
1418 bit of background of what the budget resolution is, first,
1419 before we go in there, so for the new members of the
1420 committee. The budget resolution is a House concurrent
1421 resolution that is not signed by the President, and we are
1422 not making statutory changes to the law. The basic
1423 components of the budget resolution are a series of

1424 budgetary numbers, a title on budget enforcement, and
1425 numerous provisions of what we call policy statements, or in
1426 other words, policy statements that express the will of the
1427 committee on a whole range of issues. That is what the
1428 budget resolution is.

1429 We are not the Appropriations Committee. We do not
1430 dictate what each individual programs are provided for in
1431 the way of funding. We are not the Ways and Means
1432 Committee. We do not dictate specific policies, tax rates,
1433 et cetera, relating to tax reform. And we are not the
1434 authorizing committees that relate to the policies that they
1435 have to do to fulfill reconciliation instructions.

1436 We are the Budget Committee, the budget resolution. We
1437 are the architect, if you will, of the Federal budget. The
1438 appropriators, the authorizing committees, et cetera, they
1439 are the general contractors. We decide sort of the basic
1440 framework of the budget. They are the ones who decide kind
1441 of where the nails go, where the ceiling tiles go, where the
1442 floor tiles go. We provide the framework; they provide the
1443 details.

1444 So, some of the questions I am certain we are going to
1445 get in a few minutes are going to be asking about some of
1446 the details that simply are outside the purview of the
1447 budget resolution in the Budget Committee. So, I just want
1448 to provide that sense of context.

1449 So, the chairman's mark before you is a post-policy
1450 budget resolution. We are making assumptions on a number of
1451 areas to take into account, what we argue, is a progrowth
1452 agenda of tax reform, regulatory reform, welfare reform, and
1453 repeal and replace of Obamacare. All of those functions, we
1454 believe, as well as deficit reduction, have a progrowth
1455 effect on the economy.

1456 If the members will recall, we had a hearing several
1457 weeks ago with various distinguished economists, talking
1458 about those progrowth policies, and this budget resolution
1459 incorporates a lot of that testimony from the economists of
1460 that hearing, as well of several outside economic experts
1461 that we would be glad to discuss, I guess, further in the Q-
1462 and-A process.

1463 The chairman's mark is to balance over the next 10
1464 years. We are projecting a budget surplus of \$9 billion by
1465 2027, the 10th year of the 10-year window. Based upon the
1466 CBO January baseline, each of the years our projected
1467 deficits are below the CBO deficit projection for those
1468 years vis-a-vis the January baseline projection. We do that
1469 through a number of ways. We make numerous changes on
1470 discretionary spending and we are assuming many changes on
1471 the mandatory side.

1472 On the discretionary side, for the fiscal year '18, one
1473 of the basic functions of the budget resolution is to

1474 provide 302(a) allocations to the Appropriations Committee.
1475 The budget resolution calls for \$621.5 billion for 050, or
1476 for national defense. It provides \$75 billion in GWOT
1477 funding. It provides approximately \$511 billion for
1478 nondefense discretionary and approximately \$12 billion for
1479 GWOT on the nondefense discretionary. Those numbers are
1480 being reflected by other actions by other committees.

1481 For example, the defense number is exactly being
1482 matched by the recent NDAA that was approved by the House
1483 Armed Services Committee and approved by the full House.
1484 The Appropriations Committee is moving through their various
1485 12 appropriation bills and they are fulfilling both the
1486 defense appropriation numbers, the \$621.5 plus the \$75
1487 billion in GWOT funding. They are fulfilling that number.
1488 The Appropriations Committee is also taking the final steps
1489 this week to fulfill the \$511 billion number for
1490 appropriation bills. So, that process is moving in tandem
1491 with the budget resolution process.

1492 On the mandatory side, we are making a number of
1493 assumptions on a whole range of various programs within the
1494 Federal budget. We are assuming a \$203 billion
1495 reconciliation instruction for 11 authorizing committees.
1496 Those instructions are designed to do two things. One is to
1497 provide for ways and means to do deficit-neutral tax reform
1498 and also to do at least \$203 billion in deficit reduction

1499 over the next 10 years. As the chairman has stressed in
1500 many meetings over the course of the last several weeks, the
1501 \$203 billion number is a floor, not a ceiling, and I think
1502 it is the hope of the chairman and the members of this
1503 committee that the authorizing committees, as they fulfill
1504 and meet that target, that the actual savings will be
1505 greater than \$203 billion over 10.

1506 As everybody who has been around in the Budget
1507 Committee for a while understands, the authorizing
1508 committees have maximum flexibility in reaching those
1509 numbers. It is not within the purview of the Budget
1510 Committee, not within the purview of the reconciliation
1511 instructions, that we can provide a policy directive to the
1512 committees that they have to achieve a budgetary
1513 savings/deficit reduction savings by any particular policy
1514 approach. They have maximum flexibility to reach that
1515 number. You will notice in the instructions part of the
1516 budget resolution there is just a number for each of the 11
1517 committees and that is to fulfill the requirements of the
1518 Congressional Budget Act. It only calls for a number.

1519 As I mentioned, we do a number of assumptions within a
1520 whole range of mandatory programs. We do make deficit
1521 reduction savings in Medicare of approximately \$487 billion
1522 over 10. We assume additional savings from the House
1523 passage of the American Healthcare Act. We have been

1524 working with CBO to come up, shall we say, the 11th-year
1525 savings. The number that CBO has providing thus far on the
1526 healthcare bill is based upon fiscal year 2017 through 2026.
1527 Our budget goes through fiscal year 2018 through 2027. So,
1528 we have been working with CBO with coming up with an
1529 estimate of approximately \$204 billion in deficit reduction
1530 over the next 10-year period from repealing and replacing
1531 Obamacare as it was passed by the House.

1532 We are also making some additional assumptions to get
1533 to balance. In the way of Medicaid, we are assuming some
1534 additional savings out of Medicaid of approximately \$114
1535 billion over 10 years. Those savings are in addition to the
1536 savings that were in the American Healthcare Act.

1537 We are also making some assumptions regarding all the
1538 other areas of mandatory spending. One of the principles of
1539 this budget is to ask every program, every major component
1540 of the Federal budget, to participate in the balanced budget
1541 exercise.

1542 Therefore, we are suggesting a number of savings in the
1543 welfare reform area, a number of savings in Federal
1544 retirement programs. We are making a number of savings with
1545 veterans, student loan reform programs. We are suggesting
1546 savings in agriculture programs and on and on and on.

1547 On the revenue side, we are assuming, as I said, the
1548 House-passed version of the American Healthcare Act.

1549 Embedded in that is a \$1.1 trillion reduction in revenues
1550 based upon the various taxes that were part of the ACA.
1551 Those items have been removed from the revenue baseline.

1552 So our revenue baseline is now \$1.1 trillion lower than
1553 the current law baseline, as estimated by CBO and Joint Tax.
1554 We also are assuming something new as well. We are assuming
1555 \$700 billion in additional budgetary savings from reducing
1556 by 50 percent over the next 10 years the amount of improper
1557 payments that the Federal Government provides.

1558 As the committee members may recall, we had a very good
1559 hearing from the Comptroller General of GAO, which
1560 identified for the committee that in 2016 there were over
1561 \$141 billion in improper payments provided to various
1562 recipients by the Federal Government.

1563 If you extrapolate that \$1.4 trillion over 10 years,
1564 that is approximately \$1.4 trillion in improper payments.
1565 In fact, the Comptroller General commented that that \$1.4
1566 trillion number is probably an understatement, so, actually,
1567 the real number is probably closer to maybe \$1.5 trillion,
1568 maybe even \$1.6 trillion over the next 10 years. We are
1569 assuming that we reduce that amount by 50 percent.

1570 Thus, if we started from a base of \$1.4 trillion,
1571 reduction of 50 percent of that would of course generate
1572 \$700 billion savings over 10 years.

1573 On our economic assumptions -- and I will end because I

1574 promised 10 minutes -- we are assuming an average GDP growth
1575 rate over the next 10 years of 2.6 percent. We are counting
1576 \$1.5 trillion of that macroeconomic feedback as part of our
1577 deficit reduction efforts. So, if you add up our policy
1578 changes on the mandatory and discretionary side along with
1579 the higher economic growth, we have approximately \$6.5
1580 trillion in deficit reduction as compared to the CBO
1581 baseline over the next 10 years.

1582 So, I think I will leave it at that. I have gone a
1583 little over the 10 minutes, but I think that provides a very
1584 good overview of how the chairman's mark gets to balance
1585 some of the major provisions, and we would be glad to answer
1586 any questions.

1587 On my left is Jenna Spealman who is our policy
1588 director, and on my right is Andy Morton, who is our chief
1589 economist. In the room are other staff members: Jim Bates
1590 is our chief counsel and others. They are also available to
1591 answer any questions if we cannot answer those. We would be
1592 glad to do so.

1593 [The prepared statement of Rick May follows:]

1594 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

1595 Chairman Black. Thank you, Mr. May. And I understand
1596 that Ms. DelBene has sought time for a question. The lady
1597 is recognized.

1598 Ms. DelBene. Thank you very much, Madam Chair. I have
1599 some questions about supplemental nutrition assistance
1600 programs and other income security, kind of what is looked
1601 as Function 600. The mandatory savings in Function 600
1602 total \$896 billion, so my first question is, does the
1603 resolution assume turning SNAP into a block grant, as in
1604 previous years, or does the resolution assume the
1605 President's plan to convert the program into one that
1606 requires a State match?

1607 Mr. May. Madam Chairman, Representative, you will
1608 notice in the committee report that we plan to file sometime
1609 on Friday. There will be no reference in the committee
1610 report to block grants. We have been working very closely
1611 with the House Agriculture Committee, and they have
1612 requested that we just leave that issue to be open and
1613 flexible, so we are assuming a number of savings from SNAP
1614 reforms.

1615 Ms. DelBene. But you do not know about the State
1616 match?

1617 Mr. May. We are not necessarily using the phraseology
1618 of block grants.

1619 Ms. DelBene. And so, how much does the budget assume

1620 from these changes to SNAP?

1621 Mr. May. Approximately, \$150 billion over the next 10
1622 years.

1623 Ms. DelBene. And when will that start?

1624 Mr. May. I believe sometime about the mid of the 10-
1625 year period, somewhere 5 years, I believe -- yeah, most of
1626 the savings are after the fifth year, so it would be mostly
1627 in -- savings in the sixth, seventh, eighth, ninth, and
1628 tenth year.

1629 Ms. DelBene. Okay. How much savings does the budget
1630 assume from changes to SNAP work requirements?

1631 Mr. May. Approximately \$12.5 billion, \$13 billion.

1632 Ms. DelBene. Okay. And are there other policy
1633 assumptions that are made for SNAP with respect to the
1634 budget?

1635 Mr. May. I think there are some other changes that we
1636 are assuming, but I think primarily it is sort of this
1637 flexibility, giving States more authority to help administer
1638 the so-called old block grant approach or State flexibility
1639 approach that we are using today. That is really, I think,
1640 the primary driver of --

1641 Ms. DelBene. And how much of the savings does the
1642 budget assume from federal employee or military retirement?

1643 Mr. May. If I could take my glasses off and read,
1644 approximately about \$232 billion over 10.

1645 Ms. DelBene. Two-thirty -- okay, and how much of the
1646 savings does the budget assume from changes to the earned
1647 income tax credit or to the child tax credit?

1648 Mr. May. I believe it is somewhere approximately \$20
1649 billion. But thank you for asking.

1650 Ms. DelBene. Twenty for EITC or --

1651 Mr. May. Both EITC and the child tax credit.

1652 Ms. DelBene. Combined?

1653 Mr. May. Combined.

1654 Ms. DelBene. Okay.

1655 Mr. May. I am glad you asked that question because
1656 there was some misinformation. The Republican budget, the
1657 chairman's mark, does not in any way at all reduce those
1658 benefits. The policies that are assumed in those savings is
1659 an idea that has been just considered by ways and means in
1660 the past of requiring a Social Security number for each
1661 recipient of the tax credit, therefore, there is a need to
1662 improve the administration and the waste fraud abuse of the
1663 program. If you were --

1664 Ms. DelBene. But there is no specific plan of how that
1665 would happen? You are just assuming there is going to be a
1666 dollar savings there?

1667 Mr. May. If I may, representative, as you may recall,
1668 the testimony from the Comptroller General, this program has
1669 been identified by the IRS, I believe, to have somewhere

1670 around 25 percent of the outlays for these two programs are
1671 being viewed to be going to people who are ineligible for
1672 the tax credits.

1673 Ms. DelBene. No, thank you for the number. Right now,
1674 it just looks like we have a number. Does the resolution
1675 assume any changes to child nutrition programs like the
1676 school lunch program?

1677 Mr. May. Go ahead. No, go ahead.

1678 Mr. Morton. Community eligibility provision, \$1.6
1679 billion. We increase the threshold from 40 percent to 60
1680 percent.

1681 Ms. DelBene. Okay, thank you. So, what is the
1682 remaining difference? Because if I add all of these up, I
1683 do not get to the 896.

1684 Mr. May. Well, I think there are some assumptions that
1685 we make that --

1686 Ms. Spealman. We do not share all the assumptions
1687 underlying the budget. They are just some illustrative
1688 options on how you can hit that target.

1689 Ms. DelBene. Okay. So, that is a pretty big
1690 difference, though, between these and the total number, but
1691 --

1692 Ms. Spealman. It is ultimately up to the committees of
1693 jurisdiction to determine how to hit the funding levels
1694 provided in the budget resolution.

1695 Ms. DelBene. Okay, thank you. I yield back.

1696 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back. I now
1697 recognize the ranking member, Mr. Yarmuth.

1698 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Chairman Black. I have a
1699 series of questions. First of all, let me say, Mr. May, and
1700 to segue off your initial comments, I want to thank the
1701 majority staff and the minority staff as well for the work
1702 that has been done on not just this markup but throughout
1703 the year. We appreciate the professionalism on both sides.

1704 I have a series of questions on Medicare. The budget
1705 assumes \$487 billion Medicare mandatory spending cuts over
1706 10 years. I want you to walk us through all of the
1707 components that make up the \$487 billion. I will start with
1708 questions about the four Medicare policies described in the
1709 blueprint. The first is converting Medicare into a premium
1710 support system for new beneficiaries starting in 2024. Wat
1711 is the total amount of savings assumed in the budget from
1712 that policy?

1713 Mr. May. Steve, you want to answer those? Go ahead,
1714 Steve. Introduce yourself and --

1715 Mr. Waskiewicz. Steve Waskiewicz, here, sir. I am
1716 sorry, can you repeat the question?

1717 Mr. Yarmuth. This is about the premium support system
1718 for new beneficiaries starting 2024. What is the total
1719 amount of savings assumed in the budget from that policy?

1720 Mr. Waskiewicz. So, we do not specifically break out
1721 our savings. We sort of view all of the savings between
1722 both structural reforms and our nonstructural reforms as a
1723 combination of various reforms that, in total, get you to
1724 the total of \$487 billion over the budget window.

1725 Mr. Yarmuth. But so, do you have specific policy
1726 parameters associated with that estimate and with the plan,
1727 in particular, with how the premium support amount is
1728 determined? Is it linked to the average plan bid or the
1729 second-lowest bid? What happens to the premium support
1730 payment over time? Is it tied to a specific index such as
1731 medical inflation or does it float with plan bids? Do you
1732 have any details on that?

1733 Mr. Waskiewicz. We follow the approach that CBO puts
1734 forward in their 2013 report and use the average bid option.

1735 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay. Do you have an estimate of how the
1736 plan would affect the solvency of the Medicare trust fund or
1737 the projected date of trust fund exhaustion?

1738 Mr. Waskiewicz. No, sir, we do not, and for the reason
1739 that, ultimately, authorizing committees have the
1740 flexibility to determine how this particular program would
1741 be structured, which would directly affect a lot of the
1742 questions that you are asking specifically about solvency.

1743 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay. I assume the answers are going to
1744 be pretty much the same for these other areas, but I want to

1745 ask them anyway. So, you have got one Medicare policy
1746 change promoting personal digital advanced care plans. Does
1747 the budget estimate any savings associated with this policy
1748 and how much? Obviously, you already answered the "how
1749 much;" you do not know.

1750 Mr. Waskiewicz. Yeah, we do not have a specific
1751 savings target associated with that specific policy
1752 proposal, sir.

1753 Mr. Yarmuth. Now, getting to means testing for high-
1754 income seniors, again, I wanted to ask about the 10-year
1755 savings assumed from that and those related premiums, but I
1756 guess the answer is the same.

1757 Mr. Waskiewicz. Yes, sir, it is the same answer. I
1758 would point out that we follow basically the proposal put
1759 forward by former President Obama in his previous budgets
1760 for increased means testing.

1761 Mr. Yarmuth. Good, that was my next question, so you
1762 have answered that already. The last one, reform medical
1763 liability insurance: does the budget assume outlay savings
1764 equal to the CBO score of H.R. 1215, which was \$43.9
1765 billion? And if you assume different savings, what accounts
1766 for the difference there?

1767 Mr. Waskiewicz. Yes, sir, we do assume the reforms
1768 associated with H.R. 1215.

1769 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay, thank you. And are you carrying

1770 all the savings in the Medicare function or is some carried
1771 in the health function?

1772 Mr. May. We put it in 920 do we not?

1773 Mr. Waskiewicz. Yeah.

1774 Mr. May. Madam Chair, Mr. Yarmuth, we do not put that
1775 in the Medicare function. We put that, I think, in 920.

1776 Mr. Yarmuth. What --

1777 Mr. May. 920 or 930. But we do not put it in the
1778 Medicare. And we can provide some of these details to your
1779 staff about the various components are going to save X
1780 number of dollars. We will be glad to provide that to you.
1781 We have got --

1782 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you. And what --

1783 Mr. May. Because --

1784 Mr. Yarmuth. Go ahead.

1785 Mr. May. Because medical liability or medical
1786 malpractice reform crosses so many different things, that is
1787 why we do not put it in the Medicare. But that \$47 billion,
1788 \$48 billion, is on top of the 487. We do not count that
1789 within the 487.

1790 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay, thank you. What policies account
1791 for the remainder of the \$487 billion other than the ones
1792 that I have mentioned? Does the budget assume savings from
1793 repealing the Medicare benefit improvements in the
1794 Affordable Care Act such as the provision closing the Part D

1795 coverage gap?

1796 Mr. Waskiewicz. Well, sir, we did not specifically
1797 include that within our savings number. Some of the other
1798 provisions we do include, and these are, again, just
1799 illustrative options. But to equalize the Medicare
1800 eligibility age with that of Social Security gradually over
1801 time. Also, streamlining graduate medical education funding
1802 as well is another illustrative option that we include as
1803 part of the savings in 570.

1804 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay. I was going to ask you about
1805 raising the age, so you have already answered that. My
1806 understanding is -- this is going back to the Part D
1807 coverage gap -- that last year's budget report out of the
1808 committee assumed roughly \$38 billion in Medicare spending
1809 reductions from repealing that policy. Is that consistent
1810 with this year?

1811 Mr. Waskiewicz. We do not specify that as an option
1812 within 570.

1813 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay. Does the budget assume savings
1814 from restructuring Part A and Part B cost-sharing, including
1815 establishing a unified deductible and catastrophic cap on
1816 out-of-pocket costs and making changes to Medigap
1817 supplemental coverage?

1818 Mr. Waskiewicz. Yes, sir, it does.

1819 Mr. Yarmuth. What kind of a savings assumed in your

1820 budget from these policies?

1821 Mr. Waskiewicz. Again, we do not put a specific number
1822 associated with that policy. However, it is the policy of
1823 this resolution, and we have carried this forward in past
1824 Republican budgets to simplify the program and model it
1825 after very similar to how employer-sponsored insurance is as
1826 opposed to how it currently is.

1827 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay, thank you. I want to move to
1828 Medicaid and some other health questions. Oh, no, I am
1829 going to let another member ask those. I actually recognize
1830 Mr. Carbajal for a question.

1831 Mr. May. Madam Chair, if I may interject here, Mr.
1832 Yarmuth, we would be glad to provide some of those numbers
1833 that you have asked for. But I think it is important, as
1834 Steve just mentioned, the budget resolution is based on a
1835 series of policy assumptions that we make to meet our
1836 number. But again, those are not binding on the committees.

1837 Mr. Yarmuth. I understand.

1838 Mr. May. We only provide illustrative examples. There
1839 are many, many different ways that Ways and Means, Energy
1840 and Commerce, that share jurisdiction on Medicare, that they
1841 could theoretically, at some point in the future, meet those
1842 numbers.

1843 So, it is not so much the fact that we are driving a
1844 particular policy or policies. It is simply an outline or a

1845 blueprint as to if we get the balance, these are approximate
1846 savings that we believe is a fair and reasonable way of
1847 getting to balance within the 10-year period. And we are
1848 not trying to hide anything. It is just that some of the
1849 details really are, I do not want to say irrelevant, but it
1850 is not really a policy-driven process. It is a numerical
1851 effort to show how we can get to balance.

1852 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you for that.

1853 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The
1854 gentleman, Mr. Carbajal, is recognized.

1855 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Chairwoman Black. Staff, the
1856 Building a Better America document, on page 31 and 32,
1857 states that the budget includes more funding for border
1858 security and construction. Does that include President
1859 Trump's border wall? And if so, how much is assumed for
1860 2018?

1861 Mr. May. It is the same amount that is being assumed
1862 or being implemented by the House Appropriations Committee
1863 through, I believe, the Homeland Security appropriation
1864 bill.

1865 Mr. Carbajal. Do we know what that amount --

1866 Mr. May. It accommodates -- yes, it accommodates. I
1867 read somewhere, and, Representative, do not quote me on
1868 this, but I think it is approximately \$1.6 billion in fiscal
1869 year 2018.

1870 Mr. Carbajal. And what about for the years beyond
1871 that?

1872 Mr. May. It does not necessarily make any specific
1873 assumptions beyond that. Because, again, the key number is
1874 the 302(a) allocation for fiscal year 2018 and that is why
1875 we do not necessarily make an assumption for the out years.

1876 Ms. Spealman. And it is ultimately up to the
1877 appropriators on how they decide to disperse the 302(a)
1878 allocation.

1879 Mr. Carbajal. Okay, thank you.

1880 Chairman Black. Does the gentleman yield back?

1881 Mr. Carbajal. Yes, I yield back. Sorry about that.

1882 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The
1883 gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky, is recognized.

1884 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Madam Chairman. So, the
1885 budget assumes \$1.504 trillion savings from Medicaid and
1886 other health programs over 10 years, so I want to walk
1887 through some of that. The budget assumes the House-passed
1888 American Healthcare Act in making its projections. So, how
1889 much in savings are you assuming from the AHCA? Are you
1890 carrying all of the savings in the health function? So,
1891 these are two questions: how much are you assuming in
1892 savings and are you carrying all of the savings in the
1893 health function or is some carried in other functions?

1894 Mr. May. Madam Chairman, Representative, it is all in

1895 the health function. Here are the numbers. I think how we
1896 can help show you how we are getting our deficit reduction
1897 savings. It is obviously a simple mathematical subtraction
1898 of revenues from outlays.

1899 So, if we are reducing outlays by approximately \$1.335
1900 trillion, we are reducing revenues by \$1.13 trillion, the
1901 net of that is \$204 billion in savings. So, you reduce
1902 spending; you reduce revenues because of the tax provisions.
1903 The net of spending and revenue comes to 204.

1904 Ms. Schakowsky. And it is 1.35?

1905 Mr. May. 1.35 net. That is with all the various
1906 changes of the subsidies, the Medicaid savings -- that is
1907 all rolled into that \$1.335 trillion over 10 years.

1908 Ms. Schakowsky. The AHCA effectively the ACA's
1909 Medicaid eligibility expansion, converts Medicaid to a per-
1910 capita cap or block grant, and makes other changes to the
1911 program. How much in Medicaid savings are you assuming then
1912 from the AHCA?

1913 Mr. May. I think it is approximately \$830 billion.
1914 What is it, 8 --

1915 Ms. Schakowsky. What is it?

1916 Mr. May. It is approximately \$830 billion over 10. We
1917 can get you the exact number.

1918 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay.

1919 Ms. Spealman. We assume what was given from the House-

1920 passed version of the AHCA.

1921 Mr. May. Right. Everything is from the House-passed
1922 version from the CBO score, just extrapolated out for 1 more
1923 year. It is like the 11th year. That is why the numbers
1924 may seem a little unusual, because we are all used to seeing
1925 the fiscal year 2017 through 2026 number, which is
1926 approximately \$119 billion. Why you are seeing the \$204
1927 billion is because we have extrapolated that to the extra
1928 year of 2027. So, it is a score that is over a different
1929 10-year period than the one that everyone is aware of.

1930 Ms. Schakowsky. Right. This is about work
1931 requirements. The budget goes beyond the AHCA and supports
1932 a mandatory work requirement for certain adults on Medicaid.
1933 How much savings are you assuming from this change?

1934 Mr. May. Approximately \$110 billion over 10.

1935 Ms. Schakowsky. The budget goes beyond the AHCA and
1936 encourages States to institute changes like cost-sharing for
1937 working-age adults in Medicaid, among others. How much in
1938 Medicaid savings are you assuming from this policy?

1939 Mr. May. I do not think we have got that number. What
1940 do we have? We do not have that. We would be glad to.

1941 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay. The budget goes beyond the AHCA
1942 and purports to restore "parity" for Medicaid payments. How
1943 much in Medicaid savings are you assuming from this policy
1944 and what are the policy assumptions generating the savings?

1945 Ms. Madni. Sorry, I am sorry. My name is Brittany
1946 Madni. I handle this function for the Budget Committee. We
1947 assume approximately \$2 billion in savings, give or take.
1948 We do not go into particular specified policies associated
1949 with that.

1950 We have worked in conjunction with the Committee on
1951 Energy and Commerce to come up with an approximate number in
1952 conjunction with Energy and Commerce and both CBO as well so
1953 that we can approximate some policies. The idea behind that
1954 is just to institute parity for Medicaid recipients.

1955 Ms. Schakowsky. Well, if you can share the data you
1956 achieved by talking to Energy, E&C, and CBO, that would be
1957 helpful in responding to this question --

1958 Ms. Madni. Yes, ma'am.

1959 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. Does the \$1.35 trillion
1960 figure reflect savings from other changes to Medicaid? How
1961 much? Are there savings from things like the children's
1962 health insurance program, and if so, how much?

1963 Mr. May. Let me see. Is that part of this, though?
1964 No, there are no savings regarding the healthcare -- --
1965 American Healthcare Act. There are no SCHIP's savings
1966 included in that number.

1967 Ms. Schakowsky. So, there is no change in policy in
1968 SCHIP?

1969 Mr. May. There is a change in policy, but not within

1970 the -- it is not included in the --

1971 Ms. Schakowsky. AHCA?

1972 Mr. May. The Health Care Reform Act. It is a separate
1973 policy. It is not included in that. The number I read you,
1974 \$1.35 trillion --

1975 Ms. Schakowsky. Right.

1976 Mr. May. There is nothing in that number relating to
1977 SCHIP.

1978 Ms. Schakowsky. Well, is there some way then that we
1979 can get what you get for the savings?

1980 Mr. May. Yeah, we are making some assumptions in
1981 reforms in SCHIP, but it is separate from AHCA.

1982 Ms. Schakowsky. Is that something that can be provided
1983 to us as well?

1984 Mr. May. Sure.

1985 Ms. Schakowsky. Okay, that would be helpful. Thank
1986 you, Madam Chair. I yield back.

1987 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back. I
1988 recognize the ranking member, Mr. Yarmuth.

1989 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Chairman Black. Moving to
1990 education function for a minute, the budget proposes a total
1991 of \$210 billion in cuts to mandatory Function 500 programs
1992 over 10 years. What assumptions are behind that estimate?

1993 Mr. May. Madam Chair and Mr. Yarmuth, most of those
1994 are on the student loan reforms that are asking. We have

1995 Emily Goff here that can provide some of the details. But
1996 it is primarily on the student loan section, trying to --

1997 Mr. Yarmuth. Does that touch Pell Grants as well?

1998 Mr. May. No, this budget, as past Republican budgets
1999 have, is transferring Pell Grant into purely a discretionary
2000 program, not a mandatory program.

2001 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay. The budget encourages innovation
2002 in education while also focusing on investment in career and
2003 technical education programs. Is it fair to assume that
2004 your budget increases funding for school choice and career
2005 and technical programs? If so, by how much?

2006 Mr. May. We do not make any specific policy
2007 assumptions regarding school choice at all.

2008 Mr. Yarmuth. Now, moving to the veterans function.
2009 The budget has savings of \$49 billion over 10 years in
2010 mandatory veterans program. What policies does that
2011 reflect? And do you assume the President's policy regarding
2012 changes to individual unemployability?

2013 Mr. May. Our budget does not accept the President's
2014 proposal on the unemployability, but we make a number of
2015 other policy changes. I mean, again, those numbers are
2016 something that is at the discretion of the Veterans' Affairs
2017 Committee as to how to actually meet them. But it is a
2018 whole range of policy assumptions to get to that number.

2019 Mr. Yarmuth. Right. This relates to the Crime Victims

2020 Fund. What is the \$16 billion reduction in mandatory budget
2021 authority in the justice function in 2018?

2022 Mr. May. That is simply related to a rescission of
2023 build-up surpluses that are in the Crime Victims Fund that
2024 would likely not be spent anyway. We grabbed those for
2025 deficit reduction purposes.

2026 Mr. Yarmuth. Does that mean that the Appropriations
2027 Committee will have a hole, since they have consistently
2028 used savings in this area to provide an offset in their
2029 bills?

2030 Mr. May. No, because I do not believe that we grabbed
2031 the whole surplus. We can verify, but I think there is
2032 still some surplus funds in that trust fund.

2033 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay.

2034 Mr. May. Or Crime Victims Fund.

2035 Mr. Yarmuth. I yield to Mr. Higgins.

2036 Chairman Black. Mr. Higgins from New York is
2037 recognized.

2038 Mr. Higgins. Thank you, Madam Chair. Sir, you had
2039 indicated that your budget blueprint achieves \$6.5 trillion
2040 in deficit reduction, resulting in a \$9 billion surplus in
2041 the year 2027, approximately 10 years from now.

2042 Mr. May. That is correct.

2043 Mr. Higgins. Okay. How does the budget propose to get
2044 there?

2045 Mr. May. Madam Chairman and Mr. Yarmuth, that is a
2046 great question. It is through the hard work of every member
2047 in our committee. I mean, we have been working two or three
2048 times a week since January on this budget, with the members
2049 of the committee, so it is a series of decisions. It is a
2050 series of compromises. It is a series of change of
2051 economics. It is change of looking at various programs
2052 where we can save money from a lot of reforms --

2053 Mr. Higgins. Sir, I do not question the work ethic.

2054 Mr. May. Okay, I am just saying there is -- it is a
2055 whole series of decisions. It is not a magical --

2056 Mr. Higgins. Right. But projecting budget growth and
2057 thus, in your plan, deficit reduction: what are the
2058 assumptions that go into a very bold statement about
2059 eliminating budgetary deficits entirely in the amount of
2060 \$6.5 trillion in 10 years? What is your economic growth
2061 projection?

2062 Mr. May. The economic growth projection, as I
2063 mentioned in my opening overview, is that we want to improve
2064 upon the CBO projections. CBO is projecting 1.9 percent
2065 real GDP growth averaging over the next 10 years. Our
2066 budget assumes 2.6 percent of real GDP. That generates \$1.5
2067 trillion in deficit reduction.

2068 Mr. Higgins. Okay, I appreciate that. So, in the last
2069 17 years, the American economy has grown on average each

2070 year about 2 percent. You are projecting over the next 10
2071 years that you are going to improve that economic
2072 performance by six-tenths of a percent each year. How do
2073 you do that?

2074 Mr. May. I will let my chief economist, Dr. Morton
2075 answer that question. It is Dr. Morton, is it not?

2076 Mr. Morton. It is. Yes, sir. So, this, as Rick
2077 mentioned at the outset, this is a post-policy budget --

2078 Chairman Black. Is your microphone on, Dr. Morton?

2079 Mr. Morton. Yes, it is.

2080 Mr. May. Move a little closer.

2081 Chairman Black. If you will move it just a little
2082 closer. Thank you.

2083 Mr. Morton. As Rick mentioned, the committee is taking
2084 the approach of a post-policy budget --

2085 Mr. Higgins. What does that mean?

2086 Mr. Morton. What we mean by that is this budget
2087 assumes a series of what we believe are, and expect to be,
2088 progrowth reforms, and that includes the House-passed
2089 version of the House-passed American Healthcare Act, welfare
2090 reform, comprehensive tax reform, the administration's
2091 regulatory reform, and spending-based deficit reduction, the
2092 amount of which you already mentioned. And then, economists
2093 such as John Diamond and Doug Holtz-Eakin -- and he is a
2094 former CBO director who testified before our committee --

2095 they both feel that with policies of this type as a package
2096 --

2097 Mr. Higgins. Would that be in the realm then of what
2098 is referred to or characterized by neo-economists as dynamic
2099 scoring?

2100 Mr. Morton. Well, macroeconomic feedback from stronger
2101 economic growth, and it is in addition to those two
2102 economists in a new paper released yesterday, John Taylor,
2103 John Cogan, Glenn Hubbard, Kevin Warsh, all very
2104 distinguished economists who also feel that this type of
2105 combination of progrowth policies can help us achieve higher
2106 economic growth.

2107 Mr. Higgins. So, it is dynamic scoring? So, what you
2108 are proposing to do is take policy actions today,
2109 theoretically, that will result in future economic growth,
2110 which is the assumption that you base your deficit
2111 elimination on?

2112 Mr. May. Correct. I think it is --

2113 Mr. Higgins. So, it is a latter-day view of supply-
2114 side economics. In other words, a policy whereby
2115 corporations, wealthy individuals, experience tax savings,
2116 and then that money finds its way back into the economy in
2117 new investment in job growth.

2118 Mr. May. Madam Chair and Mr. Yarmuth, Representative,
2119 I am not sure the committee would agree with that

2120 characterization exactly. But I think it is fair to say we
2121 believe, as Andy described, the progrowth policies of our
2122 budget, when implemented, will generate more economic
2123 growth, more job creation, more people will --

2124 Mr. Higgins. So, that by definition is dynamic
2125 scoring. That is --

2126 Mr. May. Well, that is --

2127 Mr. Higgins. I am just trying to get to the point.

2128 Mr. May. I think from a budgetary perspective dynamic
2129 scoring refers to a piece of particular legislation in the
2130 spending or revenue world where it is projected that that
2131 particular legislation has a macroeconomic feedback effect.
2132 We are talking more broadly. It is more than dynamic
2133 scoring. It is more of a progrowth agenda that is designed
2134 to get more people working, more people paying taxes, thus
2135 more revenues are generated to the Federal Government.

2136 Mr. Higgins. But inclusive of dynamic scoring as a
2137 component?

2138 Mr. May. We are budget guys, so we like to look at
2139 things, I guess, from a budgetary perspective rather than
2140 sort of a broader, you know, economic perspective.

2141 Mr. Higgins. Let me just tell you what my concern is.

2142 Mr. Yarmuth. Mr. Higgins, we are moving into different
2143 territory. We are here not to debate philosophy or policy.
2144 We are here just to ask questions of the staff about the

2145 budget in this section of the --

2146 Mr. Higgins. I will close. I respect that, but I
2147 mean, if you are making very ambitious budgetary projections
2148 as it relates to budgetary deficit elimination over a 10-
2149 year period, a deep understanding of the assumptions on
2150 which those ambitious budgetary goals are made, I think, are
2151 very, very relevant here.

2152 Mr. Yarmuth. And we will have the opportunity to
2153 debate that.

2154 Mr. May. If I may, just to clarify, as I said, we have
2155 \$6.5 trillion in deficit education over the 10-year period.
2156 Only \$1.5 trillion of that number is related to this
2157 macroeconomic feedback or more progrowth policies. So, it
2158 is not the whole thing. It is only a portion of it. Thank
2159 you.

2160 Mr. Yarmuth. I am going to rocket-round and then we
2161 will be finished.

2162 Chairman Black. I am sorry.

2163 Mr. Yarmuth. I have got to rocket around and --

2164 Chairman Black. Does the gentleman yield back? Mr.
2165 Higgins, do you yield back?

2166 Mr. Higgins. I do.

2167 Chairman Black. Thank you. I now recognize the
2168 ranking member, Mr. Yarmuth.

2169 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you very much. I have a rocket

2170 round now, just really quick questions.

2171 Mr. May. Simple yes and no answers would be preferred.

2172 Mr. Yarmuth. That is fine. The budget assumes \$700
2173 billion in savings from reducing improper payments across
2174 the government. Where do those savings appear in the
2175 functional distribution?

2176 Mr. May. We put those in 920, I believe. 930, I am
2177 sorry. Function 930.

2178 Mr. Yarmuth. Government-wide savings? So, in the
2179 allowances function there are \$817 billion in mandatory
2180 savings. What do they represent?

2181 Mr. May. Just stand up and say it. Just stand up.

2182 Mr. Watson. It is from the BCA.

2183 Mr. May. Mostly from the --

2184 Ms. Spealman. Oh, mandatory savings.

2185 Mr. May. What it is, is that is a baseline adjustment,
2186 for the most part. CBO will take from on the discretionary
2187 side, they provide increases in discretionary spending that
2188 are over and above the caps. We take that expenditure out
2189 of the baseline, if you will, and most of that is a baseline
2190 adjustment for the BCA.

2191 Mr. Yarmuth. Got you. Let's see. In the
2192 undistributed offsetting receipts function, what does the
2193 rough \$100 billion in savings represent?

2194 Mr. May. You know, Jenna? Go ahead.

2195 Ms. Spealman. I mean, one of the ways that you can get
2196 there is to sell strategic petroleum reserve. That is an
2197 option to get there.

2198 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay.

2199 Mr. May. I think spectrum sales would also be part of
2200 that function as well.

2201 Mr. Yarmuth. Got you. In the special discretionary
2202 category, what does the budget assume for disasters,
2203 emergency funding, and program integrity funding that get
2204 special treatment under the Budget Control Act?

2205 Mr. May. I do not believe we make any specific
2206 assumptions on those numbers. We just maintain sort of the
2207 302(a) allocation numbers that we provide to the
2208 Appropriations Committee.

2209 Mr. Yarmuth. In the table of mandatory assumptions, we
2210 have talked through quite a few functions today, but there
2211 are others with significant reductions relative to CBO's
2212 baseline. In the past, you have shared a table outlining
2213 the pragmatic assumptions you have made for mandatory
2214 programs. Would you do that again?

2215 Mr. May. Be glad to, Mr. Yarmuth.

2216 Mr. Yarmuth. Does the budget assume funding for the
2217 2020 census?

2218 Mr. May. That is a great -- I believe it does. It
2219 does. It does, yes.

2220 Mr. Yarmuth. It does? All right. In the community
2221 and regional development function, does the budget assume
2222 the President's elimination of community development block
2223 grants?

2224 Mr. May. It does. It does. Mr. Yarmuth, as you know,
2225 that proposal has been in, I think, every Republican budget
2226 since I have been here, in the '90s. So --

2227 Ms. Spealman. These are also illustrative options. It
2228 is ultimately up to the committees of jurisdiction to make
2229 these decisions.

2230 Mr. Yarmuth. What else is assumed within the \$7.2
2231 billion cut in 2018 for Function 450?

2232 Ms. Spealman. Okay, once again, there are multiple
2233 options to get there. This is for 450 mandatory or
2234 discretionary? Function 450 mandatory or discretionary?

2235 Mr. Yarmuth. Discretionary.

2236 Ms. Spealman. Discretionary? Okay. One example is to
2237 eliminate FEMA preparedness non-disaster grants. That is an
2238 option that could get you savings of about \$10.9 billion
2239 over 10 years.

2240 Mr. Yarmuth. All right, thank you. On the question of
2241 Federal employees, how much of the savings in the budget are
2242 attributed to cuts to Federal employee compensation and
2243 benefits? The budget includes \$32 billion of reconciliation
2244 savings from oversight and government reform. What policies

2245 does that assume?

2246 Mr. May. Just wait a second. Go ahead. No, go ahead.

2247 Ms. Spealman. Okay, one example. This is for Function
2248 600, which is for Federal retirees. First 50-50 match, we
2249 would move the contribution of first employees to a 50
2250 percent of the normal cost of their defined benefit plan.

2251 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay.

2252 Ms. Spealman. Illustrative option.

2253 Mr. Yarmuth. Almost done. Okay, thank you. Almost
2254 done here. This is related to revenues. You estimate that
2255 your proposals will yield enough additional economic growth
2256 to reduce deficits by \$1.8 trillion and you allocate \$300
2257 billion to offset tax reform. Does this mean you will not
2258 credit any more than that amount to a tax bill as it moves
2259 through the process?

2260 Mr. May. Madam Chairman, Mr. Yarmuth, that is one of
2261 the misnomers, I think, that has been reported, and I am
2262 glad you asked that question. What that \$300 billion
2263 represents is simply this: as you just alluded to, if you
2264 take the 2.6 percent real GDP growth and apply that to the
2265 CBO rules of thumb of projected deficit of reduction in the
2266 future, you are right, it would create \$1.8 trillion in
2267 deficit reduction over the 10-year period. We are only
2268 calculating \$1.5 trillion of that \$1.8 trillion as part of
2269 our \$6.5 trillion deficit reduction.

2270 We are not counting that \$300 billion not to make a
2271 policy decision as to say that the future dynamic effect or
2272 macroeconomic effect of tax reform will be \$300 billion. We
2273 are not saying that. We are just simply saying we wanted to
2274 avoid any sort of appearance that we are double-counting the
2275 macroeconomic effect to help reduce the deficit and also
2276 theoretically be involved in any potential scoring of tax
2277 reform in the future. I mean, the number is \$300 billion
2278 and we arrived at that \$300 billion number simply. We went
2279 back to look at past public and private projections of
2280 comprehensive tax reform and the average seemed to be around
2281 the \$300 billion, so that is why we just backed out the \$300
2282 billion. But in no way does that imply or create any type
2283 of limitation or any type of reserve for macroeconomic
2284 feedback from tax reform.

2285 Mr. Yarmuth. Okay.

2286 Mr. May. Simply because we do not what tax reform is.
2287 Again, contrary to some of the comments earlier, I mean, we
2288 do not know what Ways and Means is going to propose, but we
2289 know they will do something, and there will be, obviously, a
2290 macroeconomic feedback of whatever they propose.

2291 Mr. Yarmuth. Right. Well, then, my last question.
2292 You assume a revenue-neutral tax --

2293 Mr. May. Deficit-neutral.

2294 Mr. Yarmuth. What? Yes.

2295 Mr. May. Deficit-neutral.

2296 Mr. Yarmuth. And since the tax plans that have been
2297 out there have estimated to lose between \$3 trillion and \$7
2298 trillion, does that mean you are not embracing the tax plans
2299 put out by House Republicans and President Trump?

2300 Mr. May. It does not make any value judgment. Again,
2301 that is why I mentioned at the beginning, we are not the
2302 Ways and Means Committee. Believe me, if I would try to
2303 tell the members of this committee what Ways and Means was
2304 doing to do, I would get a phone call, the chairman would
2305 get a phone call, from the Speaker's office; that is not
2306 what we do. So, we do not sort of predict or prescribe to
2307 whatever the Ways and Means Committee. We give them a
2308 number, they have got to be deficit reduction, and it is
2309 purely up to them to decide the policies.

2310 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you very much. And Chairman Black,
2311 Mr. May, and the staff, thank you very much for your
2312 responses and we have no further questions.

2313 Mr. May. And we would be glad to answer any other
2314 questions members --

2315 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The vice
2316 chair, Mr. Rokita, is recognized.

2317 Mr. Rokita. I thank the chairman, and I thank the
2318 staff as well. It has been a pleasure to continue working
2319 with you and you do great work.

2320 Mr. May. Thank you.

2321 Mr. Rokita. I have a series of questions related to a
2322 specific area of the budget and please do not take the
2323 questions as a comment on your work, but I do want to make a
2324 record. Mr. May, you are familiar with H.R. 2997, the 21st
2325 Century Aviation Innovation Reform and Reauthorization Act?

2326 Mr. May. Yes, we are.

2327 Mr. Rokita. And we take that concept in this budget
2328 proposal?

2329 Mr. May. We do not accept that concept at all; any of
2330 our numbers. We do provide a deficit-neutral reserve fund
2331 in the budget enforcement section and that deficit-neutral
2332 reserve fund is there simply to give the House, flexibility
2333 in regarding the budget scorekeeping components of whatever
2334 the House decides to do regarding --

2335 Mr. Rokita. Fair enough. So, you are not providing a
2336 proposal for --

2337 Mr. May. No.

2338 Mr. Rokita. -- H.R. 2997?

2339 Mr. May. We are simply providing a scoring mechanism
2340 or scoring --

2341 Mr. Rokita. So, following up on that, the CBO,
2342 Congressional Budget Office, produced a cost estimate on
2343 HR2997. And also, for the record, I mentioned that this
2344 concept, or at least the budgetary aspects of the concept,

2345 were provided for in last year's budget as well.

2346 Mr. May. Yes.

2347 Mr. Rokita. We are continuing that on, so this is not
2348 necessarily new. But the July 11, 2017, document from CBO,
2349 the cost estimate, are you familiar with that document?

2350 Mr. May. Yes. Yes, we are.

2351 Mr. Rokita. Okay, we will give you a copy here as
2352 well. And without objection, I would like this entered into
2353 the record.

2354 Chairman Black. Without objection.

2355 [The information follows:]

2356 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

2357 Mr. Rokita. Thank you. On page 3 of that CBO cost
2358 estimate, it concludes that direct spending will increasing
2359 by \$90.7 billion over the 10-year window and it concludes
2360 that revenues will increase by \$70 billion, creating a net
2361 deficit over the window of \$20.7 billion, according to CBO.
2362 So, the cost of this concept, according to CBO, is \$20.7
2363 billion in the net over 10 years. Do you agree?

2364 Mr. May. That is a great question.

2365 Mr. Rokita. You are nodding your head, for the record.

2366 Mr. May. It is not a question of whether the Budget
2367 Committee agrees or disagrees. We have been working with
2368 TNI for, actually, several years on this. The scoring of
2369 that is related to CBO's determination that new mandatory
2370 spending will occur. The Budget Committee has been involved
2371 in making a reduction in the discretionary caps in the
2372 future to do the shift from governmental to nongovernmental.

2373 Mr. Rokita. Well, what is CBO's --

2374 Mr. May. CBO is assuming it is continuing to be
2375 governmental. And I do not want to speak for OMB, but OMB
2376 believes it is not a governmental.

2377 Mr. Rokita. My question is not about OMB, but --

2378 Mr. May. That is a good question.

2379 Mr. Rokita. -- under this document and CBO, they are
2380 extrapolating FAA costs of running ATC over 10 years and
2381 that has come out to \$90.7 billion. And in fact, the reason

2382 I ask the concept question is no one -- I am on
2383 Transportation and Infrastructure, that committee, for the
2384 record -- no one is saying in that bill that this is going
2385 to save money. They are giving control over airspace to
2386 interested parties who use the airspace. Eventually, it
2387 will be the airlines. It is not a savings reform. It is a
2388 control reform.

2389 So what CBO did is calculate regular costs over the 10-
2390 year window. That comes out to \$90.7 billion. Then they
2391 took the revenues out to be \$70 billion and they do not
2392 start calculating increased revenues until about halfway
2393 through or so, maybe in year six of the window, because that
2394 new board cannot start collecting the taxes the fees until
2395 year 6.

2396 So, I am sure that is why there is a deficit there
2397 under CBO's logic. The question is, for clarification, you
2398 mentioned in the beginning of your statement a reserve fund.
2399 So, here we have CBO, who is saying \$20.7 billion in
2400 deficit, and this budget document, correct, does not reflect
2401 any deficit. And the reason --

2402 Mr. May. We do not assume any deficits.

2403 Mr. Rokita. And the reason is because of this concept
2404 called a reserve fund?

2405 Mr. May. Yes, that is correct. Again, reserve funds
2406 are included in the budget for budget enforcement

2407 capabilities or provisions and for things that are yet to be
2408 determined. We have not been making any assumptions --

2409 Mr. Rokita. But from a budgetary standpoint, you have
2410 evidence here --

2411 Mr. May. It is purely -- it is policy-neutral because
2412 --

2413 Mr. Rokita. You have evidence here that says \$20.7
2414 billion, and we are going to ignore that in this budget
2415 document and just assume zero.

2416 Mr. May. We are not making any assumptions one way --

2417 Ms. Spealman. This budget does not assume --

2418 Mr. May. Anything.

2419 Ms. Spealman. -- anything.

2420 Mr. May. Regarding the ATC, we do not assume it as a
2421 savings, we do not assume it as a deficit or increasing.

2422 Mr. Rokita. With regard to other concepts in bills not
2423 yet made into law, do you act the same way?

2424 Mr. May. Exact same way. You will notice in here we
2425 have --

2426 Mr. Rokita. So, any new concept that is not law yet
2427 that we are adopting in this budget is treated as a reserve
2428 fund and not accounted for.

2429 Mr. May. Yes. The President, for example, has talked
2430 about his budget regarding an infrastructure new program.

2431 There are a lot of details, a lot of uncertainty as to how

2432 that is going to work, who is going to -- you know, what are
2433 the revenue streams, what are the spending. Is it
2434 discretionary? Is it mandatory spending? We have a reserve
2435 fund for infrastructure as well because we just simply
2436 cannot define something that is not yet sort of kind of
2437 begun --

2438 Mr. Rokita. Okay, I guess my final question -- and
2439 then I will yield back -- is, why is this in the budget
2440 then?

2441 Mr. May. Because the Committee of Jurisdiction has
2442 asked us to provide scorekeeping flexibility. It is for
2443 flexibility purpose.

2444 Mr. Rokita. But why is it even in the budget? I mean,
2445 if you are not going to score, if it is not law --

2446 Mr. May. It is a reserve fund because it just
2447 facilitates the ability of the committee and the chairman of
2448 that committee to try to address the budgetary issues that
2449 are relating to the policy. It is simply a scorekeeping
2450 mechanism. Policy-neutral -- does not make any, you know,
2451 value judgments one way or the other.

2452 Mr. Rokita. Again, like I said starting out, I thank
2453 the staff for their quality work and time. I yield back.

2454 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Are there
2455 any other questions? Seeing none, I recognize the vice
2456 chair, so.

2457 Mr. Rokita. Madam Chairman, I ask unanimous consent
2458 that the following letters supporting the budget resolution
2459 and our efforts today be entered into the record, including
2460 letters from the U.S. Chamber of Commerce and Americans for
2461 Tax Reform.

2462 Chairman Black. Without objection, so ordered.

2463 [The information follows:]

2464 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

2465 Mr. Rokita. Thank you. I yield back.

2466 Chairman Black. If there are no additional questions,
2467 this concludes the staff walkthrough of the chairman's mark.
2468 I thank all the witnesses.

2469 We will now proceed with consideration of the fiscal
2470 year 2018 concurrent resolution on the budget. Under
2471 committee rule No. 9, the committee will consider a document
2472 containing the budget aggregates, functional categories, and
2473 other components of the budget resolution.

2474 Amendments may be offered to this document, subject to
2475 the agreement between the majority and the minority. After
2476 this, the document, has been proved. It will be
2477 incorporated into the text of the concurrent resolution on
2478 the budget for the final vote on whether to report the
2479 measure to the House.

2480 The committee now will proceed to the consideration of
2481 budget aggregates, functional categories, and other
2482 appropriate matters. This text is identical to the tables
2483 distributed to the minority and posted on our website on
2484 Tuesday morning.

2485 The ranking member and I have reached an agreement to
2486 ensure that there is ample opportunity for members to offer
2487 amendments. We will conclude markup no later than midnight.
2488 To accommodate our floor votes and other committee markups,
2489 I ask unanimous consent that the committee roll any requests

2490 for a roll call vote. Without objection, so ordered.

2491 We will debate seven amendments and then hold a series
2492 of roll call votes on each amendment for which a roll call
2493 vote was requested, and that will be for those that are
2494 requested. We will repeat this process three additional
2495 times until all 28 amendments have been considered and voted
2496 on.

2497 Consistent with my agreement with Mr. Yarmuth, I ask
2498 for unanimous consent that, one, the document will be
2499 considered as read and open for an amendment at any point;
2500 the amendments considered by the committee will be those
2501 submitted pursuant to the agreement I made with the ranking
2502 member, Mr. Yarmuth; the amendments be organized into two
2503 tiers, tier one and tier two; the debate time for each tier
2504 one amendment will be limited to 14 minutes and tier two
2505 will be limited to 8 minutes.

2506 Debate time will be evenly divided between the sponsor
2507 of the amendment and the member opposed. The proponent of
2508 the amendment will have 1 minute reserved to close, so they
2509 must reserve that time for their close, because that is
2510 considered in their total. Without objection, so ordered.

2511 [The bill follows:]

2512 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

2513 Chairman Black. We will now proceed to the amendments.
2514 The amendments will be considered in numerical order on the
2515 list on the dais in front of you.

2516 Are there any amendments?

2517 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Yes, Madam Chair, I have an
2518 amendment.

2519 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 1. The clerk
2520 will designate the amendment. The staff will distribute
2521 copies of the amendment. Does everyone have one? Great.
2522 Okay.

2523 The Clerk. Amendment No. 1, offered by Representative
2524 Wasserman Schultz to reject the American Healthcare Act.

2525 [The amendment of Debbie Wasserman Schultz follows:]

2526 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

2527 Chairman Black. Ms. Wasserman Schultz is recognized
2528 for 6 minutes.

2529 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am
2530 offering an amendment on behalf of the sick, our seniors,
2531 children, the disabled, and hardworking Americans all across
2532 the country.

2533 Two nights ago, Senate Republicans dealt a death blow,
2534 thankfully, to the cruel TrumpCare plan to take healthcare
2535 away from millions of Americans, yet somehow the Republican
2536 budget still includes the insidious repeal of the Affordable
2537 Care Act. My amendment would change that and would force my
2538 colleagues to face the reality that repeal of the ACA simply
2539 is not going to happen.

2540 It is time for this chamber to say, once and for all,
2541 we will not go back to the days when health insurance
2542 companies could discriminate against people with preexisting
2543 conditions. We will not go back to a time when insurance
2544 companies could put annual and lifetime caps on the amount
2545 of care a sick person can receive. And we will not bring
2546 back out-of-pocket costs for many preventative healthcare
2547 services or strip the ability of young adults to stay on
2548 their parents' insurance until they are 26.

2549 To do otherwise would be absolutely unconscionable. It
2550 is time for the President, who warned us all that we would
2551 win so much that we would get tired of winning, to

2552 acknowledge that this bill was not a winner and that the
2553 American people sent us that strong message. It is time for
2554 Republicans in this Congress to drop their plans to give
2555 mass tax cuts to completely gut Medicaid and to give out tax
2556 breaks to the wealthiest and the most fortunate.

2557 Instead, my Republican colleagues should work with us
2558 to update and improve the Affordable Care Act so we can come
2559 together and truly make sure that we expand, not decrease,
2560 access to quality, affordable health care. We are ready to
2561 get to work on behalf of the American people.

2562 Let me state this very clearly. Every American
2563 deserves access to quality, affordable health care. Now
2564 that Donald Trump and his friends in Congress have been
2565 forced to stop this cruelty, I hope they will work with us
2566 towards achieving this goal and I yield 1 minute to Mr.
2567 Jeffries.

2568 Mr. Jeffries. I thank the distinguished gentlelady
2569 from Florida. Under TrumpCare, everyday Americans will pay
2570 more and get less. TrumpCare will increase costs, increase
2571 copays, increase premiums, and increase deductibles. It
2572 will deprive 23 million Americans of affordable healthcare
2573 coverage. TrumpCare will impose a draconian age tax on
2574 people between the ages of 50 and 64, causing them to have
2575 to pay up to five times more, and it will strip people of
2576 protection from preexisting conditions. The Affordable

2577 Care Act has worked for the American people. We should
2578 focus on strengthening it, not destroying it, which is why I
2579 support this amendment.

2580 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Ms. Chairman. I
2581 yield 1 minute to Congresswoman DelBene.

2582 Ms. DelBene. Thank you very much. I am pleased to
2583 support Ms. Wasserman Schultz's amendment. It is long past
2584 time for the other side of the aisle to drop the threat of
2585 repeal and start working with Democrats on solutions to give
2586 people better coverage at lower costs.

2587 The dangerous Republican healthcare repeal which is
2588 included in this budget would make people pay more for less
2589 and devastate middle-class families across the country. It
2590 would move our country's healthcare system backward, leave
2591 tens of millions without coverage, and saddle millions more
2592 with skyrocketing costs. Restoring annual and lifetime caps
2593 on care, decimating Medicaid, and gutting protections for
2594 preexisting conditions is not the way forward. We can and
2595 we must do better. Let's work together to strengthen our
2596 healthcare system. Let's reduce costs for small businesses,
2597 expand access to care in rural communities, and lower the
2598 cost of prescription drugs. I strongly urge my colleagues
2599 to vote yet on this amendment.

2600 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Ms. DelBene. I have
2601 shared many times and I will share again the experience that

2602 I went through when I spent a year battling breast cancer.
2603 I was diagnosed at 41 years old. On one day, I was the
2604 picture of health. The next day, I was a cancer patient.
2605 Getting diagnosed with cancer is like getting hit with an
2606 anvil or, frankly, getting diagnosed with any serious, life-
2607 threatening illness is devastating.

2608 What is also devastating is the realization that you
2609 not only had, before the Affordable Care Act, to fight for
2610 your life, but before the Affordable Care Act, you had to
2611 fight your insurance company to make sure that you got the
2612 coverage that you had paid for.

2613 Too many stories that I have heard where women
2614 struggling with breast cancer had to choose, before the
2615 Affordable Care Act, to either get the chemo or the
2616 radiation because they could not afford the copays and
2617 deductibles on both. That is a choice that no one should
2618 have to face. And now that we have the Affordable Care Act
2619 as the law of the land, no one does have to face that.

2620 The language in this legislation and this budget would
2621 take us back to the nightmarish days that too many people,
2622 the 129 million Americans that live with a preexisting
2623 condition in this country, have to live with every single
2624 day.

2625 Madame Chair, the American people have sent a strong
2626 message that they believe healthcare should be a right for

2627 all, not a privilege enjoyed only by the wealthy few. Now
2628 that the efforts to repeal the Affordable Care Act have come
2629 to an end, once and for all, it is time for Republicans to
2630 work with Democrats in an effort to update and improve it,
2631 not scuttle it. Thank you and I urge a yes vote on my
2632 amendment and I yield back.

2633 Chairman Black. I claim time in opposition to this
2634 amendment. I recognize myself for 7 minutes.

2635 You know, what Democrats will not talk about is how
2636 ObamaCare is harming millions of individuals. Healthcare
2637 costs are skyrocketing. We also see patients' choices are
2638 dwindling. As a matter of fact, in my State of Tennessee,
2639 premiums for those that are on the exchange have risen by 65
2640 percent, and in some places in this country they have risen
2641 by over 100 percent.

2642 We also see that there are dwindling choices. There
2643 are markets in my own State of Tennessee where there is not
2644 even a single provider left to provide insurance for people
2645 that seek care underneath ObamaCare, and millions are forced
2646 to pay a penalty. And you know, with that penalty, many
2647 times they do not get anything, so they are paying for
2648 nothing.

2649 Americans have health insurance on paper many times,
2650 but they really do not have access to affordable care and
2651 that is because they may get help with their premiums, but

2652 the deductibles are so high, they cannot afford the
2653 deductibles. Who in my State of Tennessee that is making
2654 \$35,000 to \$40,000 a year can afford a deductible of \$8,000
2655 to \$10,000? And that is where they are right now. So, if
2656 the program were working we would not see these kinds of
2657 things that are happening. There would be more access to
2658 care.

2659 So, instead of expanding the number of individuals with
2660 health insurance by making coverage more affordable,
2661 ObamaCare actually penalizes Americans who do not buy
2662 healthcare plans, often because they cannot afford to, and
2663 that meets the standards of what the Washington bureaucrats
2664 have set up. So, let's take a look at this.

2665 According to the IRS, in 2016, 6.5 million Americans
2666 paid \$3 billion for a penalty and did not receive any care
2667 for that. Three billion dollars and received no care. And
2668 more than 12.7 million claimed an exemption from the
2669 penalty. That means they did not feel that what they could
2670 buy was even worth it. That is roughly 20 million people
2671 who decided that ObamaCare is not worth the trouble or the
2672 price.

2673 So, the plan passed by the House moves from the top-
2674 down government mandate that forces individuals into health
2675 care that they do not want, to a plan that gives them a
2676 choice, something that they decide that they want, a

2677 coverage that they can afford, and a plan that best suits
2678 their needs.

2679 I would like to now yield 2 minutes to the gentleman
2680 from Ohio, Mr. Johnson.

2681 Mr. Johnson. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I can
2682 certainly empathize with my colleague, Ms. Wasserman
2683 Schultz, on her health condition. I too am a cancer
2684 survivor. My mother is, my brother is, and I have got
2685 thousands and thousands of people in my district that are as
2686 well.

2687 Unfortunately, many of those people have been the
2688 victim of a failed law that is no longer protecting them. I
2689 know we talk about coverage for preexisting conditions
2690 often, but I wonder what the people in the 18 counties in
2691 Ohio who have been informed that Anthem is pulling out and
2692 that they will have no choice of an insurance carrier on the
2693 exchange, I wonder what those people are going to do that
2694 have preexisting conditions when they do not have a choice
2695 for a healthcare provider.

2696 The news just continues to get more dire, it seems
2697 like, day to day, and it is important that we as lawmakers
2698 take the important steps to repeal and replace this failing
2699 law with one that is going to work for all Americans. I can
2700 tell you that the CBO confirms, as it pertains to the
2701 American Health Care Act, most of the drop-in coverage is

2702 attributed to the repeal of the individual mandate, and
2703 those millions of people that are not going to choose to buy
2704 a product that they do not want, that they do not need, and
2705 that they might not be able to afford.

2706 The House passed the American Health Care Act on May 4
2707 and this is the official position of the House at this time
2708 regarding ObamaCare repeal-and-replace efforts, and our
2709 budget, the budget that we are working on today, reflects
2710 that.

2711 So, I join Chairwoman Black to oppose this amendment
2712 and remember that, ultimately, what we are trying to do and
2713 what we did with the American Health Care Act -- and our
2714 budget reflects that -- is to give the American people more
2715 choice to higher quality access to affordable health care.

2716 There is a big difference between coverage and access.
2717 Because I have heard it mentioned already; when you have got
2718 an \$18,000-a-year premium and a \$9,000-a-year deductible,
2719 that is \$27,000 out of a couple's pocket before the
2720 insurance pays a dime.

2721 Chairman Black. Yes.

2722 Mr. Johnson. That is unacceptable and that is what we
2723 are trying to rectify. So, I urge a no vote on this
2724 amendment, Madam Chair, and I yield back.

2725 Chairman Black. I yield the balance of my time to the
2726 gentleman from Georgia, Mr. Ferguson.

2727 Mr. Ferguson. Thank you, Chairwoman Black. All too
2728 often, we are hearing stories back home about what the
2729 Affordable Care Act is doing to middle-class families and I
2730 am going to share with you one quick example.

2731 I have a friend of mine back home who is a consultant,
2732 his wife is an educator, and they now spend two-thirds --
2733 two-thirds -- of her salary on health insurance. They pay
2734 more for health insurance than they do their house. And
2735 this is not a wealthy couple. This is a middle-class
2736 couple. He is an entrepreneur. I hear this from every
2737 small business owner. I hear this across the board.

2738 We have got to keep fighting to repeal the Affordable
2739 Care Act and we have got to make sure that we do not
2740 continue to grow the mandatory spending in this Nation in an
2741 unchecked manner. We have to reel that in. We have to be
2742 fiscally responsible. If not, we will continue to destroy
2743 middle-class families and their incomes because of this law.
2744 Most importantly, we will continue to put the most
2745 vulnerable in our Nation at risk and that is something that
2746 we have to recognize because fiscal calamity puts those most
2747 vulnerable in the most precarious positions. I yield back.

2748 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Ms.
2749 Wasserman Schultz, you are recognized for 1 minute to close.

2750 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Madam Chair. I
2751 would like to yield my 1 minute to Ms. Jayapal from

2752 Washington.

2753 Ms. Jayapal. I thank Congresswoman Wasserman Schultz
2754 so much for yielding, and I just want to say how strongly I
2755 support this amendment. We have already seen that the
2756 American people have rejected TrumpCare. They have rejected
2757 attempts at health care that do not actually provide better
2758 quality affordable care for millions of Americans across the
2759 country.

2760 That is why the bill failed in the Senate. That is why
2761 Republicans in the Senate would not vote for this bill,
2762 because if we are going to take away benefits that Americans
2763 need -- preexisting conditions, the ability for seniors to
2764 be in nursing homes, the ability for people to get Medicaid
2765 -- then the American people do not want it, regardless of
2766 whether you are a Republican or a Democrat, regardless of
2767 whether you live in a red State or a blue State.

2768 So, this amendment is a commonsense amendment that
2769 reflects the will of the American people to get affordable
2770 and quality health care. And I hope that we will all pass
2771 this amendment so that we can serve the American people. I
2772 yield back.

2773 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired. The
2774 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms.
2775 Wasserman Schultz.

2776 All those in favor, say aye.

2777 All those opposed, no.

2778 A recorded vote is requested and pursuant to our
2779 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded
2780 vote until we have finished debate on this batch of seven
2781 amendments.

2782 Are there other amendments?

2783 Ms. Jackson Lee. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at
2784 the desk.

2785 Chairman Black. What is the number on your amendment?

2786 Ms. Jackson Lee. No. 2, Madam Chair.

2787 Chairman Black. Okay, thank you. This is amendment
2788 No. 2 and the clerk will designate the amendment. The staff
2789 will distribute copies of the amendment.

2790 The Clerk. Amendment No. 2, offered by Representative
2791 Jackson Lee, related to Medicaid.

2792 [The amendment of Sheila Jackson Lee follows:]

2793 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

2794 Chairman Black. Ms. Jackson Lee, you are recognized
2795 for 6 minutes. You are recognized for 6 minutes and then 1
2796 minute to close.

2797 Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you so very much. Let me thank
2798 the chair and the ranking member. And I urge adoption of
2799 the Jackson Lee amendment, which restores Federal funding to
2800 Medicaid.

2801 Tragically, a vote is pending in the United States
2802 Senate to repeal, not replace, but to repeal the healthcare
2803 lifeline of the American people. I would argue, as a good
2804 Boy Scout and Girl Scout would not do, this is like throwing
2805 gasoline on a campfire in the forest and literally burning
2806 the entire forest down. This will provide major upheaval to
2807 the American people and the lifelines that they expect to
2808 provide them with good health care will be absolutely gone.

2809 Today, Medicaid provides coverage to more than 74
2810 million Americans, including children, pregnant women,
2811 seniors. And in addition to doctor and hospital visits,
2812 Medicare covers long-term services like nursing homes and
2813 community-based services. Number 2 on the Jackson Lee
2814 amendment rejects cuts and policies harmful to vulnerable
2815 populations.

2816 Reason for supporting the amendment: The Republican
2817 budget reflects the AHCA, which drains roughly \$1 trillion
2818 from Medicaid over 10 years. Two policies drive this

2819 massive funding cut, ending ACA's Medicaid expansion and
2820 capping the Federal payments and cutting \$774 billion from
2821 Medicaid just to do tax cuts for the rich.

2822 The Jackson Lee amendment should be passed because it
2823 rejects converting Medicaid to a per-capita block grant.
2824 Listen to this story: 911 dollars were supposed to be used
2825 on a phone system; taxation to use for 911 resources. They
2826 were sent to the State. The State did not use those dollars
2827 to improve our 911 call system. They used it for other
2828 things. That is what block grants and caps will be doing.
2829 The States will use the money for other things.

2830 Number 4 reason to support the amendment: It rejects
2831 ending the Medicaid expansion under the ACA. And a young
2832 lady by the name of Brittany, who lives with autism, who
2833 depends wholly on the idea of Medicaid to give her quality
2834 of so she can buy food and have housing; that will be dashed
2835 because of the bill that is underlying the budget that cuts
2836 so much for the rich.

2837 The Jackson Lee amendment rejects adding a work
2838 requirement. Adding a work requirement to Medicaid would
2839 add a barrier to healthcare coverage. It is a myth to say
2840 that able-bodied persons are on Medicaid. What about
2841 Matthew, who has a chronic illness that cost him \$73,000 in
2842 the last 6 months and \$700,000 over a 2-year period? A
2843 young man who looks able-bodied, but is suffering from

2844 chronic illness. This is what the cutting of Medicaid will
2845 do to all.

2846 And what about the idea of those preemie babies or
2847 maternal health that will be voided, one with the repeal,
2848 one with the proposal that was represented in this room as
2849 TrumpCare, of which the President of the United States
2850 himself said that the House bill was mean. The Jackson Lee
2851 amendment provides the opportunity to balance the budget by
2852 reducing tax expenditures for the top 1 percent of income-
2853 earners. That is how we pay for the Jackson Lee amendment.

2854 Cancel the tax break for corporate jets. Restrict
2855 deductions for egregious CEO bonuses when employees do not
2856 get a raise. Also, ask that employees get raises from
2857 corporate America that are doing quite well. Wages are not
2858 stagnant. Corporations can make effective, humanitarian
2859 decisions that impact their stockholders as well. Let
2860 Americans work for good salaries. Pay them their good
2861 salaries. Close loopholes in the United States
2862 international corporate tax system that encourages companies
2863 to invert and ship jobs and profits overseas. Close the
2864 carried interest loophole taxing hedge fund managers. Talk
2865 to the hedge fund persons.

2866 This is a way to create dialogue to provide an option
2867 to the draconian budget that wants to slash and burn and
2868 follow the Senate's pathway of repealing -- repealing --

2869 health care as a lifeline for the American people. I would
2870 ask that my colleagues support the Jackson Lee amendment and
2871 I would like to reserve my time.

2872 Chairman Black. Is there a member that would claim
2873 time in opposition to this amendment?

2874 Ms. Jackson Lee. I would like to yield to the
2875 gentlelady from Washington State, Ms. Jayapal.

2876 Chairman Black. I apologize, Ms. Jackson Lee. You do
2877 still have time. I apologize.

2878 Ms. Jackson Lee. I do.

2879 Chairman Black. Ms. Jayapal, you are recognized.

2880 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Madam Chair, and thank you for
2881 yielding. I rise in strong support of this amendment.

2882 Of the many cruel assumptions that this budget
2883 resolution is based on, I think the most cruel is counting
2884 on TrumpCare to gut Medicaid for millions of Americans
2885 across the country while transferring nearly a trillion
2886 dollars in tax cuts to the wealthy and corporations.

2887 I think we have heard from Republican governors and
2888 Republican senators about the need for this incredible
2889 program. Two-thirds of all seniors in our country depend on
2890 Medicaid funding and 60 percent of all kids with
2891 disabilities actually rely on Medicaid coverage. What is
2892 more, 11 million Americans across 31 States have benefited
2893 from Medicaid expansion under the Affordable Care Act.

2894 Madam Chair, nearly have of the majority side of this
2895 committee comes from a State that has accepted Medicaid
2896 expansion. In my home State of Washington, under this
2897 budget resolution, 613,000 residents will lose Medicaid
2898 coverage. It is simply unacceptable and I urge our
2899 colleagues to adopt this amendment and make sure that we
2900 protect our Medicaid recipients across the country. I yield
2901 back.

2902 Ms. Jackson Lee. Madam Chair, if I may take the
2903 remaining few seconds to just hold up and point to someone's
2904 neighbor, someone's mother, someone's friend, a senior
2905 citizen who will be devastated by this budget and the loss
2906 of dollars to Medicaid: the vulnerable children, working
2907 families, and senior citizens in nursing homes --

2908 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired.

2909 Ms. Jackson Lee. This is what is being done. I ask
2910 for the support of the Jackson Lee amendment. I yield back.

2911 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired. Is
2912 there a member who would like to claim time in opposition to
2913 the amendment?

2914 Mr. Rokita. Madam Chairman, I claim time.

2915 Chairman Black. The gentleman is recognized for 7
2916 minutes.

2917 Mr. Rokita. I thank the chairman. The gentlelady just
2918 used the term "vulnerable," and in fact, that is the term

2919 used in the title of the amendment, and that is exactly what
2920 Medicaid is supposed to be, is health care for the most
2921 vulnerable, for our poor. It has become not that, and that
2922 is what our budget aims to correct.

2923 Medicaid was created in 1965 as an open-ended
2924 entitlement program and it has not been changed since. Now,
2925 there is no one here who thinks that how things were done in
2926 1965 or how we lived in 1965 is anywhere related, hardly, to
2927 how we operate today. Medicaid does not work for States who
2928 administer it.

2929 In fact, every one of our 50 States has some sort of
2930 waiver for the Medicaid program that the gentlelady is
2931 talking about. If every State has some kind of waiver, that
2932 is definition that does not work. We ought to be block-
2933 granting these funds to the States and let them decide who
2934 is poor, who really needs the help, what kind of help they
2935 need, and how they should best get it.

2936 Why are we so arrogant -- some of us up here in
2937 Washington -- to think that we know what is best for
2938 everybody? If you truly care about the most vulnerable,
2939 then you would care about making sure there is no waste,
2940 fraud, and abuse in the system so that those funds can get
2941 to the most vulnerable. The Government Accountability
2942 Office has designated the Medicaid program that the
2943 gentlelady defends as a "high-risk" program and they have

2944 been doing it since 2003.

2945 If Medicaid remains on its current trajectory, the
2946 program's total spending will cost \$1 trillion every year.
2947 We should be measuring our success by how many people do not
2948 need Medicaid anymore, how many people we can successfully
2949 get off the program, not how many more people we can trap
2950 inside it not working. With that, I would like to yield 2
2951 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas, Mr. Westerman.

2952 Mr. Westerman. I thank the gentleman from Indiana.
2953 And Madam Chair, as we look at this issue with Medicaid, I
2954 agree with the comments from my colleague, that it is for
2955 the most vulnerable, but if we take a step back and look at
2956 what the Affordable Care Act did for Medicaid, it expanded
2957 Medicaid services not for the blind, the disabled, the
2958 elderly; it expanded and provided free health care for 18-
2959 to-64-year-olds who were able-bodied, working-age adults who
2960 simply fell below an income threshold. Some of these people
2961 actually need help, but they also need help getting back
2962 into the job market.

2963 We have in this budget resolution to require work
2964 requirements for able-bodied, working-age adults in that
2965 Medicaid expansion population, not for aged, blind, or
2966 disabled. This is a program that is modeled after what
2967 President Clinton signed into law, similar for the TANF
2968 program. If we truly want to help Americans, we will help

2969 them to get jobs that are better-paying.

2970 We see examples where Maine instituted welfare reforms
2971 that required work requirements in 2014, and within a year
2972 the adults that had these work requirements experienced 114
2973 percent income rise. That is on average. Kansas
2974 experienced similar results. Incomes rose, on average, 127
2975 percent in the first year.

2976 We have a labor problem across our country. If we look
2977 in my home State, we have got record low unemployment. Even
2978 with record low unemployment, we have got less people
2979 employed than we had 8 years ago.

2980 The labor participation rate has dropped all across the
2981 country. Employers want to expand. The jobs are out there.
2982 We just have to get people motivated to work and we can use
2983 these programs, with sensible work requirements, to get
2984 people back in the job market. With that, I yield back.

2985 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. I recognize the
2986 gentleman from Florida, Mr. Gaetz, for 2 minutes.

2987 Mr. Gaetz. I thank the gentleman for yielding and it
2988 is not every day that the sponsor of this amendment finds
2989 herself at odds with former President Clinton, but in fact,
2990 there are two circumstances in which that is the case today.
2991 It was, of course, former President Clinton who called
2992 ObamaCare crazy, and I think he was right. This amendment
2993 would restore features of ObamaCare.

2994 Moreover, presumably, the gentlelady would have us
2995 believe that an open-ended, uncapped Medicaid system is what
2996 is best for the vulnerable. Again, former President Clinton
2997 disagrees, having stated, and I quote, "A per-capita cap
2998 approach guarantees that the elderly, disabled, and pregnant
2999 women, and children meeting certain criteria will continue
3000 to be eligible for health benefits." The trust is that the
3001 cruelty in health care is telling people that they have
3002 coverage and then not providing them access to a physician.

3003 Now, in America we have got one in every four Americans
3004 on Medicaid. It is totally unsustainable. In States that
3005 have embraced ObamaCare, it is one out of every three that
3006 are on Medicaid. That means a hardworking American has got
3007 to pay for the whole cost of their own health care and then
3008 half of the cost of somebody else's. Medicaid is important
3009 for the vulnerable, for the disabled, for seniors, for
3010 children, and we do nothing for the vulnerable when we jam
3011 more people into a system that is already failing them. And
3012 so, that is why I support the Republican approach in this
3013 budget.

3014 Let's go ahead and accept the fact that Washington has
3015 utterly failed at managing the Medicaid program.
3016 Uncontrolled costs, no evidence of better healthcare
3017 outcomes. Meanwhile, our States are doing better. All
3018 across this country, when States are able to innovate they

3019 are showing better healthcare outcomes, lower costs, and
3020 more access, and that is why I strongly support block-
3021 granting Medicaid so that we can truly have a Federalist
3022 system where the 50 laboratories of democracy that we have,
3023 have the opportunity to try different things, to succeed,
3024 and to actually deliver a higher quality healthcare product
3025 to the people of their States. That is the Federalism that
3026 our founders promised and it is the very principles that the
3027 Republicans on this committee will continue to defend. I
3028 yield back.

3029 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman and I urge my
3030 colleagues to vote no on this amendment.

3031 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The
3032 gentlelady, Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee, is recognized for 1
3033 minute to close.

3034 Ms. Jackson Lee. I heard this morning that a number of
3035 members said, "I will keep an open mind," and I believe
3036 that, though intentions are well, the words are misguided.
3037 States are not responsibly handling health care. They are
3038 begging for help, as the Governors who met were begging for
3039 help. The vulnerable will be harmed by the underlying
3040 budget and as I indicated, this person -- young babies and
3041 senior citizens -- will be harmed.

3042 As the gentleman said, with certain rules. Let me be
3043 very clear to the American people. Certain rules will mean

3044 that you will not have Medicaid for the vulnerable, senior
3045 citizens who are in nursing homes, young mothers, those who
3046 have chronic illnesses, like young Brittany with autism.
3047 You will not have health care. You will have a State that
3048 will take block-granted Medicaid dollars and use them for --
3049 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired.
3050 Ms. Jackson Lee. -- for something else. I believe the
3051 Jackson Lee amendment can be fiscally responsible, but it
3052 will save lives and I ask for the support of the Jackson Lee
3053 amendment.
3054 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired. The
3055 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms.
3056 Jackson Lee.
3057 All those in favor, say aye.
3058 All those oppose, no.
3059 The noes have it.
3060 A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to the
3061 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded
3062 vote until we have finished debating this batch of seven
3063 amendments.
3064 Are there other amendments?
3065 Mr. Boyle. Yes. Madam Chair, I have an amendment I
3066 would like to offer.
3067 Chairman Black. The amendment number is No. 3. The
3068 clerk will designate the amendment. The staff will

3069 distribute copies of the amendment.

3070 The Clerk. Amendment No. 3, offered by Representative
3071 Boyle, to insert a policy statement on preventing tax
3072 increases on low-income and middle-class families.

3073 [The amendment of Brendan Boyle follows:]

3074 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

3075 Chairman Black. Mr. Boyle is recognized for 6 minutes.

3076 Mr. Boyle. Thank you, Madam Chair. The goal of this
3077 amendment is very straightforward. This amendment opposes
3078 any tax increase on middle-class or low-income families,
3079 including any reduction in refundable tax credits.

3080 Madam Chair, I would hope that we can actually have
3081 some bipartisan support for this amendment because
3082 certainly, probably all members of this committee at one
3083 point or another have claimed to oppose tax increases on
3084 middle-class and low-income families. So, let me list a few
3085 reasons why I would ask all members to support this
3086 amendment.

3087 First, middle-class and low-income families have seen
3088 their wages stagnating for decades. For over 35 years,
3089 middle-income and low-income families have seen little if
3090 any increase in their economic well-being. This has been a
3091 problem through both Democratic and Republican
3092 administrations. By almost any measure, even as the wealthy
3093 are getting richer and richer, wealthier than at any point
3094 in American history, most everyone else is being left
3095 behind.

3096 For example, for 1979 to 2013, real after-tax income
3097 for the wealthiest 1 percent grew by about 200 percent, but
3098 for those in the bottom 80 percent, it grew just over 40
3099 percent. This understates the stagnation for many Americans

3100 as households in the lower half of the income scale have
3101 seen no real increase in their average income for 35 years.
3102 The last thing these families need is a tax increase. While
3103 these families have seen their wages stagnate, they are
3104 still struggling with growing costs in childcare, housing,
3105 and education. The very last thing they need to see on top
3106 of all of this is lower take-home pay through higher taxes.

3107 The Trump campaign tax plan would raise taxes on
3108 millions of low-income and middle-class families. During
3109 the 2016 presidential campaign, then-candidate Trump
3110 released a tax plan that included eliminating the personal
3111 exemption and eliminating the head-of-household filing
3112 status. An analysis found that even in combination with
3113 changes to the standard deduction, repealing these two
3114 provisions would raise taxes on more than 8 million
3115 families. That encompasses more than 26 million Americans.

3116 By repealing the personal exemption, the Trump plan
3117 would raise taxes on many families that have more than two
3118 children, and by repealing the head-of-household filing
3119 status, the Trump tax plan would raise taxes on families
3120 that are led by a single parent. Even accounting for other
3121 changes, the result was that large or single-parent families
3122 making low or middle incomes would actually see their taxes
3123 increase even as millionaires and billionaires would be
3124 getting massive tax cuts.

3125 I also want to again remind this committee what I
3126 mentioned a few hours ago in my opening statement. The cuts
3127 to refundable tax credits will raise taxes on low-income
3128 families. The President's budget cuts the child tax credit
3129 and the earned income tax credit by a combined \$40 billion
3130 by changing the requirements on who is eligible. So, those
3131 are millions of families, again, that are working, that
3132 would be paying higher taxes as a result of this budget.

3133 So, please join with me in sending a large, loud,
3134 bipartisan signal that we will not accept higher taxes on
3135 the working poor and the middle class, and please support me
3136 in the amendment. And with that, I would reserve for my
3137 close.

3138 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Is there a
3139 member who would like to claim time in opposition to this
3140 amendment?

3141 Mr. Palmer. I would like to claim time, Madam
3142 Chairman.

3143 Chairman Black. The gentleman, Mr. Palmer, is
3144 recognized for 7 minutes.

3145 Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I appreciate
3146 the passionate support that the gentleman from Pennsylvania,
3147 my friend, offers for this amendment. It is unfortunate
3148 that most of it is inaccurate.

3149 This amendment suggests that Republicans would raise

3150 taxes on families and single-parent households. This is
3151 disingenuous and false. The budget calls for comprehensive
3152 tax reform and progrowth policies that would benefit all
3153 Americans. In regard to the earned income tax issue that he
3154 raises, our budget would reduce improper payments out of the
3155 earned income tax credit by \$40 billion. He calls that a
3156 cut of benefits.

3157 I have a copy of the GAO report, which we had a hearing
3158 with Comptroller General Gene Dodaro. He pointed out that
3159 the earned income tax credit -- the improper payments was
3160 \$16.8 billion in 2016 alone.

3161 So, basically, we are trying to cut one-fourth of the
3162 improper payments through fraud by simply requiring that
3163 individuals who get the earned income tax credit show proof
3164 that they are eligible by submitting the Social Security
3165 Number for their children. By the way, the earned income
3166 tax credit has a 24 percent error rate.

3167 So, these are issues that we are trying to address. In
3168 a situation where the Federal Government is operating at a
3169 deficit, we are having to borrow money to send out
3170 fraudulent payments and pay interest on fraudulent payments,
3171 so I do not think it is improper for this committee to
3172 pursue necessary measures to reduce that.

3173 At this point, I would like to yield 2 minutes to my
3174 friend, Jason Lewis, the gentleman from Minnesota.

3175 Mr. Lewis. I would thank the gentleman. Let me just
3176 assure my colleagues on the other side that no one on this
3177 side wants to raise taxes on anybody. That is the whole
3178 point of this exercise. And this rather strange amendment
3179 assumes that that is the case, and yet our budget resolution
3180 and the tax reforms call for increasing the standard
3181 deduction from \$6,300 to \$12,000 for individuals and \$12,600
3182 to \$24,000 for married couples filing jointly. So, that is
3183 going to lower the rates on everyone, remove a whole lot of
3184 people from the code, and simplify the code.

3185 Now, we can stick with the same, if we want. We can
3186 continue down this misguided path of high marginal tax rates
3187 for some folks, but give the loopholes to the politically
3188 connected. We think better having much, much lower rates
3189 for more people, but everybody being treated the same way.

3190 Now, as to taxes, fairness, and economic growth, let me
3191 remind my colleagues -- or, I should say, let me just
3192 reiterate -- that some of my colleagues seem to be surprised
3193 that tax reductions are actually going to those folks who
3194 have had their taxes raised under the Affordable Care Act,
3195 under the last administration. So, undoing those tax hikes
3196 is all of a sudden this great giveaway.

3197 It was not a giveaway when John F. Kennedy slashed the
3198 top marginal rates in the early 1960s, leading to a decade
3199 of economic growth. It was not a giveaway when Bill Clinton

3200 slashed the capital gains taxes and pushed for welfare
3201 reform. That was not a giveaway because those Democrats
3202 were not plagued by partisanship. They saw an economy
3203 growing that benefits everybody.

3204 Growth is not a function of more government spending.
3205 If it were, we would be growing by gangbusters. It is a
3206 function of risk, and the high tax rates that my colleagues
3207 on the other side constantly promote discourage risk. I
3208 would urge my colleagues to vote no and I yield back.

3209 Mr. Palmer. I thank the gentleman. I now recognize
3210 the gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Renacci, for 2 minutes.

3211 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Mr. Palmer, and I would also
3212 agree the gentleman from Pennsylvania has used ideas coming
3213 out of the Trump budget, not the budget that is in front of
3214 us, and I think that is important. I am a member of the
3215 Ways and Means Committee and this budget really says that we
3216 are supposed to enact progrowth, simplified tax reform;
3217 deficit-neutral, budget-neutral. It does not talk about
3218 many of the issues that the gentleman from Pennsylvania is
3219 talking about and I understand his concerns. But as a
3220 CPA and someone who has spent nearly 30 years in the
3221 business world, creating more than a thousand jobs, I do
3222 know how complicated our tax code. That is why it is
3223 important that Congress does work closely with the White
3224 House to enact simplified, progrowth tax reform.

3225 Simplifying our tax code would also allow hardworking
3226 Americans that Congressman Boyle was talking about to keep
3227 more of their hard-earned money with them instead of having
3228 to spend it on compliance. We should be striving for that,
3229 to help all Americans by spurring economic growth and
3230 creating more job opportunities.

3231 I suggest that we look at the simplification and I know
3232 in the Ways and Means committee we will be. I mean, just
3233 some of the issues -- we have a tax code that is more than
3234 100 pages of IRS instructions to explain tax benefits
3235 related to higher education, 218 words in the tax code to
3236 define what "married" means, and more than 80 line items on
3237 Form 1040. We should be working together, as this budget
3238 says, for simplified, progrowth tax reform. And I urge a no
3239 vote on this amendment.

3240 Mr. Palmer. I thank the gentleman. I just want to
3241 point out, on the wage stagnation, the Bureau of Labor
3242 Statistics puts out a category it calls the Labor
3243 Productivity and Cost. That includes total compensation.
3244 And since 1973, total compensation, as measured by the
3245 Bureau of Labor Statistics, has actually gone up 30 percent.
3246 When employers compensate employees, they include the cost
3247 of things like health care. And since 2009, that has
3248 increased from \$590 per employee to \$1,121, plus another
3249 \$458 per month that employees are identifying that they are

3250 having to provide in compensation for healthcare-related
3251 costs.

3252 The last thing I want to point out, Madam Chairman, is
3253 in 1967, households earning an annual income of \$50,000
3254 constituted 58.2 percent of all Americans. By the end of
3255 2014, that fell to 46.8 percent. While only 8.1 percent of
3256 American households in 1967 earned \$100,000, by 2014 that
3257 had gone up to 24.7 percent. Rather than a collapsing
3258 middle class, I think what we have is a growing upper-middle
3259 class.

3260 And the key that I want to get across here is that we
3261 can argue over these issues, but we need to argue from
3262 facts, and the facts are that total compensation being
3263 provided by businesses to employees has actually gone up. I
3264 yield back and I urge my colleagues to vote no.

3265 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Boyle
3266 is recognized for 1 minute to close.

3267 Mr. Boyle. Thank you, Madam Chair, and I thank the
3268 former football star from Alabama for his comments. Since
3269 he said we need to work from facts, let me just correct a
3270 couple misstatements that were mentioned on the other side.

3271 The reference was made to the Kennedy tax cut in the
3272 early 1960s. Marginal tax rates were significantly higher
3273 than they are today. That Kennedy tax cut, even after the
3274 tax cut took places, rates were significantly higher than

3275 they are today, even taking the top rate at 39.6 percent.
3276 During the Eisenhower and Kennedy years, they were in the 60
3277 percent range. Even the Reagan tax cut that was cited in
3278 the 1980s brought the tax rates down to a level that is
3279 higher than where tax rates are today.

3280 So, those are the simple facts and need to be pointed
3281 out when we are talking about tax cuts. I cannot imagine
3282 anyone on the other side would want to go back to the tax
3283 rates as they were during the Kennedy years.

3284 I would also point out, because I am not sure where I
3285 am on the minute, nothing was really addressed with respect
3286 to the earned income tax credit. Mention was made about
3287 fraud, but I see a lack of support or enthusiasm for the
3288 actual program, which, again, incentivizes work, especially
3289 for those who are the working poor. This is one of the
3290 smartest tax credits that we have; used to have bipartisan
3291 support on the other side. And we can signal support for it
3292 by supporting this amendment. Thank you and I yield back.

3293 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The
3294 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr.
3295 Boyle.

3296 All of those in favor, say aye.

3297 Those opposed, no.

3298 A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to the
3299 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded

3300 vote until we have finished this batch of seven amendments.

3301 Mr. Yarmuth, you are recognized --

3302 Mr. Yarmuth. Yes, I have an amendment at the desk.

3303 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 4. The clerk

3304 will designate the amendment. The staff will distribute

3305 copies of the amendment.

3306 The Clerk. Amendment No. 4, offered by Representative

3307 Yarmuth, to insert a policy statement on defense and

3308 nondefense funding increases.

3309 [The amendment of John Yarmuth follows:]

3310 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

3311 Chairman Black. Mr. Yarmuth, you are recognized for 6
3312 minutes.

3313 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Chairman Black. We have been
3314 playing a game in this Congress for several years now with
3315 statutory caps on spending. These caps were brought into
3316 play in the Budget Control Act of 2011, when they were
3317 thought to be so unattractive and so outrageously imprudent
3318 that they would spur negotiators into action to create a
3319 budget agreement. Of course, that budget agreement never
3320 happened and we were stuck with the whole notion of
3321 sequestration and budgetary caps.

3322 We should not be curtailing important services through
3323 arbitrary restrictions. We have never allowed these caps to
3324 fully go into effect. In the past, bipartisan agreements
3325 have eased these limits so we could adequately fund
3326 government programs, and we have done so in the spirit of
3327 the original Budget Control Act with a commitment to parity
3328 for defense and nondefense spending. It is time for us to
3329 get to the negotiating table and find a way.

3330 We Democrats are not averse to lifting the defense cap,
3331 but we object to leaving nondefense behind, or, worse,
3332 lowering the nondefense cap to help pay for defense. As a
3333 matter of fact, that is exactly what happened with the Trump
3334 budget proposal for 2018, when the administration proposed a
3335 \$54 billion increase in defense and a \$54 billion cut in

3336 nondefense.

3337 Nondefense discretionary funding provides resources for
3338 hundreds of programs that affect Americans every day,
3339 programs that range from producing innovative research to
3340 advance the quality of our lives, to making sure Americans
3341 drink clean water, breathe clean air, travel safely, and
3342 maintain our status as the world's economic leader.

3343 The 2018 cap for nondefense spending matches the lowest
3344 levels in history as a percentage of the economy, but the
3345 chairman's mark brings that level even lower, cutting \$5
3346 billion more. Over 10 years, cuts under this budget get
3347 even worse. Nondefense discretionary funding will decline
3348 from \$511 billion in 2018 to \$424 billion in 2027. That is
3349 an 18 percent cut in actual dollar amounts. For 2027, that
3350 is an NDD cut of more than \$200 billion from CBO's baseline,
3351 while defense sees an increase in that year of more than \$50
3352 billion. That is a far cry from the parity envisioned by
3353 the Budget Control Act.

3354 My amendment would call on Congress to do the
3355 responsible thing and raise the spending limits, with parity
3356 for defense and nondefense investments, as soon as possible.
3357 With that, I yield as much as time as she consumes from my
3358 remaining time to Ms. Jayapal.

3359 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Ranking Member Yarmuth. I
3360 rise in strong support of this amendment. I think what we

3361 have to understand is that national security is intricately
3362 linked with economic security and I think that is really
3363 what we are talking about when we talk about increasing and
3364 having parity between nondefense discretionary and defense
3365 spending.

3366 We cannot increase defense spending at the expense of
3367 our nondefense discretionary because, for everybody who
3368 might be listening out there, what we are talking about are
3369 essential programs like education, infrastructure, job
3370 training, State Department investment, cancer research. And
3371 just as one example, you know, we are cutting 19 percent of
3372 the State Department budget in this proposed budget
3373 resolution.

3374 This is something that, for example, our military
3375 commanders, our generals, over 110 generals, have written a
3376 letter and said, "Please do not decrease the spending for
3377 diplomacy and development because we will need more bullets
3378 if you do that." So, the idea of parity is really about
3379 making sure that we understand that, yes, defense spending
3380 is important, but we have to continue to invest in the
3381 economic opportunity that actually provides economic
3382 security for millions of Americans across this country.

3383 And my fear is that with the spending caps that we
3384 have, if we continue down this path we are going to
3385 dramatically reduce the investments that we have, the

3386 investment dollars we have to invest in our communities and
3387 to actually make sure that we can provide people with
3388 opportunity, provide people with education, provide people
3389 with health care, job training, and all of the things that
3390 are so essential to our economic security. So, I thank you
3391 for allowing me to support this amendment with these words
3392 and I yield back.

3393 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back. Is there
3394 a member who would like to claim time in opposition to the
3395 amendment?

3396 Mr. Smucker. I would like to claim time, Chair.

3397 Chairman Black. You are recognized for 7 minutes, Mr.
3398 Smucker.

3399 Mr. Smucker. Thank you, Madam Chair. I would like to
3400 thank the ranking member for his comments in regards to this
3401 amendment. You know, I am new here and it was hard for me
3402 to understand exactly what sequestration is, exactly what
3403 the Budget Control Act of 2011 was. It was hard for me to
3404 believe that Congress would allow arbitrary limits to stand
3405 in place rather than making decisions on our budgets based
3406 on what we really believed met the needs. But the ranking
3407 member's description of the budget, I have come to
3408 understand, is exactly correct.

3409 And so, in regard to Congress, as the amendment states,
3410 must begin negotiations to raise the limits in a reasonable

3411 manner, I would agree with. We will need to get to that
3412 point.

3413 And I also agree that the defense level spending in
3414 this budget is a better response to the needs we have than
3415 the limits that are set by the Control Act. You know, the
3416 first duty of our Federal Government is to keep our families
3417 safe. This includes protecting our Nation against threats
3418 both foreign and domestic, and this budget reflects the
3419 needs that we are seeing today.

3420 Our country faces larger, more complex threats from all
3421 across the globe than it did back in 2011. We are seeing
3422 threats from North Korea, ISIS, Russia, and Iran, and the
3423 responsibility to promote the security at home and assert
3424 our strength abroad is one that this committee takes
3425 seriously and is reflected in this budget. The budget
3426 provides our Nation's servicemen and -women with the tools,
3427 resources, and the pay that they need to keep our homeland
3428 safe.

3429 Where I disagree with this amendment and why I rise in
3430 opposition is that the idea that we have to tie arbitrarily
3431 any particular areas of the budget to another does exactly
3432 what the Budget Control Act did. It takes the
3433 responsibility away from us to evaluate exactly what the
3434 needs are.

3435 So, in the same way that our defense spending number is

3436 based on our needs, the same way we make that decision, we
3437 should be doing that on any area of the budget and not just
3438 based on a spending level in another area. And in fact,
3439 that is exactly what was done in the last omnibus
3440 appropriations bill that was signed in 2017 and agreed to by
3441 former President Obama. So, he rejected the idea that there
3442 had to be a one-to-one spending or parity between defense
3443 and nondefense.

3444 So, again, I rise in opposition. I ask members of the
3445 committee to oppose this bill for that reason and I would
3446 like to yield 2 minutes of my time to Representative
3447 Bergman.

3448 Mr. Bergman. Thanks, Mr. Smucker, and thanks, Madam
3449 Chairman. I am going to use a visual example here based on
3450 what I think this amendment means. We have a
3451 nondiscretionary dollar, so we just take it and split it 50-
3452 50. To me, that does not reflect anything in the reality of
3453 prioritization of a limited resource. You have to remember,
3454 I am a Marine. We deal with things very simply.

3455 But I would suggest to you very strongly that debt and
3456 defense are related very deeply, because as former Chairman
3457 of the Joint Chiefs Admiral Mullen said, debt, our national
3458 debt, is the single biggest security threat to our country.

3459 Defense dollars in this budget are not plus-up funds.
3460 Instead, they are catch-up dollars after 8 years, sorely

3461 needed after 8 years of underfunding the Department of
3462 Defense. We have servicemen and -women who are tired. We
3463 have equipment that is broken. That was not recognized for
3464 too long. It is our congressional responsibility to provide
3465 for the common defense; said another way, to guarantee the
3466 safety and security of all of our citizens.

3467 You know, there is an old saying that says, "Sometimes
3468 it is tough to remember what your priorities were in the
3469 swamp if the alligator has got you up the tree." Well, in
3470 this particular case, I would suggest to you the alligator
3471 is the debt and we need to make sure that we focus on what
3472 comes first. We need to have the strong defense. And it is
3473 not at the risk of other things. It is a balancing and a
3474 prioritization, which is our congressional responsibility,
3475 to prioritize these very limited resources.

3476 So, in making those tough decisions regarding the
3477 prioritization and the allocation of limited fiscal
3478 resources, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote no on this
3479 amendment and I yield back.

3480 Mr. Smucker. Thank you, Madam. I yield back the
3481 balance of my time.

3482 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
3483 of his time. Mr. Yarmuth, you are recognized for 1 minute
3484 to close.

3485 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Chairman Black. This

3486 amendment reinstates the Budget Control Act's guiding
3487 principle of parity for defense and nondefense spending
3488 increases. And I am glad at least that we have a bipartisan
3489 agreement on the fact that the defense caps are too low and
3490 need to be increased. Unfortunately, the other seems unable
3491 to accept that nondefense programs also play a vital role in
3492 keeping our Nation and economy strong.

3493 As a matter of fact, I remember when former Chairman
3494 Hal Rogers of my State was chairman of the Appropriations
3495 Committee and he made the case very, very strenuously that
3496 the nondefense discretionary caps were too low and you could
3497 not appropriate funds adequately with those levels. So, we
3498 have already gone over what these funds include: homeland
3499 security, education, research, health care, transportation,
3500 much more. These are programs that the American people need
3501 and overwhelmingly support and will help support a great,
3502 robust economy. So, I urge my colleagues to support my
3503 amendment to raise the cap so we can invest in our national
3504 priorities. And I yield back.

3505 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The
3506 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr.
3507 Yarmuth.

3508 All those in favor, say aye.

3509 Those opposed, no.

3510 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

3511 Mr. Yarmuth. I request a recorded vote.

3512 Chairman Black. A recorded vote is requested.

3513 Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, we will
3514 postpone the recorded vote until we have finished debating
3515 this batch of seven amendments.

3516 Are there other amendments?

3517 We will recess to go to the floor to vote and we will
3518 resume immediately after the vote.

3519 [Recess.]

3520 Chairman Black. The committee will come to order. Are
3521 there any other amendments? This is amendment No. 6, and
3522 the clerk will designate the amendment. The staff will
3523 distribute copies of the amendment.

3524 The Clerk. Amendment No. 6, offered by Mr. Jeffries'
3525 judiciary policy statement on preserving Medicare for
3526 seniors and persons with disabilities.

3527 [The amendment of Hakeem Jeffries follows:]

3528 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

3529 Chairman Black. Mr. Jeffries is recognized for 6
3530 minutes.

3531 Mr. Jeffries. Thank you, Madam Chair. This amendment
3532 will help ensure that Congress does not fund tax breaks for
3533 Trump's wealthy friends and special interests by cutting
3534 Medicare. Congress should protect Medicare for seniors and
3535 people with disabilities, not undermine it. The Republican
3536 budget will eliminate guaranteed, long-established health
3537 insurance benefits for seniors and the elderly, as well as
3538 people with disabilities under the Medicare program.

3539 The Republican budget will increase costs for the
3540 elderly and disabled by establishing a Medicare voucher
3541 scheme that provides insufficient payments to Medicare
3542 beneficiaries in order to purchase needed health care, and
3543 the Republican budget will destroy needed Medicare program
3544 by diverting the healthiest enrollees into private plans
3545 which would undermine traditional Medicare's ability to
3546 control costs. Once again, this budget omits the policy
3547 details that would allow us to engage in a full analysis of
3548 the plan.

3549 One thing is clear: The budget utterly fails to address
3550 the root causes of growing healthcare cost, which is price-
3551 gouging by pharmaceutical companies. Instead, it aims to
3552 cut taxes for millionaires and billionaires while telling
3553 seniors to go take a hike, take on more of the cost and

3554 financial risk of their healthcare. I now yield 1 minute to
3555 Representative Suzan DelBene.

3556 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. I am pleased to support Mr.
3557 Jeffries' amendment preserving the Medicare guarantee for
3558 our seniors. The House Republican budget spells disaster
3559 for the more than 58 million Americans who rely on Medicare,
3560 including 90,000 in my district. Privatizing Medicare,
3561 replacing comprehensive coverage with a dangerous voucher
3562 system, is yet another assault on the middle class, and it
3563 is unacceptable. Not even President Trump supports this
3564 plan.

3565 Every day, 10,000 Americans turn 65, and they expect
3566 Medicare to be there for them just as it was generations
3567 before. We should not be balancing the budget on the backs
3568 of seniors; instead, we should be tackling the rising cost
3569 of prescription drugs and helping more seniors get the care
3570 they need. I urge my colleagues to vote yes on this
3571 amendment, and I yield back.

3572 Mr. Jeffries. I thank the gentlelady from Washington;
3573 I now yield 1 minute to Representative Michelle Lujan
3574 Grisham.

3575 Ms. Lujan Grisham. I want to thank my friend and
3576 colleague from New York for yielding, and I too want to add
3577 my support to his amendment to protect Medicare. Now, I am
3578 starting to detect a pattern in the kind of healthcare

3579 policies Republicans are putting forward: Cut Federal health
3580 programs and make States and consumers, then, pay more.
3581 This time, in fact, it is seniors and disabled adults who
3582 will bear those costs. Seniors who are living on fixed
3583 incomes and are probably the least able to absorb increases
3584 in premiums or out-of-pocket costs will be expected to pay
3585 25 percent more to remain in traditional Medicare under this
3586 plan, and the notion that they are positioned to negotiate
3587 individually when insurance companies do not negotiate or
3588 unsuccessfully negotiate with pharmaceutical companies,
3589 frankly, to me, is ludicrous.

3590 This comes, in fact, as you have heard, after President
3591 Trump promised repeatedly during the campaign that he could
3592 save Medicare and Medicaid and Social Security without cuts.
3593 I happen to agree with him. By continuing to work with
3594 payment reforms that reward quality over volume and reining
3595 in prescription drug prices, we can, in fact, lower these
3596 costs even more and further extend the life of the Medicare
3597 trust fund. I encourage my colleagues to abandon this
3598 approach and to instead work to strengthen the Medicare
3599 program for America's seniors and disabled. I yield back.

3600 Mr. Jeffries. I thank the distinguished gentlelady
3601 from New Mexico, and now I yield 1 minute to Representative
3602 Jan Schakowsky from the great State of Illinois.

3603 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. I support Congressman

3604 Jeffries's amendment. Then-candidate Trump bragged that he
3605 was, "the first and only potential GOP candidate to state
3606 there will be no cuts to Social Security, Medicare, and
3607 Medicaid." And that promise will be broken if the policies
3608 in this budget are enacted.

3609 Despite what by Republican colleagues will claim, this
3610 budget will end Medicare as we know it by essentially
3611 privatizing the program. However, the Republican budget is
3612 very short on details. Will seniors be given a voucher to
3613 pay their private insurance premiums? Will costs go up for
3614 the seniors if their vouchers do not cover the entire
3615 premium? Will they be subject to higher cost-sharing?
3616 Seniors across the country are paying close attention and
3617 have every reason to worry, so I urge my colleagues to
3618 support this amendment and preserve Medicare for generations
3619 to come. With that, I yield back.

3620 Mr. Jeffries. I thank the distinguished gentlelady
3621 from Illinois. The Republican budget, once again, seeks to
3622 balance itself on the backs of the most vulnerable amongst
3623 us: working families, middle-class folks, the poor, the
3624 sick, the afflicted, rural America, and now, by targeting
3625 Medicare, seniors who are simply trying to live out their
3626 golden years with the dignity and respect that they not only
3627 deserve but have earned by paying into the system. And that
3628 is why I urge support for this amendment to protect Medicare

3629 in this country. I yield back.

3630 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Is there a
3631 member who would like to claim time in opposition to the
3632 amendment? Mr. Smucker, you are recognized for 7 minutes.

3633 Mr. Smucker. Thank you, Madam Chair. Let's be clear:
3634 It is important that we strengthen, we secure, and we save
3635 Medicare for current seniors and for future generations of
3636 Americans, and our budget does just that.

3637 The math on this is absolutely clear: Because of rising
3638 health costs and demographic changes, the 2007 Medicare
3639 Trustees Report projected that the Medicare program will be
3640 bankrupt in 2029. CBO similar projects Medicare's
3641 insolvency in 2025. This means that, as soon as 8 years
3642 from now, the Medicare program as we know it will likely be
3643 insolvent if we do not act now to protect and preserve the
3644 program. Specifically, Medicare's hospital insurance trust
3645 fund will be unable to pay 100 percent of patient care
3646 costs, which would reduce beneficiary access to healthcare
3647 services. Such an outcome is completely, simply
3648 unacceptable for the millions of seniors who rely on this
3649 program.

3650 To clarify any misconceptions about our plan, let's
3651 debunk some of the political attacks on our efforts to save
3652 and strengthen Medicare for the American people. Number
3653 one: Our budget protects the current Medicare system as it

3654 is, so those at or near retirement will be unaffected and
3655 experience no changes, while protecting the Medicare system
3656 for younger generations as well. This resolution fully
3657 supports a patient-centered Medicare program that increases
3658 quality and choice for beneficiaries. The Medicare
3659 improvements envisioned in this budget would adopt the
3660 popular, simplified coverage structure of Medicare advantage
3661 and would allow seniors greater planned choices while
3662 reducing costs.

3663 And furthermore, the government payment would be
3664 adjusted so the sick would receive more financial assistance
3665 if their conditions worsened, and lower-income seniors would
3666 receive additional support to help cover premiums and out-
3667 of-pocket costs. Under this improved program, traditional
3668 Medicare is saved, and it will always and I repeat, always,
3669 be an option. Traditional Medicare available to seniors.

3670 And finally, CBO determined that a Medicare program
3671 following the model proposed by this budget would result in
3672 cost savings for both seniors and for the program. Under
3673 our plan, 50 million seniors are empowered to use choice and
3674 competition to bring down healthcare costs. The real threat
3675 to the Medicare guarantee is the status quo. Costs continue
3676 to skyrocket; today's seniors continue to lose access to
3677 quality care, and the program remains on a quick path to
3678 bankruptcy. Inaction and ignorance will not protect

3679 Medicare; it will only hasten the program's demise, leaving
3680 our Nation's seniors in despair.

3681 Our budget plan ensures solvency for the Medicare
3682 program and safeguards this vital program for our Nation's
3683 current seniors and future generations of beneficiaries to
3684 come. There, for these reasons, I urge a "no" vote on this
3685 amendment. And I yield the balance of my time to Mr.
3686 Woodall.

3687 Mr. Woodall. I thank my friend for yielding. I have
3688 always believed that there is more that unites us than that
3689 divides us, and, thinking about Ms. DelBene's comments, I
3690 think we can all agree that seniors in this country expect
3691 Medicare to be there for them. They have paid into Medicare
3692 Part A their entire life and they do expect it to be there
3693 for them, but you said something interesting, and it was,
3694 "just as it has always been." Certainly, the confidence we
3695 want to be just as it has always been, and that confidence
3696 is not there any longer, after trustees report tells us that
3697 bankruptcy is imminent.

3698 But, more importantly, just as it has been, as Mr.
3699 Smucker says, locks us into the status quo. I remember the
3700 debates that were had in this body over Medicare advantage,
3701 and member after member lined up and said, "I do not want to
3702 see the Medicare program changed." And, as Mr. Smucker
3703 alluded to, Medicare advantage is the single most popular

3704 aspect of the Medicare program today, and yet we see budget
3705 after budget, often from the other side, trying to restrict
3706 the Medicare advantage program. If you want the program to
3707 continue just as it always has, with no improvements and no
3708 changes, the trustees tell us that option is not available
3709 to us; bankruptcy is imminent. But, more importantly, why
3710 would you not? Why would you not want to add more choices
3711 to the system? We have done it in the past, we have done it
3712 successfully, and we have done it to the delight of those
3713 members on Medicare.

3714 But I will say this to all of my colleagues in great
3715 candor: we need to end the ruse that folks like me, in my
3716 40's, are going to have the same Medicare program that my
3717 mom and dad had. We have never had enough money coming into
3718 the program, to preserve the Medicare program, for folks in
3719 their 30s and 40s, and we still do not today. The time to
3720 act, the time to make those changes is today, while folks
3721 still have enough time looking forward into their future to
3722 plan. And I want to be clear: this budget protects every
3723 single senior on Medicare today, making sure those promises
3724 are kept. Expanded, but kept.

3725 Madam Chair, this has been called the Third Rail of
3726 Politics, and folks have allowed the degradation of the
3727 solvency of the trust fund to come to the place that it is
3728 today because they were afraid to tackle it. Through your

3729 leadership on this committee, folks have had the courage to
3730 stand up and say, "We can protect Medicare today, we can
3731 improve Medicare tomorrow, and the status quo is not an
3732 acceptable alternative." I urge my colleagues, knowing that
3733 there is more on which we agree than that we disagree, to
3734 reject this amendment. Let's agree to fight for Medicare,
3735 but let's let that fighting be against the status quo and in
3736 favor of long-term solvency. And with that, I yield back
3737 the balance of my time.

3738 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back the balance
3739 of his time; Mr. Jeffries is recognized for 1 minute to
3740 close.

3741 Mr. Jeffries. The Republican budget's plan for
3742 unfettered market competition is a recipe for disaster.
3743 Prior to the creation of Medicare in 1965, almost half of
3744 American seniors had no health insurance whatsoever. As
3745 healthcare costs steadily rose, the so-called market failed
3746 to respond. Medicare changed that dynamic. Democrats are
3747 committed to keeping and strengthening Medicare for seniors
3748 and disabled workers by reducing cost growth within the
3749 system while protecting and providing essential benefits.
3750 The Affordable Care Act includes numerous cost-containment
3751 tools and has contributed to record-low rates of healthcare
3752 spending growth since 2010. It has begun Medicare's
3753 transformation toward rewarding quality and value and

3754 keeping it sustainable. We need to build upon that
3755 progress, not undermine it. I yield back.

3756 Chairman Black. The gentleman's time is expired. The
3757 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr.
3758 Jeffries.

3759 All those in favor, say, aye.

3760 All those opposed, no.

3761 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

3762 Mr. Jeffries. Madam Chair, I request a recorded vote.

3763 Chairman Black. A recorded vote is requested.

3764 Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, we will
3765 postpone the recorded vote until we have finished debate to
3766 the batch of seven amendments. Are there other amendments?

3767 Ms. Schakowsky. Yes, Madam Chair. I have an amendment
3768 at the desk.

3769 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 7. The Clerk
3770 will designate the amendment; the staff will distribute
3771 copies of the amendment.

3772 The Clerk. Amendment No. 7, offered by Representative
3773 Schakowsky: to insert a policy statement on women's health
3774 care.

3775 [The amendment of Janice Schakowsky follows:]

3776 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

3777 Chairman Black. Ms. Schakowsky is recognized for 6
3778 minutes.

3779 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, Madam Chair. I offer an
3780 amendment to protect women's health by ending the war on
3781 Planned Parenthood and allowing women to pick their own
3782 medical provider. I really find it ironic that Republicans
3783 claim that they want increase choices for people and allow
3784 them to make their own health decisions, but apparently that
3785 right does not extend to women.

3786 Planned Parenthood is a trusted source of health care
3787 for 2.5 million Americans every single year. One in five
3788 women will visit a Planned Parenthood clinic in her
3789 lifetime. It offers preventive care, vaccines, screenings,
3790 contraception, and it is for men as well as women, by the
3791 way, that can go to Planned Parenthood. And yet,
3792 Republicans continue to do everything they can to restrict
3793 women from getting their care from Planned Parenthood. The
3794 Republican budget proposes not only removing Planned
3795 Parenthood from the Medicaid program, but also makes it
3796 ineligible to participate in any Federal program.

3797 And let's not pretend that this war on Planned
3798 Parenthood is anything other than a direct attack on women's
3799 health. Over half of Planned Parenthood health centers are
3800 in health-professional shortage areas, rural or medically
3801 underserved areas. These are places that desperately need

3802 more healthcare providers, and yet Republicans are trying to
3803 make it hard for women in these areas to access care.
3804 Democratic women, Republican women, independents. In fact,
3805 the CBO projects that about 15 percent of people living in
3806 those areas would lose access to care. Seventy-five percent
3807 of patients at Planned Parenthood have incomes at or below
3808 150 percent of the Federal poverty level. This attack on
3809 Planned Parenthood will hurt low-income families and
3810 communities of color and most communities that already face
3811 dangerous health disparities. Teen pregnancy and abortion
3812 rates are at historic lows. Defunding Planned Parenthood
3813 and other reproductive health providers would take away the
3814 very services that have lowered those rates.

3815 Let me be clear: The Republican plot to defund Planned
3816 Parenthood is nothing more than a direct attack on women,
3817 and women are simply not going to stand for it. Let me say
3818 that the Republicans have long contended that the federally
3819 qualified health programs at the clinics, community health
3820 centers, can take up the slack if Planned Parenthood is
3821 eliminated. Actually, those very clinics have said that is
3822 not true. This will cause about 15 percent of people living
3823 in those underserved areas to lose access to care. And now,
3824 I would like to yield 1 minute to Congresswoman Jayapal.

3825 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Congresswoman Schakowsky, for
3826 this important amendment. By pushing the agenda to defund

3827 Planned Parenthood, I fear that my colleagues on the
3828 Republican side are using this budget resolution to punish
3829 millions of women around the country. In a single year,
3830 Planned Parenthood provides care for 2.4 million people at
3831 over 600 affiliate care centers around the country. Eighty
3832 percent of patients visit the clinics to prevent pregnancies
3833 and to get contraceptive pills which prevented 567,000
3834 unintended pregnancies. With more than half of the health
3835 centers in underserved areas, Planned Parenthood provides
3836 crucial care to women and men who otherwise would not have
3837 access at all.

3838 Defunding these clinics would mean a loss of healthcare
3839 access to over 40 percent of the women who use them as
3840 primary care facilities. And community health centers,
3841 which, by the way, are all across the country in rural
3842 areas, cannot absorb millions of new patients. So, I hope
3843 our colleagues on both sides of the aisle will actually
3844 support this amendment, because cutting funding does not
3845 save us money; it is simply a tool to control women's
3846 choices and bodies. I yield back the balance of my time.

3847 Ms. Schakowsky. And now, I would like to yield 1
3848 minute to Congresswoman DelBene.

3849 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. I strongly support Ms.
3850 Schakowsky's amendment to protect women's access to care
3851 through Planned Parenthood. The House Republican budget

3852 would be devastating to women's health; not only does it
3853 undermine health coverage for maternity care and birth
3854 control, but it also takes the extreme step of defunding
3855 Planned Parenthood, a trusted medical provider to 2.5
3856 million Americans that is something they rely on.

3857 Politicians have no right to interfere in a woman's
3858 personal medical decisions, and that includes when and where
3859 she gets health care. Last year, Planned Parenthood
3860 performed more than 600,000 cancer screenings and helped
3861 detect abnormalities in more than 72,000 women. This is
3862 life-saving care. It is time for Republicans to stop their
3863 relentless crusade against Planned Parenthood and give women
3864 the dignity of making their own healthcare decisions. I
3865 urge all my colleagues who respect women's health to vote
3866 "yes" on this amendment, and I yield back.

3867 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, and I yield the remaining
3868 time to Congresswoman Jackson Lee.

3869 Ms. Jackson Lee. This is a story about the devastating
3870 impact of the destruction of Planned Parenthood. Seventy-
3871 five percent of Planned Parenthood patients have incomes at
3872 or below 150 percent of the Federal poverty level, and at
3873 least 60 percent of patients access care through Medicaid or
3874 Title X family planning, and more than one-third of patients
3875 are people of color. Here is a healthy mother wanting to
3876 have a healthy baby. Her preventative healthcare comes from

3877 Planned Parenthood. Do you want to stop this kind of life-
3878 saving healthcare? That is what the TrumpCare Democratic --
3879 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time has expired.

3880 Ms. Jackson Lee. -- budget is all about. I yield
3881 back.

3882 Chairman Black. And I claim the time in opposition to
3883 this amendment and yield myself 7 minutes. So, as Paul
3884 Harvey says, here is the rest of the story. Let's talk
3885 about the additional women's health funding that is in this
3886 budget. The budget supports enhanced access to women's
3887 healthcare services. This budget also assumes that the
3888 American Healthcare Act, which provides additional funding,
3889 specifically for maternal health through Patient and State
3890 Stability Fund. This budget fully funds discretionary
3891 programs that the Department of Health and Human Services
3892 that focus on women's health, including the NIH, Office of
3893 Women's Health, the NIH Pregnancy and Perinatal Branch, the
3894 CDC Office of Women's Health, the CDC efforts to prevent the
3895 spread of Zika virus which impacts pregnant women.

3896 So, here are some other responses of the rest of the
3897 story. Our budget does eliminate Federal funding from
3898 Planned Parenthood. However, it promotes redirecting these
3899 funds to community health centers. The budget promotes
3900 investing in community health centers to promote greater
3901 access to care for women. The community health centers are

3902 nonprofit. They are community based clinics that provide
3903 comprehensive care including mammograms which, by the way,
3904 Planned Parenthood claims to have provided. And we now know
3905 that they do not provide mammograms. In fact, they do not
3906 have a single location that provides a mammogram.

3907 Now, here are some other little facts. There are 9,000
3908 community health centers which, unlike Planned Parenthood
3909 clinics, are required, yes, they are required by law, to be
3910 located in medically underserved areas with high levels of
3911 poverty and infant mortality. So when others talk about,
3912 "Oh, there is not going to be services," they are actually
3913 required to be in those very communities where women need
3914 these healthcare services the very most. In fact, in 2015,
3915 community health centers provided health services for more
3916 than 20 million Americans. Nearly 60 percent of those that
3917 they provided services for were females. In contrast,
3918 Planned Parenthood served less than three million. So let's
3919 look at that. Nearly 20 million or more than 20 million in
3920 community health centers and fewer than three million in
3921 Planned Parenthood facilities.

3922 This budget also makes efforts to ensure that taxpayer
3923 dollars do not go to the Nation's largest provider of
3924 abortions, but rather supports those healthcare centers that
3925 truly provide comprehensive care to women, more than just
3926 mammograms, more than just prenatal care. There are other

3927 services they provide that are not provided in Planned
3928 Parenthood centers. The Federal Government should not force
3929 States to provide funding to clinics such as Planned
3930 Parenthood that perform elective abortions. And, similarly,
3931 the government should not force taxpayers to fund clinics
3932 where they are against their own values. This budget
3933 continues this protraction by proposing to eliminate all
3934 Federal funding for Planned Parenthood and similar
3935 organizations.

3936 Now, additionally, let's look at the CBO score that was
3937 mentioning in the opening remarks. So, the congressional
3938 budget office does anticipate some small costs associated
3939 with the complete elimination of funding Planned Parenthood.
3940 The Budget Committee contests the score that they have put
3941 out because it is based on CBO's faulty assumption that
3942 reducing Planned Parenthood funding would result in more
3943 pregnancies from a lack of access to contraceptives. As I
3944 have already talked about, there are 20 million women that
3945 are taken care of in the community health centers and only
3946 less than three million in Planned Parenthood. But this is
3947 unreasonable. And you talk about being against women, this
3948 is a sexist assumption that women's ability to seek out care
3949 depends upon having a Planned Parenthood facility across the
3950 street.

3951 As we are providing additional funding for community

3952 health centers as part of our ACA, it is unreasonable for
3953 CBO to assume that women are incapable of finding another
3954 provider. Women are smarter than this. They are able to
3955 find other providers. If it is their option, they are smart
3956 enough to find other providers. And I am insulted to say
3957 that women are not going to be able to make that choice to
3958 find another provider. We, in our budget, assume that women
3959 are capable, they are smart, they are independent enough to
3960 seek contraceptives elsewhere instead of giving up and going
3961 straight home to get pregnant as CBO assumes. It is an
3962 insult to women. Women do not need some paternalistic
3963 government to provide for them.

3964 Our budget is prowomen, it is progirl, and it is pro-
3965 unborn-baby-girl. You talk about being prowomen, if we are
3966 taking little girl's lives, that does not seem to me to be
3967 very prowoman. So, I urge a no vote on this amendment and I
3968 yield back the balance of my time. Now, Ms. Schakowsky is
3969 recognized for 1 minute to close.

3970 Ms. Schakowsky. A couple of things, Planned Parenthood
3971 does screening for breast cancer, yes? And then, it will
3972 refer woman where there is a mammogram when there is
3973 something abnormal found. And these screenings are very
3974 important.

3975 As far as insulting women, are you kidding me? There
3976 are women that have to travel hundreds of miles in order to

3977 get to a clinic. They do not have a Planned Parenthood
3978 clinic nearby. And so, it is not for a lack of smarts and
3979 intelligence that women seek. And, again, it is Democratic
3980 and Republican women alike that seek Planned Parenthood
3981 clinics. In fact, 19 national polls have shown that
3982 American people do not support defunding Planned Parenthood.
3983 But if the Republicans have their way, millions of patients
3984 will in fact lose access to cancer screening and
3985 contraception and SCI testing and well women visits and
3986 more. And those very community health centers you cite
3987 suggest that it would be a problem for them. They would not
3988 be able to make up the gap. So, I urge my colleagues to
3989 support this prowoman amendment. And I yield back.

3990 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back the balance
3991 of her time. The question is on agreeing to the amendment
3992 by Ms. Schakowsky.

3993 All those in favor, say aye.

3994 Those opposed, no.

3995 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

3996 Ms. Schakowsky. Madam Chair, I request a recorded
3997 vote.

3998 Chairman Black. A recorded vote is requested, and
3999 pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement we will postpone
4000 the recorded vote until we have finished debate on the batch
4001 of this seven. Okay, so do we have No. 8 here? Mr.

4002 Higgins. Okay, so Mr. Higgins is here. So, are there other
4003 amendments? Mr. Higgins?

4004 Mr. Higgins. Yes, thank you, Madam Chair.

4005 Chairman Black. You have an amendment at the desk?

4006 Mr. Higgins. I do.

4007 Chairman Black. Okay, so this is amendment No. 8. And
4008 the clerk will designate the amendment. The staff will
4009 distribute copies of the amendment.

4010 The Clerk. Amendment No. 8 offered by Representative
4011 Higgins related to America's transportation infrastructure.

4012 [The amendment of Brian Higgins follows:]

4013 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

4014 Mr. Higgins. Thank you, Madam --

4015 Chairman Black. Mr. Higgins is recognized for 6
4016 minutes.

4017 Mr. Higgins. Thank you, Madam Chair. You know,
4018 fundamental to the growth of any advanced industrial society
4019 is the investment you make in infrastructure for a couple of
4020 reasons. One is it is a massive investment that you finance
4021 publicly at very, very low rates to create jobs in the
4022 construction trades and supply and materials industry
4023 immediately. And after you make that investment, it
4024 unleashes the creativity and the resources of the private
4025 sector. We see that happening in places like Buffalo, New
4026 York. Every place where we have made Federal investments
4027 and new roads, we see new investment in businesses along
4028 those new roads that we built. The state of the American
4029 infrastructure is pathetic. And this is a pathetically weak
4030 response to an urgent need to rebuild our Nation's roads and
4031 bridges.

4032 The 2018 budget proposes to spend less than \$92 billion
4033 in outlays for American transportation infrastructure. When
4034 you compare that to the \$118 billion that U.S. taxpayers
4035 paid to rebuild the roads and bridges of Afghanistan, it
4036 pales in comparison. When you consider the \$96 billion U.S.
4037 taxpayers paid to rebuild the roads and bridges of Iraq, a
4038 \$92 billion investment in 2018 in rebuilding the

4039 infrastructure of America is, again, I think a national and
4040 international embarrassment. Now, keep in mind that both
4041 Iraq and Afghanistan, they are nations with a population of
4042 approximately 30 million people. America is 325 million
4043 people.

4044 The American Society of Civil Engineers consistently
4045 rates the quality of American infrastructure at a D rating,
4046 the world economic forum where American infrastructure in
4047 terms of quality was number one. Ten years ago, it is not
4048 number 24. Recently, JPMorgan Chase President and CEO Jamie
4049 Dimon has said that the United States has not built a major
4050 airport in 20 years. China built 75 new airports in the
4051 past 10 years.

4052 As I mentioned previously, China announced a major
4053 infrastructure investment to open up their markets to 27 new
4054 Asian countries to advance the products that they make in
4055 China. Our only investment is that of \$92 billion for next
4056 year and a nebulous request for funding to build
4057 infrastructure along the southern border. We can obviously
4058 do much better. The United States Chamber of Commerce also
4059 says that we lose \$200 billion in lost productivity because
4060 the poor quality of our infrastructure.

4061 So, I would ask, respectfully, that one area where
4062 Republicans and Democrats clearly should be able to come
4063 together is on a robust public investment and infrastructure

4064 because of the economic activity that would result. You
4065 know, a lot of people talk about tax cuts around here. And
4066 tax cuts do not pay for themselves. The most accurate and
4067 credible analysis is that you could return about a third of
4068 the money that you lay out for tax cuts.

4069 Infrastructure is very, very different. It is a proven
4070 job creator, and it is a proven business investment maker
4071 after you have made that investment. So, it asks that we
4072 please consider not cutting infrastructure and adding to it
4073 considerably if, in fact, we hope to get anywhere near where
4074 your budget projects that the economy has to grow over the
4075 next 10 years to create a surplus. And with that, Madam
4076 Chair, I would yield 1 minute to Mr. Carbajal.

4077 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Representative Higgins. I
4078 just want to address the inadequate funding for
4079 infrastructure in this budget resolution. This Republican
4080 budget would reduce funding for Amtrak, eliminate funding
4081 for high-speed rail, phase out capital grants for mass
4082 transit projects, and eliminate TIGER Grants. Communities
4083 across our Nation are struggling with crumbling
4084 infrastructure as the result of years of deferred
4085 maintenance, neglect, and a lack of strategic investment.
4086 As a former county supervisor, I saw firsthand and worked to
4087 invest additional resources towards infrastructure at the
4088 local level.

4089 The Federal Government must also do its part and
4090 partner to support State and local infrastructure
4091 investments by providing additional Federal resources.
4092 Investing in infrastructure will not only create more jobs
4093 at a time when so many Americans are hurting for work but
4094 will also stimulate our economy. I urge my colleagues to
4095 support the Higgins Amendment. I yield back.

4096 Mr. Higgins. Thank you. I yield 1 minute to Ms.
4097 DelBene.

4098 Chairman Black. You have 20 seconds.

4099 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. I just say that I am pleased
4100 to support Mr. Higgins' Amendment. For too many years,
4101 shortsighted cuts have failed to deliver investments and
4102 safety improvements that are desperately needed across the
4103 country and definitely my home State. I urge my colleagues
4104 to support this amendment and I yield back.

4105 Chairman Black. Perfect. Is there a member who would
4106 like to claim time in opposition to this amendment?

4107 Mr. Faso. Madam chair?

4108 Chairman Black. Mr. Faso, you are recognized for 7
4109 minutes.

4110 Mr. Faso. Madam Chairman, I am recognized for 7
4111 minutes, but I do not think it will take that long. Because
4112 as much as I appreciate my friend, Mr. Higgins, his
4113 proposal, and the sentiments behind them, and I certainly

4114 agree with the sentiments behind the need for infrastructure
4115 funding, unfortunately they have pulled out the same kind of
4116 sad tale of what they believe are tax benefits, et cetera,
4117 to finance these expenditure increases when, in fact, what
4118 we should be doing is focusing on progrowth tax reform, not
4119 trying to just incrementally pick one little item here or
4120 there in order to finance the expenditures that the
4121 gentleman suggests.

4122 I would also point out to my friend from California
4123 that he references the President's initial budget submission
4124 and, yet, the nondefense discretionary portion of the budget
4125 that the budget resolution contemplates at a level of 511
4126 restores and sustains virtually all of the programs that the
4127 gentleman elaborated upon.

4128 And our colleague, Mr. Diaz-Balart is not here. He is
4129 the chairman of the Appropriations Subcommittee on
4130 Transportation, and he would be able to confirm that the
4131 efforts of the Transportation Appropriations Subcommittee
4132 are restoring the programs to sufficient funding levels.
4133 Are we spending enough in our country today on
4134 infrastructure? I would argue, and I think my friend, Mr.
4135 Higgins, would agree certainly he does, that we are not.

4136 But the approach that is being taken, rounding up the
4137 usual suspects that our friends on the other side like to
4138 point to as the funding source is simply inappropriate and

4139 ill-advised at this time. What we need to be doing is
4140 looking seriously about long-term funding for
4141 infrastructure, ones that rely upon people that use much of
4142 the infrastructure to pay for it. And if the gentleman had
4143 been offering a proposal that would suggest that we should
4144 have a transportation-focused infrastructure financing
4145 approach, I might be inclined to agree with him.

4146 I think we could find bipartisan agreement on much of
4147 that. But this approach that is being suggested in the
4148 proposal is simply one that is not going to pass the smell
4149 test and should not be adopted. And I would urge a no-vote
4150 on it. And, with that, I would be happy to yield to my
4151 friend, Mr. Lewis, from Minnesota.

4152 Mr. Lewis. I thank the gentleman. The whole point
4153 about government spending as a better way of allocating
4154 resources really needs to be addressed here. My friends
4155 across the aisle and I agree, in a strong, reliable
4156 transportation system, some things the Federal Government
4157 has to do with regard to infrastructure. That is why I
4158 believe the last Congress devoted about \$305 billion to
4159 improve transit systems, bridges, highways. This amendment,
4160 unfortunately, would be more of the same, more of the same
4161 from the last administration from previous failed stimulus
4162 programs. It would increase taxes on American businesses in
4163 order to pay for more spending.

4164 Now, when I say to talk about spending, they are -- you
4165 know, economists will tell you, "What is the best way to
4166 allocate resources?" And the best way to allocate resources
4167 is where you get the highest economic return. I have to
4168 admit I have a bias here. I think market discipline allows
4169 private sector resources to actually have an economic
4170 return. We call those profits in order to service the debt.
4171 Government far too often devotes their resources for a
4172 political return.

4173 Hence, we spent \$836 billion on a stimulus package, and
4174 we got 1.6 percent economic growth out of it. How many
4175 times are we going to go down this road? And by the way,
4176 whether you tax, inflate, or borrow, all government spending
4177 comes out of the private sector, diverting those resources
4178 that could be used for productive investment into
4179 unproductive investment all too often. Right now, they want
4180 to pay for it with higher taxes, but unfortunately we
4181 already have the highest corporate income tax rate in the
4182 industrialized world.

4183 I hope my friends across the aisle are listening to
4184 this. We have the most progressive income tax code of all
4185 OECD nations. We cannot get much more progressive than we
4186 are, and yet they want to raise taxes. Look, the only way
4187 to get economic growth, or the best two ways to get it, in
4188 fact, the best way to get it, is productivity increase. But

4189 you can do it with a growing population as well. How do you
4190 grow productivity? By making transportation and
4191 infrastructure investments that have an economic return.
4192 But having more government stimulus spending, hiring people
4193 to dig ditches and shovel ready jobs and then fill them back
4194 up again does not grow the economy, and that is why this
4195 amendment is misguided and this unlimited amount of Federal
4196 spending, over \$4 trillion now, is a drag on economic
4197 growth. Therefore, I urge a no vote on this particular
4198 amendment and yield back.

4199 Mr. Faso. Madam Chairman, in the interest of moving
4200 things along, I yield back as well.

4201 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. The
4202 sponsor of the amendment, Mr. Jeffries, is recognized for 1
4203 minute. Oh, excuse me, Mr. Higgins. I apologize, Mr.
4204 Higgins.

4205 Mr. Higgins. Oh, that is okay. I appreciate the
4206 thoughts of my colleagues, but when you look at
4207 infrastructure investment, every city, town, and village
4208 issues debt to finance infrastructure. And, right now, you
4209 can borrow money at very, very favorable rates to rebuild
4210 the roads and bridges of America. Half of that outlay would
4211 be eliminated altogether by the economic growth that would
4212 result. The fact of the matter is, as I mentioned before,
4213 corporate leaders all over the Nation, including Mr. Dimon,

4214 are talking about the lack of infrastructure investment
4215 growth, the lack of new airports in America when other
4216 countries that we are competing with for global economic
4217 dominance are making the kinds of investments that are
4218 producing 7 percent annual economic growth. I am simply
4219 telling you a mix of market forces and government support
4220 can produce an economy that grows jobs and creates economic
4221 opportunity for future generations. Thank you.

4222 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Question
4223 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr. Higgins.

4224 All those in favor, signal by saying aye.

4225 All those opposed, no.

4226 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

4227 A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to the
4228 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded
4229 vote until we have finished the debate on this batch of
4230 seven.

4231 And, therefore, we are going to take a very brief
4232 recess of just 5 minutes. The members have been called that
4233 are not currently here. They are on their way, and we will
4234 resume at 5 minutes to take votes on the first seven
4235 amendments. The committee stands in recess.

4236 [Recess.]

4237 Chairman Black. The committee will come to order. And
4238 since we decided to roll votes today, the committee will

4239 resume with postponed votes of the following amendments: Ms.
4240 Wasserman Schultz, Ms. Jackson Lee, Mr. Boyle, Mr. Yarmuth,
4241 Mr. Jeffries, Ms. Schakowsky, and Mr. Higgins. The clerk
4242 will designate.

4243 The Clerk. Amendment No. 1 offered by Representative
4244 Wasserman Schultz.

4245 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

4246 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4247 Mr. Rokita. No.

4248 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4249 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

4250 [No response.]

4251 Mr. Cole?

4252 [No response.]

4253 Mr. McClintock?

4254 Mr. McClintock. No.

4255 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

4256 Mr. Woodall?

4257 Mr. Woodall. No.

4258 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

4259 Mr. Sanford?

4260 Mr. Sanford. No.

4261 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

4262 Mr. Womack?

4263 Mr. Womack. No.

4264 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
4265 Mr. Brat?
4266 Mr. Brat. No.
4267 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
4268 Mr. Grothman?
4269 Mr. Grothman. No.
4270 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
4271 Mr. Palmer?
4272 Mr. Palmer. No.
4273 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
4274 Mr. Westerman?
4275 Mr. Westerman. No.
4276 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
4277 Mr. Renacci?
4278 Mr. Renacci. No.
4279 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
4280 Mr. Johnson?
4281 Mr. Johnson. No.
4282 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
4283 Mr. Smith?
4284 Mr. Smith. No.
4285 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
4286 Mr. Lewis?
4287 Mr. Lewis. No.
4288 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

4289 Mr. Bergman?
4290 Mr. Bergman. No.
4291 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
4292 Mr. Faso?
4293 Mr. Faso. No.
4294 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
4295 Mr. Smucker?
4296 Mr. Smucker. No.
4297 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
4298 Mr. Gaetz?
4299 Mr. Gaetz. No.
4300 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
4301 Mr. Arrington?
4302 Mr. Arrington. No.
4303 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
4304 Mr. Ferguson?
4305 Mr. Ferguson. No.
4306 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
4307 Mr. Yarmuth?
4308 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
4309 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
4310 Ms. Lee?
4311 [No response.]
4312 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
4313 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

4314 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
4315 Mr. Moulton?
4316 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
4317 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
4318 Mr. Jeffries?
4319 [No response.]
4320 Mr. Higgins?
4321 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
4322 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, Aye.
4323 Ms. DelBene?
4324 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
4325 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
4326 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
4327 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
4328 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
4329 Mr. Boyle?
4330 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
4331 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
4332 Mr. Khanna?
4333 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
4334 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
4335 Ms. Jayapal?
4336 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
4337 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
4338 Mr. Carbajal?

4339 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

4340 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

4341 Ms. Jackson Lee?

4342 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

4343 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

4344 Ms. Schakowsky?

4345 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

4346 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

4347 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

4348 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4349 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

4350 Madam Chairman?

4351 Chairman Black. No.

4352 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

4353 Chairman Black. Are there members who wish to vote or
4354 change their vote? Did you vote? Oh, I am sorry, you
4355 voted? Okay, I apologize. I did not realize the members
4356 who just came in had voted. If not, the clerk shall report.

4357 The Clerk. Madam chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
4358 12 and the noes are 21.

4359 Chairman Black. The noes have it and the amendment is
4360 agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
4361 offered by Ms. Jackson Lee. The clerk will redesignate the
4362 amendment.

4363 The Clerk. Amendment No. 2 offered by Representative

4364 Jackson Lee.

4365 Chairman Black. I apologize. The amendment is not
4366 agreed to. The amendment is not agreed to. The committee
4367 will now vote on the amendment offered by Ms. Jackson Lee.

4368 The Clerk. Amendment No. 2 offered by Representative
4369 Jackson Lee.

4370 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

4371 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4372 Mr. Rokita. No.

4373 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4374 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

4375 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4376 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

4377 Mr. Cole?

4378 [No response.]

4379 Mr. McClintock?

4380 Mr. McClintock. No.

4381 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

4382 Mr. Woodall?

4383 Mr. Woodall. No.

4384 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

4385 Mr. Sanford?

4386 Mr. Sanford. No.

4387 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

4388 Mr. Womack?

4389 Mr. Womack. No.
4390 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
4391 Mr. Brat?
4392 Mr. Brat. No.
4393 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
4394 Mr. Grothman?
4395 Mr. Grothman. No.
4396 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
4397 Mr. Palmer?
4398 Mr. Palmer. No.
4399 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
4400 Mr. Westerman?
4401 Mr. Westerman. No.
4402 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
4403 Mr. Renacci?
4404 Mr. Renacci. No.
4405 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
4406 Mr. Johnson?
4407 Mr. Johnson. No.
4408 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
4409 Mr. Smith?
4410 Mr. Smith. No.
4411 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
4412 Mr. Lewis?
4413 Mr. Lewis. No.

4414 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
4415 Mr. Bergman?
4416 Mr. Bergman. No.
4417 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
4418 Mr. Faso?
4419 Mr. Faso. No.
4420 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
4421 Mr. Smucker?
4422 Mr. Smucker. No.
4423 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
4424 Mr. Gaetz?
4425 Mr. Gaetz. No.
4426 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
4427 Mr. Arrington?
4428 Mr. Arrington. No.
4429 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
4430 Mr. Ferguson?
4431 Mr. Ferguson. No.
4432 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
4433 Mr. Yarmuth?
4434 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
4435 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
4436 Ms. Lee?
4437 [No response.]
4438 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

4439 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

4440 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

4441 Mr. Moulton?

4442 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

4443 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

4444 Mr. Jeffries?

4445 [No response.]

4446 Mr. Higgins?

4447 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

4448 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

4449 Ms. DelBene?

4450 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

4451 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

4452 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

4453 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

4454 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

4455 Mr. Boyle?

4456 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

4457 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

4458 Mr. Khanna?

4459 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

4460 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

4461 Ms. Jayapal?

4462 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

4463 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

4464 Mr. Carbajal?

4465 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

4466 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

4467 Ms. Jackson Lee?

4468 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

4469 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

4470 Ms. Schakowsky?

4471 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

4472 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

4473 Madam Chairman?

4474 Chairman Black. No.

4475 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

4476 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

4477 Excuse me, are there any members who wish to vote or

4478 change their vote? Mr. Jeffries?

4479 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

4480 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

4481 Chairman Black. The clerk shall report.

4482 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

4483 13, and the noes are 21.

4484 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

4485 not agreed to.

4486 Mr. Rokita. [Presiding.] The committee will now vote

4487 on the amendment offered by Mr. Boyle. The clerk will

4488 redesignate the amendment.

4489 The Clerk. Amendment No. 3, offered by Representative
4490 Boyle.

4491 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

4492 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4493 Mr. Rokita. No.

4494 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4495 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

4496 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4497 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

4498 Mr. Cole?

4499 [No response.]

4500 Mr. McClintock?

4501 Mr. McClintock. No.

4502 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

4503 Mr. Woodall?

4504 Mr. Woodall. No.

4505 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

4506 Mr. Sanford?

4507 Mr. Sanford. No.

4508 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

4509 Mr. Womack?

4510 Mr. Womack. No.

4511 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

4512 Mr. Brat?

4513 Mr. Brat. No.

4514 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
4515 Mr. Grothman?
4516 Mr. Grothman. No.
4517 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
4518 Mr. Palmer?
4519 Mr. Palmer. No.
4520 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
4521 Mr. Westerman?
4522 Mr. Westerman. No.
4523 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
4524 Mr. Renacci?
4525 Mr. Renacci. No.
4526 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
4527 Mr. Johnson?
4528 Mr. Johnson. No.
4529 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
4530 Mr. Smith?
4531 Mr. Smith. No.
4532 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
4533 Mr. Lewis?
4534 Mr. Lewis. No.
4535 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
4536 Mr. Bergman?
4537 Mr. Bergman. No.
4538 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

4539 Mr. Faso?
4540 Mr. Faso. No.
4541 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
4542 Mr. Smucker?
4543 Mr. Smucker. No.
4544 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
4545 Mr. Gaetz?
4546 Mr. Gaetz. No.
4547 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
4548 Mr. Arrington?
4549 Mr. Arrington. No.
4550 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
4551 Mr. Ferguson?
4552 Mr. Ferguson. No.
4553 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
4554 Mr. Yarmuth?
4555 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
4556 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
4557 Ms. Lee?
4558 [No response.]
4559 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
4560 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
4561 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
4562 Mr. Moulton?
4563 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

4564 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
4565 Mr. Jeffries?
4566 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
4567 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
4568 Mr. Higgins?
4569 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
4570 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
4571 Ms. DelBene?
4572 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
4573 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
4574 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
4575 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
4576 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
4577 Mr. Boyle?
4578 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
4579 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
4580 Mr. Khanna?
4581 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
4582 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
4583 Ms. Jayapal?
4584 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
4585 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
4586 Mr. Carbajal?
4587 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.
4588 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

4589 Ms. Jackson Lee?

4590 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

4591 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

4592 Ms. Schakowsky?

4593 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

4594 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

4595 Madam Chairman?

4596 Chairman Black. No.

4597 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

4598 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members that wish to vote or
4599 change their vote? Hearing none, the clerk shall report.

4600 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
4601 13, and the noes are 21.

4602 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it. The amendment is not
4603 agreed to.

4604 Next, we will vote on an amendment offered by Mr.
4605 Yarmuth. The clerk shall request-designate the amendment.

4606 The Clerk. Amendment No. 4 offered by Representative
4607 Yarmuth.

4608 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

4609 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4610 Mr. Rokita. No.

4611 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4612 Mr. Diaz-Balart.

4613 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4614 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.
4615 Mr. Cole?
4616 [No response.]
4617 Mr. McClintock?
4618 Mr. McClintock. No.
4619 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
4620 Mr. Woodall?
4621 Mr. Woodall. No.
4622 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
4623 Mr. Sanford?
4624 Mr. Sanford. No.
4625 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
4626 Mr. Womack?
4627 Mr. Womack. No.
4628 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
4629 Mr. Brat?
4630 Mr. Brat. No.
4631 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
4632 Mr. Grothman? Mr. Grothman?
4633 Mr. Grothman. No.
4634 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
4635 Mr. Palmer?
4636 Mr. Palmer. No.
4637 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
4638 Mr. Westerman?

4639 Mr. Westerman. No.
4640 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
4641 Mr. Renacci?
4642 Mr. Renacci. No.
4643 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
4644 Mr. Johnson?
4645 Mr. Johnson. No.
4646 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
4647 Mr. Smith?
4648 Mr. Smith. No.
4649 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
4650 Mr. Lewis?
4651 Mr. Lewis. No.
4652 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
4653 Mr. Bergman?
4654 Mr. Bergman. No.
4655 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
4656 Mr. Faso?
4657 Mr. Faso. No.
4658 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
4659 Mr. Smucker?
4660 Mr. Smucker. No.
4661 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
4662 Mr. Gaetz?
4663 Mr. Gaetz. No.

4664 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
4665 Mr. Arrington?
4666 Mr. Arrington. No.
4667 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
4668 Mr. Ferguson?
4669 Mr. Ferguson. No.
4670 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
4671 Mr. Yarmuth?
4672 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
4673 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
4674 Ms. Lee?
4675 [No response.]
4676 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
4677 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
4678 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
4679 Mr. Moulton?
4680 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
4681 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
4682 Mr. Jeffries?
4683 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
4684 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
4685 Mr. Higgins?
4686 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
4687 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
4688 Ms. DelBene?

4689 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
4690 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
4691 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
4692 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
4693 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
4694 Mr. Boyle?
4695 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
4696 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
4697 Mr. Khanna?
4698 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
4699 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
4700 Ms. Jayapal?
4701 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
4702 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
4703 Mr. Carbajal?
4704 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.
4705 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.
4706 Ms. Jackson Lee?
4707 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.
4708 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.
4709 Ms. Schakowsky?
4710 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.
4711 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.
4712 Madam Chairman?
4713 Chairman Black. No.

4714 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

4715 Mr. Rokita. Thank you. Are there any members that
4716 wish to vote or change their vote? If not, the clerk shall
4717 report.

4718 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
4719 13, and the noes are 21.

4720 Mr. Rokita. I say the noes have it. The amendment is
4721 not agreed to. Next, the committee will now vote on the
4722 amendment offered by Ms. Jackson Lee. The clerk will
4723 redesignate the amendment.

4724 The Clerk. Amendment No. 6 offered by Representative
4725 Jeffries.

4726 Mr. Rokita. We will go with No. 6 by Jeffries. I had
4727 No. 5. Oh, that is the one we skipped, excuse me.

4728 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, I believe it is roll call
4729 vote No. 5, but amendment No. 6.

4730 Mr. Rokita. The one offered by Mr. Jeffries, then,
4731 thank you.

4732 The Clerk. Correct.

4733 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

4734 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4735 Mr. Rokita. No.

4736 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4737 Mr. Diaz-Balart.

4738 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4739 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.
4740 Mr. Cole?
4741 [No response.]
4742 Mr. McClintock?
4743 Mr. McClintock. No.
4744 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
4745 Mr. Woodall?
4746 Mr. Woodall. No.
4747 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
4748 Mr. Sanford?
4749 Mr. Sanford. No.
4750 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
4751 Mr. Womack?
4752 Mr. Womack. No.
4753 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
4754 Mr. Brat?
4755 Mr. Brat. No.
4756 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
4757 Mr. Grothman?
4758 Mr. Grothman. No.
4759 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
4760 Mr. Palmer?
4761 Mr. Palmer. No.
4762 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
4763 Mr. Westerman?

4764 Mr. Westerman. No.

4765 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

4766 Mr. Renacci?

4767 Mr. Renacci. No.

4768 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

4769 Mr. Johnson?

4770 Mr. Johnson. No.

4771 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

4772 Mr. Smith?

4773 Mr. Smith. No.

4774 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.

4775 Mr. Lewis?

4776 Mr. Lewis. No.

4777 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

4778 Mr. Bergman?

4779 Mr. Bergman. No.

4780 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

4781 Mr. Faso?

4782 Mr. Faso. No.

4783 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.

4784 Mr. Smucker?

4785 Mr. Smucker. No.

4786 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

4787 Mr. Gaetz?

4788 Mr. Gaetz. No.

4789 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
4790 Mr. Arrington?
4791 Mr. Arrington. No.
4792 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
4793 Mr. Ferguson?
4794 Mr. Ferguson. No.
4795 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
4796 Mr. Yarmuth?
4797 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
4798 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
4799 Ms. Lee?
4800 [No response.]
4801 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
4802 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
4803 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
4804 Mr. Moulton?
4805 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
4806 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
4807 Mr. Jeffries?
4808 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
4809 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
4810 Mr. Higgins?
4811 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
4812 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
4813 Ms. DelBene?

4814 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

4815 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

4816 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

4817 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

4818 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

4819 Mr. Boyle?

4820 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

4821 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

4822 Mr. Khanna?

4823 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

4824 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

4825 Ms. Jayapal?

4826 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

4827 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

4828 Mr. Carbajal?

4829 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

4830 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

4831 Ms. Jackson Lee?

4832 Ms. Jackson Lee. What amendment is this, please?

4833 The Clerk. This is amendment No. 6 offered by

4834 Representative Jeffries.

4835 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

4836 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

4837 Ms. Schakowsky?

4838 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

4839 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

4840 Mr. Rokita. Thank you. Are there any members who wish
4841 to vote or change their vote? How is the gentlelady
4842 recorded?

4843 The Clerk. She is not recorded.

4844 Ms. Lee. Aye.

4845 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

4846 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or
4847 change their vote? How is the chairman recorded?

4848 The Clerk. She is not recorded.

4849 Chairman Black. No.

4850 Mr. Rokita. She votes no.

4851 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

4852 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or
4853 change their votes? Hearing none, the clerk shall report.

4854 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
4855 14, and the noes are 21.

4856 Mr. Rokita. Okay, the noes have it. The amendment is
4857 not agreed to. Next, the committee will vote on the
4858 amendment offered by Ms. Schakowsky. The clerk will
4859 redesignate the amendment.

4860 The Clerk. Amendment No. 7, offered by Representative
4861 Schakowsky.

4862 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

4863 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4864 Mr. Rokita. No.

4865 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4866 Mr. Diaz-Balart.

4867 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4868 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

4869 Mr. Cole?

4870 [No response.]

4871 Mr. McClintock?

4872 Mr. McClintock. No.

4873 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

4874 Mr. Woodall?

4875 Mr. Woodall. No.

4876 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

4877 Mr. Sanford?

4878 Mr. Sanford. No.

4879 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

4880 Mr. Womack?

4881 Mr. Womack. No.

4882 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

4883 Mr. Brat?

4884 Mr. Brat. No.

4885 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

4886 Mr. Grothman?

4887 Mr. Grothman. No.

4888 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

4889 Mr. Palmer?
4890 Mr. Palmer. No.
4891 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
4892 Mr. Westerman?
4893 Mr. Westerman. No.
4894 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
4895 Mr. Renacci?
4896 Mr. Renacci. No.
4897 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
4898 Mr. Johnson?
4899 Mr. Johnson. No.
4900 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
4901 Mr. Smith?
4902 Mr. Smith. No.
4903 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
4904 Mr. Lewis?
4905 Mr. Lewis. No.
4906 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
4907 Mr. Bergman?
4908 Mr. Bergman. No.
4909 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
4910 Mr. Faso?
4911 Mr. Faso. No.
4912 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
4913 Mr. Smucker?

4914 Mr. Smucker. No.

4915 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

4916 Mr. Gaetz?

4917 Mr. Gaetz. No.

4918 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

4919 Mr. Arrington?

4920 Mr. Arrington. No.

4921 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

4922 Mr. Ferguson?

4923 Mr. Ferguson. No.

4924 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

4925 Mr. Yarmuth?

4926 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

4927 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

4928 Ms. Lee?

4929 Ms. Lee. Aye.

4930 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

4931 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

4932 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

4933 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

4934 Mr. Moulton?

4935 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

4936 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

4937 Mr. Jeffries?

4938 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

4939 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
4940 Mr. Higgins?
4941 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
4942 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
4943 Ms. DelBene?
4944 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
4945 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
4946 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
4947 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
4948 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
4949 Mr. Boyle?
4950 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
4951 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
4952 Mr. Khanna?
4953 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
4954 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
4955 Ms. Jayapal?
4956 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
4957 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
4958 Mr. Carbajal?
4959 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.
4960 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.
4961 Ms. Jackson Lee?
4962 [No response.]
4963 Ms. Schakowsky?

4964 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

4965 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

4966 Madam Chairman?

4967 Chairman Black. No.

4968 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

4969 Mr. Rokita. Are there any other members who wish to
4970 vote or change their vote? Hearing none, the clerk shall
4971 report.

4972 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
4973 13, and the noes are 21.

4974 Mr. Rokita. And the noes have it. The amendment is
4975 not agreed to. Next, we will vote on an amendment offered
4976 by Mr. Higgins. The clerk will redesignate the amendment.

4977 The Clerk. Amendment No. 8, offered by Representative
4978 Higgins.

4979 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

4980 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

4981 Mr. Rokita. No.

4982 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

4983 Mr. Diaz-Balart.

4984 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

4985 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

4986 Mr. Cole?

4987 [No response.]

4988 Mr. McClintock?

4989 Mr. McClintock. No.
4990 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
4991 Mr. Woodall?
4992 Mr. Woodall. No.
4993 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
4994 Mr. Sanford?
4995 Mr. Sanford. No.
4996 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
4997 Mr. Womack?
4998 Mr. Womack. No.
4999 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
5000 Mr. Brat?
5001 Mr. Brat. No.
5002 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
5003 Mr. Grothman?
5004 Mr. Grothman. No.
5005 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
5006 Mr. Palmer?
5007 Mr. Palmer. No.
5008 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
5009 Mr. Westerman?
5010 Mr. Westerman. No.
5011 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
5012 Mr. Renacci?
5013 Mr. Renacci. No.

5014 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
5015 Mr. Johnson?
5016 Mr. Johnson. No.
5017 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
5018 Mr. Smith?
5019 Mr. Smith. No.
5020 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
5021 Mr. Lewis?
5022 Mr. Lewis. No.
5023 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
5024 Mr. Bergman?
5025 Mr. Bergman. No.
5026 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
5027 Mr. Faso?
5028 Mr. Faso. No.
5029 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
5030 Mr. Smucker?
5031 Mr. Smucker. No.
5032 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
5033 Mr. Gaetz?
5034 Mr. Gaetz. No.
5035 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
5036 Mr. Arrington?
5037 Mr. Arrington. No.
5038 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

5039 Mr. Ferguson?

5040 Mr. Ferguson. No.

5041 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

5042 Mr. Yarmuth?

5043 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

5044 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

5045 Ms. Lee?

5046 Ms. Lee. Aye.

5047 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

5048 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

5049 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

5050 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

5051 Mr. Moulton?

5052 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

5053 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

5054 Mr. Jeffries?

5055 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

5056 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

5057 Mr. Higgins?

5058 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

5059 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

5060 Ms. DelBene?

5061 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

5062 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

5063 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

5064 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

5065 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

5066 Mr. Boyle?

5067 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

5068 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

5069 Mr. Khanna?

5070 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

5071 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

5072 Ms. Jayapal?

5073 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

5074 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

5075 Mr. Carbajal?

5076 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

5077 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

5078 Ms. Jackson Lee?

5079 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

5080 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

5081 Ms. Schakowsky?

5082 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

5083 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

5084 Madam Chairman?

5085 Chairman Black. No.

5086 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no. Madam Chairman, on

5087 that vote, the ayes are 14, and the noes are 21.

5088 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

5089 not agreed to.

5090 Ms. Lee. Madam Chairman, excuse me.

5091 Chairman Black. The gentlelady is recognized.

5092 Ms. Jackson Lee. Madam Chairman, thank you so very
5093 much. I believe that I was in the room as the vote was
5094 being called on women's health. I would like to be
5095 registered, at least in the record, for voting aye for
5096 amendment No. 7 as unanimous consent.

5097 Chairman Black. The clerk will report. Was she
5098 recorded? Was Madam Jackson Lee?

5099 The Clerk. No, Madam Chairman, she was not recorded on
5100 the vote.

5101 Chairman Black. If we can record her, for the record,
5102 as voting aye.

5103 The Clerk. We will. Yes, ma'am.

5104 Ms. Lee. Thank you. Thank you very much, Madam
5105 Chairman.

5106 Chairman Black. You are welcome.

5107 Ms. Lee. I yield back.

5108 Chairman Black. You are welcome. Okay. Okay, great.
5109 Okay, are there any other amendments?

5110 Ms. Lee. Thank you, Madam Chair, I have an amendment.
5111 It is No. 5.

5112 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 5. The clerk
5113 will designate the amendment, and the staff will designate

5114 the copies of the amendment.

5115 The Clerk. Amendment No. 5 offered by Representative

5116 Lee related to funding for antipoverty programs.

5117 [The amendment of Barbara Lee follows:]

5118 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

5119 Ms. Lee. Thank you very much. Madam Chair, this
5120 amendment would restore funding for several mandatory
5121 funding programs that are very critical to reducing poverty
5122 and providing opportunity for all. These programs include
5123 social security, Medicare, SNAP, and many more.

5124 My amendment, which is necessary, would ensure that we
5125 continue to invest in our communities and provide a basic
5126 standard of living for everyone. Once again, we see a
5127 budget that seems to ignore the fact that there are still
5128 more than 46 million Americans living in poverty, both in
5129 rural and urban areas. In fact, in rural America, it
5130 continues to face levels of poverty that are close to 3
5131 percent higher than rates in urban and metro areas.

5132 This budget is balanced by slashing critical, earned
5133 benefits like Social Security and Medicare, programs vital
5134 to reducing poverty and providing a decent standard of
5135 living for all. Now, let me say that again: earned
5136 benefits. We know that these programs work. According to a
5137 study from Pew Charitable Trusts, an additional 8 million
5138 people would be living in poverty without our Nation's food
5139 stamp program. And our poverty rate for senior citizens
5140 would jump from 14.6 percent to 52.67 percent without Social
5141 Security, again earned benefits.

5142 This is almost four times higher, yet, once again, we
5143 see our Republican colleagues wanting to cut and turn these

5144 programs into block grants, despite evidence that clearly
5145 shows that that would make them much less effective. How
5146 many times do I have to remind us cutting poverty programs
5147 is not the same as cutting poverty? Is that really how we
5148 want to budget, by dolling out the pain to those with the
5149 least resources, while rewarding the wealthiest with tax
5150 breaks and huge companies with corporate welfare?

5151 Madam Chair, this is really shocking that, once again,
5152 we are seeing a budget that really does not recognize that
5153 too many Americans are still being left behind and
5154 struggling to find jobs that pay a living wage. They are
5155 forced to choose between paying their bills and putting food
5156 on the table. No one in the richest Nation on earth should
5157 have to make that choice. And I know from personal
5158 experience that people want to work.

5159 I know that people want to be able to feed their
5160 children. They do not want to be on government assistance,
5161 but that bridge over troubled waters should be there when
5162 they need it. I, yes, am a former public assistance
5163 recipient and also SNAP beneficiary. It was a bridge over
5164 troubled water, and I needed it, and my government helped me
5165 to get to where I am today, and I thank them for that.

5166 And so this is a moral document and it should make
5167 lifting Americans out of poverty a priority, rather than cut
5168 programs that will ensure they continue to have to struggle

5169 just to make ends meet. I would like to yield 2 minutes to
5170 my colleagues, Congresswoman Sheila Jackson Lee.

5171 Ms. Jackson Lee. I think I want to take just a moment
5172 to thank Congresswoman Lee for continued decades, and
5173 certainly her time in the United States Congress, for
5174 enlightening us on what really happens when you provide
5175 individuals not a hand out but a hand up. I started by
5176 acknowledging the fact that this is a draconian budget, a
5177 Trump budget that cuts \$200 billion. And, frankly, it goes
5178 into the forests; it takes gasoline and pours it on a
5179 campfire and brings the whole forest down.

5180 That is what will happen to those who need a lifeline.
5181 It is well known that programs like TANF, SNAP, the
5182 Affordable Housing, and the Child Text Credit helps
5183 Americans who are facing hard times, which can access food
5184 and shelter. It is also well-documented that in nonmetro
5185 areas, 2.6 percentage points of poverty were higher in the
5186 1990s and 2.7 percentage points higher from 2000, 2009
5187 compared to metro areas. This was nonmetro area. So
5188 poverty particularly impacts the rural areas.

5189 I would make the argument of supporting the Lee
5190 amendment for the fact that she gives a lifeline to
5191 individuals who seek a better life and who are prepared to
5192 serve their Nation, some in uniform, to be able to make this
5193 country the great country that it is. I thank the

5194 gentlelady for yielding, and I yield back.

5195 Chairman Black. Thank you very much. Is there a
5196 member who would like to claim time in opposition to the
5197 amendment?

5198 Ms. Lee. Madam Chairman?

5199 Chairman Black. Oh, I apologize. You still had time,
5200 Ms. Lee.

5201 Ms. Lee. I still do?

5202 Chairman Black. Yes, you still have time.

5203 Ms. Lee. If there are no other members on our side, I
5204 will close. Let me thank the gentlelady for her comments
5205 and for her tremendous leadership, trying to make sure that
5206 everyone has an opportunity to lift themselves out of
5207 poverty.

5208 I will close by saying that this amendment is really
5209 about equity. It is about equity of opportunity for all
5210 Americans. And we know that there are tremendous
5211 disparities in poverty rates among our African American and
5212 Latino communities, with 24 percent of African Americans and
5213 21 percent of Latinos living in poverty, compared to 9
5214 percent of whites, even though the majority of those living
5215 below the poverty line, of course, are whites. And so we
5216 have to come together to try to figure out how, for all of
5217 us, to lift everyone out of poverty.

5218 In terms of wealth, these numbers are even more stark.

5219 The Institute for Policy Studies found that it would take
5220 the average black family 228 years to amass the same amount
5221 of wealth the white families have today if rates remain the
5222 same. That is in the year 2241. That is how long it is
5223 going to take to make up these years, in terms of amounting
5224 wealth.

5225 And so it is really a disgrace that we continue to cut
5226 our safety net and programs that really help everyone, all
5227 Americans, to lift themselves out of poverty into the middle
5228 class. So I hope you support this amendment, so we can make
5229 sure that more people are not pushed into poverty, and so we
5230 can begin to close some of these inequities in our country.
5231 Thank you again.

5232 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time has expired. Is
5233 there a member who would like to claim time in opposition
5234 for the amendment?

5235 Mr. McClintock, you are recognized for 7 minutes.

5236 Mr. McClintock. Great. Thank you, Madam Chairman.
5237 Well, since 1964, we have tried it the Democrats' way.
5238 According to The Heritage Foundation, we have spent \$22
5239 trillion fighting the war on poverty as a result. Adjusted
5240 for inflation, this is three times more than all of the
5241 military wars we have ever fought combined. Put another
5242 way, it is \$176,000 taken from the lifetime earnings of
5243 every family in America over those 50 years. We have

5244 created 92 different Federal antipoverty programs in this
5245 effort. And I think, after 50 years of experience with
5246 these programs, we are entitled to ask, how is the war on
5247 poverty coming?

5248 In 1996, the poverty rate stood at 14.7 percent.
5249 Today, it is 13.5 percent; \$22 trillion and 50 years later,
5250 poverty has barely budged. Republicans have warned for
5251 years of the poverty trap. The practical effect of these
5252 programs is to trap generations in poverty by robbing them
5253 of the incentive to succeed and denying them the dignity,
5254 the indescribable feeling of self-worth, that comes with a
5255 paycheck. As the old adage says, "Give a man a fish, he
5256 will eat for a day. Teach a man how to fish, and he will
5257 eat for a lifetime." This budget is predicated on this
5258 simple principle.

5259 If you are able-bodied with no dependence, in return
5260 for your welfare benefits, we ask that you look for a job or
5261 train for a job. And if a job is offered, we expect you to
5262 take it. According to Forbes, when Maine applied this
5263 condition, 90 percent of this population found work, and
5264 within a year, their incomes rose 114 percent. Let me
5265 repeat that. The income of these welfare recipients rose
5266 114 percent in the first year once the work requirement took
5267 effect.

5268 Alabama had similar results this year when 13 counties

5269 implemented work requirements for SNAP. The reforms in this
5270 budget are specifically designed to change the incentives,
5271 to get people back into the workforce, so that they, too,
5272 can see their income soar along with their self-respect and
5273 dignity. They also assure that we can focus more resources
5274 on those who cannot fend for themselves. Not only do the
5275 Democrats propose keeping people trapped in poverty with
5276 their programs, but they also propose to harm the economy,
5277 robbing people of the opportunity to succeed. Taxing the
5278 top 1 percent might make a good bumper sticker, but it hurts
5279 the very people they say they are trying to help.

5280 The vast majority of American businesses are
5281 individuals filing under subchapter S, and most of that
5282 income is already taxed in the top bracket. Businesses do
5283 not pay business taxes. The only 3 ways that a business tax
5284 can possibly be paid is by us, as consumers, through higher
5285 prices; by, us as employees, through lower wages; and by us,
5286 as investors, through lower earnings on our retirement
5287 savings. And as Arthur Laffer has often warned, and my home
5288 State of California is again discovering, there is nothing
5289 more portable in this world than money and rich people.

5290 High taxes have already sent hundreds of billions of
5291 dollars of capital offshore. So let me repeat this for my
5292 Democratic colleagues. The only way a business tax can be
5293 paid is by consumers through higher prices, employees

5294 through lower wages, and by investors through lower earnings
5295 as those taxes are passed along. And that, by the way, on
5296 the earning side is mainly the retirement plans.

5297 Our tax plan produces more affordable products for
5298 consumers, higher wages, and more jobs for employees, and
5299 higher returns for people's retirement funds. Now, there
5300 was a time when Democrats supported these policies. That is
5301 what John F. Kennedy accomplished through the tax cuts in
5302 the early 1960s, reminding us that a rising tide lifts all
5303 boats.

5304 Because of these failed policies of the last 50 years,
5305 our Nation is now more than \$20 trillion in debt. The only
5306 way that we are going to escape a fiscal and economic
5307 collapse is to restore the growth rates we had after Reagan,
5308 cut the top tax rate from 70 percent down to 28 percent.
5309 When he did that, the economy grew at twice the rate it is
5310 now, and tax revenue skyrocketed from \$599 billion to \$991
5311 billion. Put more simply, Reagan cut tax rates by more than
5312 half and tax revenues nearly doubled.

5313 History teaches us that lesson very clearly. In the
5314 last 60 years, the top income tax rate has been as high as
5315 91 percent. It is been as low as 28 percent. But income
5316 tax revenues have stayed remarkably steady between 13 and 20
5317 percent of GDP. Indeed, some of the lowest income tax
5318 revenues came when the top tax rate was at its highest, and

5319 some of the highest revenues came when the top rate was
5320 quite low.

5321 But although the tax rate within this envelope has
5322 remarkably little effect on revenues, it has a huge impact
5323 on economic growth. The success of our antipoverty programs
5324 is not how much we spend on them; it is how many people are
5325 lifted out of poverty. The Democratic antipoverty programs
5326 have spent \$22 trillion fighting poverty, and the poverty
5327 rate has barely budged. It seems the more we invest in our
5328 mistakes, the less willing we are to admit them. I think it
5329 is time we connected the dots between poverty and the
5330 Democratic policies.

5331 Has it escaped anyone's attention that the cities with
5332 the most entrenched Democratic machines, the cities where
5333 Democrats have had their way for generations, are the very
5334 same cities where poverty and unemployment are off the
5335 charts and where kids are trapped in failing schools with no
5336 way out? This is the unbroken legacy of the Democrats'
5337 policies, and you see it vividly in any government they have
5338 controlled unopposed for more than a decade.

5339 I do not think there is a single exception to this
5340 rule. This budget charts a new course for our Nation using
5341 policies that are proven time and again to dramatically
5342 improve the lives of those who have been victimized by the
5343 Democrats' poverty trap. The policies called forth by this

5344 budget have time and again produced economic growth and
5345 prosperity for our country. It is time that we had a
5346 rebirth of freedom. It is time for another morning to dawn
5347 in America. It is time to make this country great again.
5348 With that, I yield back.

5349 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Ms. Lee is
5350 recognized for 1 minute to close.

5351 Ms. Lee. Thank you very much. Let me just say, first
5352 of all, we are talking about earned benefits in this
5353 amendment.

5354 Secondly, believe you me, there would be millions more
5355 who would have fallen beneath the poverty line had it not
5356 been for the 1964, 1965 bills that allowed for Medicare and
5357 some of these other programs to be established.

5358 And so, I think when you look at how our country, and
5359 the values of our country, hopefully are enshrined in our
5360 Constitution, people should have a right to dignity, to a
5361 decent standard of living, the right to work. And this
5362 budget cuts workforce training. It cuts all of the
5363 apprenticeship training programs. It cuts the very lifeline
5364 out of what it takes to be able to move from poverty into a
5365 good paying job.

5366 So, we cannot have it both ways. We cannot cut the
5367 safety net and cut earned benefits, cut workforce training,
5368 cut education and not have any job creation efforts in the

5369 budget and yet, you know, put forth a budget that really
5370 harms many, many millions of Americans, both rural and
5371 urban.

5372 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired.

5373 Ms. Lee. So, I hope we get an aye vote for this.

5374 Thank you.

5375 Chairman Black. The question is agreeing on the
5376 amendment offered by Ms. Lee.

5377 All those in favor, say aye.

5378 All those opposed, no.

5379 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

5380 A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to our
5381 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded
5382 vote until we have finished debating the next seven
5383 amendments. Are there other amendments?

5384 Ms. Jayapal. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
5385 desk.

5386 Chairman Black. This is Amendment No. 9 and the clerk
5387 will designate the amendment. The staff will distribute
5388 copies of the amendment.

5389 The Clerk. Amendment No. 9, offered by Representative
5390 Jayapal, related to Border Security and Immigration
5391 Monetarization Act.

5392 [The amendment of Pramila Jayapal follows:]

5393

***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

5394 Chairman Black. Ms. Jayapal is recognized for 6
5395 minutes.

5396 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Madam Chair. If this
5397 committee really wants to get to the kind of growth that is
5398 projected in this budget, one way to actually get there is
5399 to enact comprehensive immigration reform. My amendment
5400 does just that. Estimates from economists on both sides of
5401 the aisle project that passing immigration reform would
5402 bring \$1.5 to \$1.8 trillion into our economy over the next
5403 14 years.

5404 For all the rhetoric spread about undocumented
5405 immigrants, Madam Chair, the facts are clear. Undocumented
5406 immigrants pay an estimated \$11.7 billion in taxes each
5407 year. And I comprehensive reform were enacted that provided
5408 legal status for all undocumented immigrants, it would
5409 increase state and local tax contributions by an estimated
5410 \$2 billion a year.

5411 Now, just last month in this committee, we heard from
5412 three economists, two of whom were majority witnesses to
5413 this committee, and all of whom testified to the benefits of
5414 comprehensive immigration reform. These comments are in
5415 line with broad support among economists recognizing the
5416 benefits, and I request unanimous consent, Madam Chair, to
5417 enter into the record a letter from 1,470 economists calling
5418 on Congress to fix our broken immigration system.

5419 Chairman Black. Without objection.

5420 [The information follows:]

5421 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

5422 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you. Signatories include six Nobel
5423 laureates and members of the Reagan, George H.W. Bush,
5424 Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama administrations. And, in
5425 the letter, these economists recognize, and this is a quote,
5426 that "the benefits that immigration brings to society far
5427 outweigh their costs. And smart immigration policy could
5428 better maximize the benefits the immigration while reducing
5429 the costs." All of these economists agree that immigration
5430 reform would bring entrepreneurs who start new businesses
5431 and hire American workers, bring young workers who help
5432 offset the largescale retirement of baby boomers, and
5433 diverse skillsets that keep our workforce flexible and help
5434 our communities and our economy grow.

5435 Moody's has estimated that for every 1 percent of
5436 increase in the immigrant population, our GDP would rise by
5437 1.15 percent. And at the same time, Madam Chair, harsh
5438 immigration policies actually hurt our economy and tear
5439 apart our communities.

5440 Mr. Holtz-Eakin, who was before us last month,
5441 testified to us on this committee that his institute had put
5442 out a report on the enormous costs of the proposed harsh
5443 immigration policies being proposed. Deporting 11 million
5444 undocumented immigrants, for example, would be an \$8
5445 trillion hit to our economy, a hit that none of our States
5446 would ever recover from. And just as one example,

5447 eliminating immigrant labor in the dairy industry, for
5448 example, would cause the total number of dairy farms to drop
5449 dramatically and increase milk prices by 90 percent.

5450 Madam Chair, all of us, regardless of immigration
5451 status, are harmed when ICE raids sensitive locations like
5452 schools and courthouses and shelters. My Republican
5453 colleagues know this themselves and they have been
5454 responding to numerous calls from families, businesses, and
5455 farms in their district who know we need a real and
5456 comprehensive human solution. And, with that, I would like
5457 to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Illinois,
5458 Representative Schakowsky.

5459 Ms. Schakowsky. I thank the vice ranking member for
5460 yielding. Our immigration system, it is hard to argue, is
5461 broken. We spent over \$2 billion for ICE to detain
5462 immigrants, few of whom have committed serious crimes. This
5463 administration creates fear in our communities by rounding
5464 up mothers and fathers and tearing families apart. Instead
5465 of adopting comprehensive immigration reform that would
5466 reduce our budget deficit and strengthen social security,
5467 this budget would continue to build a deportation course
5468 that would send individuals back to countries they have not
5469 seen maybe in decades.

5470 My Republican colleagues say they are concerned with
5471 strengthening our economy, yet they fail to see the

5472 potential for comprehensive immigration reform to deliver on
5473 that goal. We are a Nation of immigrants. Let's fix our
5474 broken immigration system and make comprehensive immigration
5475 reform a real priority. And I yield back.

5476 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Ms. Schakowsky. And I would
5477 like to yield 1 minute to my colleague from Washington
5478 State, Susan DelBene.

5479 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. I am pleased to support Ms.
5480 Jayapal's amendment. We need bipartisan comprehensive
5481 immigration reform that protects workers, unites families,
5482 and provides an earned pathway to citizenship. And I
5483 believe, given the chance to vote, many of my colleagues on
5484 the other side of the aisle might agree. Study after study
5485 has demonstrated that immigrants are critical to the U.S.
5486 economy from helping fill agricultural positions where labor
5487 shortages can result in lost crops to building cutting edge
5488 startups that create jobs and field growth right here at
5489 home.

5490 A 2016 study by the National Foundation for American
5491 Policy showed that just 87 startups founded by immigrants in
5492 the U.S. created over 700 jobs each, and that is just a
5493 sampling. We should be supporting, not deporting, these
5494 law-abiding people who are making our country stronger and
5495 more productive. I urge my colleagues to vote, "Yes," on
5496 this amendment and I yield back.

5497 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you. And I yield the remainder of
5498 the time to Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee from the great State of
5499 Texas.

5500 Ms. Jackson Lee. I rise to support the gentlelady's
5501 amendment. And I would like to indicate the CBO estimated
5502 study in 113th Congress. The Democratic Immigration Reform
5503 bill H.R. 15 would have reduced the deficit by \$900 billion.
5504 This budget that we are fighting over, and the fact that we
5505 are not offering common sense amendments, and supporting
5506 comprehensive immigration reform, because all that this
5507 Republican budget does is take the money and give it to the
5508 rich, the billionaires and the millionaires, for a tax cut.
5509 It has no pathway to help the American people. I yield
5510 back.

5511 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time has expired. Is
5512 there a member who would like to claim the time in
5513 opposition to this amendment?

5514 Mr. Arrington. Madam Chair?

5515 Chairman Black. Mr. Arrington is recognized for 7
5516 minutes.

5517 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Madam Chair. And I
5518 appreciate the gentlelady's thoughtful comments on this
5519 issue. I understand it is an emotionally charged issue on
5520 all sides of the immigration equation. And I acknowledge
5521 that the legal immigration process is not perfect and, in

5522 areas, it is broken and we need to fix it. And I am
5523 committed to fixing it. I have experience in my own
5524 district in West Texas where there are gaps that need to be
5525 closed, namely in agriculture where there is a shortage of
5526 labor. But before we can undertake major comprehensive
5527 immigration reform, we have to prove to the American people
5528 that we are willing and able to stop the flow of illegal
5529 immigrants and commit the necessary resources to secure our
5530 border.

5531 The last administration demonstrated just the opposite.
5532 Whether it was President Obama's policies on catch and
5533 release, tolerating sanctuary cities, or woefully
5534 underfunding border security, the message to the American
5535 people was clear: President Obama was not interested in
5536 solving this problem. Even worse, he abdicated his first
5537 responsibility to keep the American people safe, in my
5538 opinion.

5539 I do recognize that most of the people that are coming
5540 to this country do so because they want a better life for
5541 their families. America is the beacon of hope and the land
5542 of freedom and opportunity, and I think we all respect and
5543 appreciate that. But if somebody is coming here illegally,
5544 we cannot reward that. We have to uphold rule of law. It
5545 is part of the basic underpinning of the American democracy.

5546 I am proud that America is a Nation of immigrants, but

5547 I am equally proud that we are a Nation of laws. I urge a
5548 no vote and I yield the balance of my time to the gentleman
5549 from Georgia, Mr. Ferguson.

5550 Mr. Ferguson. Thank you, Mr. Arrington. And I am
5551 happy to address this most important issue. And, like you,
5552 I would like to thank my colleague from Washington for her
5553 thoughts on this important issue. But I think the first
5554 thing that we have got to recognize is that our immigration
5555 system does need reforms, but it has to be done the right
5556 way.

5557 And one of the things that I think that is so vitally
5558 important to that discussion is building trust with the
5559 American people. And that trust cannot be built until we
5560 know for sure that the border is secure and that we have
5561 security from folks that wish to do us harm coming into this
5562 Nation. And that is a tough thing to talk about because,
5563 many times, that paints everyone with a bad light, and that
5564 is not what the intent of it is to do. But there are
5565 several other issues that we have got to contend with.

5566 First of all, H.R. 15 gives unchecked authority to the
5567 executive branch to prevent future removals, including
5568 removals of criminal aliens. H.R. 15 is designed to conceal
5569 the cost from taxpayers by delaying amnesty recipients'
5570 access to most government benefits for the first decade
5571 after the bill is enacted. About 13 years after passage,

5572 amnesty recipients would be eligible for over 80 Federal
5573 means-tested welfare programs. I think we can all recognize
5574 that not every immigrant would be on welfare or receiving an
5575 entitlement, but right now we have a mandatory spending
5576 curve that is out of control, and we must get that and we
5577 must address that and we must be realistic about that.

5578 As we continue to grow mandatory spending, it crowds
5579 out every other thing in our budget and everything else that
5580 we need to do. And before we can expand our immigration
5581 policy, that is something that we must do because we cannot
5582 take care of anybody if this Nation is in a fiscal crisis
5583 and a sovereign debt crisis. I think we all recognize the
5584 great contribution that immigrants make to this Nation, just
5585 as all of our ancestors have. And we need to continue to
5586 welcome people into this community, but it must be done in a
5587 lawful way. We must uphold the laws that we have, and we
5588 must be sure that this Nation is on sound financial footing.
5589 With that, Madam Chairman, I yield back.

5590 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Mr. Ferguson. I yield the
5591 balance of the time to Mr. Grothman.

5592 Mr. Grothman. All right, it is amazing we are sitting
5593 here on the budget, everything an excuse to talk about
5594 immigration and confused legal immigration to illegal
5595 immigration. It is true, Presidents of both parties for a
5596 variety of reasons have ignored our immigration laws. But

5597 let's face it. In this large world, there are a lot of
5598 people that want to come here. There are a lot of people
5599 who want to come here legally. And the problem with this
5600 amendment, it seems to favor people who would have rather
5601 come to America illegally than people who wanted to fill out
5602 the appropriate forms and go through the waiting period and
5603 come here legally.

5604 Now, as we look at the future of the American economy,
5605 and the future amount of cost that is involved, let's stop
5606 and think: which class of citizens is going to be more
5607 likely to be law abiding? Well, right now, the five
5608 districts closest to the Mexican border are five districts
5609 who are way disproportionately have criminal cases filed by
5610 Federal prosecutors. It would not be surprising to me if
5611 the people who are coming here illegally rather than legally
5612 are more likely to commit crimes. As far as take advantage
5613 of our incredibly generous safety nets, it is hard to get
5614 exact figures here because I do not think people are filling
5615 out forms staying here illegally. But again, obviously, if
5616 we do not pick our immigrants, we are going to be more
5617 likely to get people who take advantage of our generous
5618 welfare benefits.

5619 As far as age is concerned, let's be honest. We do not
5620 want to take people. We have already a huge crisis in our
5621 country as far as healthcare costs. I do not think we want

5622 to be the country that takes in everybody in their declining
5623 years and has to pay for their health care. But, again,
5624 this is something we can take care of if we are picking our
5625 immigrants rather than saying, "Whoever comes here illegally
5626 can have a payout to citizenship." And common sense will
5627 tell you as we pick our immigrants for this country, we
5628 would be better off taking people who come here legally
5629 rather than muddling the American minds and working towards
5630 amnesty for people who come here and are breaking the law in
5631 the first place.

5632 For the long run benefit of America, whether you are
5633 looking at the income side of the equation and want the most
5634 productive citizens who are going to be paying the most tax,
5635 or whether you look at the expense side of the equation and
5636 look for citizens who are least likely to take advantage of
5637 our welfare programs, the idea of at least this example of
5638 comprehensive immigration reform should be a nonstarter.
5639 And I yield my remaining 2 seconds back to Congressman
5640 Arrington.

5641 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Mr. Grothman. Madam Chair,
5642 I yield back.

5643 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Ms.
5644 Jayapal, you are recognized for 1 minute to close.

5645 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Madam Chair. I just have to
5646 say that the bill that is being proposed being enacted was

5647 the same bill from 2013 that passed in the U.S. Senate with
5648 68 bipartisan votes. There was an entire Board of Security
5649 piece of that bill that contained billions of dollars into
5650 border security. And, in fact, at the time, Senator McCain
5651 said that it was ridiculous that we were going to put that
5652 much money into border security because those were not
5653 actually what would fix our situation.

5654 The reality, Madam Chair, is that immigrants, and I
5655 resent any suggestion otherwise, immigrants are law-abiding
5656 citizens. And they are helping our economy grow. And if we
5657 want to project a 3 percent growth that, frankly, no
5658 economist has said is possible, then we have got to invest
5659 in our long-term future for this country to make sure that
5660 we have workers in the country and to make sure that we
5661 continue to recognize the benefits that those workers bring
5662 to our economy. So, I hope that my colleagues on both sides
5663 of the aisle will vote for this amendment, recognizing that
5664 this is in the interests of all of our districts in our
5665 economy. Thank you, Madam Chair; I yield back.

5666 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back. The
5667 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms.
5668 Jayapal.

5669 All those in favor, say aye.

5670 All those opposed, no.

5671 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

5672 A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to our
5673 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded
5674 vote until we have finished debating the next seven
5675 amendments. Are there other amendments?

5676 Mr. Carbajal. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
5677 desk.

5678 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 10. The clerk
5679 will designate the amendment and the staff will distribute
5680 the copies of the amendment.

5681 The Clerk. Amendment No. 10, offered by Representative
5682 Carbajal, to insert a policy statement on rejecting
5683 construction of a border wall.

5684 [The amendment of Salud Carbajal follows:]

5685 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

5686 Chairman Black. Mr. Carbajal is recognized for 6
5687 minutes.

5688 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Madam Chair. Before I
5689 proceed to offer my amendment, I just have to say, as an
5690 immigrant myself, and on behalf of immigrants, how abhorrent
5691 I found the comments by one of my colleagues, insinuating
5692 that immigrants are more likely to commit crimes. Some of
5693 them actually join our military. Some of them actually
5694 become members of Congress like yours truly. So I just
5695 wanted to say that, for the record.

5696 My amendment rejects the construction of an American
5697 taxpayer-funded wall on the U.S. southern border which is a
5698 costly and ineffective method for dealing with our country's
5699 broken immigration system. A border wall will not stop
5700 unauthorized entry into the country, and it will not fix our
5701 broken immigration system. Walls are easily circumvented,
5702 and they do nothing to stop people who have overstayed their
5703 Visas which is more common than unauthorized entries across
5704 the southern border. This Republican budget wastes billions
5705 of dollars on an ineffective wall while doing nothing to
5706 protect undocumented immigrants who come here as children,
5707 also known as DREAMers, who know the U.S. as their only
5708 home.

5709 President Trump promised U.S. taxpayers that they would
5710 not have to pay for a wall. One of President Trump's main

5711 campaign complaints was to build a wall and make Mexico pay for
5712 it. The American people should not be forced to pay for
5713 such a wall. Yet, as we heard earlier, this budget provides
5714 \$1.6 billion in 2018 to begin the construction of a border
5715 wall. And building a border wall will not curb criminal
5716 activity the way Republicans say it will.

5717 Ninety percent of the illicit drugs smuggled into our
5718 country come from our ports of entry. President Trump has
5719 failed to present the American public with an official cost
5720 figure for his wall. Estimates range from \$22 billion to
5721 \$70 billion. We have no provisional cost figures for this
5722 unnecessary wall. Yet, we are asking the American taxpayer
5723 to cover whatever that uncertain cost may be.

5724 Finally, no evidence-based analysis has been completed
5725 on whether physical border barriers have any impact on
5726 diverting undocumented immigrants or on apprehension means.
5727 The GAO has found that Customs and Border Protection, which
5728 is within DHS, has no entrance in place to determine whether
5729 border fencing has any significant impact on its mission.

5730 Let's instead focus on fixing our broken immigration
5731 system through comprehensive immigration reform which would
5732 boost our economy and reduce the deficit. A border wall
5733 will do little to better secure America's borders and its
5734 costs are uncertain, which is why I ask my colleagues to
5735 reject the construction of a new border wall by supporting

5736 my amendment. I would now like to yield 1.5 minutes to the
5737 representative from Washington, Ms. Jayapal.

5738 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you for yielding. Former Homeland
5739 Security's Secretary General Janet Napolitano once said,
5740 "You show me a 50-foot wall and I will show you a 51-foot
5741 ladder." Fencing alone will never be enough to fix our
5742 broken immigration system. And actually, as recently as
5743 April, our current Homeland Security secretary said that it
5744 is highly improbable the wall will be built from sea to
5745 shining sea.

5746 As long as we continue to throw money at enforcement
5747 without providing a roadmap to citizenship for the 11
5748 billion undocumented men, women, and children, we will
5749 continue to have people trying to cross the border illegally
5750 in a desperate attempt to reunite with their loved ones. No
5751 wall and no jail will ever crush the undeniable desire of
5752 mothers and fathers to be with their children.

5753 Moreover, as the humanitarian crises continue in the
5754 northern triangle countries of El Salvador, Honduras, and
5755 Guatemala, people will continue to seek safety on our
5756 shores. The conditions in these countries are extremely
5757 grave, particularly for women. The northern triangle
5758 countries are actually among the top five countries in the
5759 world with the worst female homicide rate. When we crack
5760 down on border security without addressing the broken

5761 immigration system, then unfortunately people are forced
5762 into the shadows and pursue more dangerous routes to safety.
5763 I hope that we can pass this sensible amendment to reject
5764 the wall and I yield back the balance of my time.

5765 Mr. Carbajal. I would now like to yield 1 minute to my
5766 colleague representative from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky.

5767 Ms. Schakowsky. I thank you for yielding. President
5768 Trump has laid out his vision for a border wall. He wants
5769 it to run along the entire border regardless of whether that
5770 is really effective. Last week, he said, "You need to be
5771 able to see through it," because, "when they throw the large
5772 sack of drugs over, and if you have people on the other side
5773 of the wall, you do not see them. They hit you on the head
5774 with 60 pounds of stuff," and, of course, Mexico will pay
5775 for it.

5776 Congress should not ask Americans to pay for this
5777 incredibly expensive waste. We need real solutions like
5778 comprehensive immigration reform. We need to help the
5779 refugees desperately facing violent conditions. Let's start
5780 by adopting this amendment which rejects funding for
5781 President Trump's border wall. And I yield back.

5782 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time is expired. Is
5783 there a member who would like to claim time in opposition to
5784 the amendment?

5785 Mr. Arrington. Madam Chair, I would like to claim

5786 time.

5787 Chairman Black. Mr. Arrington, you are recognized for
5788 7 minutes.

5789 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Madam Chair. I appreciate
5790 the comments of my friend from California. And, by the way,
5791 I am proud to serve with you. From Texas, and I am sure
5792 other border States feel the same way, stopping illegal
5793 immigration and securing our border is of the utmost
5794 concern. In my district in West Texas, it was the number
5795 one issue. It is not just the illegal person, it is the
5796 illegal activity that also comes across the border, and it
5797 is drugs and human trafficking and gang activity and other
5798 criminal activity. Our citizens in Texas alone have paid
5799 hundreds of millions of dollars to do the job that the
5800 Federal Government was supposed to do, their first job,
5801 protect our sovereign borders, keep the American people
5802 safe. Put America first.

5803 Furthermore, American taxpayers have spent upwards of
5804 \$100 billion on account of illegal immigration. In fiscal
5805 year 2016, the United States border patrol apprehended over
5806 400,000 illegal immigrants attempting to cross our southern
5807 border with Mexico. While these illegal entries were
5808 thwarted by border patrol, we have no idea how many more
5809 undocumented immigrants were able to enter our country
5810 successfully.

5811 This is not about knowing how to solve the problem.
5812 This is about having the political will to solve it. And
5813 the last administration clearly was unwilling. Border
5814 security is a comprehensive strategy. It is sufficient
5815 boots on the ground. And, by the way, we are 1,000 border
5816 patrol agents short of the minimal standard. It is
5817 leveraging technology, and it is a wall or a fence or some
5818 physical barrier in strategic places. Anyone who has been
5819 to the border knows that calling it porous is an
5820 understatement. It is wide open. I have met with border
5821 patrol agents. I am sure many of my colleagues have as
5822 well. And, to a person, they say they need the physical
5823 barriers in order to do their job to keep us safe and
5824 enforce the law.

5825 It is past time our Nation's leaders got serious about
5826 our public safety mission and give this President the
5827 resources he needs to secure our borders. This President is
5828 willing. Let's give him the resources so that he is able.
5829 Stopping illegal immigration is first and foremost an issue
5830 of national security. Let's respect the rule of law. Let's
5831 protect the American people, and let's secure our border. I
5832 urge a no-vote, and I yield the gentleman from California,
5833 Mr. McClintock.

5834 Mr. McClintock. I thank the gentleman. I have always
5835 found it confusing when the Democrats say that they care

5836 deeply about unemployment, income inequality, and wages, but
5837 they are perfectly fine with adding millions of illegal
5838 immigrants to compete for entry-level jobs which increases
5839 unemployment, adds to income inequality, and drives wages
5840 down.

5841 I have also found it confusing when Democrats who
5842 constantly preach for more and more government spending and
5843 infrastructure investment and shovel-ready projects suddenly
5844 are appalled by the cost of the border wall which is
5845 estimated between \$8 and \$12 billion.

5846 Let's put this in perspective. The direct cost to
5847 taxpayers for illegal immigration is an estimated \$113
5848 billion a year. That includes nearly \$30 billion from the
5849 Federal Government. Illegals pay an estimated \$11 billion
5850 in taxes. So, the next cost is roughly \$100 billion, and
5851 that does not include the social costs of crime, drug, and
5852 sex trafficking, and the costs of supporting children born
5853 to illegal immigrants. Put another way, it is three-tenths
5854 of 1 percent of what the Federal Government spends.

5855 So there it is, a one-time investment of \$12 billion to
5856 save \$100 billion in net expenditures, assure market wages
5857 for every American worker, and reduce the onset of crime. I
5858 think that is a very good investment. And I would remind my
5859 friend from California of the Fox report in 2015. Illegal
5860 immigrants as opposed to all immigrants, illegal immigrants,

5861 account for 3.7 percent of the population. They are
5862 convicted of 13.6 percent of all crimes, 12 percent of all
5863 murders, 20 percent of kidnappings, and 16 percent of drug
5864 trafficking. Final thought, this is not a new idea. Israel
5865 has a 245-mile wall on its southern border with Egypt. It
5866 has reduced illegal crossings by 99.8 percent. And I yield
5867 back.

5868 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Mr. McClintock. And I now
5869 yield to the gentleman from Florida, Mr. Gaetz.

5870 Mr. Gaetz. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I
5871 believe that these two amendments offered by Democrats
5872 really reveal the strategy the Democrats have. They want a
5873 porous border. They do not want a wall. They do not want a
5874 circumstance where the rule of law is applied in their
5875 country, and there are mechanisms in place to ensure that
5876 people are not drawn across our borders illegally. But it
5877 does not stop there.

5878 If you look at the immediately preceding amendment, the
5879 strategy after, inviting illegal immigration into the
5880 country, is to start giving illegal immigrants welfare. The
5881 very amendment that is embodied in H.R. 15 would say that,
5882 after roughly 13 years, illegal immigrants would be eligible
5883 to receive welfare assistance.

5884 This question was litigated in the last election.
5885 Donald Trump won largely on the theory that we do need to

5886 put America first. And that is not to say that people do
5887 not have compassionate stories all over the world. They
5888 most certainly do.

5889 But the American taxpayer cannot shoulder the burden of
5890 compassion for every single person on the planet Earth that
5891 has a compelling story. We have Americans with compelling
5892 stories that need our assistance that need us to be
5893 investing in infrastructure and economic growth and rising
5894 opportunity for everyone in this country.

5895 And so, the construction of this border wall, which I
5896 sincerely look forward to voting for on the House floor,
5897 signifies this Republican Congress's commitment to stand
5898 with our President, to stand against illegal immigration, to
5899 fight for the rule of law, and put the interests of the
5900 American people first. That is why we won this last
5901 election and it is exactly what we are going to do. And I
5902 yield back to the gentleman from Texas.

5903 Mr. Arrington. Thank you, Mr. Gaetz. Madam Chair, I
5904 yield back the balance of my time.

5905 Chairman Black. The gentleman has yielded back the
5906 balance of his time. Mr. Carbajal, you are recognized for 1
5907 minute to close.

5908 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Madam Chair. Democrats
5909 [inaudible] amendment of securing our borders, but we want
5910 to do it effectively. The last bill that was passed

5911 actually invested \$40 billion towards border security. All
5912 I am saying is do not build something just to build
5913 something symbolic which is not going to be effective. It
5914 only goes to divide us. It only goes to create division and
5915 create a symbol of division that our country is not -- does
5916 not have as a value.

5917 The figures that were mentioned earlier are clearly not
5918 from any credible source, or else those figures would be
5919 shared more often. Again, today is really about advocating
5920 for sound, reasonable solutions, you know, not symbolic,
5921 ineffective solutions that cost the taxpayers billions of
5922 dollars. What we should be doing is investing in
5923 comprehensive immigration reform to address those very
5924 important issues. I yield back.

5925 Chairman Black. The gentleman's time has expired. The
5926 question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr.
5927 Carbajal.

5928 All those in favor, say aye.

5929 All those opposed, no.

5930 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

5931 Mr. Carbajal. May I request a recorded vote?

5932 Chairman Black. A recorded vote is requested.

5933 Pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone
5934 the recorded vote until after we have finished debating on
5935 the seven amendments. There has been a vote called. And

5936 AFTER 6:00 P.M.

5937 so, we will recess to go to the floor to vote, and we will
5938 resume immediately after the vote.

5939 [Recess.]

5940 Chairman Black. The committee will come to order. Are
5941 there any other amendments?

5942 Ms. Lujan Grisham. I have an amendment at the desk.

5943 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 10. The clerk
5944 will designate the amendment. The staff will distribute the
5945 copies of the amendment.

5946 Ms. Lujan Grisham. I think it is 11.

5947 Chairman Black. Excuse me this is amendment No. 11.

5948 The Clerk. Amendment No. 11 offered by Representative
5949 Lujan Grisham related to nutrition assistance.

5950 [The amendment of Michelle Lujan Grisham follows:]

5951 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

5952 Chairman Black. Ms. Lujan Grisham is recognized for 6
5953 minutes.

5954 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you, Madam Chairman. The
5955 Republican budget cuts the supplemental nutrition program by
5956 \$150 billion, turns it into a block grant program. And I
5957 open my remarks this morning about a constituent of mine,
5958 Layne Havens, who is trying to survive on \$33 a week in SNAP
5959 benefits while raising a 9-year-old son. Without that \$33,
5960 she has indicated that she is not able to afford the most
5961 important foods for her son. Foods with meats, foods with
5962 protein and iron in them that she needs to keep her child
5963 healthy.

5964 But this is just one story. And the cuts in this
5965 budget will harm an estimated 43 million Americans who
5966 receive SNAP; almost half of whom are children. In fact,
5967 over 80 percent of SNAP households are living at or below
5968 the poverty line and almost 90 percent of these participants
5969 live in a household with a child under 18, an elderly person
5970 over 60, or an individual with disabilities. In addition,
5971 one in four children at the Department of Defense schools
5972 are eligible for free lunch. In 2016, \$67 billion in food
5973 stamps was spent at our commissaries, and 1.5 million
5974 Veterans a year are on SNAP.

5975 Although some States are slowly coming out of the
5976 recession, my home State of New Mexico has been left behind.

5977 And, in fact, we are one of the hungriest States in the
5978 Nation. In 2016, New Mexico ranked second worst for
5979 childhood hunger. One out of four New Mexican children are
5980 food insecure, and also in 2016, a quarter of our States
5981 population was on SNAP; this is 471,000 New Mexicans. Not
5982 only does this budget drastically cut SNAP it also imposes
5983 even stricter work requirements that already exist in the
5984 program. The budget does nothing to increase job training,
5985 raise the minimum raise, or increase funding for any other
5986 programs would help people find employment or take home a
5987 bigger paycheck.

5988 In New Mexico, there are no jobs. There is no job
5989 training and we are already one of the hungriest and poorest
5990 states in the entire country. We have the second-highest
5991 unemployment rate at 6.6 percent. Albuquerque has lost
5992 approximately four private sector jobs per day over the last
5993 10 years. Cutting SNAP devastates my state, as well as many
5994 other hungry states like Mississippi, Texas, Alaska, and
5995 Kentucky. My amendment rejects these deep cuts to SNAP and
5996 improves access to child nutrition assistance in the summer
5997 months, and I encourage my colleagues to support it. I
5998 yield 1 minute to my friend Congresswoman DelBene.

5999 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. I am pleased to support
6000 Representative Lujan Grisham's amendment. This budget hurts
6001 the neediest and most vulnerable Americans by making drastic

6002 cuts to SNAP and converting the program into a block grant
6003 by 2021. SNAP will provide benefits to over 43 million
6004 Americans this year; almost half of whom are children. And
6005 over 80 percent of SNAP households are living at or below
6006 the poverty line; access to SNAP by pregnant women leads to
6007 healthier babies and girls who have access to SNAP as
6008 children are 18 percent more likely to graduate from high
6009 school.

6010 The Republican budget is playing politics with hunger.
6011 We should be focusing on creating jobs, not punishing our
6012 most vulnerable citizens. I strongly urge my colleagues to
6013 vote yes on this amendment, and I yield back.

6014 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you. I now yield 1 minute to
6015 my friend Congressman Carbajal.

6016 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Ms. Lujan Grisham. Our
6017 budget should not be balanced on the backs of the most
6018 vulnerable. This republican budget does just that. Most
6019 SNAP recipients are children, the elderly, and the disabled.
6020 Those who can work, work, either in jobs paying too little,
6021 or providing too few hours to support their families. The
6022 rest includes vulnerable populations who need support to
6023 address barriers to work like returning Veterans or former
6024 foster youth.

6025 The Republican blueprint suggests eliminating wavers
6026 for able-bodied adults without dependents. As we have seen

6027 since the Great Depression recession, these wavers are vital
6028 tools to provide food assistance to communities with
6029 chronically high unemployment. Taken away this flexibility
6030 from States is guaranteed to worsen hunger. SNAP has one of
6031 the highest stimulus effects of any Federal spending
6032 supporting economic growth and jobs.

6033 I urge support for Representative Lujan Grisham's
6034 amendment. I yield back.

6035 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you. I now yield 1 minute to
6036 my friend Congresswoman Schakowsky.

6037 Ms. Schakowsky. I thank my colleague for her
6038 amendment. This proposed budget assumes \$150 billion in
6039 cuts to the SNAP program over the next 10 years. Cutting
6040 SNAP would leave American families, including children,
6041 unable to put food on the table and with nowhere else to
6042 return. We cannot expect that local charities or States
6043 will be able to fill the void left by this budget cut. For
6044 every meal provided by a charity in Illinois, SNAP provides
6045 nine.

6046 I have to ask my colleagues sitting here today, "Did
6047 you really come to Congress to take food out of the mouths
6048 of hungry children?" I urge my colleagues to reject this
6049 budget's deep cuts to the SNAP program and I yield back.

6050 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you. I reserve.

6051 Chairman Black. The gentlelady reserves her time. Is

6052 there a member who would like to claim the time in
6053 opposition to the amendment?

6054 Mr. McClintock. Madam Chairman?

6055 Chairman Black. Mr. McClintock is recognized for 7
6056 minutes.

6057 Mr. McClintock. Thank you. Madam Chairman, this
6058 amendment actually perpetuates the debt and poverty spiral
6059 that the Democrats have put us in in the last eight years.
6060 In 2002, one in 15 Americans were on SNAP or food stamps.
6061 Today, one in seven are. Let me put it another way. In
6062 2007, just before the recession hit, unemployment was 4.6
6063 percent; there were 26 million Americans on food stamps.
6064 Unemployment is back down to about the same, 4.7 percent,
6065 but the number of Americans on food stamps is now 44
6066 million. The unemployment rates remain pretty much the
6067 same. The enrollment has nearly doubled.

6068 Let me put it in family-sized numbers: this program now
6069 consumes an average of \$568 from the taxes paid by every
6070 American family. Let me repeat that: \$568 of the taxes paid
6071 by an average family goes to pay for the SNAP program. And
6072 before the SNAP card was designed to blend in with debit
6073 cards, the most bitter complaints I got were from moms and
6074 dads on tight budgets who paid those taxes, frugally passed
6075 over the expensive foods at the grocery store, and then
6076 found the person ahead of them in line with a SNAP card

6077 purchasing these very same things.

6078 We owe it to those average, hard-working families who
6079 pay those \$568 dollars of taxes for SNAP, and then have to
6080 scrimp on luxuries for their families in order to pay those
6081 taxes, we owe it to them to assure that those who are
6082 receiving benefits, who have no dependents, and who are
6083 perfectly capable of working, or training for work, or, at
6084 least, looking for work, do so in return for those benefits
6085 because that is what every one of those hard-working
6086 families are doing.

6087 I suspect that we will find with this modest
6088 requirement what 13 Alabama counties found when they set
6089 that condition at the beginning of the year for able-bodied
6090 SNAP recipients with no dependents. In those counties, in a
6091 5-month period, the number of recipients declined from 5,538
6092 to 831; that is an 85 percent decline. That does not mean
6093 that we are cutting SNAP benefits; it means we are
6094 protecting them for those who truly need them.

6095 We are also recommending that States take some
6096 responsibility for these programs. Right now, the Federal
6097 Government picks up the tab, but the State doles out the
6098 benefits. This gives them zero incentive to guard against
6099 waste, fraud, and abuse and gives them a perverse incentive
6100 to overload the roles to bring more money into the State.

6101 So, I pointed out before, you do not help the poor by

6102 harming the economy. When you raise taxes on the so-called
6103 1 percent, you are actually hitting business that pass along
6104 these tax increases, it is higher prices for consumers,
6105 lower wages for workers, and lower earnings for investors;
6106 largely people's pensions. And the truth is, if we do not
6107 reform these programs they will continue to outgrow the
6108 economy until the program collapses of its own weight on
6109 precisely the truly needy that we are trying to protect. I
6110 yield the balance of my time to Mr. Grothman.

6111 Mr. Grothman. Thank you. I feel bad disagreeing with
6112 the wonderful Congressman Lujan Grisham, but this is a
6113 program, when you look, it has grown from \$16 million to \$44
6114 million over 16 years, at a time when unemployment, at least
6115 in my State, and I think, largely nationwide, is the lowest
6116 it has been in years and years and years, you have to
6117 realize there is something wrong here. Because when the
6118 economy is humming along like this and you have almost three
6119 times as many people under the program as a few years ago,
6120 it means reform is necessary.

6121 Now, I do not care whether you go in my district, but
6122 you talk to people in Washington, right now people sell SNAP
6123 for 50 cents on the dollar. Which also indicates something
6124 is wrong. Because I would not sell, you know, \$20 of food
6125 for \$10. But that is what is going all around this country
6126 and it is something that ought to be reported a little bit

6127 more. The SNAP program incentivizes people in two ways.
6128 First of all, the SNAP program incentivizes people not to
6129 work as much.

6130 When combined with the many other anti-poverty programs
6131 we have in this country, one can only say it discourages
6132 work or it discourages working full-time. And I think
6133 anybody who talks to employers making in the lower-wage
6134 class, they will give you examples of people who have turned
6135 down wages, turned down additional hours because they like
6136 to keep their benefits going. The other problem I have with
6137 SNAP is it discourages marriages. It is only of many
6138 government anti-poverty programs that you are eligible for,
6139 provided there is not a hard-working, full-time working
6140 person in the household.

6141 So, given those things, I think this is an
6142 inappropriate amendment. I think if people want to
6143 introduce something making it easier to find work or
6144 training people in the many areas that we are screaming for
6145 more people, I think that would be a more productive use.
6146 But common sense will tell you, that when you have an
6147 increase of almost three-fold in 16 years, and your
6148 unemployment rate is so very low, there are people taking
6149 advantage of this program who do not have to take advantage
6150 of it. I yield the remainder of my time.

6151 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Ms. Lujan

6152 Grisham is recognized for 1 minute to close.

6153 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you, Madam Chair. I am going
6154 to tease a bit my colleague, Mr. Grothman. I have been
6155 engaged for 5 years and I took the SNAP challenge. And now,
6156 finally, I can explain the reason I am not married to my
6157 fiance.

6158 I do not think we have a good understanding of the SNAP
6159 program. Veterans, working military, the constituent I
6160 mentioned, working mom, 53 cents an hour was her raise, you
6161 cannot do it. It is \$33 a week. When I took the SNAP
6162 challenge, I could not afford any productive, good, healthy
6163 food. And I suffered a sports injury, and I could not buy
6164 any of the foods that the doctor told me would heal that.
6165 Fortunately, I did not have to live on \$33 a week with a
6166 family for food. But these folks do. Thirty-eight thousand
6167 grocery stores. You want to do something about growing the
6168 economy? And you said the economy is humming? In prior
6169 statements, you said this budget was necessary because the
6170 economy is not humming.

6171 I would submit to you that we do not have a good
6172 understanding of the seniors, disabled adults, and the
6173 children, veterans, and active working military who are on
6174 this program, who, without which do not have sufficient
6175 resources to buy the very food in which to exist. I yield
6176 back.

6177 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time has expired.
6178 The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms.
6179 Lujan Grisham.

6180 All those in favor, say aye.

6181 Those opposed, no.

6182 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

6183 A recorded vote is requested, and pursuant to our
6184 unanimous consent agreement we will postpone the recorded
6185 vote until we have finished debating this batch of seven
6186 amendments. Are there other amendments?

6187 Ms. DelBene. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
6188 desk.

6189 Chairman Black. This amendment is No. 12. The clerk
6190 will designate the amendment and the staff will distribute
6191 the copies of the amendment.

6192 The Clerk. Amendment No. 12, offered by Representative
6193 DelBene, to insert a reserve fund to insure economic growth
6194 and job creation in areas with high poverty, unemployment,
6195 food insecurity, homelessness, and foreclosure rates.

6196 [The amendment of Suzan DelBene follows:]

6197 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

6198 Chairman Black. Ms. DelBene is recognized for 6
6199 minutes.

6200 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Madam Chair. Too many
6201 Americans are still struggling, particularly in economically
6202 troubled areas with high poverty rates. Helping people find
6203 good-paying, long-term work in a high demand field is the
6204 best way to ensure that everyone has access to economic
6205 advancement. If we invest a little now, in a targeted way,
6206 not only can we help the people who are still feeling left
6207 behind, but we can actually save the government money in the
6208 long run, by making people self-sufficient. It is important
6209 to remember that these investments we make not only have an
6210 incredible impact on our economy, but also on people's
6211 lives.

6212 My amendment adds a deficit-neutral reserve fund to
6213 accommodate policies and programs that foster economic
6214 development and boost job creation in areas with high
6215 poverty, unemployment, food insecurity, homelessness, and
6216 foreclosure rates, including tribal communities. This could
6217 include the establishment of an inter-agency commission to
6218 help coordinate resources and insure that targeted areas
6219 area receiving appropriate support or supporting pilot
6220 programs or studies, to determine the most effective way to
6221 focus resources to assist struggling communities. This
6222 amendment could also be used to expand important programs,

6223 such as the Community Development Block Grants, and the
6224 Promise Zones Initiative, programs that help people in rural
6225 and tribal areas, for example, that have been left behind.

6226 Community Development Block Grants help States and
6227 localities get the kinds of infrastructure investment, job
6228 creation, and poverty elimination that many of our
6229 communities desperately need. Community Development Block
6230 Grants also help drive economic growth, helping communities
6231 leverage funds for essential water and sewer improvement
6232 projects, housing needs, forging innovative partnerships to
6233 meet increasing public service needs, and revitalizing their
6234 economies. They support local businesses, builders, and
6235 contractors, and service providers who improve the
6236 neighborhoods where they work and live.

6237 They are also a great return on Federal investment.
6238 Every dollar leverages \$3.65 of other public and private
6239 sources of capital. I know this first-hand because in 2014,
6240 Snohomish County in my district received a \$1.5 million
6241 grant from the Department of Housing and Urban Development
6242 to help local communities recover from a deadly mudslide
6243 that devastated the community.

6244 And Promise Zones establish partnerships between the
6245 Federal Government, local communities, and businesses, to
6246 comprehensively address a region's or a neighborhood's
6247 needs. These competitively chosen Promise Zones are high-

6248 poverty, urban, rural, and tribal communities, where local
6249 government, non-profits, businesses, and community leaders
6250 collaborate to make investments that reward hard work and
6251 expand opportunity. The Federal Government partners with
6252 these communities to help them secure the resources and
6253 flexibility they need to achieve their goals. I urge my
6254 colleagues to support this amendment, and I am pleased to
6255 yield 1 minute to Congressman Moulton.

6256 Mr. Moulton. I want to thank my friend from Washington
6257 for the time. And I am proud to support her amendment.

6258 Our economy is changing and we must prepare our current
6259 and future workforce for the jobs of the 21st century. This
6260 proposed budget does just the opposite of that, in gutting
6261 vital funds for workforce development programs. Gutting
6262 these vital programs and slashing spending do not foster
6263 economic growth or help businesses create jobs. Rather,
6264 they harbor anxiety in the workforce.

6265 Just last week, I introduced a bill that will allow
6266 industries, academic institutions, vocational and technical
6267 schools, and workforce development programs across the
6268 country form partnerships and train Americans for the new
6269 economy. That type of collaboration and innovation is what
6270 should be fueling our debate about the future of work.

6271 It is time for politicians to stop rigging the system.
6272 We need a budget that seriously looks at how to foster

6273 growth in the modern economy. And this is not that budget.
6274 The amendment will make it better. I yield back.

6275 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. And now, I yield 1 minute to
6276 Congresswoman Schakowsky.

6277 Ms. Schakowsky. I thank the congresswoman for her
6278 amendment. Instead of a bold investment in infrastructure,
6279 this budget ends TIGER Grants, cuts off funding for new
6280 transit projects. Those cuts mean fewer construction jobs
6281 and less access to jobs for workers who depend on our
6282 transportation system. Republicans talk about flexibility
6283 for States and cities. This budget cuts Community
6284 Development Block Grants, arguably the most flexible funding
6285 that the government provides for local economic development
6286 efforts. And I have never met a mayor, Democrat or
6287 Republican, who has told me, "Cut CDBG."

6288 Congresswoman DelBene's amendment has the right
6289 priorities that invest in our communities to address
6290 poverty, reduce unemployment, and improve housing. And it
6291 pays for those investments by asking the wealthiest
6292 Americans and largest corporations to pay their fair share.
6293 I urge my colleagues to support Congressman DelBene's
6294 amendment. I yield back.

6295 Ms. DelBene. Thank you and I yield the remaining time
6296 to Congresswoman Lujan Grisham.

6297 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you to my colleague from

6298 Washington. We often say that our budgets, Madam Chair, are
6299 a reflection of our values. And while I hear a lot about
6300 the need to grow the economy, create good paying jobs for
6301 working families on the campaign trail, this budget does not
6302 reflect those values. This amendment calls for a
6303 comprehensive strategy to increase economic opportunities in
6304 high poverty, high unemployment areas. And no place needs
6305 this amendment more than my home State in New Mexico.

6306 We should improve work training and educational
6307 opportunities, increase access to affordable housing, and
6308 facilitate private investment in underserved communities.
6309 To say that we need investments in economic growth in New
6310 Mexico is an understatement. I urge my colleagues to take
6311 this opportunity to invest in working families in New Mexico
6312 and across the country. I yield back.

6313 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Madam Chair. I reserve.

6314 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back. Is there
6315 a member who would like to claim time in opposition to the
6316 amendment? The gentleman from Ohio, Mr. Renacci, is
6317 recognized for 4 minutes.

6318 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. This
6319 amendment asks that we reserve money. And in my world, in
6320 the real world, you reserve money when you have money. It
6321 is one of the problems we have in Washington. We do not
6322 have money, we are borrowing money. It says, though, we are

6323 going to be deficit neutral, of course, by reducing tax
6324 expenditures for the top one percent and reducing unjust tax
6325 expenditures on corporations. Again and again, my
6326 colleagues on the other side of the aisle believe that if we
6327 tax the rich and spend more money on Federal programs, then
6328 we will be able to make significant strides to reduce
6329 poverty.

6330 However, the results tell a much, much, different
6331 story. There are 92 different Federal programs and a poorly
6332 coordinated effort to fight poverty already. This approach
6333 was built on the premise that compassion is best measured by
6334 how much we spend, and not by how much people are lifted out
6335 of poverty. For too long, this is really how we have
6336 measured the success of each of our welfare programs. Let's
6337 face it, the war on poverty began with the premise by
6338 President Johnson in 1964. Our aim is not only to relieve
6339 the symptom of poverty, but to cure it, and above all, to
6340 prevent it. That is just not happening today.

6341 Today, we still spend twice the amount on SNAP as we
6342 did before the 2007 recession. And with more than 40
6343 million Americans still receiving SNAP, many of these
6344 recipients are able-bodied adults who should be
6345 participating in the workforce. That is why it is vital
6346 that instead of setting up reserve funds, we actually
6347 analyze current programs and make sure that they work more

6348 efficiently. That is truly what the American people want.

6349 When I go home, they tell me, "Why are you guys wasting
6350 so much money? Why can you not spend it appropriately? And
6351 why cannot you spend it efficiently and effectively?" That
6352 is why it is vital that we work to enact progrowth policies,
6353 not set up reserve funds. That is why it is important that
6354 we work to spur job creation. This budget includes policies
6355 that will actually reduce the regulatory burden.

6356 My colleagues on the other side talked about jobs. If
6357 you want to make sure we have jobs, reduce the regulations
6358 on the businesses. I was a businessman for 30 years.
6359 Reduce the regulatory climate, reduce the tax burden --
6360 which is what this budget does -- and it allows businesses
6361 to be able to employ more people and get people back to
6362 work. As a member of the Ways and Means Committee, I
6363 believe that reforming our tax code will unleash that
6364 entrepreneurial spirit of the country and will help lead to
6365 growth that will help all Americans.

6366 Again, simply setting up a reserve fund, after we
6367 already have so many programs, is not something the American
6368 people want. The American people want us to use the dollars
6369 that we take from them efficiently and effectively, not set
6370 up an additional account. I will now yield some time to Mr.
6371 Smucker.

6372 Mr. Smucker. Thank you. I would like to first thank

6373 the maker of this amendment for its introduction and for the
6374 comments that were made today. You know, there is much that
6375 I think we agree on. That probably all of us agree on here
6376 today. We all want everyone to have the opportunity to
6377 succeed. To have the chance to make the most of their
6378 lives, no matter where they start. It is called living the
6379 American Dream.

6380 But, unfortunately, as Mr. Renacci has said, we have
6381 had a long war on poverty in our country, and it is
6382 characterized by a legacy of broken promises that have
6383 failed to lift hard-working Americans out of poverty, and
6384 instead, too often traps families, simply shuffling them
6385 from one program to another, instead of helping them to
6386 break free altogether.

6387 Clearly, we need a better way to approach this. If
6388 more government spending, more government programs, led to
6389 greater economic growth and opportunity, then things should
6390 be booming and the rate of poverty should be decreasing.
6391 But we know this is simply not the case. The number of
6392 Americans living in poverty has risen 25 percent, just since
6393 2007. And, in fact, real median and household income was
6394 \$56,500 in 2015, the latest year available. That is 1.6
6395 percent below its pre-recession peak in 2007.

6396 I am really proud of some of the work that has being
6397 done in the district that I represent, where a group of

6398 individuals and organizations has come together to combat
6399 poverty and have set some aggressive goals to reduce and
6400 halve the rate of poverty in our community. And they have
6401 done two things, which I think are worth mentioning. Too
6402 many people mistakenly believe that compassion is measured
6403 simply by how much money the Federal Government spends, not
6404 by how many people we lift out of poverty.

6405 And one of the things that this group has had many
6406 discussions about is, How to measure effectiveness? And
6407 that has one of the things that they have decided upon. You
6408 measure it by people who have been lifted out of poverty,
6409 not by the dollars spent. And the other thing that they are
6410 doing very well is, having agencies work together to try to
6411 create a more unified approach to addressing poverty.

6412 We must stop relieving the symptoms of poverty, and
6413 rather focus our efforts on addressing the issue of poverty
6414 at its roots. Yes, we need a safety net. We need support
6415 for families in need. But we must also couple that with
6416 real opportunity through economic growth. The tax and spend
6417 policies of the previous administrations have weighed on our
6418 Nation's economy. There simply was very little
6419 accountability from the executive branch, and very little
6420 coordination with the stakeholders at the front line of this
6421 fight, to identify the policies that were working and those
6422 that were not. Our budget rejects those careless policies.

6423 I mentioned earlier today, as a former business owner,
6424 I saw firsthand how our onerous tax system was limiting job
6425 creation and stunting economic growth. I understand that
6426 inherent in a strong, thriving economy, is a work ethic, the
6427 dignity of work that has long defined the American Dream.

6428 The Federal Government should no longer create a
6429 culture of dependency on government, but rather, it should
6430 promote self-sufficiency and the value of a hard-earned
6431 dollar. Our budget resolution puts forth progrowth
6432 policies, such as fundamental tax reform, lowering the
6433 Federal debt, which will lead to a stronger economy and more
6434 good-paying jobs. For these reasons, I urge a no vote.

6435 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield back.

6436 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Ms.

6437 DelBene is now recognized for 1 minute to close.

6438 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. A long-term budget must
6439 support the development of a competitive American workforce,
6440 encourage job creation, and grow and economy that works for
6441 all Americans, and this requires sustained investment in
6442 areas that create opportunities for millions of Americans.
6443 And programs like Community Development Block Grants are
6444 proven and effective, and we should not be cutting these
6445 programs if we want to truly make a difference.

6446 It is also important to note that the increased funding
6447 for community development in my amendment is offset by an

6448 equal amount of revenue from reducing tax expenditures that
6449 go to top income earners, reducing corporate tax breaks, and
6450 closing loopholes that allow tax inversions and encourage
6451 companies to shelter their profits in foreign tax havens. I
6452 urge my colleagues to vote yes on this important amendment,
6453 and I yield back.

6454 Chairman Black. The gentlelady yields back. The
6455 question is on agreeing on the amendment offered by Ms.
6456 DelBene.

6457 All those in favor say aye.

6458 All those opposed, no.

6459 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

6460 A recorded vote is requested, pursuant to the unanimous
6461 consent agreement, we will postpone the recorded vote until
6462 we have finished debating this batch of seven amendments.
6463 Are there other amendments?

6464 Mr. Moulton. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
6465 desk.

6466 Chairman Black.. This is amendment No. 13. The clerk
6467 will designate the amendment and the staff will distribute
6468 the copies of the amendment.

6469 The Clerk. Amendment Number 13, offered by
6470 Representative Moulton, to insert a policy statement to
6471 fully fund the investigation of Russian interference in the
6472 2016 U.S. Presidential election.

6473

[The amendment of Seth Moulton follows:]

6474

***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

6475 Chairman Black. Mr. Moulton is recognized for 6
6476 minutes.

6477 Mr. Moulton. Thank you, Madam Chairman, for the time.
6478 When our Founding Fathers framed the Constitution, they were
6479 wary that foreign intervention could lead to the downfall of
6480 their newly founded government. In Federalist Paper No. 68,
6481 Alexander Hamilton said that those foreign powers who seek
6482 to gain influence in our political institutions are "the
6483 most deadly adversaries of Republican government."

6484 While I know we are not going to agree on much today,
6485 there is one thing that I know we all share. And that is a
6486 belief that free and fair elections are the cornerstone of
6487 our democracy. Foreign interference in our elections
6488 undermines the public trust and casts doubt on the
6489 legitimacy of our government.

6490 Our Nation's intelligence agencies, including the DNI,
6491 NSA, FBI, and the CIA, have all concluded that Russia
6492 launched a campaign to undermine the 2016 U.S. Presidential
6493 election, which included cyberattacks, dissemination of
6494 false information and other intelligence operations. We
6495 know that members of the Trump campaign had frequent and
6496 repeated contact with Russian government officials and
6497 oligarchs, and then lied about this contact in testimony to
6498 Congress and in their security clearance applications.

6499 In April, we learned that Jared Kushner, President

6500 Trump's son-in-law, and top advisor, failed to inform the
6501 FBI of meetings he had with the head of a major, Russian,
6502 state-owned bank, Sergey Gorkhov, who is a close confidant
6503 of Russian President Vladimir Putin. And with Russia's
6504 ambassador to the United States, Sergey Kislyak, during the
6505 Presidential transition.

6506 Since then, Kushner has reportedly updated the list of
6507 contacts three times, adding over 100 people, including
6508 Natalia Veselnitskaya, the Russian lawyer whom Kushner,
6509 Donald Trump Jr., and former Trump campaign chairman Paul
6510 Manafort, met with in June 2016, under the assumption that
6511 they would provide politically damaging information about
6512 Secretary Hillary Clinton, as part of the Russian
6513 government's effort to support the Trump campaign.

6514 Let me tell you. If one of my Marines had done the
6515 same thing on his security clearance application -- just
6516 think about that for a second. A young Marine, someone who,
6517 unlike all these members of the Trump campaign, actually
6518 volunteered to put his life on the line for our country. If
6519 he had had illicit contacts with enemy agents which, make no
6520 mistake, is exactly who these Russians are, and then lied
6521 about it on his security clearance form, he would probably
6522 be in prison. Well, this guy is in the White House, with
6523 access to some of the Nation's most sensitive intelligence.
6524 Wake up. This is insane.

6525 Regardless of which party you belong to, our national
6526 security must come first. And that is why I am offering
6527 this amendment, which will ensure adequate funding for
6528 Special Counsel Robert Mueller, appointed by the Department
6529 of Justice, so that he can perform a thorough and non-
6530 partisan investigation of Russia's campaign to affect the
6531 2016 U.S. Presidential election. And any individuals in the
6532 United States that may have colluded in those efforts.

6533 This is about protecting the integrity of our democracy
6534 from a country that has thousands of active nuclear warheads
6535 aimed at us right now, and has conducted an aggressive
6536 campaign to undermine democratic governments around the
6537 globe. Restoring faith in our electoral process should
6538 transcend party lines. As President Trump's own FBI
6539 Director nominee recently affirmed, this is not a political
6540 witch hunt. This is an issue of national security that we
6541 should all be committed to supporting.

6542 Did you ever ask your father or grandfather what he did
6543 in World War II? Well, someday our grandchildren will ask
6544 us, "Where did we stand when Russia attacked the United
6545 States?" My colleagues, think about what your grandson or
6546 granddaughter will say when he or she reads about you
6547 someday. Did you have the courage to stand up for our
6548 country, our Constitution, and our values? Or did you vote
6549 this down because your party bosses told you to? The

6550 committee should pass this amendment to show it fully
6551 supports the investigation. And to give the public
6552 confidence that Congress is committed to finding the facts.
6553 With that, I would like to yield my time to my colleague
6554 from New York, Mr. Jeffries.

6555 Mr. Jeffries. I thank the distinguished gentleman from
6556 the Commonwealth of Massachusetts for your leadership on
6557 this issue and for your service.

6558 Seventeen different intelligence agencies concluded
6559 that Russian interfered with our election for the sole
6560 purpose of helping Donald Trump secure the presidency.
6561 During this same period of time, when Russia was attacking
6562 our democracy, high-level members of the Trump campaign and
6563 his allies were in regular communication with these Russian
6564 spies: Paul Manafort, the campaign chairman, Michael Flynn,
6565 his former National Security adviser, Carter Page, his
6566 foreign policy adviser, Michael Cohn, his personal attorney,
6567 Roger Stone, longtime confidant, Jeff Sessions, his Attorney
6568 General, Jared Kushner, his son-in-law and senior White
6569 House adviser, Donald Trump Jr., his son.

6570 What were they talking about? We need to get to the
6571 bottom of this investigation and see that the greatest
6572 coincidence in the history of our democracy was something
6573 really wrong occurred. That is why we need to fully fund
6574 this investigation.

6575 Chairman Black. The gentleman's time has expired. Is
6576 there a member who would like to claim time in opposition to
6577 the amendment?

6578 Mr. Woodall. Madam Chairman.

6579 Chairman Black. Mr. Woodall is recognized for 7
6580 minutes.

6581 Mr. Woodall. Thank you, Madam Chairman. I want to be
6582 clear that I am grateful for Mr. Moulton's service to this
6583 country. He is a great patriot and he has performed a
6584 valuable service for this country, and I am grateful for it.
6585 I would say to my friends here today, though, I believe this
6586 amendment is a disservice to what we could be about.

6587 The gentleman said in his statement that restoring
6588 faith in our electoral politics should transcend party
6589 lines. And he is 100 percent right when he says that, and I
6590 know there is not one member on this committee who is not
6591 committed to getting to the bottom of this investigation.
6592 But to suggest, number one, that the Budget Committee has
6593 any role in funding investigations is to mislead the
6594 American public because we do not. To suggest that we are
6595 not committed to funding those investigations is to mislead
6596 the American public because we are.

6597 I get up in the morning, Madam Chairman, from time to
6598 time I am reading the Twitter feed that comes across my desk
6599 at 6:00 in the morning. But this morning, it was Mr.

6600 Moulton's face that came across my desk at 6:00 in the
6601 morning. It is the first time that has happened to me. We
6602 do not have a regular meeting scheduled at that time. House
6603 Democrat, to try to force GOP to go on record supporting the
6604 Russian probe. In fact, they are quoting from the very
6605 powerful statement that Mr. Moulton gave. Where were you?
6606 What will you do when your grandson asks?

6607 This came from the CNN webpage, and I know my
6608 colleagues do not have a lot of confidence in our Atlanta-
6609 based news broadcast. But I want to read from that article,
6610 after they go on to talk about the importance of the
6611 investigation and how we are going to get folks on record,
6612 they say -- and I quote -- "Congressional Republicans have
6613 been publicly supportive of Mueller. House Republican
6614 Speaker, Paul Ryan, and Senate Majority Leader, Mitch
6615 McConnell, have both praised his appointment as Special
6616 Counsel, and there has been no indication on Capitol Hill
6617 that the GOP-controlled Congress would attempt to undermine
6618 his efforts or withhold any resources from his team."

6619 I want to say that again. There has been no indication
6620 that the GOP-controlled Congress would undermine his
6621 investigation or withhold any resources from his team. And
6622 my fear is, for something that should be non-partisan, like
6623 the integrity of the American electoral process, to suggest
6624 -- in what often shakes up as being a fairly partisan Budget

6625 Committee markup -- to suggest that there is an opportunity
6626 that someone on this committee, that someone in this
6627 Congress would stand in the way, flies in the face of every
6628 shred of evidence that is out there.

6629 We are just seeing right now, even as we are sitting in
6630 this committee room, that Donald Trump Jr. and Paul Manafort
6631 are coming before the Senate Judiciary Committee. Why?
6632 Because Senator Grassley postponed that committee meeting to
6633 make their presentations possible. That is coming next
6634 week. We are going to have Jared Kushner in front of the
6635 Senate Intelligence Committee next week.

6636 I know that there is bipartisan commitment to getting
6637 to that confidence that every American needs in our
6638 electoral process. I just caution, my friends, in our
6639 bipartisan pursuit to make that happen, we can do a lot of
6640 damage. This does not need to be a partisan matter, this
6641 can be an American matter. I urge the defeat of this
6642 amendment to make sure that it is so. With that, I would
6643 like to yield to my friend, Mr. Gaetz.

6644 Mr. Gaetz. I thank the gentleman for yielding. And I
6645 think it bears repeating to thank the amendment sponsor for
6646 his service to the country. It is evident that this
6647 amendment is offered with sincerity and with a sincere
6648 desire to do what is right to protect the American election
6649 system.

6650 The challenge with the amendment is that it seeks
6651 funding for something that is not underfunded. There has
6652 been no indication that the Department of Justice, the
6653 Special Counsel, the House Intelligence Committee, the
6654 Senate Select Committee on Intelligence, lack resources to
6655 be able to get to the bottom of any potential interference
6656 by Russia in the 2016 election. A lot of folks in my
6657 district who voted for Donald Trump, and I have not met the
6658 first one yet that says that they did so because Vladimir
6659 Putin told them to.

6660 And so I would suggest that perhaps we ought to be
6661 focused on the issues that impact the quality of life for
6662 the American people: jobs, economic growth, opportunity,
6663 better schools, better roads. And I think it is perhaps
6664 misplaced for the opposition party here to be so focused on
6665 Russia and not focused on the needs of Americans. That is
6666 certainly what they have sent us here for, and I yield back
6667 the balance of our time.

6668 Mr. Woodall. Madam Chair? I would like to yield to my
6669 friend from Indiana, Mr. Rokita.

6670 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman as well. I think
6671 the points were very well made by my two colleagues, and I
6672 appreciate them making them. I know they speak the
6673 sentiment of a lot of us here on the committee.

6674 I just would indicate that I am not sure the

6675 gentleman's amendment was sincere. The gentleman sits on
6676 this committee. The gentleman knows that the issues he is
6677 bringing up is the jurisdiction of the Committee on
6678 Administration, not this committee. The gentleman also
6679 knows that the investigations have been fully funded.

6680 So I would just add that into the record, and also say
6681 that the question that this committee should be asking about
6682 our grandchildren is not necessarily about this amendment
6683 and the political point it is scoring with the liberal base.
6684 It is, what are we doing to our grandchildren in terms of
6685 what will be \$100 trillion in debt? And no amendment that I
6686 have heard today from the Democrats addresses that serious
6687 question that is in the jurisdiction of the Budget
6688 Committee. I yield.

6689 Mr. Woodall. Madam Chair, I yield back.

6690 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Mr.
6691 Moulton is recognized for 1 minute to close.

6692 Mr. Moulton. Madam Chairman, I would like to thank my
6693 colleagues from Georgia and Florida for their thoughtful
6694 comments in rebuttal to this amendment. You know, I also
6695 appreciate you following me on Twitter, Mr. Woodall, and for
6696 reading from the article this morning.

6697 You quoted that congressional Republicans have been
6698 supportive of the investigation. You quoted that there has
6699 been no indication that the GOP would withhold funds. If

6700 that is the case, then this is a simple vote. Vote to
6701 support the amendment. Vote to support the sincerity of our
6702 elections. Vote to support the same bipartisanship that you
6703 purport exists on this issue. Vote to support the
6704 amendment. Do not give in to the party politics of the
6705 Budget Committee. Do the right thing for our national
6706 security. And with that, I yield back.

6707 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back.

6708 Ms. Schakowsky. Madam Chair?

6709 Chairman Black. For what purpose does the gentlelady
6710 seek recognition?

6711 Ms. Schakowsky. I would just like to say that while we
6712 may differ, we should not question each other's motivations,
6713 and I personally felt resentful that the author and the
6714 person offering this amendment, that somehow, his
6715 motivations were questioned. I think we can question a lot
6716 of things, but not that.

6717 Chairman Black. The gentlelady's time has expired.
6718 The question is on agreeing on the amendment offered by Mr.
6719 Moulton.

6720 All those in favor, say aye.

6721 All those opposed, no.

6722 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

6723 Mr. Moulton. May I request a recorded vote?

6724 Chairman Black. A recorded vote is requested, and

6725 pursuant to unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone
6726 the recorded vote until we have finished debating this batch
6727 of seven amendments. Are there other amendments?

6728 Mr. Khanna. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the
6729 desk.

6730 Chairman Black. This is amendment No. 14. The clerk
6731 will designate the amendment, and the staff will distribute
6732 the copies of the amendment.

6733 The Clerk. Amendment No. 14, offered by Representative
6734 Khanna to insert a deficit-neutral reserve fund to improve
6735 the earned income tax credit.

6736 [The amendment of Ro Khanna follows:]

6737 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

6738 Chairman Black. Mr. Khanna is recognized for 6
6739 minutes.

6740 Mr. Khanna. Thank you, Madam Chair. Now, this
6741 amendment is to strengthen the earned income tax credit. As
6742 a freshman member of Congress, I know that this committee is
6743 often partisan, but my hope is that we actually could come
6744 to agreement on this earned income tax credit and we may get
6745 some colleagues on the Republican side voting for it, partly
6746 because it was actually a Republican idea. It was Milton
6747 Friedman's idea to have the earned income tax credit, and it
6748 was President Richard Nixon who deserves credit, in 1975,
6749 for instituting the earned income tax credit.

6750 The issue with the earned income tax credit -- and my
6751 colleagues, Representative Jayapal and Representative
6752 Jackson Lee will elaborate -- it is actually job-creating.
6753 I heard Congressman McClintock's comments about his concern
6754 with dependency or programs that do not create jobs. And we
6755 can debate that, but there is no doubt that the earned
6756 income tax credit actually supports job creation, and it
6757 does it for a very simple reason.

6758 About 80 cents to the dollar go to people who are
6759 working, and it provides an incentive for more people to
6760 enter the workforce, because they know they are going to
6761 make more money if they enter the workforce. And 20 cents
6762 on the dollar goes to the employer, and that gives an added

6763 incentive to recruit. So we know from economic study after
6764 study says that the expansion of the earned income tax
6765 credit actually tightens labor markets, increases the amount
6766 of jobs that are being created.

6767 The second thing we know is it does not affect
6768 automation, because it has no impact on having people
6769 substitute machines for labor. And this is, again, both
6770 conservative and liberal economists that have looked at this
6771 program have said that.

6772 The third thing we know is that people who get the
6773 earned income tax credit actually spend that money often on
6774 getting a college education for their kids. There are
6775 studies that show that seniors have higher rates going into
6776 college. If they get the earned income tax credit, it
6777 encourages education, that school test scores have improved.
6778 Again, these are economic studies not by liberal economists,
6779 but by both liberal and conservative economists.

6780 And I know there is this concern about the manipulation
6781 of the earned income tax credit and some overpayments, and
6782 those are legitimate concerns. No one is saying the program
6783 is perfect. I am sure if you looked at how very wealthy
6784 people avoid tax or their collections, there is concerns
6785 there as well.

6786 But Senator Orrin Hatch said that the 2015 agreement
6787 was the strongest agreement in cleaning up the abuse of the

6788 earned income tax credit. There are other proposals we can
6789 do, bipartisan proposals that will strengthen the
6790 enforcement. We can require, for example, commercial
6791 preparers of these tax returns to be certified.

6792 We can look at some of the overfiling which comes from
6793 families that are either separated or divorced, and both the
6794 parents are filing; often innocent mistakes because of the
6795 complexity of modern families. But just because there is an
6796 issue that needs to be addressed on strengthening the
6797 ability to get the earned income tax credit does not mean
6798 that we should throw out an idea that the most prominent
6799 economists have said is the best job-creating effort.

6800 The final point before I turn it over to my two
6801 distinguished colleagues is even Speaker Ryan has recognized
6802 that we ought to expand the earned income tax credit for
6803 childless workers, and that is one of the things that this
6804 amendment would do. And the reason is because there are a
6805 lot of young people who want to be entrepreneurs, many in my
6806 district in Silicon Valley and other parts of the country,
6807 and they would benefit by being able to go start a small
6808 business, by being able to be entrepreneurs; and they should
6809 be able to take advantage of the earned income tax credit.
6810 It is something that is universally recognized as improving
6811 the program.

6812 So I am hopeful that we may get folks on the other side

6813 who have ever quoted Milton Friedman to be supporting this
6814 amendment. I now turn it over to my distinguished
6815 colleague, Representative Jayapal.

6816 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you so much for this amendment. I
6817 am in strong support of it. And I wanted to just emphasize
6818 that we have talked a lot on this committee today about
6819 getting people back to work, about making sure that people
6820 are actually taking care of themselves and supporting
6821 themselves. And very reputable studies show that the earned
6822 income tax credit actually encourages large members,
6823 particularly of single parents, to leave welfare for work,
6824 and it does it for a very simple reason. It actually is not
6825 just a cash transfer.

6826 The EITC draws workers into formal employment, and it
6827 increases their market incomes. And once they are employed,
6828 then that gives them the opportunity to gain skills and to
6829 continue to move through the ladder of employment. So it
6830 puts any person in a much better position.

6831 Now, the EITC has also lifted 6.5 million people out of
6832 poverty, including 3.5 million kids, and I think we can all
6833 agree that if you have a two-parent family with two kids and
6834 they are working full time that you should then be able to
6835 raise your kids. But at the current Federal minimum wage,
6836 it is simply not possible unless you have the EITC and SNAP.
6837 And I see that time is running out, and I want to make sure

6838 Representative Jackson Lee has --

6839 Mr. Khanna. I will have Representative Jackson Lee
6840 close for us because I know our time is limited. So I will
6841 have her do our closing.

6842 Chairman Black. The gentleman's time has expired. Is
6843 there a member who would like to claim time in opposition to
6844 the amendment? Mr. Renacci, you are recognized for 7
6845 minutes.

6846 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Madam Chairwoman. And as a
6847 member of the House Ways and Means Committee, I look forward
6848 to working with my colleagues across the aisle to advance
6849 legislation regarding the earned income tax credit.
6850 Additionally, I agree with Mr. Khanna that the earned income
6851 tax credit is an effective tool in encouraging labor
6852 participation and fighting poverty. It is great that during
6853 a markup that has so far been partisan, that we are able to
6854 find policies that we agree on.

6855 However, before we discuss expansion of this program,
6856 we need to look at the problems that currently exist within
6857 the program, and that is one of the things the American
6858 taxpayers would want us to do. And it does not need a
6859 reserve fund. There is plenty of dollars available if we
6860 just look at the improper payment rate.

6861 So according to the IRS, in 2016, the EITC improper
6862 payment rate was 24 percent, equaling more than \$16 billion.

6863 Most of those improper payments came from false claims from
6864 taxpayers who over report their income through reporting
6865 fictitious wages or self-employment income. That is simply
6866 unacceptable.

6867 Hardworking American taxpayers expect for their hard-
6868 earned money to be spent responsibly, and we have an
6869 obligation to meet that expectation. That is why this
6870 budget proposes additional verification requirements and why
6871 I am also working on legislation which I welcome the members
6872 on the other side of the aisle to work with me on in
6873 conjunction with the Social Security Administration and the
6874 IRS to eliminate fraudulent EITC claims. If we eliminate
6875 those fraudulent claims, just in 2006 alone, we will have
6876 that fund you are looking for of \$16 billion extra.

6877 So I hope to be able to work with my colleagues across
6878 the aisle on this issue to address the misuse of these
6879 Federal funds, which means we would not need to be looking
6880 at a reserve fund as requested. And I would urge a no vote,
6881 and I would now go to Mr. Grothman for some time.

6882 Mr. Grothman. Thanks. I hate to throw some water on
6883 this wonderful earned income tax credit. I think it is
6884 accurate to say the earned income tax credit encourages
6885 work, but it does not encourage a lot of work. And that is
6886 why I think it was such a poorly-designed program in the
6887 first place. I have been told, without confirming it, that

6888 when Milton Friedman encouraged the program in the first
6889 place, it was supposed to replace other income transfer
6890 programs instead.

6891 But what it does is this. Let's take a parent with two
6892 kids. And the numbers vary depending upon the number of
6893 kids. It is true it encourages her to make up to \$14,000 a
6894 year. When she makes over \$24,000 a year, they begin to
6895 take away the substantial credit. So as soon as she gets to
6896 \$24,000, it says, stop, do not make more money. I believe
6897 when you have one kid, it discourages you from working and
6898 making more than \$19,000 a year.

6899 Now, why in the world would we come up with a program
6900 that tells someone, once you hit \$19,000 a year, stop
6901 working, do not look for a raise, do not look for overtime,
6902 do not look to improve yourself? To me, I want people
6903 making \$35,000 a year, \$45,000 a year, \$65,000 a year. The
6904 idea of introducing a program that says, "Please do not make
6905 \$19,000 a year," or, "Please do not make more than \$23,000 a
6906 year, or they will hammer you," is a huge mistake. As was
6907 already pointed out, when you give such big checks away, one
6908 shot, \$6,000, you really almost invite people to try to
6909 abuse the program, which they do.

6910 The final thing I will bring up -- I always try to meet
6911 with any people around my district. And I like to tour,
6912 sometimes, the low-income housing. And usually, the people

6913 that run the low-income housing are more Democrat in nature,
6914 so I love to talk to them, because I love to talk to
6915 Democrats. And one thing that we agree on is the earned
6916 income tax program is not all it is cracked up to be.

6917 I encourage my colleagues to tour their local low-
6918 income housing projects, talk to the people who run them, if
6919 they live there, and ask them what they think the residents
6920 are doing with their earned income tax credit. Hint: It
6921 does not go for tuition. Thanks so much.

6922 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Mr. Grothman. I yield some
6923 time now to Mr. Smith.

6924 Mr. Smith. Thank you. You know, the earned income tax
6925 credit has been around since 1975. And every administration
6926 since 1975 has expanded the program in some form, shape, or
6927 another. And we know that the earned income tax credit has
6928 helped numerous American families in a lot of ways.

6929 We also know that to continue to help these American
6930 families with this current income tax credit is by making
6931 sure that there is not fraud in the program. And as the
6932 gentleman from Ohio illustrated earlier of what was the
6933 report of the IRS from 2016 of the overpayments of almost 24
6934 percent of the earned income tax credit, that is
6935 unacceptable. And so this budget proposal actually does a
6936 recommendation that requires one guideline and verification,
6937 and that is a Social Security number. A Social Security

6938 Number.

6939 And we have had people on the other side of the aisle
6940 say that this was a restriction and would be a tax increase
6941 of \$40 billion affecting child care tax credits and earned
6942 income tax credits. That is absolutely ridiculous. If the
6943 American people actually saw that the only guideline that is
6944 in this budget proposal is the fact that you need a Social
6945 Security Number to get the earned income tax or the child
6946 care tax credit, they would be astonished of the talking
6947 points on the other side, saying that this is a tax increase
6948 on them.

6949 No, this is making sure that anyone who actually has a
6950 child will have a Social Security Number and will provide
6951 that in order to earn the child care tax. And anyone who is
6952 going to receive the earned income tax credit also has to
6953 have a Social Security Number. Those are simple guidelines,
6954 and this is there to assure that this program is there and
6955 will help the most needy.

6956 With that, Ms. Chairman, I yield back. I yield to Mr.
6957 Renacci.

6958 Mr. Renacci. Thank you. I would only close by saying,
6959 look, this is pretty simple. This is under the jurisdiction
6960 of the Ways and Means Committee. It is the sole tax-writing
6961 committee in the House, and expansion of the earned income
6962 tax credit falls within this jurisdiction. So I would urge

6963 a no vote, and I yield back.

6964 Chairman Black. The gentleman yields back. Mr. Khanna
6965 is recognized for 1 minute to close.

6966 Mr. Khanna. Thank you, Madam Chair. I yield my time
6967 to Representative Jackson Lee.

6968 Ms. Jackson Lee. I thank the gentleman of California
6969 for his thoughtful amendment. In 2016, 27 million
6970 households received benefits from EITC. But thanks to EITC,
6971 over 6 million people were raised out of poverty.
6972 Interestingly enough, the expansion of EITC for childless
6973 workers has bipartisan support: Speaker Ryan, President
6974 Obama.

6975 We understand that childless workers would benefit
6976 because it only deals with people who are employed.
6977 Childless workers are the only group that can currently be
6978 taxed into poverty. But if they have this earned income
6979 tax, they can have improved educational outcomes, wages, and
6980 long-term health.

6981 I can assure you that it is important to correct, but
6982 we should not eliminate. But I thought we had a deal, Mr.
6983 Khanna. I thought you had someone to agree with you. But
6984 frankly, you just cannot win with these Republicans. SNAP
6985 recipients are too lazy to work. EITC recipients are
6986 dishonest workers. Medicaid recipients are undeserving, and
6987 sick people get sick because they do not eat healthy. Where

6988 can we have some coming together? Presidents Reagan, H.W.
6989 Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama understand that
6990 EITC helps people to get out of poverty. The expansion is a
6991 good idea or childless workers to help them get out of
6992 poverty.

6993 Chairman Black. The lady's time has expired.

6994 Ms. Jackson Lee. With that, I ask support of the
6995 gentleman's amendment. I yield back.

6996 Chairman Black. The lady's time has expired. The
6997 question is agreeing on the amendment by Mr. Khanna. All
6998 those in favor, say aye.

6999 All those opposed, no.

7000 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

7001 Mr. Khanna. I ask for a recorded vote.

7002 Chairman Black. A recorded vote is requested.

7003 Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, we will
7004 postpone the recorded vote until we are finished debating
7005 this entire patch of seven amendments.

7006 And I believe we have reached that point in time. I
7007 think there are a few members that are still making it from
7008 one of the markups, so if we could just suspend for just a
7009 few moments as we get those other members into the
7010 committee, and then I think we can move on.

7011 The committee will come to order. And since we have
7012 decided to roll votes, the committee will resume our

7013 postponed votes on the following amendments: amendment No. 5
7014 by Ms. Lee, amendment No. 9 by Ms. Jayapal, amendment No. 10
7015 by Mr. Carbajal, amendment No. 11 by Lujan Grisham,
7016 amendment No. 12 by Ms. DelBene, amendment No. 13 by Mr.
7017 Moulton, and amendment No. 14 by Mr. Khanna.

7018 The committee will now vote on the amendment offered by
7019 Ms. Lee. The clerk will designate the amendment.

7020 The Clerk. Amendment No. 5, offered by Representative
7021 Lee.

7022 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

7023 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

7024 Mr. Rokita. No.

7025 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

7026 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

7027 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

7028 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

7029 Mr. Cole?

7030 [No response.]

7031 Mr. McClintock?

7032 Mr. McClintock. No.

7033 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

7034 Mr. Woodall?

7035 Mr. Woodall. No.

7036 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

7037 Mr. Sanford?

7038 Mr. Sanford. No.

7039 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

7040 Mr. Womack?

7041 Mr. Womack. No.

7042 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

7043 Mr. Brat?

7044 Mr. Brat. No.

7045 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

7046 Mr. Grothman?

7047 Mr. Grothman. No.

7048 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

7049 Mr. Palmer?

7050 Mr. Palmer. No.

7051 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

7052 Mr. Westerman?

7053 Mr. Westerman. No.

7054 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

7055 Mr. Renacci?

7056 Mr. Renacci. No.

7057 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

7058 Mr. Johnson?

7059 Mr. Johnson. No.

7060 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

7061 Mr. Smith?

7062 Mr. Smith. No.

7063 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
7064 Mr. Lewis?
7065 Mr. Lewis. No.
7066 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
7067 Mr. Bergman?
7068 Mr. Bergman. No.
7069 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7070 Mr. Faso?
7071 Mr. Faso. No.
7072 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7073 Mr. Smucker?
7074 Mr. Smucker. No.
7075 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7076 Mr. Gaetz?
7077 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7078 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7079 Mr. Arrington?
7080 Mr. Arrington. No.
7081 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
7082 Mr. Ferguson?
7083 Mr. Ferguson. No.
7084 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
7085 Mr. Yarmuth?
7086 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
7087 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

7088 Ms. Lee?

7089 [No response.]

7090 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

7091 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

7092 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

7093 Mr. Moulton?

7094 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

7095 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

7096 Mr. Jeffries?

7097 [No response.]

7098 Mr. Higgins?

7099 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7100 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7101 Ms. DelBene?

7102 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7103 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7104 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7105 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7106 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7107 Mr. Boyle?

7108 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7109 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7110 Mr. Khanna?

7111 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7112 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7113 Ms. Jayapal?

7114 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7115 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7116 Mr. Carbajal?

7117 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7118 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7119 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7120 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7121 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7122 Ms. Schakowsky?

7123 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7124 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7125 Ms. Lee?

7126 Ms. Lee. Aye.

7127 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

7128 Madam Chairman?

7129 Chairman Black. No.

7130 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7131 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote

7132 or change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

7133 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

7134 13 and the noes are 21.

7135 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

7136 not agreed to.

7137 The committee will now vote on the amendment offered by

7138 Ms. Jayapal, No. 9. The clerk will designate the amendment.
7139 The Clerk. Amendment No. 9, offered by Representative
7140 Jayapal.
7141 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.
7142 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?
7143 Mr. Rokita. No.
7144 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.
7145 Mr. Diaz-Balart?
7146 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.
7147 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.
7148 Mr. Cole?
7149 [No response.]
7150 Mr. McClintock?
7151 Mr. McClintock. No.
7152 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
7153 Mr. Woodall?
7154 Mr. Woodall. No.
7155 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
7156 Mr. Sanford?
7157 Mr. Sanford. No.
7158 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
7159 Mr. Womack?
7160 Mr. Womack. No.
7161 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
7162 Mr. Brat?

7163 Mr. Brat. No.
7164 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
7165 Mr. Grothman?
7166 Mr. Grothman. No.
7167 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
7168 Mr. Palmer?
7169 Mr. Palmer. No.
7170 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
7171 Mr. Westerman?
7172 Mr. Westerman. No.
7173 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
7174 Mr. Renacci?
7175 Mr. Renacci. No.
7176 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
7177 Mr. Johnson?
7178 Mr. Johnson. No.
7179 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
7180 Mr. Smith?
7181 Mr. Smith. No.
7182 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
7183 Mr. Lewis?
7184 Mr. Lewis. No.
7185 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
7186 Mr. Bergman?
7187 Mr. Bergman. No.

7188 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7189 Mr. Faso?
7190 Mr. Faso. No.
7191 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7192 Mr. Smucker?
7193 Mr. Smucker. No.
7194 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7195 Mr. Gaetz?
7196 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7197 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7198 Mr. Arrington?
7199 Mr. Arrington. No.
7200 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
7201 Mr. Ferguson?
7202 Mr. Ferguson. No.
7203 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
7204 Mr. Yarmuth?
7205 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
7206 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
7207 Ms. Lee?
7208 Ms. Lee. Aye.
7209 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
7210 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
7211 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
7212 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

7213 Mr. Moulton?

7214 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

7215 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

7216 Mr. Jeffries?

7217 [No response.]

7218 Mr. Higgins?

7219 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7220 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7221 Ms. DelBene?

7222 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7223 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7224 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7225 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7226 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7227 Mr. Boyle?

7228 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7229 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7230 Mr. Khanna?

7231 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7232 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7233 Ms. Jayapal?

7234 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7235 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7236 Mr. Carbajal?

7237 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7238 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7239 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7240 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7241 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7242 Ms. Schakowsky?

7243 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7244 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7245 Madam Chairman?

7246 Chairman Black. No.

7247 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7248 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to

7249 change their vote or any members who have not voted? If

7250 not, the clerk shall call the report.

7251 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

7252 13 and the noes are 21.

7253 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

7254 not agreed to.

7255 The committee will now vote on the amendment offered by

7256 Mr. Carbajal, No. 10. The clerk will designate the

7257 amendment.

7258 The Clerk. Amendment No. 10, offered by Representative

7259 Carbajal.

7260 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

7261 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

7262 Mr. Rokita. No.

7263 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.
7264 Mr. Diaz-Balart?
7265 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.
7266 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.
7267 Mr. Cole?
7268 [No response.]
7269 Mr. McClintock?
7270 Mr. McClintock. No.
7271 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
7272 Mr. Woodall?
7273 Mr. Woodall. No.
7274 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
7275 Mr. Sanford?
7276 Mr. Sanford. No.
7277 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
7278 Mr. Womack?
7279 Mr. Womack. No.
7280 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
7281 Mr. Brat?
7282 Mr. Brat. No.
7283 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
7284 Mr. Grothman?
7285 Mr. Grothman. No.
7286 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
7287 Mr. Palmer?

7288 Mr. Palmer. No.
7289 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
7290 Mr. Westerman?
7291 Mr. Westerman. No.
7292 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
7293 Mr. Renacci?
7294 Mr. Renacci. No.
7295 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
7296 Mr. Johnson?
7297 Mr. Johnson. No.
7298 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
7299 Mr. Smith?
7300 Mr. Smith. No.
7301 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
7302 Mr. Lewis?
7303 Mr. Lewis. No.
7304 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
7305 Mr. Bergman?
7306 Mr. Bergman. No.
7307 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7308 Mr. Faso?
7309 Mr. Faso. No.
7310 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7311 Mr. Smucker?
7312 Mr. Smucker. No.

7313 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7314 Mr. Gaetz?
7315 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7316 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7317 Mr. Arrington?
7318 Mr. Arrington. No.
7319 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
7320 Mr. Ferguson?
7321 Mr. Ferguson. No.
7322 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
7323 Mr. Yarmuth?
7324 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
7325 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
7326 Ms. Lee?
7327 Ms. Lee. Aye.
7328 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
7329 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
7330 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
7331 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
7332 Mr. Moulton?
7333 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
7334 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
7335 Mr. Jeffries?
7336 [No response.]
7337 Mr. Higgins?

7338 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7339 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7340 Ms. DelBene?

7341 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7342 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7343 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7344 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7345 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7346 Mr. Boyle?

7347 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7348 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7349 Mr. Khanna?

7350 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7351 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7352 Ms. Jayapal?

7353 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7354 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7355 Mr. Carbajal?

7356 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7357 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7358 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7359 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7360 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7361 Ms. Schakowsky?

7362 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7363 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7364 Madam Chairman?

7365 Chairman Black. No.

7366 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7367 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote
7368 or to change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

7369 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
7370 13, and the noes are 21.

7371 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
7372 not agreed to.

7373 The committee will now vote on the amendment offered by
7374 Ms. Lujan Grisham, amendment No. 11. The clerk will
7375 designate the amendment.

7376 The Clerk. Amendment No. 11, offered by Representative
7377 Lujan Grisham.

7378 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

7379 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

7380 Mr. Rokita. No.

7381 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

7382 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

7383 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

7384 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

7385 Mr. Cole?

7386 [No response.]

7387 Mr. McClintock?

7388 Mr. McClintock. No.
7389 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
7390 Mr. Woodall?
7391 Mr. Woodall. No.
7392 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
7393 Mr. Sanford?
7394 Mr. Sanford. No.
7395 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
7396 Mr. Womack?
7397 Mr. Womack. No.
7398 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
7399 Mr. Brat?
7400 Mr. Brat. No.
7401 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
7402 Mr. Grothman?
7403 Mr. Grothman. No.
7404 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
7405 Mr. Palmer?
7406 Mr. Palmer. No.
7407 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
7408 Mr. Westerman?
7409 Mr. Westerman. No.
7410 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
7411 Mr. Renacci?
7412 Mr. Renacci. No.

7413 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
7414 Mr. Johnson?
7415 Mr. Johnson. No.
7416 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
7417 Mr. Smith?
7418 Mr. Smith. No.
7419 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
7420 Mr. Lewis?
7421 Mr. Lewis. No.
7422 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
7423 Mr. Bergman?
7424 Mr. Bergman. No.
7425 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7426 Mr. Faso?
7427 Mr. Faso. No.
7428 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7429 Mr. Smucker?
7430 Mr. Smucker. No.
7431 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7432 Mr. Gaetz?
7433 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7434 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7435 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington?
7436 Mr. Arrington. No.
7437 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

7438 Mr. Ferguson?

7439 Mr. Ferguson. No.

7440 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

7441 Mr. Yarmuth?

7442 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

7443 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

7444 Ms. Lee?

7445 Ms. Lee. Aye.

7446 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

7447 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

7448 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

7449 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

7450 Mr. Moulton?

7451 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

7452 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

7453 Mr. Jeffries?

7454 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

7455 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

7456 Mr. Higgins?

7457 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7458 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7459 Ms. DelBene?

7460 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7461 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7462 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7463 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7464 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7465 Mr. Boyle?

7466 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7467 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7468 Mr. Khanna?

7469 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7470 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7471 Ms. Jayapal?

7472 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7473 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7474 Mr. Carbajal?

7475 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7476 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7477 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7478 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7479 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7480 Ms. Schakowsky?

7481 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7482 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7483 Madam Chairman?

7484 Chairman Black. No.

7485 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7486 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote

7487 or to change their vote?

7488 If not, the clerk shall report.

7489 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
7490 14, and the noes are 21.

7491 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
7492 not agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
7493 offered by Ms. DelBene, No. 12.

7494 Excuse me, Mr. Moulton, No. 13. Guess I should have
7495 crossed that out. No, I was correct on Ms. DelBene on 13
7496 or, excuse me, on 12.

7497 Let me start that all over again. It has been a very
7498 long day. Let me put my finger on the right one. We are
7499 now going to vote on amendment No. 12 by Ms. DelBene. The
7500 clerk will redesignate the amendment.

7501 The Clerk. Amendment No. 12, offered by Representative
7502 DelBene.

7503 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

7504 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

7505 Mr. Rokita. No.

7506 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

7507 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

7508 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

7509 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

7510 Mr. Cole?

7511 [No response.]

7512 Mr. McClintock?

7513 Mr. McClintock. No.

7514 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

7515 Mr. Woodall?

7516 Mr. Woodall. No.

7517 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

7518 Mr. Sanford?

7519 Mr. Sanford. No.

7520 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

7521 Mr. Womack?

7522 Mr. Womack. No.

7523 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

7524 Mr. Brat?

7525 Mr. Brat. No.

7526 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

7527 Mr. Grothman?

7528 Mr. Grothman. No.

7529 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

7530 Mr. Palmer?

7531 Mr. Palmer. No.

7532 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

7533 Mr. Westerman?

7534 Mr. Westerman. No.

7535 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

7536 Mr. Renacci?

7537 Mr. Renacci. No.

7538 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
7539 Mr. Johnson?
7540 Mr. Johnson. No.
7541 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
7542 Mr. Smith?
7543 Mr. Smith. No.
7544 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
7545 Mr. Lewis?
7546 Mr. Lewis. No.
7547 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
7548 Mr. Bergman?
7549 Mr. Bergman. No.
7550 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7551 Mr. Faso?
7552 Mr. Faso. No.
7553 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7554 Mr. Smucker?
7555 Mr. Smucker. No.
7556 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7557 Mr. Gaetz?
7558 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7559 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7560 Mr. Arrington?
7561 Mr. Arrington. No.
7562 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

7563 Mr. Ferguson?

7564 Mr. Ferguson. No, ma'am.

7565 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

7566 Mr. Yarmuth?

7567 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

7568 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

7569 Ms. Lee?

7570 Ms. Lee. Aye.

7571 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

7572 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

7573 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

7574 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

7575 Mr. Moulton?

7576 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

7577 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

7578 Mr. Jeffries?

7579 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

7580 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

7581 Mr. Higgins?

7582 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7583 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7584 Ms. DelBene?

7585 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7586 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7587 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7588 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7589 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7590 Mr. Boyle?

7591 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7592 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7593 Mr. Khanna?

7594 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7595 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7596 Ms. Jayapal?

7597 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7598 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7599 Mr. Carbajal?

7600 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7601 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7602 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7603 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7604 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7605 Ms. Schakowsky?

7606 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7607 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7608 Madam Chairman?

7609 Chairman Black. No.

7610 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7611 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote

7612 or change their vote?

7613 If not, the clerk shall report.

7614 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
7615 14, and the noes are 21.

7616 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
7617 not agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
7618 offered by Mr. Moulton, amendment No. 13, and the clerk will
7619 redesignate the amendment.

7620 The Clerk. Amendment No. 13, offered by Representative
7621 Moulton.

7622 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

7623 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

7624 Mr. Rokita. No.

7625 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

7626 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

7627 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

7628 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

7629 Mr. Cole?

7630 [No response.]

7631 Mr. McClintock?

7632 Mr. McClintock. No.

7633 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

7634 Mr. Woodall?

7635 Mr. Woodall. No.

7636 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

7637 Mr. Sanford?

7638 Mr. Sanford. No.

7639 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

7640 Mr. Womack?

7641 Mr. Womack. No.

7642 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

7643 Mr. Brat?

7644 Mr. Brat. No.

7645 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

7646 Mr. Grothman?

7647 Mr. Grothman. No.

7648 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

7649 Mr. Palmer?

7650 Mr. Palmer. No.

7651 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

7652 Mr. Westerman?

7653 Mr. Westerman. No.

7654 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

7655 Mr. Renacci?

7656 Mr. Renacci. No.

7657 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

7658 Mr. Johnson?

7659 Mr. Johnson. No.

7660 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

7661 Mr. Smith?

7662 Mr. Smith. No.

7663 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
7664 Mr. Lewis?
7665 Mr. Lewis. No.
7666 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
7667 Mr. Bergman?
7668 Mr. Bergman. No.
7669 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7670 Mr. Faso?
7671 Mr. Faso. No.
7672 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7673 Mr. Smucker?
7674 Mr. Smucker. No.
7675 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7676 Mr. Gaetz?
7677 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7678 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7679 Mr. Arrington?
7680 Mr. Arrington. No.
7681 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
7682 Mr. Ferguson?
7683 Mr. Ferguson. No.
7684 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
7685 Mr. Yarmuth?
7686 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
7687 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

7688 Ms. Lee?

7689 Ms. Lee. Aye.

7690 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

7691 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

7692 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

7693 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

7694 Mr. Moulton?

7695 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

7696 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

7697 Mr. Jeffries?

7698 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

7699 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

7700 Mr. Higgins?

7701 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7702 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7703 Ms. DelBene?

7704 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7705 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7706 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7707 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7708 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7709 Mr. Boyle?

7710 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7711 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7712 Mr. Khanna?

7713 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7714 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7715 Ms. Jayapal?

7716 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7717 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7718 Mr. Carbajal?

7719 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7720 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7721 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7722 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7723 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7724 Ms. Schakowsky?

7725 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7726 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7727 Madam Chairman?

7728 Chairman Black. No.

7729 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7730 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote

7731 or change their vote?

7732 If not, the clerk shall report.

7733 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

7734 14, and the noes are 21.

7735 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

7736 not agreed to. The committee is now ready to vote on an

7737 amendment offered by Mr. Khanna, amendment No. 14. The

7738 clerk will redesignate the amendment.

7739 The Clerk. Amendment No. 14, offered by Representative

7740 Khanna.

7741 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

7742 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

7743 Mr. Rokita. No.

7744 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

7745 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

7746 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

7747 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

7748 Mr. Cole?

7749 [No response.]

7750 Mr. McClintock?

7751 Mr. McClintock. No.

7752 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

7753 Mr. Woodall?

7754 Mr. Woodall. No.

7755 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

7756 Mr. Sanford?

7757 Mr. Sanford. No.

7758 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

7759 Mr. Womack?

7760 Mr. Womack. No.

7761 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

7762 Mr. Brat?

7763 Mr. Brat. No.

7764 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

7765 Mr. Grothman?

7766 Mr. Grothman. No.

7767 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

7768 Mr. Palmer?

7769 Mr. Palmer. No.

7770 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

7771 Mr. Westerman?

7772 Mr. Westerman. No.

7773 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

7774 Mr. Renacci?

7775 Mr. Renacci. No.

7776 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

7777 Mr. Johnson?

7778 Mr. Johnson. No.

7779 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

7780 Mr. Smith?

7781 Mr. Smith. No.

7782 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.

7783 Mr. Lewis?

7784 Mr. Lewis. No.

7785 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

7786 Mr. Bergman?

7787 Mr. Bergman. No.

7788 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
7789 Mr. Faso?
7790 Mr. Faso. No.
7791 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
7792 Mr. Smucker?
7793 Mr. Smucker. No.
7794 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
7795 Mr. Gaetz?
7796 Mr. Gaetz. No.
7797 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
7798 Mr. Arrington?
7799 Mr. Arrington. No.
7800 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
7801 Mr. Ferguson?
7802 Mr. Ferguson. No.
7803 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
7804 Mr. Yarmuth?
7805 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
7806 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
7807 Ms. Lee?
7808 Ms. Lee. Aye.
7809 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
7810 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
7811 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
7812 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

7813 Mr. Moulton?

7814 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

7815 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

7816 Mr. Jeffries?

7817 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

7818 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

7819 Mr. Higgins?

7820 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

7821 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

7822 Ms. DelBene?

7823 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

7824 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

7825 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

7826 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

7827 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

7828 Mr. Boyle?

7829 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

7830 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

7831 Mr. Khanna?

7832 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

7833 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

7834 Ms. Jayapal?

7835 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

7836 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

7837 Mr. Carbajal?

7838 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

7839 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

7840 Ms. Jackson Lee?

7841 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

7842 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

7843 Ms. Schakowsky?

7844 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

7845 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

7846 Madam Chairman?

7847 Chairman Black. No.

7848 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

7849 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote
7850 or to change their vote?

7851 If not, the clerk shall report.

7852 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
7853 14, and the noes are 21.

7854 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
7855 not agreed to.

7856 Mr. Rokita. [Presiding.] We will now continue on with
7857 tier two amendments. Are there tier two amendments? Anyone
7858 with tier two amendments?

7859 Mr. Yarmuth. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
7860 desk.

7861 Mr. Rokita. This is amendment No. 15. The clerk will
7862 designate the amendment. The staff will distribute copies

7863 of the amendment.

7864 The Clerk. Amendment No. 15, offered by Representative
7865 Yarmuth, to eliminate the reconciliation instructions.

7866 [The amendment of John Yarmuth follows:]

7867 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

7868 Mr. Rokita. I will go down to 4 minutes total time,
7869 each side. So Mr. Yarmuth, you are recognized for 3
7870 minutes.

7871 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. My amendment
7872 would strike the reconciliation instructions from the
7873 resolution. As everyone knows, the resolution would
7874 instruct 11 committees to report mandatory spending cuts of
7875 \$203 billion. This process is being undertaken for one
7876 reason and one reason only, and that is to facilitate a
7877 majority-only vote in the Senate on tax cuts for the
7878 wealthiest Americans and corporations.

7879 By contrast, the cuts that would be forced by the
7880 reconciliation instructions are cuts that would hurt the
7881 most vulnerable citizens in our country. For instance, the
7882 Agriculture Committee is ordered to come up with a certain
7883 amount of cuts. Where are they going to get it? Obviously,
7884 from SNAP.

7885 This is the case with almost every one of the
7886 committees. The ways that they could actually save money
7887 would be to cut benefits for Americans. And the only
7888 exception to that, probably, is the instruction aimed at the
7889 Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, which would
7890 necessitate that they take it out on Federal employees,
7891 either on their pensions or salaries.

7892 So this is one of the most cynical processes that I

7893 think is imaginable. The only way that these tax cuts could
7894 be implemented, could be passed through the Congress, is if
7895 you pass an instruction that forces pain on American
7896 citizens. This is exactly what the American people do not
7897 want or expect out of their government, that we would
7898 provide tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and
7899 corporations and pay for it on the backs of people who are
7900 struggling to make their lives better.

7901 So I know that I am going to get a lot of Republican
7902 support for this amendment because, obviously, it would make
7903 the whole exercise moot if we passed it. But I think it is
7904 a point that has to be made, and I urge its adoption. And
7905 with that, I yield the remainder of my time to Ms.
7906 Schakowsky.

7907 Ms. Schakowsky. I thank the ranking member for his
7908 amendment. The proposed budget cuts \$203 billion in
7909 mandatory spending that will erode the basic standard of
7910 living for millions of Americans. This budget attacks
7911 Federal workers who have already given up \$182 billion in
7912 wages and benefits, and now this Republican budget cuts even
7913 their retirement benefits. This budget goes after the poor,
7914 the hungry, the disabled. It takes benefits away from
7915 public servants and retirees. And who wins? The wealthiest
7916 Americans and the largest corporations.

7917 We should strike the reconciliation instructions.

7918 Budgets are about priorities, and it is time to get our
7919 priorities straight. We should support the Yarmuth
7920 amendment, and I yield back.

7921 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields.

7922 Mr. Yarmuth. I yield.

7923 Mr. Rokita. Is there a member who would like to claim
7924 time in opposition to the amendment?

7925 Mr. McClintock. Mr. Chairman?

7926 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman from California is
7927 recognized for 4 minutes.

7928 Mr. McClintock. Thank you. Mr. Chairman,
7929 reconciliation is the mechanism to make statutory changes in
7930 mandatory spending programs to keep them within the limits
7931 set by the budget. The budget sets discretionary limits and
7932 mandatory limits. The discretionary limits go to the
7933 Appropriations Committee, and they mark to those limits.

7934 The mandatory limits are supposed to go to the
7935 authorizing committees, and they are supposed to make
7936 statutory changes to keep mandatory programs within those
7937 limits. The problem is, we have not availed ourselves of
7938 this mechanism in decades, and mandatory spending is now
7939 eating us alive. It is growing three times faster than the
7940 ability of the economy to support it.

7941 This budget finally uses reconciliation as it was
7942 intended. It is exceedingly modest. It restrains the

7943 growth of mandatory spending by \$200 billion over 10 years.
7944 That is \$20 billion a year. That is one-half of 1 percent
7945 of what the Federal Government is spending. And once again,
7946 it does not cut spending. It restrains the growth of
7947 spending. This is absolutely essential this year, because
7948 this budget busts the caps on discretionary spending and
7949 appropriates more than the President has requested. And we
7950 have to ask, what is the alternative?

7951 And I would remind my Democratic colleagues again of
7952 the CBO June forecast. On our current path, in 4 fiscal
7953 years, we will be running trillion-dollar deficits and will
7954 start running the risk of a sovereign debt crisis. And 2
7955 years after that, just our interest costs alone will exceed
7956 what we are currently spending for the entire defense
7957 establishment. Without the reconciliation instructions in
7958 this budget, the discretionary increases would make a dire
7959 situation even worse.

7960 We are already at the historic upper limit of how much
7961 tax revenue the economy can generate, and there is simply,
7962 absolutely no alternative but to restrain the growth of
7963 these programs and give the economy the time and room that
7964 it needs to expand. And I yield the balance of my time to
7965 Mr. Woodall.

7966 Mr. Woodall. I thank my friend for yielding. And I
7967 appreciate the cautionary tale my ranking member gives. I

7968 just want to say, it does not have to be that way, does not
7969 have to be that partisan approach. And historically, it has
7970 not been. Reconciliation is the tool that we use to make
7971 these hard decisions, but historically, we have done these
7972 things collaboratively.

7973 I will remind my friends, since many of them are new,
7974 when we passed the Balanced Budget Act of 1997, Republicans
7975 leading the House, a Democrat in the White House, we reduced
7976 the budget by \$127 billion in 5 years. It passed 85 to 15
7977 in the Senate. I will remind my friends, when we reformed
7978 welfare, Republicans in the House, Democrats in the White
7979 House, it passed 78 to 21 in the Senate, both process
7980 through reconciliation. I will remind my friends, when
7981 Democrats controlled the United States' Senate and President
7982 Bush was in the White House, we passed our reconciliation
7983 bill on a voice vote.

7984 Yes, reconciliation is a tool for mandatory spending
7985 changes, and it is the only tool that we have. And yes, it
7986 ensures that, with 51 votes, we can move the needle for the
7987 American people, but it does not have to be 51 votes. It
7988 could be 65 votes. It could be 76 votes. It could be a
7989 voice vote. And as my Speaker likes to say, I would
7990 encourage my colleagues to raise their gaze that perhaps we
7991 might get there this year. With that, I yield back the
7992 balance of my time.

7993 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields. The gentleman from
7994 Kentucky is recognized for 1 minute to close.

7995 Mr. Yarmuth. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I
7996 appreciate the comments of my friend from Georgia. Of
7997 course, if we had 65 votes or 78 votes or whatever it was,
7998 we would not need reconciliation. And the fact remains that
7999 the cuts that are almost inevitable from this process are
8000 cuts and votes that could never be passed on their own.
8001 Some of them might be, but a lot of them would not be. I
8002 would dare to say that, right now, if you tried to cut
8003 Federal pensions or salaries, even on a majority vote by
8004 itself in the Senate, you could not pass it. And that is
8005 why I think this process is so cynical.

8006 I would much rather see a budget process where it was
8007 forced to be bipartisan in the Senate because, with 52
8008 Republicans and 48 Democrats, should be relatively easy to
8009 get something done on a bipartisan basis. It has not proven
8010 that way. I think I certainly would welcome the type of
8011 atmosphere that my friend suggests, but we do not have that
8012 now. And I, again, urge my colleagues to adopt this
8013 amendment, and I yield back.

8014 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. The question
8015 is agreeing on the amendment offered by Mr. Yarmuth of
8016 Kentucky.

8017 All those in favor, say aye.

8018 All those opposed, say no.

8019 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

8020 Mr. Yarmuth. I request a recorded vote.

8021 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to
8022 the unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone this
8023 recorded vote until we have finished debating this batch of
8024 seven amendments. Is there someone wishing to make an
8025 amendment?

8026 Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I have an
8027 amendment.

8028 Mr. Rokita. Ms. Lee is recognized.

8029 Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is
8030 very --

8031 Mr. Rokita. Excuse me. The clerk will designate the
8032 amendment.

8033 Ms. Lee. Excuse me.

8034 The Clerk. Amendment No. 16, offered by Representative
8035 Lee. To decrease budget authority and associated outlays
8036 for Function 970, the global war on terrorism.

8037 [The amendment of Barbara Lee follows:]

8038 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8039 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady is recognized for 3
8040 minutes.

8041 Ms. Lee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This amendment is
8042 very straightforward. It would cut the extra \$10 billion
8043 included in this bill for the Overseas Contingency
8044 Operations fund. That is OCO. I am saddened, though not
8045 surprised, to see the Republicans, once again, are using
8046 this sham accounting system by leaving the OCO account and
8047 loophole open to get around spending caps in this budget.
8048 What is worse, this is \$10 billion over the Pentagon's
8049 request, \$10 billion. That is \$10 billion in off-budget war
8050 spending that pads the wallets of defense contracts.

8051 Over the years, I am proud to say that there has been
8052 bipartisan agreement over concerns regarding the OCO slush
8053 fund and its being used as a source of our long-term
8054 Pentagon spending. We know OCO has expanded beyond any
8055 reasonable measure of what a contingency fund should be, and
8056 really, it is a black box with no oversight. And now, with
8057 more wars underway in Syria and Iraq, a war that Congress
8058 has yet, mind you, to debate and vote on as required by the
8059 Constitution, the OCO account continues to bloom.

8060 In recent years, we have paid nearly all wartime
8061 operations out of a fund that was meant to be a small
8062 emergency fund. This practice has resulted in less
8063 oversight and less certainty and higher levels of waste.

8064 Certainly, the OCO account no longer serves its intended
8065 purpose. Now is the time to end this loophole that allows
8066 the Pentagon to hide the true costs of having war without
8067 end.

8068 Mr. Chairman, leaving the door open to using OCO to
8069 plus-up base-level funding for DOD from an account that
8070 lacks adequate transparency and oversight really does a
8071 disservice to the taxpayers of this country and to the
8072 obligations of this committee. It is really beyond
8073 comprehension that the Pentagon has lost tens of billions of
8074 dollars to waste, fraud, and abuse while Congress sits idly
8075 by.

8076 So I hope that all members of this committee, who are
8077 really serious about wanting deficit reduction and
8078 accountability in government spending, support this
8079 amendment. Thank you, and I reserve the balance of my time.

8080 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady reserves. Is there a
8081 member who wants to claim opposition?

8082 Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Chairman?

8083 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Gaetz, the gentleman from Florida, is
8084 recognized for 4 minutes.

8085 Mr. Gaetz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I agree with
8086 the gentlelady who introduced this amendment that we could
8087 do a lot more to move funding from overseas contingency
8088 operations into the base budget for the Department of

8089 Defense. As a matter of fact, I join fellow members of both
8090 the Armed Services Committee and the Budget Committee in our
8091 bipartisan desire to do so.

8092 But here is the problem. After 8 years of the Obama
8093 administration hollowing out our military, leaving our
8094 troops without the necessary capabilities, not supporting
8095 them when they are down-range and putting themselves in
8096 danger, we have to now go in and fill that hole temporarily,
8097 so that the best among us, the bravest, who go overseas and
8098 fight for America's freedom and our interests in the global
8099 war on terror, in fact, have the capabilities and support
8100 necessary to achieve the mission.

8101 And so, while I believe the intent of the amendment is
8102 correct, and I fully agree with it, I would ask my
8103 colleagues to oppose the amendment, so that, while we are
8104 recovering from 8 years of harm to our military under the
8105 Obama administration, we are able to get back to a more
8106 responsible mechanism of budgeting. And I certainly give my
8107 commitment to do so. And I would yield to the gentleman
8108 from Ohio, Mr. Johnson.

8109 Mr. Johnson. I thank my colleague for yielding. You
8110 know, I spent 26.5 years in the Air Force, retiring in 1999.
8111 I have never seen a more uncertain time in our Nation in
8112 regards to the conflicts that we are facing. The uncertain
8113 nature of war mandates that these overseas contingency funds

8114 continue to provide flexibility to fight and win against
8115 current and ever-changing threats; for example, the expanded
8116 scope of operations in Syria, Libya, the horn of Africa, and
8117 continued operations in Iraq and Afghanistan. It is
8118 critical that we continue this funding line in order to face
8119 those complex and evolving threats.

8120 You know, eliminating this funding would harm
8121 replacement of equipment that has been destroyed during
8122 wartime. And we have heard the examples from the Armed
8123 Services community about the holes and the gaps that exist
8124 today in our military. We have got to replace equipment
8125 that has been damaged and to bring that equipment back to
8126 its original capability, so that it can go do the job for
8127 our troops that it was designed to do.

8128 I believe that the meeting of the financial needs of
8129 the war fighter should continue to be the highest priority
8130 of Congress. I mean, that is the oath that we take, to
8131 support and defend our Nation. And this overseas
8132 contingency fund continues to ensure that those war fighters
8133 have the proper funding to fight and to win against these
8134 emerging threats.

8135 If we were to adopt this amendment, it would preclude
8136 us from being able to adjust to unforeseen circumstances
8137 related to national security, and that is just totally
8138 unacceptable. I, too, urge a no vote on this amendment.

8139 And with that, I yield back.

8140 Mr. Gaetz. I thank the gentleman for his comments, and
8141 I would conclude by saying that I often share with my
8142 constituents that I am on the two scariest committees in
8143 Congress: Armed Services and Budget because, in the Armed
8144 Services Committee, we continue to see the capabilities of
8145 our adversaries climb as our capabilities have remained in
8146 jeopardy as a consequence of the Obama administration.

8147 And of course, in the Budget Committee, if we do not
8148 take meaningful steps to reduce the deficit and reduce the
8149 debt, we will be ill-equipped to deal with those adversaries
8150 and their enhanced capabilities. With that, I would urge my
8151 colleagues to vote against the amendment.

8152 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. I thank the
8153 gentleman. And Ms. Lee, you are recognized for 1 minute to
8154 close.

8155 Ms. Lee. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. First of
8156 all, you cannot tell me that a plus-up of \$72 billion for
8157 the Pentagon cannot fill the gaps and holes that my
8158 colleague referred to in the base budget. This is \$10
8159 billion over what the President requested. Minimally, the
8160 American people deserve transparency and oversight.

8161 Again, this OCO account does not provide that. So if
8162 this committee wants to plus-up the OCO account, transfer it
8163 into the base budget, so the American people know what their

8164 taxpayer dollars are going for. We need to have
8165 accountability in government spending. My amendment would
8166 take us in the correct direction for that, and so I ask for
8167 an aye vote.

8168 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady yields back. The question
8169 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms. Lee.

8170 All those in favor, say aye.

8171 All those opposed, say no.

8172 Ms. Lee. I ask for a recorded vote.

8173 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady asks for a recorded vote.
8174 It has been requested. Pursuant to the unanimous consent
8175 agreement, we will postpone the recorded vote until we have
8176 finished debating this batch of seven amendments. Are there
8177 other amendments?

8178 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment
8179 at the desk.

8180 Mr. Rokita. This is amendment No. 17. The clerk will
8181 designate the amendment.

8182 The Clerk. Amendment No. 17, offered by Representative
8183 Lujan Grisham. To insert a deficit-neutral reserve fund
8184 related to the availability of access to long-term care
8185 services.

8186 [The amendment of Michelle Lujan Grisham follows:]

8187 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8188 Mr. Rokita. And I understand the staff has already
8189 distributed copies of this series of amendments. Ms. Lujan
8190 Grisham, you are recognized for 3 minutes.

8191 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. For all
8192 our talk today about reining in spending, this Republican
8193 budget does nothing to address one of the biggest drivers of
8194 cost on the Federal balance sheet: long-term care. We have
8195 a looming long-term care crisis in this country. By 2030,
8196 there will be more than 72 million older Americans making up
8197 19 percent of the total population.

8198 Now, as they age, many of these seniors will need long-
8199 term supports and services, ranging from assistance with
8200 eating or dressing in their homes to more intensive nursing
8201 home care. Very few of them will have the resources
8202 required to pay for those services, which can be very
8203 difficult to access and extremely expensive. For example,
8204 in 2016, the average cost of a private room in a nursing
8205 home was about \$92,000, and the average cost of a home
8206 health aide was \$31,000.

8207 Now, while it was never designed to serve as a
8208 universal, long-term care program, Medicaid is already the
8209 primary payer for long-term supports and services, covering
8210 about 43 percent, \$146 billion, of all long-term care
8211 spending in 2013. And Medicaid spending on long-term care
8212 is expected to increase by almost 50 percent by 2026.

8213 Now, my amendment creates a deficit-neutral reserve
8214 fund in support of initiatives that increase access to long-
8215 term care supports and services for seniors and individuals
8216 with disabilities. This allows us to consider a broad range
8217 of solutions to these challenges, from changes in Federal
8218 health programs to comprehensive Federal long-term care
8219 insurance. These solutions can help bend the cost curve and
8220 save Federal Government money. They also fill the gaps in
8221 our fragmented, long-term care system, reaching middle class
8222 families who currently have nowhere to turn for support. I
8223 would like to yield 1 minute to my friend from Illinois,
8224 Congresswoman Schakowsky.

8225 Ms. Schakowsky. Half the Americans turning 65 will
8226 need intensive, long-term care assistance, and 18 percent of
8227 women will need long-term care for more than 5 years. One
8228 year of assisted living costs \$44,000 on average, and a
8229 private room in a nursing home costs over \$92,000. This
8230 budget makes the problem worse by slashing Medicaid.

8231 In Illinois, my Republican Governor attempted to
8232 tighten eligibility for long-term care. His proposal would
8233 have taken long-term services away from 40,000 seniors and
8234 10,000 people with disabilities. Fortunately, it failed.
8235 And under the Republican budget, other States may cut
8236 benefits, putting long-term care out of reach for many
8237 Americans. The Lujan Grisham amendment will help resolve

8238 this problem. I urge its support.

8239 Ms. Lujan Grisham. I reserve.

8240 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady reserves. Is there a
8241 member who wants to claim time in opposition to this
8242 amendment?

8243 Chairman Black. Mr. Chairman, I claim time.

8244 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady from Tennessee is
8245 recognized for 4 minutes.

8246 Chairman Black. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I want
8247 to talk to this situation as a nurse for more than 40 years.
8248 I am intimately familiar with long-term care services, and I
8249 very much agree with the spirit of the amendment offered by
8250 my friend from the other side of the aisle.

8251 However, Medicare is on an unsustainable path. At its
8252 current pace of expenditures, the Medicare actuaries
8253 estimated that the program will go bankrupt by 2029, and CBO
8254 estimates that it will occur even sooner, at 2025. And this
8255 means that the benefits would be reduced automatically on
8256 that date if nothing is done to reform the program and save
8257 it as it is now. So I think it is irresponsible to add a
8258 new healthcare benefit to a program that is already unable
8259 to afford its current liabilities to the point where its
8260 existing beneficiaries are at risk.

8261 We have already tried this before. As a matter of
8262 fact, it was part of the ACA. I remember, when I came in

8263 here to Congress in 2010, I remember seeing the CLASS Act,
8264 which was included in the ACA. It was designed specifically
8265 to meet long-term care needs of our population. But even
8266 the Obama administration and Secretary Sebelius said it was
8267 unworkable. They deemed it unworkable and took it out of
8268 the plan. This did not take legislative action. It was
8269 done by the administration.

8270 So, adding a new benefit without improving the program
8271 through some structural reforms only hastens the program's
8272 trajectory toward insolvency and ensures that Medicare is
8273 unable to keep the promise of healthcare security to our
8274 current seniors and our future seniors as well. And
8275 instead, this budget resolution proposes some needed
8276 improvements to the Medicare program.

8277 I invite my colleagues from the other side of the aisle
8278 to look at those improvements that would actually save,
8279 strengthen, and secure the program for both current and
8280 future recipients. It also provides additional flexibility
8281 and authority for States to address these issues for their
8282 populations. And I can tell you that we have done that in
8283 the State of Tennessee and had quite a number of successes
8284 as a result of that.

8285 And so, for the reasons that I have already stated, I
8286 would urge a no vote on this amendment. I yield to Mr.
8287 Ferguson for the remainder of my time.

8288 Mr. Ferguson. Thank you, Madam Chairman. And to my
8289 colleague from New Mexico, I thank you for raising this
8290 important issue. Medicare and Medicaid and senior services
8291 are so vitally important to this Nation and I think that it
8292 is important to recognize that, as the chairwoman pointed
8293 out in her remarks, that the program is on an unsustainable
8294 path. And nothing could be worse than the catastrophic
8295 failure of this program financially, not only to the
8296 recipients of this program, but also to the huge financial
8297 impact that it would place on our Nation and the burden that
8298 it would continue to place on future generations.

8299 As you know, under our budget, States will have the
8300 flexibility and authority to shape Medicaid programs to fit
8301 their needs and their State populations, and we feel like
8302 that is something that is very important, given the
8303 diversity of our States. With State flexibility for
8304 Medicaid, States will have the freedom to adjust the
8305 benefits, such as aiding greater long-term services and
8306 supports to improve their program, and this can be done
8307 without breaking the Federal budget.

8308 States are better equipped to know how to address
8309 particular long-term care needs in their States and their
8310 populations, much better than the folks here in Washington.
8311 And the structural improvements to Medicare and Medicaid
8312 proposed in this budget save, strengthen, and preserve these

8313 programs for future generations.

8314 This is not an issue that needs to be politicized. All
8315 too often, every time someone brings this topic up, the
8316 other side eviscerates them politically. It is time that we
8317 have an honest conversation about this in our Nation to
8318 protect the seniors that are currently receiving the
8319 benefits, those that are close to the finish line, and to
8320 make sure that future generations have access to these
8321 important programs. I yield back.

8322 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman
8323 yields back. Ms. Lujan Grisham, you are recognized for a
8324 minute to close.

8325 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Thank you. I am confused because
8326 Medicare does not provide for long-term care benefit.
8327 Medicaid is the primary source that I was referring to. But
8328 I do appreciate that my colleagues are clear that this
8329 should not be a political issue, which is why it is a
8330 deficit-neutral reserve amendment. Because if we do not
8331 plan, you are burdening future generations.

8332 I am a primary caregiver. My mother's Social Security
8333 is \$18,000 a year. She can afford none of these services
8334 without my support. I am lucky because I am here and I have
8335 a great family with that support. Most Americans are having
8336 to dip into their savings, are having to go to part-time
8337 work. More than \$500 billion is provided by unpaid family

8338 caregivers. We have an obligation to start to plan so that
8339 we shore up these programs and help States and families
8340 provide the best quality of care.

8341 And lastly, if you do not do this on the front end, you
8342 are going to spend more on Medicare in the long end because
8343 you are going to make people sicker. Thank you. I yield
8344 back.

8345 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady's time is expired. The
8346 question is on agreeing to the amendment.

8347 All those in favor, say aye.

8348 And all those opposed, say no.

8349 In the opinion of this chair, the noes have it.

8350 I thank the gentleman. A recorded vote is requested.

8351 Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, we will
8352 postpone the recorded vote until we have finished this batch
8353 of seven amendments.

8354 Are there any other amendments?

8355 Mr. Moulton. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
8356 desk.

8357 Mr. Rokita. This is amendment No. 18. The clerk will
8358 designate the amendment.

8359 The Clerk. Amendment No. 18, offered by Representative
8360 Moulton, to increase budget authority and outlays for
8361 Function 150, international affairs.

8362 [The amendment of Seth Moulton follows:]

8363

***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8364 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman is recognized for 3 minutes.

8365 Mr. Moulton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, for the time.

8366 As a veteran, I can tell you that this budget resolution we
8367 are considering today will put the lives of our men and
8368 women in uniform at risk. The proposed cuts to the State
8369 Department and foreign aid programs are anti-military and
8370 show a clear lack of understanding for how to keep our
8371 Nation strong and safe.

8372 That is why I am offering this amendment to restore
8373 vital funding to the State Department. It does so by
8374 reducing tax expenditures for the top 1 percent of income
8375 earners and eliminating corporate tax breaks, including
8376 loopholes that encourage firms to ship jobs and capital
8377 overseas and shelter their profits in foreign tax havens.

8378 President Trump's own Secretary of Defense, Secretary
8379 Mattis, has said before Congress that "if you do not fund
8380 the State Department fully, then I need to buy more
8381 ammunition." To quote again from Secretary Mattis, "What
8382 you have to do is make certain that your foreign policy is
8383 led by the diplomats, not by the military."

8384 Mr. Chairman, I would like to submit this letter for
8385 the record. One hundred and twenty retired generals and
8386 admirals, including General David Petraeus, General John
8387 Allen, and Admiral James Stavridis, who expressed their
8388 opposition to cuts in diplomatic programs.

8389 Mr. Rokita. Without objection.

8390 [The information follows:]

8391 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8392 Mr. Moulton. I am baffled by the fact that, despite
8393 our Nation's leading generals advocating for more funding
8394 for diplomacy, Director Mulvaney, President Trump, Secretary
8395 Tillerson, and many of my Republican colleagues in Congress
8396 would pursue a budget that does the exact opposite. Now,
8397 who do you trust more with our national security, the former
8398 commanding general of the First Marine Division in combat or
8399 the former CEO of Exxon?

8400 During the Iraq war, there was an inverse relationship
8401 between the density of USAID projects and casualty rates.
8402 The more USAID programs in an area, the fewer U.S. combat
8403 troop casualties there were, according to U.S. military
8404 research.

8405 As an Iraq war veteran, I cannot tell you how sad and
8406 frustrating it is to see young Americans being sent back to
8407 Iraq and Afghanistan to re-fight the same battles that we
8408 won years ago. There is bipartisan blame to go around for
8409 this failure, but one thing is clear: Our failure to win the
8410 peace after we won the war has cost more young American
8411 lives.

8412 Let's not make that mistake again. Let's properly fund
8413 our State Department and development efforts to keep our
8414 country and our troops as safe as they can be. I would now
8415 like to yield my remaining time to Mr. Khanna of California.

8416 Mr. Khanna. I will just offer this quote by Douglas

8417 MacArthur. "The soldier, above all, prays for peace because
8418 they know the hardships of war." That is paraphrasing. So,
8419 I admire your service to our country and your perspective, I
8420 think, is true to General MacArthur's words.

8421 Mr. Moulton. I thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I yield
8422 back.

8423 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields. Is there a member
8424 wishing to claim time in opposition to this amendment? Mr.
8425 Bergman, the gentleman from Michigan, is recognized for 4
8426 minutes.

8427 Mr. Bergman. Thank you, sir. With all due respect to
8428 my fellow Marine across the aisle, many of you, if not all
8429 of you, on this committee know that the most challenging
8430 place to be is the peacetime Marine Corps because if we do
8431 not have an enemy to fight we will probably take on each
8432 other, because the point of it is that steel sharpens steel,
8433 and as I see across the room here today, I see some good
8434 sharp steel because we train, we train to go to the fight.

8435 And I would suggest to you that, having served with
8436 General Mattis and many of the retired generals and admirals
8437 that you cited, Mr. Moulton, that they have a very unique
8438 and well-established perspective in war fighting and world
8439 diplomacy. That is one of the things that our all-recruited
8440 military does for its senior officers and its senior
8441 enlisted, is provide them with the training to allow them to

8442 lead in very challenging conditions. And I guess that I
8443 would suggest to you that, at the same time, all of them
8444 know that resources in the fight are limited.

8445 They are limited to what you have with you when the
8446 lead flies. And they know that they have to prioritize and
8447 reprioritize those limited resources to make sure that they
8448 have enough to complete the mission. But they also realize,
8449 I would suggest to you, that to be overlapping or
8450 duplicative is one of the things that creates challenges for
8451 all folks in the joint fight.

8452 And in this case, when you have combined forces with
8453 Department of Defense and Department of State, there is
8454 duplication in unnecessary areas, whether it be dealing with
8455 NGOs, whether it be running training programs, or be it
8456 getting involved in pots of money with education and
8457 different things that cannot continue to occur because we
8458 are wasting valuable and limited dollars to support our
8459 diplomatic efforts overseas, which oh, by the way, they are
8460 funded in this budget.

8461 The money that we spend and invest in other countries
8462 to develop our allies has to be widely done, but we have got
8463 a national debt of \$20 trillion, and to quote a former
8464 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs, Mike Mullen, "Our debt is our
8465 single biggest threat to security."

8466 So, it is in the best interest of our country and our

8467 State Department and our Department of Defense to ensure
8468 that we as a Congress give them what they need to do the
8469 fight and allow them to work it out but not duplicate the
8470 efforts. Because when you start duplicating efforts, you
8471 are then beginning to trip on one another and I can tell you
8472 I have seen this, experienced this at the general officer
8473 level, and it takes away from the effectiveness of our joint
8474 force.

8475 So, again, I would urge my colleagues to vote against
8476 this amendment because our budget is going to be the driver
8477 that allows us, as United States military and a diplomatic
8478 department, to prosper around the world as we support our
8479 allies. So, I thank you and I yield the rest of my time.

8480 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman
8481 yields back. Mr. Moulton, you are recognized for 1 minute
8482 to close.

8483 Mr. Moulton. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and I want to
8484 thank my colleague and fellow Marine for his comments. But
8485 I would like to see the evidence for this duplication. I
8486 would like to see it because Secretary Mattis came before
8487 the Armed Services Committee this year and said, "Do not cut
8488 State Department funding." Because General Petraeus -- and
8489 there is no one who has been more at the forefront of this
8490 fight in Iraq and Afghanistan -- came before our committee
8491 this year and said, "Do not make these cuts to this

8492 funding."

8493 You are right that steel sharpens steel and we should
8494 have a debate, but the experts are very clear on where they
8495 lie here and one thing is certain: We are not in a peacetime
8496 Marine Corps. You said we are in a peacetime Marine Corps.
8497 We are not in a peacetime Marine Corps. There is a war
8498 going on and we need to get the troops what they need.
8499 Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I yield back.

8500 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. The question
8501 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr. Moulton.

8502 All those in favor, say aye.

8503 And all those opposed, say no.

8504 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

8505 A recorded vote has been requested. Pursuant to the
8506 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone this recorded
8507 vote until we have finished debating this batch of seven
8508 amendments. Are there any other amendments?

8509 Mr. Jeffries. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
8510 desk.

8511 Mr. Rokita. This would be amendment No. 19. The clerk
8512 will designate the amendment.

8513 The Clerk. Amendment No. 19, offered by Representative
8514 Jeffries, to insert a policy statement on implementation of
8515 the Mnuchin rule.

8516 [The amendment of Hakeem Jeffries follows:]

8517

***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8518 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Jeffries is recognized for 3 minutes.

8519 Mr. Jeffries. Thank you, Mr. Chair. This amendment
8520 would implement the Mnuchin rule, which stems from Treasury
8521 Secretary Mnuchin's promise that, "there would be no
8522 absolute tax cut for the upper class in reference to any
8523 administration tax reform legislation."

8524 By almost any measure in this country, the rich are
8525 getting richer while the vast majority of Americans are
8526 being left behind. Since the early 1970S, the productivity
8527 of the American worker has increased in excess of 285
8528 percent. During that same period of time, wages have
8529 increased by less than 10 percent. The productivity gains
8530 of the American worker have gone to the privileged few.
8531 Hardworking Americans are subsidizing the lifestyles of the
8532 wealthy and the well-off.

8533 Half of American households have seen no real increase
8534 in their average income for 35 years. Meanwhile, the wealth
8535 of a person in the top 1 percent has nearly quadrupled to
8536 \$10 million. Numbers do not lie. The wealthy are doing
8537 much better, while the middle class and those who aspire to
8538 be part of it are being left behind. The House Republican
8539 tax plan is the latest version of the failed trickle-down
8540 economic theory that tax cuts for the rich will supposedly
8541 pay for themselves.

8542 When George W. Bush cut taxes for the rich, what

8543 happened? Deficits skyrocketed and this country confronted
8544 the worst economic crisis since the Great Depression. The
8545 top tax rate under President Clinton was 39.6 percent, yet
8546 somehow more than 20 million jobs were created and we
8547 experienced unprecedented economic growth. The top tax rate
8548 under President Bush was cut to 35 percent, yet we lost
8549 approximately 650,000 jobs during his presidency. The top
8550 tax rate under President Obama rose to 39.6 percent, yet
8551 somehow more than 14 million private sector jobs were
8552 created.

8553 There is no evidence that cutting taxes on the super-
8554 rich will lead to greater job creation and economic growth.
8555 Even Treasury Secretary Mnuchin disagrees with the voodoo
8556 economic approach. We should follow the Mnuchin rule and
8557 reject any effort related to tax reform that provides a net
8558 tax cut to households in the top one percent. I yield back.

8559 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields. Is there a member
8560 wishing time in opposition to this amendment? The gentleman
8561 from Missouri, Mr. Smith, is recognized for 4 minutes.

8562 Mr. Smith. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Our current tax
8563 code is needlessly complex, filled with special preference,
8564 exclusions, and deductions. It is estimated that the
8565 American people spend 8.9 billion hours and \$409 billion a
8566 year navigating our broken system. The tax code is over
8567 70,000 pages, 55 times the size of the King James version of

8568 the Bible. It is clear we need a new tax code, one that is
8569 fair and simple for everyone.

8570 Our tax code should be focused on jobs for Americans
8571 and should ensure that the United States is the best place
8572 in the world to work and raise a family. On the Ways and
8573 Means Committee, we are studying this issue closely and
8574 working towards this goal. Our budget proposal provides
8575 instructions to promote tax reform that stimulates the
8576 economy and creates jobs. My Republican colleagues and I
8577 are committed to this approach and we are committed to a tax
8578 code that works for every American regardless of where they
8579 live or how much they earn. I urge a no vote on this
8580 amendment. I would like to yield to my good friend Mr.
8581 Renacci from Ohio.

8582 Mr. Renacci. Thank you. Although I have a lot of
8583 respect for Secretary Mnuchin, tax reform should be based on
8584 the American people rule, not the Mnuchin rule. That rule
8585 should assure that the economy grows with progrowth policies
8586 allowing for more good-paying jobs. As a CPA who practiced
8587 for many years and a small-business man for almost 3 decades
8588 before I came to Congress, I have a concern that this
8589 amendment does not take into consideration that small
8590 businesses often pay taxes under the individual income tax
8591 system. Therefore, amendments such as this could negatively
8592 impact successful small businesses that play a vital role in

8593 our economy and that are an engine of economic growth. And
8594 let's not forget the biggest driver of Federal revenue is
8595 not higher tax rates but economic growth.

8596 Small businesses generate 60 to 80 percent of net new
8597 jobs annually and employ about half of all private sector
8598 employees. I should know. Again, as a businessman, most of
8599 my businesses were set up in a pass-through situation, which
8600 meant that they came down to my personal income tax return.
8601 This amendment would put small businesses at an economic
8602 disadvantage compared to their competitors and prevent them
8603 from even greater future growth.

8604 This amendment would hurt economic growth, it will hurt
8605 job creation, it will hurt working Americans, and it will
8606 hurt the entrepreneurial spirit that makes our country
8607 great. We should be committed to reforming our broken tax
8608 code so that it works for every American at every income
8609 level regardless of where they live or how much money they
8610 earn. Tax reform needs to be fair to all Americans. I urge
8611 a no vote on this amendment and yield back the remaining
8612 balance of my time.

8613 Mr. Smith. I would like to yield to Mr. Lewis.

8614 Mr. Lewis. You know, it is right that the numbers do
8615 not lie. When Ronald Reagan took office the top marginal
8616 tax rate was 70 percent. When he left office, it was 28
8617 percent. Even through Clinton's tax hikes, Obama's tax

8618 hikes were not close up to 70 percent. My colleagues on the
8619 other side are right. So, we are still living in an era of
8620 Reagan-led economic growth through reductions in taxes.

8621 But beyond the numbers and beyond the fact that the tax
8622 hikes of Bill Clinton and the tax hike of President Obama
8623 did nothing to address income equality -- in fact, income
8624 inequality got worse -- we have to be very careful in this
8625 rhetoric, this politics of envy. You know, we are setting
8626 some dangerous social divisions by focusing on a select
8627 group of successful Americans. Earlier today, House
8628 Minority Leader Nancy Pelosi said the Republican budget
8629 stirs up violence. Stirs up violence. Now, that is just
8630 plain irresponsible.

8631 You know, this year was the 100th birthday of President
8632 Kennedy. At the Economic Club of New York in 1962, he said
8633 a complicated tax code with high rates exerts too heavy a
8634 drag on growth and it reduces financial incentives for
8635 growth. That is, I should say, what mainstream Democrats
8636 used to believe about a rising time.

8637 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman's time has expired.

8638 Mr. Lewis. Where have they gone? I yield back.

8639 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. Mr. Jeffries is
8640 recognized for 1 minute to close.

8641 Mr. Jeffries. I have heard a lot of things during my
8642 time in Congress, but the notion that we are still living

8643 through the Reagan economy in 2017 is quite new. When
8644 Kansas tried its experiment in trickle-down voodoo economics
8645 by cutting taxes for the rich and creating a pass-through
8646 loophole of its own, it was a spectacular failure, an
8647 unmitigated disaster. Huge deficits led to massive cuts in
8648 education spending.

8649 The Kansas economy stagnated even as its neighbors
8650 experienced economic growth, and the Republican-controlled
8651 Kansas legislature finally revolted, overturning much of its
8652 reckless tax cut. I have finally figured out what trickle-
8653 down economics means for the middle class. You may get a
8654 trickle, but you are guaranteed to stay down. I yield back.

8655 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. The question
8656 is on agreeing to the amendment by Mr. Jeffries. All
8657 those in favor, say aye.

8658 And all those opposed, say no.

8659 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

8660 A recorded vote has been requested. Pursuant to the
8661 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the record of
8662 it until we have finished debating this batch of seven
8663 amendments.

8664 Are there other amendments? Hearing none, I guess we
8665 are done.

8666 Okay, Mr. Higgins has an amendment.

8667 Mr. Higgins. It is an amendment to restore EPA

8668 funding --

8669 Mr. Rokita. Okay -- has an amendment at the desk. I

8670 believe it is amendment 20. The clerk will designate.

8671 The Clerk. Amendment No. 20, offered by Representative

8672 Higgins, to increase budget authority and outlays for

8673 Function 300, natural resources and environment.

8674 [The amendment of Brian Higgins follows:]

8675 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8676 Mr. Rokita. And Mr. Higgins is recognized for 3
8677 minutes.

8678 Mr. Higgins. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Today, the
8679 Environmental Protection Agency is under threat from the
8680 administration that compromises the safety of our air and
8681 water in order to achieve small spending reductions. The
8682 budget we are considering today affirms these cuts and
8683 threatens to undermine years of progress.

8684 When President Nixon united with Congress to establish
8685 the Environmental Protection Agency and signed into law the
8686 Clean Air and Clean Water Acts nearly 50 years ago, the
8687 protection of our environment was a top priority. But now,
8688 decades of hard work by both parties to rid our air of toxic
8689 pollutants, remove waste from our rivers and lakes, and
8690 provide safe drinking water to our communities is at risk.

8691 In my home community of Buffalo, New York, we have seen
8692 the EPA's effectiveness firsthand. Thirty years ago, the
8693 Buffalo River was declared biologically dead and
8694 ecologically destroyed because of industrial dumping of
8695 toxic waste.

8696 Today, the river has been remediated and transformed to
8697 a recreational waterway with vastly improved water quality.
8698 The Great Lakes Restoration Initiative administered by the
8699 EPA, the Buffalo-Niagara River Keeper, and corporate partner
8700 Honeywell has invested more than \$70 million to remove

8701 67,000 truckloads of toxic waste from the Buffalo River. As
8702 a result, the Buffalo River and adjacent land is helping to
8703 lead an economic and life quality renaissance at the water's
8704 edge in Buffalo, New York.

8705 Along with the Great Lakes Restoration Initiative, the
8706 EPA also administers similar programs in Puget Sound,
8707 Chesapeake Bay, Long Island Sound, the Gulf of Mexico, and
8708 others. These programs, which have marked progress in
8709 restoring native habitats, improving water quality, and
8710 enhancing fish populations are also economic drivers. More
8711 than 1.5 million jobs and \$62 billion in wages are directly
8712 tied to the Great Lakes.

8713 But our work is not completed. This summer, western
8714 Lake Erie is expected to experience another significant
8715 harmful algae bloom, which is caused by agricultural runoff
8716 that leads to compromised water quality, fish kills, and
8717 foul odor over an area that often spans thousands of square
8718 miles. I urge the committee to adopt my amendment and to
8719 continue the bipartisan tradition of protecting the
8720 environment. I thank you and I yield back.

8721 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman's
8722 time has expired. Is there a member who wishes to claim
8723 time in opposition?

8724 Mr. Gaetz. Yes, Mr. Chairman.

8725 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Gaetz, the gentleman from Florida, is

8726 recognize for 4 minutes.

8727 Mr. Gaetz. I am sorry, a point of inquiry, Mr.

8728 Chairman. Did the amendment sponsor have 3 minutes? Oh, he

8729 reserved one minute for close?

8730 Mr. Rokita. Yeah.

8731 Mr. Gaetz. Okay. Thank you, I appreciate that.

8732 Mr. Rokita. We are on 4 minutes total.

8733 Mr. Gaetz. Much appreciated. The amendment suggests

8734 that we need to increase funding for the EPA, one of the

8735 most bloated, ineffective, bureaucratically constrained

8736 agencies that government has ever known. Do not take my

8737 word for it. It was the Office of Management and Budget

8738 that recently rated the 30 least cost-effective regulations

8739 in government. The EPA had created 17 of them. One deputy

8740 at the EPA recently stole a million dollars. Others were

8741 busted for misusing public funds to hire a public relations

8742 consultant. Stanford fellow Dr. Henry Miller referred to

8743 the EPA as relentlessly ideological, politicized, corrupt,

8744 and incompetent. Look no further than Flint, Michigan,

8745 where the EPA's own Inspector General confirmed that the EPA

8746 had information and the authority to act but did nothing.

8747 On human rights, the EPA has been entirely ineffective.

8748 It was Martin Castro, Chairman of the U.S. Commission on

8749 Civil Rights, who said that the EPA has failed miserably in

8750 its mandate to protect communities of color from

8751 environmental hazards. In my own community, there are
8752 Superfund sites that were designated before I was born and
8753 yet still have seen little or nothing happen for the benefit
8754 of people in those communities.

8755 I am grateful for the gentleman's commitment to the
8756 environment. I share that commitment, but my view is that
8757 we have got to get past the ineffective government EPA-run
8758 system and do far more to incentivize activity at our
8759 colleges and universities, to engage our State and local
8760 government partners. That is really the way to take the
8761 billions of dollars that we waste today on bureaucracy in
8762 Washington and make sure that that money ends up enhancing
8763 habitat and ensuring that we protect our environment and our
8764 globe for generations to come. I yield the remainder of our
8765 time to Mr. Westerman of Arkansas.

8766 Mr. Westerman. I thank the gentleman for yielding.
8767 And Mr. Chairman, as we look at this and I think about the
8768 short time that I have been in Congress -- and the gentleman
8769 mentioned that the EPA was under threat from the current
8770 administration -- I would submit that the U.S. economy is
8771 under threat from the EPA.

8772 In fact, the Competitive Enterprise Institute
8773 calculated that Federal regulations alone cost our economy
8774 roughly \$1.9 trillion per year with over \$400 billion in
8775 regulatory costs coming from the EPA.

8776 I have seen the EPA in hearings try to regulate things
8777 like putting the ozone level at levels lower than what
8778 occurs naturally in pristine locations such as Yellowstone
8779 National Park or in the Ozark Mountains in my district. The
8780 EPA has manipulated the public comment process. They have
8781 pushed agendas of NGOs that are based on politics and
8782 ideology and not based on science. They have tried to
8783 expand their reach and their jurisdiction through policies
8784 like Waters of the U.S.

8785 The EPA has served an important role in our country,
8786 but they are looking for things to regulate that do not need
8787 regulated nearly as much anymore and they certainly do not
8788 need additional funding to carry on this attack on American
8789 business and on jobs and the economy in the United States.
8790 I urge my colleagues to vote no on this and I yield back.

8791 Mr. Gaetz. Mr. Chairman, we yield back the remainder
8792 of our time.

8793 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. The gentleman
8794 yields back. The gentleman from New York is recognized for
8795 1 minute to close.

8796 Mr. Higgins. Thank you. I appreciate both gentlemen's
8797 frustration with the EPA as a bureaucracy. I too experience
8798 that with all Federal agencies. Because we are frustrated
8799 by the Veterans Administration bureaucracy and
8800 ineffectiveness does not mean that we discard the programs

8801 that are important to help veterans, and similarly, here EPA
8802 is really not the target of your budget cut. It is a symbol
8803 of it. The real target of it is the real programs that
8804 provide real assistance to communities to clean up their
8805 rivers, to clean up their lakes from industrial pollution
8806 over many, many decades, and I think we can separate the
8807 two.

8808 We should always promote and push hard for efficiency
8809 within the Environmental Protection Agency, but that does
8810 not mean that some of the programs are not very valuable to
8811 the communities we respectively represent. I yield back.
8812 Thank you.

8813 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. The question
8814 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr. Higgins of
8815 New York.

8816 All those in favor, say aye.

8817 And all those opposed, say no.

8818 A recorded vote has been requested. Pursuant to the
8819 unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the required
8820 vote until we have finished debating this batch of seven
8821 amendments.

8822 Are there other amendments?

8823 Ms. DelBene. I have an amendment at the desk.

8824 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady from Washington has an
8825 amendment at the desk. It is amendment No. 21. The clerk

8826 will designate.

8827 The Clerk. Amendment No. 21, offered by Representative

8828 DelBene, to increase budget authority for Functions 250,

8829 science, space, and technology; and Function 550, Health.

8830 [The amendment of Susan DelBene follows:]

8831 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

8832 Mr. Rokita. Ms. DelBene is recognized for 3 minutes.

8833 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Mr. Chair. My amendment
8834 increases strategic long-term investments in research at the
8835 National Institutes of Health and the National Science
8836 Foundation. And I urge my colleagues to support it.

8837 To maintain America's role as a global leader in
8838 innovation and groundbreaking discoveries, it is essential
8839 that we avoid shortsighted cuts to these critical agencies;
8840 like the cuts included in President Trump's draconian
8841 budget, which recklessly slashes funding for research that
8842 we know saves lives and creates jobs.

8843 Unfortunately, the House Republican budget also
8844 neglects investments in basic research through NIH, NSF, and
8845 other important agencies. Even though we know these
8846 investments help us push the boundaries of scientific
8847 knowledge, advance promising research, and offer hope to
8848 millions of Americans. Funding for the lifesaving work at
8849 NIH is also a key economic driver, supporting more than
8850 400,000 jobs and generating over \$60 billion in economic
8851 activity. It delivers an enormous return on investment
8852 today and for generations to come.

8853 For all of these reasons, Congress has collectively
8854 dedicated \$4 billion in additional resources for NIH-funded
8855 research in recent years. Now is not the time to undermine
8856 our momentum, particularly as scientists pursue cutting edge

8857 innovations in precision medicine and immunotherapy. We
8858 should not be taking steps that could hinder medical
8859 research across the country. That is why I, along with more
8860 than 100 of my colleagues, have called for NIH to receive no
8861 less than \$36 billion in the next fiscal year.

8862 Funding for the National Science Foundation is also
8863 extremely important. It supports critical research to
8864 defend our Nation's cyber security, foster innovation, and
8865 develop a globally competitive workforce. The work done at
8866 NSF is a key driver of the U.S. economy and enhances our
8867 Nation's security. That is why we should be forward looking
8868 rather than always being reactive and dedicate at least \$8
8869 billion to NSF next year. I urge my colleagues to support
8870 this amendment and I yield.

8871 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady yields. Is there a member
8872 claiming time in opposition? Mr. Ferguson, the gentleman
8873 from Georgia, is recognized for 4 minutes.

8874 Mr. Ferguson. Thank you. I thank you for the time and
8875 would first like to state that I, too, believe that the
8876 basic research is important for this Nation. My background
8877 at the University of Georgia was in biochemistry and organic
8878 chemistry. And I fully understand the importance of
8879 research and the impact that it can have on the health of
8880 this Nation.

8881 And this budget does provide stable funding for the

8882 National Science Foundation, but it is important that we
8883 focus our priorities on basic research in both mathematical
8884 and physical science, engineering and computer information
8885 science and the biological science. But it must be focused
8886 on the basic research.

8887 Spending in research and development within the NSF is
8888 now over \$60 billion per year distributed across almost
8889 9,000 total grants. The proper role of the Federal
8890 government is to support basic research and distribute
8891 funding accordingly. And the NSF could be more transparent
8892 and accountable to the taxpayer.

8893 One possible example would be to require every grant it
8894 issues to be accompanied by an explanation of the project's
8895 specific merits and how it serves the national interest as
8896 prescribed in the recently enacted American Innovation and
8897 Competitiveness Act. We must make sure that these grant
8898 programs serve a vital interest. We cannot afford funding
8899 for programs that encourage wasteful or low-return studies,
8900 and those should be redirected to scientific research that
8901 are funded in a different arena.

8902 The funding, however, we must note, is discretionary.
8903 It will ultimately be decided by the Committee on
8904 Appropriations in conjunction with authorizers on the
8905 Committee on Energy and Commerce and the Committee on
8906 Science, Space, and Technology. With that, I would like to

8907 yield a couple of minutes to my colleague from Georgia, Mr.
8908 Woodall.

8909 Mr. Woodall. I thank my friend for yielding. He and I
8910 share a great State back home, home of the Winship Cancer
8911 Institute, a National Cancer Institute, comprehensive cancer
8912 center, the Marcus Autism Institute, the single finest
8913 autism research facility in the country, certainly home to
8914 the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention. The
8915 commitment to this basic research is something that we
8916 share, again, one of the many things that unites us instead
8917 of divides us.

8918 And it has to be said as the appropriators are busy
8919 marking up right now, we are looking at an increase in NIH
8920 funding over last year. We are looking at an increase in
8921 Alzheimer's disease research over last year. We are looking
8922 at an increase in brain research over last year. We are
8923 looking at an increase in line item after line item after
8924 line item with scarce resources. And I must point out to my
8925 colleagues, the entire budget gets squeezed when we fail to
8926 take on our mandatory spending challenges.

8927 At the time of my birth, this Congress invested two-
8928 thirds of every dollar it collected in America. And today,
8929 we spend more than two-thirds of every dollar we collect
8930 propping up the financial stability of America.

8931 I do not know where we think that takes us. This

8932 fundamental basic science research, critically important to
8933 who we are as a Nation and who we are as a people. And I
8934 applaud this committee for the work that it is doing to
8935 ensure that those dollars continue again plus up from last
8936 year.

8937 But hear my words, if we do not come together and take
8938 on our mandatory spending challenges, they will squeeze out
8939 every nickel of this research that we all value and are
8940 committed to continue. Join us in solving this mandatory
8941 spending issue, celebrate this increase in NIH funding for
8942 next year, and resist this amendment. With that, I yield
8943 back.

8944 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman from Georgia yields back.
8945 The gentlelady from Washington is recognized for 1 minute to
8946 close.

8947 Ms. DelBene. Thank you. I also studied biology and
8948 started my career doing biomedical research and immunology
8949 research. And I understand how critically important it is
8950 that we invest in research because it leads to great
8951 breakthroughs. And that basic research has been the
8952 foundation of huge economic growth across our country. And
8953 so, we get an incredible return and if we are shortsighted,
8954 we will no longer get that return for future generations.

8955 On a bipartisan basis, members of Congress have
8956 repeatedly demonstrated our clear and unambiguous support

8957 for medical research at the NIH and shortsighted cuts to NIH
8958 as well as to the National Science Foundation would have a
8959 serious impact on our Nation's global competitiveness and
8960 our capacity for innovation in the 21st century. I urge my
8961 colleagues to vote yes on this important amendment, and I
8962 yield back.

8963 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady yields back. I have been
8964 informed that some of our members are at the Appropriations
8965 Committee and on their way back. This is the seventh
8966 amendment in the second tier. So, we are going to intend to
8967 stop here, recess until those members come back, and then we
8968 will vote on this batch of seven amendments.

8969 Ms. DelBene. Mr. Chair, I do not think you finished up
8970 with just asking for votes.

8971 Mr. Rokita. Yeah, I guess I can ask for a voice vote,
8972 and then will you promise to ask for a recorded vote?

8973 Ms. DelBene. I promise.

8974 Mr. Rokita. Okay. I did not want to be in suspense.
8975 The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms.
8976 DelBene of Washington.

8977 All those in favor say aye.

8978 And those opposed say no.

8979 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

8980 Ms. DelBene. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I ask for a
8981 recorded vote.

8982 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to
8983 the unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the
8984 recorded vote until we have finished debating the batch of
8985 seven amendments, which we have just done. And now we will
8986 remain in recess until we have our colleagues back with us.

8987 [Recess.]

8988 Mr. Rokita. The committee will now come back to order.
8989 Since we have decided to roll votes today, the committee
8990 will resume postponed votes on the following amendments: No.
8991 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20 and 21. The committee will now vote
8992 on the amendment offered by Mr. Yarmuth of Kentucky. The
8993 clerk will redesignate the amendment

8994 The Clerk. Amendment No. 15, offered by Representative
8995 Yarmuth.

8996 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

8997 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

8998 Mr. Rokita. No.

8999 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9000 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9001 [No response.]

9002 Mr. Cole?

9003 [No response.]

9004 Mr. McClintock?

9005 Mr. McClintock. No.

9006 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9007 Mr. Woodall?
9008 Mr. Woodall. No.
9009 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
9010 Mr. Sanford?
9011 [No response.]
9012 Mr. Womack?
9013 Mr. Womack. No.
9014 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
9015 Mr. Brat?
9016 Mr. Brat. No.
9017 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
9018 Mr. Grothman?
9019 Mr. Grothman. No.
9020 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
9021 Mr. Palmer?
9022 Mr. Palmer. No.
9023 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
9024 Mr. Westerman?
9025 Mr. Westerman. No.
9026 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
9027 Mr. Renacci?
9028 Mr. Renacci. No.
9029 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
9030 Mr. Johnson?
9031 Mr. Johnson. No.

9032 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
9033 Mr. Smith?
9034 Mr. Smith. No.
9035 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
9036 Mr. Lewis?
9037 Mr. Lewis. No.
9038 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
9039 Mr. Bergman?
9040 Mr. Bergman. No.
9041 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
9042 Mr. Faso?
9043 Mr. Faso. No.
9044 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
9045 Mr. Smucker?
9046 Mr. Smucker. No.
9047 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
9048 Mr. Gaetz?
9049 Mr. Gaetz. No.
9050 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
9051 Mr. Arrington?
9052 Mr. Arrington. No.
9053 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
9054 Mr. Ferguson?
9055 Mr. Ferguson. No.
9056 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

9057 Mr. Yarmuth?

9058 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

9059 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

9060 Ms. Lee?

9061 [No response.]

9062 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

9063 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

9064 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

9065 Mr. Moulton?

9066 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

9067 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

9068 Mr. Jeffries?

9069 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

9070 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

9071 Mr. Higgins?

9072 [No response.]

9073 Ms. DelBene?

9074 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

9075 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

9076 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

9077 [No response.]

9078 Mr. Boyle?

9079 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

9080 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

9081 Mr. Khanna?

9082 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

9083 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

9084 Ms. Jayapal?

9085 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

9086 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

9087 Mr. Carbajal?

9088 [No response.]

9089 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9090 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9091 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9092 Ms. Schakowsky?

9093 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9094 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

9095 Mr. Sanford?

9096 Mr. Sanford. No.

9097 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

9098 Mr. Rokita. Are there any other members who wish --

9099 The Clerk. Madam Chairman?

9100 Chairman Black. No.

9101 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9102 Mr. Rokita. Are there any other members who wish to

9103 vote or change their vote? Mr. Higgins, how is Mr. Higgins

9104 recorded?

9105 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

9106 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

9107 Mr. Rokita. Are there any other members who wish to
9108 vote or change their vote? If not, the clerk shall call the
9109 roll. Excuse me, if not, the clerk shall report.

9110 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
9111 11, and the noes are 20.

9112 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it. The amendment is not
9113 agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
9114 offered by Ms. Lee.

9115 The committee will now vote on the amendment offered by
9116 Ms. Lujan Grisham. The clerk will redesignate the
9117 amendment, No. 17. We are skipping 16 for 17.

9118 The Clerk. Offered by Representative Lujan Grisham.

9119 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

9120 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

9121 Mr. Rokita. No.

9122 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9123 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9124 [No response.]

9125 Mr. Cole?

9126 [No response.]

9127 Mr. McClintock?

9128 Mr. McClintock. No.

9129 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9130 Mr. Woodall?

9131 Mr. Woodall. No.

9132 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
9133 Mr. Sanford. No.
9134 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
9135 Mr. Womack?
9136 Mr. Womack. No.
9137 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
9138 Mr. Brat?
9139 Mr. Brat. No.
9140 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
9141 Mr. Grothman?
9142 Mr. Grothman. No.
9143 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
9144 Mr. Palmer?
9145 Mr. Palmer. No.
9146 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
9147 Mr. Westerman?
9148 Mr. Westerman. No.
9149 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
9150 Mr. Renacci?
9151 Mr. Renacci. No.
9152 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
9153 Mr. Johnson?
9154 Mr. Johnson. No.
9155 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
9156 Mr. Smith?

9157 Mr. Smith. No.

9158 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.

9159 Mr. Lewis?

9160 Mr. Lewis. No.

9161 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

9162 Mr. Bergman?

9163 Mr. Bergman. No.

9164 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

9165 Mr. Faso?

9166 Mr. Faso. No.

9167 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.

9168 Mr. Smucker?

9169 Mr. Smucker. No.

9170 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

9171 Mr. Gaetz?

9172 Mr. Gaetz. No.

9173 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

9174 Mr. Arrington?

9175 Mr. Arrington. No.

9176 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

9177 Mr. Ferguson?

9178 Mr. Ferguson. No.

9179 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

9180 Mr. Yarmuth?

9181 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

9182 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
9183 Ms. Lee?
9184 [No response.]
9185 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
9186 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
9187 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
9188 Mr. Moulton?
9189 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
9190 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
9191 Mr. Jeffries?
9192 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
9193 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
9194 Mr. Higgins?
9195 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
9196 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
9197 Ms. DelBene?
9198 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
9199 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
9200 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
9201 [No response.]
9202 Mr. Boyle?
9203 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
9204 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
9205 Mr. Khanna?
9206 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

9207 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

9208 Ms. Jayapal?

9209 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

9210 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

9211 Mr. Carbajal?

9212 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

9213 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

9214 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9215 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9216 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9217 Ms. Schakowsky?

9218 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9219 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

9220 Madam Chairman?

9221 Chairman Black. No.

9222 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9223 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or

9224 change their vote? Seeing none, the clerk shall report.

9225 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

9226 12, and the noes are 20.

9227 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it; the amendment is not

9228 agreed to. Next, we will vote on the amendment offered by

9229 Mr. Moulton, amendment No. 18. Clerk will redesignate the

9230 amendment.

9231 The Clerk. Amendment No. 18 offered by Representative

9232 Moulton.

9233 Mr. Rokita. Clerk will call the roll.

9234 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

9235 Mr. Rokita. No.

9236 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9237 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9238 [No response.]

9239 Mr. Cole?

9240 [No response.]

9241 Mr. McClintock?

9242 Mr. McClintock. No.

9243 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9244 Mr. Woodall?

9245 Mr. Woodall. No.

9246 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

9247 Mr. Sanford?

9248 Mr. Sanford. No.

9249 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

9250 Mr. Womack?

9251 Mr. Womack. No.

9252 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

9253 Mr. Brat?

9254 Mr. Brat. No.

9255 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

9256 Mr. Grothman?

9257 Mr. Grothman. No.

9258 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

9259 Mr. Palmer?

9260 Mr. Palmer. No.

9261 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

9262 Mr. Westerman?

9263 Mr. Westerman. No.

9264 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

9265 Mr. Renacci?

9266 Mr. Renacci. No.

9267 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

9268 Mr. Johnson?

9269 Mr. Johnson. No.

9270 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

9271 Mr. Smith?

9272 Mr. Smith. No.

9273 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.

9274 Mr. Lewis?

9275 Mr. Lewis. No.

9276 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

9277 Mr. Bergman?

9278 Mr. Bergman. No.

9279 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

9280 Mr. Faso?

9281 Mr. Faso. No.

9282 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
9283 Mr. Smucker?
9284 Mr. Smucker. No.
9285 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
9286 Mr. Gaetz?
9287 Mr. Gaetz. No.
9288 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
9289 Mr. Arrington?
9290 Mr. Arrington. No.
9291 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
9292 Mr. Ferguson?
9293 Mr. Ferguson. No.
9294 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
9295 Mr. Yarmuth?
9296 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
9297 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
9298 Ms. Lee?
9299 [No response.]
9300 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
9301 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
9302 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
9303 Mr. Moulton?
9304 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
9305 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
9306 Mr. Jeffries?

9307 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

9308 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

9309 Mr. Higgins?

9310 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

9311 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

9312 Ms. DelBene?

9313 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

9314 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

9315 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

9316 [No response.]

9317 Mr. Boyle?

9318 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

9319 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

9320 Mr. Khanna?

9321 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

9322 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

9323 Ms. Jayapal?

9324 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

9325 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

9326 Mr. Carbajal? Mr. Carbajal?

9327 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

9328 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

9329 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9330 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9331 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9332 Ms. Schakowsky?

9333 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9334 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

9335 Madam Chairman?

9336 Chairman Black. No.

9337 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9338 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or

9339 change their vote? Hearing none, the clerk shall report.

9340 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

9341 12, and the noes are 20.

9342 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it; the amendment is not

9343 agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment

9344 offered by Mr. Jeffries. The clerk will redesignate the

9345 amendment.

9346 The Clerk. Amendment No. 19, offered by Representative

9347 Jeffries.

9348 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

9349 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

9350 Mr. Rokita. No.

9351 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9352 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9353 [No response.]

9354 Mr. Cole?

9355 [No response.]

9356 Mr. McClintock?

9357 Mr. McClintock. No.

9358 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9359 Mr. Woodall?

9360 Mr. Woodall. No.

9361 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

9362 Mr. Sanford?

9363 Mr. Sanford. No.

9364 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

9365 Mr. Womack?

9366 Mr. Womack. No.

9367 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

9368 Mr. Brat?

9369 Mr. Brat. No.

9370 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

9371 Mr. Grothman?

9372 Mr. Grothman. No.

9373 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

9374 Mr. Palmer?

9375 Mr. Palmer. No.

9376 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

9377 Mr. Westerman?

9378 Mr. Westerman. No.

9379 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

9380 Mr. Renacci?

9381 Mr. Renacci. No.

9382 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
9383 Mr. Johnson?
9384 Mr. Johnson. No.
9385 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
9386 Mr. Smith?
9387 Mr. Smith. No.
9388 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
9389 Mr. Lewis?
9390 Mr. Lewis. No.
9391 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
9392 Mr. Bergman?
9393 Mr. Bergman. No.
9394 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
9395 Mr. Faso?
9396 Mr. Faso. No.
9397 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
9398 Mr. Smucker?
9399 Mr. Smucker. No.
9400 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
9401 Mr. Gaetz?
9402 Mr. Gaetz. No.
9403 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
9404 Mr. Arrington?
9405 Mr. Arrington. No.
9406 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

9407 Mr. Ferguson?

9408 Mr. Ferguson. No.

9409 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

9410 Mr. Yarmuth?

9411 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

9412 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

9413 Ms. Lee?

9414 Ms. Lee. Aye.

9415 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

9416 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

9417 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

9418 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

9419 Mr. Moulton?

9420 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

9421 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

9422 Mr. Jeffries?

9423 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

9424 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

9425 Mr. Higgins?

9426 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

9427 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

9428 Ms. DelBene?

9429 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

9430 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

9431 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

9432 [No response.]

9433 Mr. Boyle?

9434 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

9435 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

9436 Mr. Khanna?

9437 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

9438 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

9439 Ms. Jayapal?

9440 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

9441 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

9442 Mr. Carbajal?

9443 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

9444 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

9445 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9446 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9447 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9448 Ms. Schakowsky?

9449 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9450 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

9451 Madam Chairman?

9452 Chairman Black. No.

9453 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9454 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or

9455 change their vote? Seeing none, the clerk shall report.

9456 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

9457 13, and the noes are 20.

9458 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it; the amendment is not
9459 agreed to. Now we are going to go back to amendment 16.

9460 The committee will vote on the amendment offered by Ms. Lee.

9461 The clerk will redesignate the amendment.

9462 The Clerk. Amendment No. 16 offered by Representative
9463 Lee.

9464 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

9465 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

9466 Mr. Rokita. No.

9467 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9468 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9469 [No response.]

9470 Mr. Cole?

9471 [No response.]

9472 Mr. McClintock?

9473 Mr. McClintock. No.

9474 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9475 Mr. Woodall?

9476 Mr. Woodall. No.

9477 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

9478 Mr. Sanford? Mr. Sanford?

9479 Mr. Rokita. How is Mr. Sanford recorded?

9480 The Clerk. He is not recorded.

9481 Mr. Sanford. Aye.

9482 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, aye.

9483 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Sanford. How is Mr. Sanford recorded?

9484 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, aye.

9485 Mr. Womack?

9486 Mr. Womack. No.

9487 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

9488 Mr. Brat?

9489 Mr. Brat. No.

9490 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

9491 Mr. Grothman?

9492 Mr. Grothman. No.

9493 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

9494 Mr. Palmer?

9495 Mr. Palmer. No.

9496 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

9497 Mr. Westerman?

9498 Mr. Westerman. No.

9499 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

9500 Mr. Renacci?

9501 Mr. Renacci. No.

9502 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

9503 Mr. Johnson?

9504 Mr. Johnson. No.

9505 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

9506 Mr. Smith?

9507 Mr. Smith. No.

9508 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.

9509 Mr. Lewis?

9510 Mr. Lewis. Aye.

9511 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, aye.

9512 Mr. Bergman?

9513 Mr. Bergman. No.

9514 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

9515 Mr. Faso?

9516 Mr. Faso. No.

9517 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.

9518 Mr. Smucker?

9519 Mr. Smucker. No.

9520 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

9521 Mr. Gaetz?

9522 Mr. Gaetz. No.

9523 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

9524 Mr. Arrington?

9525 Mr. Arrington. No.

9526 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

9527 Mr. Ferguson?

9528 Mr. Ferguson. No.

9529 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

9530 Mr. Yarmuth?

9531 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

9532 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

9533 Ms. Lee?

9534 Ms. Lee. Aye.

9535 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

9536 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

9537 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

9538 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

9539 Mr. Moulton?

9540 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

9541 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

9542 Mr. Jeffries?

9543 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

9544 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.

9545 Mr. Higgins?

9546 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

9547 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

9548 Ms. DelBene?

9549 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

9550 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

9551 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

9552 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

9553 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

9554 Mr. Boyle?

9555 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

9556 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

9557 Mr. Khanna?

9558 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

9559 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

9560 Ms. Jayapal?

9561 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

9562 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

9563 Mr. Carbajal?

9564 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

9565 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

9566 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9567 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9568 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9569 Ms. Schakowsky?

9570 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9571 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9572 [No response.]

9573 Mr. Cole?

9574 Mr. Cole. No.

9575 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

9576 Madam Chairman?

9577 Chairman Black. No.

9578 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9579 Mr. Rokita. Are there any other members who wish to

9580 vote or change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

9581 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

9582 16, and the noes are 19.

9583 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it; the amendment is not
9584 agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
9585 offered by Mr. Higgins, amendment No. 20. The clerk will
9586 redesignate the amendment.

9587 The Clerk. Amendment No. 20 offered by Representative
9588 Higgins.

9589 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

9590 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

9591 Mr. Rokita. No.

9592 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9593 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9594 [No response.]

9595 Mr. Cole?

9596 Mr. Cole. No.

9597 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

9598 Mr. McClintock?

9599 Mr. McClintock. No.

9600 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9601 Mr. Woodall?

9602 Mr. Woodall. No.

9603 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

9604 Mr. Sanford?

9605 Mr. Sanford. No.

9606 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

9607 Mr. Womack?
9608 Mr. Womack. No.
9609 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
9610 Mr. Brat?
9611 Mr. Brat. No.
9612 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
9613 Mr. Grothman? Mr. Grothman?
9614 Mr. Grothman. No.
9615 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
9616 Mr. Palmer?
9617 Mr. Palmer. No.
9618 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
9619 Mr. Westerman?
9620 Mr. Westerman. No.
9621 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
9622 Mr. Renacci?
9623 Mr. Renacci. No.
9624 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
9625 Mr. Johnson?
9626 Mr. Johnson. No.
9627 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
9628 Mr. Smith?
9629 Mr. Smith. No.
9630 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
9631 Mr. Lewis?

9632 Mr. Lewis. No.

9633 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

9634 Mr. Bergman?

9635 Mr. Bergman. No.

9636 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

9637 Mr. Faso?

9638 Mr. Faso. No.

9639 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.

9640 Mr. Smucker?

9641 Mr. Smucker. No.

9642 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

9643 Mr. Gaetz?

9644 Mr. Gaetz. No.

9645 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

9646 Mr. Arrington?

9647 Mr. Arrington. No.

9648 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

9649 Mr. Ferguson?

9650 Mr. Ferguson. No.

9651 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

9652 Mr. Yarmuth?

9653 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

9654 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

9655 Ms. Lee?

9656 Ms. Lee. Aye.

9657 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
9658 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
9659 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
9660 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
9661 Mr. Moulton?
9662 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
9663 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
9664 Mr. Jeffries?
9665 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
9666 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
9667 Mr. Higgins?
9668 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
9669 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
9670 Ms. DelBene?
9671 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
9672 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
9673 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
9674 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
9675 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
9676 Mr. Boyle?
9677 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
9678 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
9679 Mr. Khanna?
9680 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
9681 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

9682 Ms. Jayapal?

9683 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

9684 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

9685 Mr. Carbajal?

9686 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

9687 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

9688 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9689 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9690 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9691 Ms. Schakowsky?

9692 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9693 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

9694 Madam Chairman?

9695 Chairman Black. No.

9696 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9697 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or
9698 change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

9699 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are
9700 14, and the noes are 21.

9701 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it; the amendment is not
9702 agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
9703 offered by Ms. DelBene, amendment 21. The clerk will
9704 redesignate the amendment.

9705 The Clerk. Amendment No. 21 offered by Representative
9706 DelBene.

9707 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will call the roll.

9708 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

9709 Mr. Rokita. No.

9710 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

9711 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

9712 [No response.]

9713 Mr. Cole?

9714 Mr. Cole. No.

9715 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

9716 Mr. McClintock?

9717 Mr. McClintock. No.

9718 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

9719 Mr. Woodall?

9720 Mr. Woodall. No.

9721 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

9722 Mr. Sanford?

9723 Mr. Sanford. No.

9724 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

9725 Mr. Womack?

9726 Mr. Womack. No.

9727 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

9728 Mr. Brat?

9729 Mr. Brat. No.

9730 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

9731 Mr. Grothman?

9732 Mr. Grothman. No.

9733 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

9734 Mr. Palmer?

9735 Mr. Palmer. No.

9736 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.

9737 Mr. Westerman?

9738 Mr. Westerman. No.

9739 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.

9740 Mr. Renacci?

9741 Mr. Renacci. No.

9742 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.

9743 Mr. Johnson?

9744 Mr. Johnson. No.

9745 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.

9746 Mr. Smith?

9747 Mr. Smith. No.

9748 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.

9749 Mr. Lewis?

9750 Mr. Lewis. No.

9751 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.

9752 Mr. Bergman?

9753 Mr. Bergman. No.

9754 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

9755 Mr. Faso?

9756 Mr. Faso. No.

9757 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
9758 Mr. Smucker?
9759 Mr. Smucker. No.
9760 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
9761 Mr. Gaetz?
9762 Mr. Gaetz. No.
9763 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
9764 Mr. Arrington?
9765 Mr. Arrington. No.
9766 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
9767 Mr. Ferguson?
9768 Mr. Ferguson. No.
9769 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
9770 Mr. Yarmuth?
9771 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
9772 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
9773 Ms. Lee?
9774 Ms. Lee. Aye.
9775 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
9776 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
9777 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
9778 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
9779 Mr. Moulton?
9780 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
9781 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

9782 Mr. Jeffries?
9783 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
9784 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
9785 Mr. Higgins?
9786 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
9787 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
9788 Ms. DelBene?
9789 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
9790 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
9791 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
9792 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
9793 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
9794 Mr. Boyle?
9795 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
9796 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
9797 Mr. Khanna?
9798 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
9799 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
9800 Ms. Jayapal?
9801 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
9802 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
9803 Mr. Carbajal?
9804 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.
9805 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.
9806 Ms. Jackson Lee?

9807 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

9808 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

9809 Ms. Schakowsky?

9810 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

9811 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

9812 Madam Chairman?

9813 Chairman Black. No.

9814 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

9815 Mr. Rokita. Are there any members who wish to vote or

9816 change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

9817 The Clerk. Mr. Chairman, on that vote, the ayes are

9818 14, and the noes are 21.

9819 Mr. Rokita. The noes have it; the amendment is not

9820 agreed to. I recognize Ms. Lee.

9821 Ms. Lee. Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. I just

9822 want to note, for the record, that, had I been here for the

9823 prior amendments, I would have voted aye on all of them.

9824 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentlelady.

9825 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Mr. Chairman?

9826 Mr. Rokita. I recognize Ms. Wasserman Schultz.

9827 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I

9828 also would like to record that, had I been here, I would

9829 have recorded an aye vote for the amendments that I missed.

9830 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentlelady.

9831 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Having been in the

9832 Appropriations markup at the same time.

9833 Mr. Rokita. Understood. I thank the gentlelady. The
9834 gentleman is recognized.

9835 Mr. Carbajal. Mr. Chair, I wanted to also reflect
9836 that, if I would have been here for amendment 15, I would
9837 have voted yea.

9838 Mr. Rokita. It is noted for the record. I thank the
9839 gentleman. Are there any other amendments, moving into the
9840 second batch of seven in tier two? I recognize the
9841 gentlelady from Tennessee. Oh, no, no, no. Who are we up
9842 with?

9843 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Mr. Chairman, I have an
9844 amendment at the desk.

9845 Mr. Rokita. Thank you. The gentlelady has an
9846 amendment at the desk. The clerk will designate the
9847 amendment.

9848 The Clerk. Amendment No. 22, offered by Representative
9849 Wasserman Schultz, to increase budget authority and outlays
9850 on early childhood programs.

9851 [The amendment of Debbie Wasserman Schultz follows:]

9852 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

9853 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady is recognized for 3
9854 minutes.

9855 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I offer
9856 an amendment to provide adequate funding for early learning
9857 and early childhood development programs. Overwhelming
9858 research shows that children benefit from access to high-
9859 quality early childhood programs, and society as a whole
9860 benefits from targeted investments in making sure every
9861 child gets these opportunities.

9862 Research also shows that every public dollar spent on
9863 high-quality early childhood education can equal a net
9864 payoff of \$8 in increased productivity, less reliance on
9865 public assistance, and other savings. We know that the best
9866 way to reduce the achievement gap is to give every child the
9867 right start from the very beginning, from birth to age 5.
9868 Childcare is one of the biggest expenses families face. In
9869 some families, these costs can exceed the cost of housing,
9870 college tuition, transportation, or food.

9871 This amendment providing \$600 million in necessary
9872 services is offset by increasing taxes on the top 1 percent
9873 of income earners. Quality daycare is critical to a child's
9874 early development. According to the NIH, teens who were in
9875 high-quality childcare settings as young children score
9876 higher on measures of academic and cognitive achievement,
9877 and were slightly less likely to report acting-out

9878 behaviors.

9879 Early childhood education can also lower involvement
9880 with the criminal justice system. Success of our children
9881 cannot be a partisan issue, and it should not be. We need
9882 everyone in Congress from both parties to help us make this
9883 investment in the next generation. I strongly urge my
9884 colleagues to do what is right, and vote in favor of this
9885 amendment to increase funding for early learning programs,
9886 and I yield 1 minute to Ms. Schakowsky of Illinois.

9887 Ms. Schakowsky. I would thank my colleague so much for
9888 her amendment. The Republican budget would threaten funding
9889 for critical early childhood programs like Head Start,
9890 programs with a track record of improving children's
9891 academic and emotional well-being. In Illinois, early
9892 childhood programs have suffered from a lack of State
9893 budget; we have no State budget in 2 years, and
9894 organizations face \$100 million shortfall with Federal and
9895 State funds on hold. Children's education suffers. As a
9896 former educator, I was a teacher myself; I know that
9897 investing in children at an early age is exactly what we
9898 need to do, and it is the most important thing that we can
9899 do for our own futures. Investing in early learning
9900 programs now will yield great returns in the future. I
9901 yield back.

9902 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, and I yield 30

9903 seconds to the gentlelady from Texas, Ms. Jackson Lee.

9904 Ms. Jackson Lee. It has often been said that programs
9905 like the Great Society never worked, but I would argue that
9906 there are individuals in the United States' Congress, some
9907 who have achieved the status of President of the United
9908 States, that have been exposed to early childhood education.
9909 I am reminded of the fight to save Head Start, to listen to
9910 the parents who were desperate and devastated that their
9911 child would not have a seat in Head Start. Head Start gives
9912 an upstart. It is not a handout; it is a hand up. Early
9913 childhood education provides the opportunity to be
9914 successful in the future.

9915 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady's time has expired.

9916 Ms. Jackson Lee. I support the gentlelady's amendment.
9917 I yield back.

9918 Mr. Rokita. Is there a member who would like to claim
9919 the time in opposition to the amendment?

9920 Chairman Black. Mr. Chairman, I seek time in
9921 opposition.

9922 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady from Tennessee is
9923 recognized for 4 minutes.

9924 Chairman Black. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I, being
9925 a mother, a grandmother, and having run a childcare center
9926 myself, agree that parents should be able to have access and
9927 choose among high-quality early education development

9928 services, including good parental support and involvement.
9929 These services will work for those that are working parents,
9930 that particularly need those kinds of services.

9931 But for far too many of these programs, including those
9932 providing early childhood services, Washington measures the
9933 success not on the outcomes, but how much money we spend.
9934 We continue to do that here in this town. The Education and
9935 Workforce Committee recently held hearings by the Government
9936 Accountability Office's report on early childhood programs.
9937 The GAO found that there are 44 Federal programs offering
9938 some level of early education services, with duplication and
9939 inefficiencies. Nine of them are for this express purpose,
9940 and these nine programs cost approximately \$15 billion a
9941 year; duplications and inefficiencies.

9942 Head Start. Head Start has been around, I remember,
9943 when I was in nursing school back in 1968. I was very
9944 excited in nursing school to find out that there were going
9945 to be these programs that would help our children. So it
9946 has been around for a long time; as a matter of fact, it is
9947 spending a total of about \$9 billion annually. I personally
9948 read the most recent report.

9949 The Head Start report was put out by the Department of
9950 Health and Human Services in 2010, and there was a follow-up
9951 in 2012. And I was not surprised at what I saw because I
9952 have seen this over the last 40 years, and that is Head

9953 Start did not produce lasting, positive effects on
9954 children's math, language, and literacy skills and on
9955 parenting practices.

9956 Now, I want to be sure that, when we spend this money,
9957 that, absolutely, we are taking care of children, and we are
9958 giving them the best services that we can. A 2014 study by
9959 the University of California at Berkeley, a professor used
9960 the data from the HHS study and found that Head Start's
9961 effectiveness really does go up, and it varies across head
9962 Start's centers, but the results go up when they offer more
9963 instruction in full days and that are also offered with
9964 frequent home visits, where they were associated with higher
9965 effectiveness. So when you measure and you show that things
9966 do work, let us put that in place, but we are not seeing
9967 that across the board.

9968 In the hearing on the GAO report, the Education and
9969 Workforce Committee also looked at ways that States are
9970 innovating to improve early childhood education services.
9971 And the budget envisions ending these inefficiencies and
9972 ensuring that early childhood programs really do produce a
9973 lasting education gain for kids and their families. The
9974 budget also believes that States and localities should be
9975 empowered to improve programs that are working in their own
9976 areas, the innovation at the States, and to show that there
9977 is measurement and actual process improvement.

9978 This amendment would increase taxes on the American
9979 businesses, our country's job creators, and the tax code
9980 does have special credits, deductions, and loopholes, and
9981 that is why we propose progrowth tax reform. It is to clear
9982 these loopholes, and lower taxes for all taxpayers. A
9983 simpler, competitive tax system will encourage investment
9984 and private-sector creation.

9985 Look, we want to make sure that these programs are well
9986 done. But throwing more money at it is not the answer.
9987 Measuring them, making sure that they are actually working
9988 for these children is the answer. And with that, I yield
9989 back.

9990 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady yields back. The
9991 gentlewoman from Florida is recognized for 1 minute to
9992 close.

9993 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The
9994 gentlelady seems to think that you could add to the services
9995 that Head Start provides, like expanding to a full day or
9996 adding to the services without more funding. Home visits
9997 cost money. A full day, instead of a half day, costs money.
9998 And the other thing that the majority seems to believe,
9999 which is inexplicable, is that it is more important to
10000 provide the wealthiest 1 percent of Americans with a tax
10001 break than to make sure that we can add \$600 million to
10002 ensure that the next generation of our youngest people in

10003 America get the best possible start in life.

10004 That is an outrageous, unacceptable contrast. If
10005 member of the committee want to talk about how much we value
10006 ensuring all of our children have a shot at success, then we
10007 must have a budget that reflects that because the budget is
10008 a reflection of our values, and this budget telegraphs loud
10009 and clear where the majority's values are, and the American
10010 people need to know, and that is why we are here shining a
10011 spotlight on how egregious and outrageous their priorities
10012 are. I yield back.

10013 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady yields back. The question
10014 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms. Wasserman
10015 Schultz.

10016 All those in favor, say aye.

10017 All those opposed, say no.

10018 In the opinion of chair, the noes have it. Are there
10019 other amendments?

10020 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. I would like to ask for a
10021 recorded vote, Mr. Chairman.

10022 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to
10023 the unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the
10024 recorded vote until we have finished debating this batch of
10025 seven amendments. Are there other amendments?

10026 Mr. Boyle?

10027 Mr. Boyle. Thank you, Mr. Chair. I do have an

10028 amendment at the desk.

10029 Mr. Rokita. The clerk will designate.

10030 The Clerk. Amendment No. 23, offered by Representative

10031 Boyle, to insert a policy statement on Social Security.

10032 [The amendment of Brendan Boyle follows:]

10033 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10034 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Boyle is recognized for 3 minutes.

10035 Mr. Boyle. Thank you. Mr. Chairman, this amendment
10036 states that it is the policy resolution that Congress will
10037 not cut Social Security benefits now or in the future. And
10038 here is why that is important.

10039 Because of the move to dynamic scoring, if you are
10040 going to add up this budget, and you do not believe that two
10041 plus two necessarily equals seven, as the dynamic scoring in
10042 this budget would suggest, that means there will have to be
10043 further, very deep cuts over the next decade in order to
10044 make this budget add up. I am very concerned that those
10045 cuts would come from Social Security.

10046 More than 61 million Americans receive Social Security.
10047 For a quarter of those on Social Security, it is over 90
10048 percent of their income. This is, over the last 82 years,
10049 really, one of, if not the most, successful program. When
10050 we consider that pre-1935, 46 percent of seniors were mired
10051 in poverty, today that figure is a fraction of it. Social
10052 Security is not the only reason for that success, but it is
10053 a big reason. Now I will yield for 1 minute to the
10054 gentlelady from Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky.

10055 Ms. Schakowsky. Social Security is critical to one in
10056 four American families. Retirees, disabled workers, women
10057 and children. And without Social Security benefits, half of
10058 women over 65 would live in poverty. In fact, it is the

10059 only source of income for nearly three in 10 women over 65,
10060 and the older they get, the greater the reliance.

10061 Over 4 million women receive Social Security disability
10062 insurance, and yes, Social Security disability is part of
10063 Social Security. Americans strongly support Social
10064 Security; 88 percent of voters oppose cuts to Social
10065 Security benefits; and 72 percent of Americans think we
10066 should consider raising benefits. Yet this out-of-touch
10067 Republican budget takes aim at Social Security, while
10068 providing more tax cuts for the wealthy. Again, misdirected
10069 priorities. Is this what you really think your constituents
10070 want? I yield back.

10071 Mr. Boyle. I yield.

10072 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields. Is there a member
10073 wishing to oppose this amendment?

10074 Mr. Renacci, the gentleman from Ohio, is recognized for
10075 4 minutes.

10076 Mr. Renacci. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The problem
10077 with this amendment is it assumes a one-size-fits-all
10078 Washington approach to assuring cuts do not occur. Just say
10079 no cuts, and everything will be fine. The problem is,
10080 Social Security is on a dire fiscal path. According to the
10081 most recent Social Security Treasury report, Social Security
10082 will be insolvent by 2033, and recipients will see a 25
10083 percent cut in benefits. Social Security's long-term

10084 deficit increased from 2.66 percent of taxable payroll in
10085 2016 to 2.83 in 2017, and unfunded obligations increased
10086 from 11.4 trillion to 12.5 trillion. Think about that. The
10087 unfunded obligations increased by 1.1 trillion in just one
10088 year. This is simply unsustainable.

10089 This amendment would make it extremely difficult to
10090 make lasting, bipartisan reforms to the program by taking
10091 any sort of reform, such as adjusting the retirement age, or
10092 even cutting benefits for higher-income recipients out of
10093 consideration. Like my colleagues on the other side of the
10094 aisle, we all are committed to protecting Social Security.
10095 However, I know reforms and difficult choices will have to
10096 be made in order to do so.

10097 We must work in a bipartisan way to address this issue
10098 and ensure that this program is solvent and able to operate,
10099 as designated, for the next generations of Americans. All
10100 policies for reform should be on the table, and we must find
10101 a way to work together and stop kicking this can down the
10102 road, so that Social Security is around for our children and
10103 grandchildren. And now I would like to yield some time to
10104 Mr. Sanford.

10105 Mr. Sanford. I thank the gentleman and would just echo
10106 his sentiments. I think you have three different
10107 considerations. I think you have the consideration that he
10108 just mentioned, in terms of solvency of the trust fund

10109 itself. But you also have a second consideration, which is
10110 this whole notion of intergenerational warfare within the
10111 budget.

10112 The idea that, you know, apparently, as it has been
10113 polled, more young people are likely to believe in a UFO's
10114 return to America or to the world, than to believe that they
10115 will get the full value of their Social Security over time.
10116 I think the market presently discounts the validity of the
10117 political promises that are in place. As we know, there are
10118 more than \$100 trillion worth of political promises that are
10119 outlying, and the history of man is that folks in politics
10120 are, more often than not, able to promise a lot more than
10121 they can deliver on.

10122 So I think we have to look at not only solvency, in
10123 terms of what may happen in 2033, but we have to look at,
10124 one, negative cash flow. The, you know, the unified budget,
10125 which worked so well when folks were coming into the system,
10126 with workers coming into the system, the knife cuts against
10127 you as 60 million baby boomers march their way toward
10128 retirement, which is the case now.

10129 And increasingly, as more and more retirees, indeed,
10130 retire, there will be heavier, heavier drags, ultimately to
10131 the point of insolvency in the trust fund, but more
10132 significantly to the point of negative cash flow each year,
10133 which sets up this, again, math war of, do we apply it to

10134 Social Security, the money that is in Washington, or do we
10135 apply it to other needs and goods and services that are
10136 provided by Washington?

10137 And finally, I would say simply this. You know, it was
10138 Jesse Jackson who mentioned that, you know, capitalism
10139 without "capital" is just "-ism." And I think that there is
10140 a lot of validity when you think about this notion of wealth
10141 formation with young people. We have to have something that
10142 they can have and hold onto. Flemming v. Nestor, which was
10143 a Supreme Court decision back in 1960, said that none of us
10144 have any legal claim whatsoever to our own Social Security
10145 monies that may have been paid in over the years to
10146 Washington.

10147 And what a lot of young people are saying is I would
10148 like to have some degree of control in some form of private
10149 account that would allow me to know that that money will be
10150 there not only for me, but should I die early, for those
10151 that I love. And so I think that this idea of looking at
10152 reforms, not closing the door to the idea of other ideas
10153 that might work, is essential, and for that reason, back
10154 what my colleague just had to say.

10155 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman's time has expired. Mr.
10156 Boyle, you are recognized for 1 minute to close.

10157 Mr. Boyle. Yes, well, thank you. Let us just be
10158 clear, for 82 consecutive years, 100 percent of payments

10159 have been mailed out on time every single month. It is a
10160 perfect record, dating back to 1935, and as both speakers on
10161 the other side conceded, from now through at least the year
10162 2033, the next 16 years, it is a 100 percent funded program.

10163 There have been other times in Social Security's
10164 history when there have been projected shortfalls decades in
10165 advance. We got together and solved those. What I am
10166 concerned about, though, is any potential solving of a
10167 problem that will not happen for at least another 20 years,
10168 on the other side tends to mean either a benefit cut or
10169 raising the retirement age. People need to be aware of
10170 that. They are not talking about increasing revenue; they
10171 are talking about benefit cuts or raising the retirement
10172 age. That is why this amendment is needed.

10173 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. The question
10174 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr. Boyle.

10175 All those in favor, say aye.

10176 And all those opposed, say no.

10177 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

10178 Are there other amendments?

10179 Mr. Boyle. Mr. Chairman, I would like to request a
10180 recorded vote.

10181 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to
10182 the unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the
10183 recorded vote until we have finished this batch of seven

10184 amendments. Are there other amendments?

10185 Mr. Khanna. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the
10186 desk.

10187 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Khanna, this is amendment No. 24. The
10188 clerk will designate the amendment.

10189 The Clerk. Amendment No. 24, offered by Representative
10190 Khanna, to inserting policy statements supporting the
10191 mission and independence of the Consumer Financial
10192 Protection Bureau.

10193 [The amendment of Ro Khanna follows:]

10194 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10195 Mr. Rokita. Thank you. Mr. Khanna is recognized for 3
10196 minutes.

10197 Mr. Khanna. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Mr. Chair, 7 years
10198 ago, President Obama signed into law the Dodd-Frank Wall
10199 Street Reform and Consumer Protection Act. The act created
10200 the Consumer Financial Protection Bureau. The Consumer
10201 Bureau is focused on one goal: watching out for American
10202 consumers in the market of consumer financial products and
10203 services.

10204 The Bureau has helped consumers with diverse financial
10205 products, whether it is student loans, credit cards,
10206 mortgages, and it has allowed consumers to make choices
10207 based on honest, accurate information. The CFPB has
10208 accomplished a great deal since opening in 2011. The Bureau
10209 has helped over 29 million individual consumers receive over
10210 \$11.8 billion in relief, while responding to over 1 million
10211 consumer complaints. Its enforcement actions have protected
10212 service members from predatory practices and provided over
10213 130 million in due compensation to service members,
10214 veterans, and their families. The Bureau has saved
10215 consumers over \$16 billion in undisclosed credit card fees.

10216 This is a necessary bureau, especially after the
10217 financial crash, and it should have support, hopefully, from
10218 many people on this committee. I yield back.

10219 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. Is there a

10220 member wishing to claim opposition to this amendment?

10221 Mr. Ferguson from Georgia, you are recognized for 4
10222 minutes.

10223 Mr. Ferguson. Thank you. I think we can all agree
10224 that protecting American consumers is important, but there
10225 are some real problems with the way that the CFPB is set up.
10226 Rather than operating like a normal program, the CFPB is
10227 funded from remittances from the Federal Reserve entirely
10228 outside of the accountability of Congress, and it is clouded
10229 in secrecy. It is also run by a director that is
10230 unaccountable to Congress and who cannot be removed by the
10231 President of the United States. In fact, in October, the
10232 D.C. Circuit Court of Appeals ruled that the leadership
10233 structure of the CFPB is unconstitutional, because it does
10234 not have appropriate oversight from the President of the
10235 United States. The case is ongoing and is being appealed by
10236 the CFPB.

10237 The fact that Congress has already acted this year to
10238 protect consumers and address the structural deficiencies in
10239 the CFPB, through H.R. 10, the Financial Choice Act, which
10240 passed the House on June 8 of 2017, by a vote of 233 to 186.
10241 Many of my colleagues wanted to repeal the CFPB entirely,
10242 but in a highly significant step, H.R. 10 did not repeal
10243 CFPB, but provided good governance reforms to the CFPB and
10244 renamed it the Consumer Law Enforcement Agency.

10245 Some of these reforms included providing annual
10246 appropriations to this new agency, requiring this agency to
10247 adhere to good government, statewide cost-benefit analysis,
10248 and allowing this new agency to remain responsible for
10249 enforcing consumer protection laws. Our budget makes
10250 government across the board more accountable to the people
10251 that it exists to serve. I ask that everyone consider a no
10252 vote on this. And I yield the time to Mr. Arrington.

10253 Mr. Arrington. I thank the gentleman. I think the
10254 CFPB, in short, is a constitutional abomination, and we
10255 should repeal it. But let me say that we all want to ensure
10256 consumers are protected, and I just think the best way to do
10257 that is a robust, transparent, competitive market. No law,
10258 no regulation, will ever give the impetus and the incentive
10259 to a business or a bank to delight their customer like good,
10260 old-fashioned competition. If you do not delight your
10261 customer, if you do not protect the consumer, your
10262 competitor will, and their family, and their friends, and so
10263 on and so forth.

10264 No nanny state can compare, and is no match, for an
10265 efficient market. As former chief of staff at the FDIC, I
10266 watched as laws like Dodd-Frank wrapped the flag of Wall
10267 Street reform and consumer protection. I mean, who could be
10268 against motherhood and apple pie and consumer protection?
10269 But then hundreds of rules and regulations later, tens of

10270 billions of costs that are borne disproportionately by
10271 community banks, like the ones that are the hub of economic
10272 activity in rural America, that cost is passed to consumers;
10273 consumers have a more difficult time getting credit,
10274 starting a business, owning a home.

10275 They have fewer choices. They have more rigmarole,
10276 more regulatory burden. I do not see anything good coming
10277 out of CFPB. It is duplicative; they already have this
10278 function at other banking agencies. And it is unaccountable
10279 to Congress and the President. A Federal court already
10280 ruled that its governance was unconstitutional. We need to
10281 rein in the CFPB. I would like to repeal it. I support the
10282 Choice Act. We need to rein it in at a minimum for the good
10283 of consumers and for Main Street America. I urge a no vote,
10284 and I yield back to the gentleman from Georgia.

10285 Mr. Ferguson. Chairman, I yield back.

10286 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields. Mr. Khanna, you are
10287 recognized for 1 minute to close.

10288 Mr. Khanna. On this issue, I disagree with my good
10289 friend, Congressman Arrington and Congressman Ferguson. You
10290 know, I know that people on the other side often say, "Why
10291 do we have regulations?" And every time I fly, I am very
10292 thankful that we have regulations on airline safety, and the
10293 same thing is true about consumers. This is not about
10294 whether you believe in the market or do not believe in the

10295 market.

10296 For markets to work, you need transparency; you need
10297 consumers having adequate information, and I do not think
10298 there are any Americans who believe and would trust Wall
10299 Street bankers to provide that information. We saw what
10300 happened when there was not regulation, and the deregulation
10301 led to one of the worst crashes in American history since
10302 the Depression. We learned the lesson in the Depression; we
10303 had regulations. Then we started deregulating; it led to
10304 the crisis; we finally decided to solve that. Let us not
10305 deregulate and have a third financial crisis. I yield back
10306 my time.

10307 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. the question
10308 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Mr. Khanna.

10309 All those in favor, say aye.

10310 All those opposed, say no.

10311 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

10312 Mr. Khanna. Mr. Chair, I ask for a recorded vote.

10313 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote has been requested.

10314 Pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement, we will
10315 postpone the recorded vote until we have finished this batch
10316 of seven amendments.

10317 The gentleman from California is recognized.

10318 Mr. McClintock. Mr. Chairman, I would ask unanimous
10319 consent to insert into the record a economic paper on the

10320 prospects for higher economic growth.

10321 Mr. Rokita. Without objection.

10322 [The information follows:]

10323 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10324 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentleman. Are there other
10325 amendments?

10326 Ms. Jayapal. Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment at the
10327 desk.

10328 Mr. Rokita. This is amendment No. 25, offered by
10329 Gentlelady Jayapal. The clerk will designate the amendment.

10330 The Clerk. Amendment No. 25, offered by Representative
10331 Jayapal, to increase budget authority and outlays for
10332 Function 300, natural resources and environment.

10333 [The amendment of Pramila Jayapal follows:]

10334 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10335 Mr. Rokita. Ms. Jayapal, you are recognized for 3
10336 minutes.

10337 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Mr. Chair. My amendment seeks
10338 to restore our place in the global fight against climate
10339 change by supporting State and local entities that wish to
10340 combat climate change. President Trump's reckless
10341 withdrawal from the Paris climate accord last month only
10342 sets us on a course that gravely harms our planet. In
10343 shirking our leadership role to cut carbon emissions, we are
10344 giving license to the 194 other signatories of the Paris
10345 climate accord to shirk their responsibilities, too.
10346 Withdrawing from the Paris climate accord only stalls our
10347 move to renewable sources of energy.

10348 The President's rationale for withdrawal is that
10349 leaving the accord will create jobs. But unfortunately, Mr.
10350 Chairman, this is a false choice. Battling climate change
10351 and ensuring a strong, innovative private sector are not
10352 incompatible. For example, according to the Energy
10353 Department, nearly 374,000 people are employed in the solar
10354 industry, actually more than the 160,000 that are employed
10355 in the coal industry. Many noted economists agree.

10356 The chief economist at Moody's Analytics, Mark Zandi,
10357 put it this way. He said, "Global climate change is a
10358 threat to the economy." And Defense Secretary James Mattis
10359 has called climate change a national security threat. He

10360 specifically said, "Impacting stability in areas of the
10361 world where our troops are operating today."

10362 Mr. Chair, the consensus on greenhouse gases and global
10363 warming has been long established and crosses the aisle.
10364 President Reagan understood this. At President Reagan's
10365 State of the Union Address in 1984, he said this:
10366 "Preservation of our environment is not a liberal or a
10367 conservative challenge. It is common sense."

10368 The facts are this. Greenhouse gasses, like carbon
10369 dioxide, are trapping heat on the planet and making it
10370 warmer. Second, the use of coal, oil, and gas release
10371 carbon dioxide into the atmosphere. Carbon dioxide becomes
10372 trapped, and the earth becomes warmer. We are seeing this
10373 everywhere. We are experiencing greater greenhouse effects
10374 on the communities; we are seeing more regional climate
10375 change; average temperatures have increased; sea levels are
10376 rising; and there is ocean acidification.

10377 Mr. Chair, all of these have serious economic impacts,
10378 whether it is droughts that face farms or damage sustained
10379 due to stronger, more frequent storms, or whether it is
10380 destruction of coastal property or the devastation of ocean
10381 ecosystems that industries rely on. I would like to yield
10382 the rest of my time to the Representative from the great
10383 State of Illinois, Ms. Schakowsky.

10384 Ms. Schakowsky. I thank my colleague so much for her

10385 amendment. We know climate change is real; it is happening;
10386 and it is happening at an alarming rate. We know that it
10387 has got implications for our national security. It
10388 certainly has implications for our economy. It has
10389 implications for health. I am so disappointed that
10390 President Trump surrendered America's leadership when he
10391 removed our Nation from the Paris climate agreement. The
10392 rest of the world, and our own private sector, is moving
10393 ahead.

10394 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady's time has expired.

10395 Ms. Schakowsky. Oh, I yield back.

10396 Mr. Rokita. I thank the gentlelady. Is there a member
10397 who would like to claim time in opposition?

10398 The gentleman from Alabama, Mr. Palmer, is recognized
10399 for 4 minutes.

10400 Mr. Palmer. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. The President
10401 was right to withdraw from the Paris climate accord, which
10402 was entered into unilaterally without the advice and consent
10403 of the Senate, as is required by the Constitution. The
10404 burden of complying with the agreement fell heavily on the
10405 United States.

10406 While the United States committed itself to significant
10407 emissions reductions, major emitters such as China offered
10408 commitments that were the same as their current
10409 trajectories. India committed to improving its emissions

10410 per unit of GDP at a rate slower than they were already
10411 improving. Analysis by MIT, the Massachusetts Institute of
10412 Technology, found that a full compliance with all the
10413 pledges would reduce temperatures by .2 degrees Celsius in
10414 the year 2100.

10415 Some studies indicated that the deal would have cost
10416 Americans 9 million jobs and \$3 trillion. That is an
10417 extreme price to pay for very little result. American
10418 companies are already reducing their emissions on their own.
10419 Instead of wasting any more time on the unconstitutional
10420 accord, we need to focus our efforts on taking advantage of
10421 this country's abundant resources and reducing barriers and
10422 regulation on energy production. What I would like to do
10423 now is urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment, but I
10424 would like to yield 1 minute to Mr. Grothman.

10425 Mr. Grothman. It would have been frustrating if even
10426 the Federal Government had stayed part of this accord
10427 because it does put the United States at a competitive
10428 disadvantage. But this is even more irritating, and I think
10429 it is something we see in the field of immigration as well.

10430 Encouraging local units of government or individual
10431 States to have their own foreign policy. It is like we are
10432 back in the days of the Articles of Confederation. We do
10433 not like what the President says; each individual city or
10434 each individual State has their own foreign policy.

10435 The United States has done a great job of reducing
10436 carbon emissions, quite frankly a better job than most of
10437 the countries that are part of this accord. And the idea
10438 that we would spend more money encouraging every State to
10439 have their own foreign policy is ridiculous on its face. We
10440 should vote no on this amendment.

10441 Mr. Palmer. Mr. Chairman, I would just like to point
10442 that, based on the improvements that the United States has
10443 made in reducing emissions, we were on pace to achieve every
10444 objective in the climate accord anyway. So it makes no
10445 sense to remain in an unconstitutional agreement.

10446 The other thing I would like to point out is that a lot
10447 of the climate hysterics focuses around weather events. I
10448 would like to point out that a lot of the people who believe
10449 that climate change is having a weather impact were
10450 predicting a massive outbreak of hurricanes. We have had
10451 the lowest hurricane activity in decades. Massive outbreak
10452 of other storms, we have had the lowest outbreak of
10453 tornadoes in decades. And much of what has been predicted
10454 just simply has not come to pass. So with that, Mr.
10455 Chairman, I urge my colleagues to vote no on the amendment,
10456 and I yield back.

10457 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. The gentlelady
10458 is recognized for 1 minute to close.

10459 Ms. Jayapal. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Let me just say

10460 that, if it were up to us, we would love to have the Federal
10461 Government be involved in the Paris accords. We would not
10462 necessarily choose that individual States should be leading
10463 on such an important issue. But unfortunately, as I have to
10464 remind my colleagues, the Federal Government, specifically
10465 President Trump, chose to pull out of the Paris accords.

10466 Instead of G20, we had G19 around the Paris climate
10467 agreement. That is unfortunate for all of us. Mr. Chair, I
10468 want to close by quoting President George W. Bush in 1990,
10469 in remarks to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.
10470 President Bush said this: "We all know that human activities
10471 are changing the atmosphere in unexpected and unprecedented
10472 ways." Mr. Chairman, we are at an important juncture. We
10473 have the ability to translate scientific evidence into
10474 action, and this amendment takes a step in returning us on
10475 the right path. I urge my colleagues to support this
10476 amendment, and I yield back.

10477 Mr. Rokita. The gentlelady yields back. The question
10478 is on agreeing to the amendment offered by Ms. Jayapal.

10479 All those in favor, say aye.

10480 And all those opposed, say no.

10481 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

10482 Ms. Jayapal. May I have a recorded vote, Mr. Chair?

10483 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote has been requested.

10484 Pursuant to the unanimous agreement, we will postpone the

10485 recorded vote until we have finished debating the batch of
10486 seven amendments. Are there other amendments?

10487 Mr. Carbajal. Mr. Chair, I have an amendment at the
10488 desk.

10489 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman has an amendment at the
10490 desk; it is No. 26. The clerk will designate.

10491 The Clerk. Amendment No. 26, offered by Representative
10492 Carbajal, to increase budget authority and outlays for
10493 Function 700, Veterans' Benefits and Services.

10494 [The amendment of Salud Carbajal follows:]

10495 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10496 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Carbajal, you are recognized for 3
10497 minutes.

10498 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you, Mr. Chair. Today's proposed
10499 Republican budget reduces veterans' mandatory funding by
10500 nearly \$50 billion over the next 10 years. While the
10501 resolution does not specify where these cuts would come
10502 from, the President proposed a similar amount by cutting off
10503 disability payments for veterans receiving Social Security,
10504 a devastating blow to veterans left unable to work due to a
10505 service-connected disability. My amendment would restore
10506 funding for critical mandatory veterans' programs.

10507 Currently, there are 21 million veterans living in the
10508 United States and up to 26.7 million family members and
10509 dependents who may be eligible for benefits; 8.9 million
10510 veterans receive health care through the Veterans Health
10511 Administration each year, up from 5 million veterans in
10512 2001. The VA also provides mandatory benefits to veterans
10513 who have earned them, including disability compensation to
10514 4.6 million veterans, and over 400 survivors; education
10515 benefits to 1 million veterans and their dependents, so they
10516 can gain new degrees and skills; and VA mortgage loans to
10517 2.6 million veterans, so they can achieve the American Dream
10518 of home ownership.

10519 The VA is also making progress on the benefits claims
10520 backlog. But more must be done, and we must help make that

10521 possible. My amendments make sure we fully fund our
10522 commitment to our veterans, and offset the amount equally
10523 with revenue from many of the following categories: reducing
10524 tax breaks for the top 1 percent of income earners;
10525 canceling the tax break for corporate jets; closing
10526 loopholes that encourage companies to invert and ship jobs
10527 and profits overseas; reducing subsidies to big oil
10528 companies; and restricting deductions for egregious CEO
10529 bonuses, when employees do not get a raise.

10530 I urge my colleagues to support our veterans and
10531 support this amendment. Mr. Chair, I yield back.

10532 Mr. Rokita. The gentleman yields back. Is there a
10533 member who wishes to claim time in opposition?

10534 Mr. Bergman, the gentleman from Michigan, is recognized
10535 for 4 minutes.

10536 Mr. Bergman. Thank you, Mr. Chairman. We all know
10537 that, you know, veterans, when they signed that oath and
10538 went into service, they pledged their lives in defense of
10539 our country, and they deserve every benefit. They have
10540 earned them all. But we also hear that the simple answer is
10541 more money and more people applied to a task will solve
10542 everything. Well, we know that does not work.

10543 First of all, veterans are a top priority in this
10544 budget. The budget matches President Trump's request,
10545 provides about 6 percent increase, in discretionary budget

10546 authority. This is in addition to 27 percent increase in
10547 discretionary funding for the Department of VA over the past
10548 6 years under a Republican-controlled House. Given the
10549 continued failures of the VA to deliver health care and
10550 benefits to American's veterans effectively and efficiently,
10551 including giving them timely access to health care, it is
10552 clear that the VA has a management problem, not a money
10553 problem.

10554 This budget resolution calls for benefit program
10555 reforms. And to suggest reforms are not needed to improve
10556 America's veterans' health care and well-being is just
10557 wrong. This budget grandfathers in all the current
10558 beneficiaries. Last week, we had a hearing with the
10559 Veterans Affairs Subcommittee, and still, 25-plus years
10560 later, after the Gulf War, first Gulf War, Desert Shield,
10561 Desert Storm, VA still does not have the proper techniques
10562 to diagnose Gulf War Syndrome.

10563 They have not had a sense of urgency in the Veterans
10564 Affairs administration. Their leadership now is committed
10565 to making those reforms necessary. And this budget
10566 adequately funds that, and those veterans are going to be
10567 taken care of. We owe it to them. They deserve it. Mr.
10568 Chairman, I yield to my colleague, Mr. Johnson.

10569 Mr. Johnson. I thank my colleague for yielding, and I
10570 associate myself with all of Mr. Bergman's comments. You

10571 know, as Congress operates under statutory spending caps
10572 required by law, mismanagement of funds squanders valuable
10573 resources. I, too, have set on the Veterans Affairs
10574 Committee, and I have seen some of the dysfunction. And I
10575 agree with my colleague that the new leadership is trying
10576 very, very hard to turn this around. And I am optimistic
10577 that we are finally beginning to see progress. But without
10578 significant reforms, we are going to see a lot of these
10579 problems crop back up again. And some of these programs are
10580 in dire need of reform.

10581 Take a look at what the Government Accountability
10582 Office has said. Since 2003, VA healthcare and mandatory
10583 benefit programs, like disability compensation, have
10584 appeared on the GAO high-risk list because they are
10585 vulnerable to fraud, waste abuse, and mismanagement. They
10586 are in need of transformation, or they have the inability to
10587 ensure allocated resources are being used in a cost-
10588 effective and efficient way.

10589 Now, those are not my words. Those are the GAO's
10590 words. We applaud the VA's decision, for example, to
10591 replace its legacy system with a single electronic health
10592 record. They have been working on that for years, and they
10593 have spent over \$4 billion on IT, but they have still not
10594 quite gotten there yet. So I agree with my colleague. We
10595 think this budget supports our veterans and, with that, I

10596 yield back.

10597 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Carbajal is recognized for 1 minute to
10598 close.

10599 Mr. Carbajal. Thank you very much. I really
10600 appreciate my colleague's comments. But the fact of the
10601 matter is that this budget still cuts \$50 billion that
10602 impacts veterans. I just want to reiterate the need to
10603 honor our commitment to our Nation's veterans and fully fund
10604 the benefits our veterans have earned. I am a veteran
10605 myself. This includes funding not only for the VA, but
10606 funding for all other agencies that care for our vets and
10607 their families.

10608 We can put all the spin we want. We can talk about the
10609 terrible things that the VA has not been able to get over,
10610 in terms of management, but our veterans should not get
10611 penalized. And no matter how we characterize this, we are
10612 talking a significant cut to our veterans. The Republican
10613 budget shortchanges our commitment and the needs of our
10614 veterans. I ask my colleagues to support my amendment.
10615 Thank you. I yield back.

10616 Mr. Rokita. The question is on agreeing to the
10617 amendment offered by Mr. Carbajal.

10618 All those in favor, say aye.

10619 Those opposed, no.

10620 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

10621 Are there any other amendments?

10622 Mr. Carbajal. Can I get a recorded vote please?

10623 Mr. Rokita. A recorded vote is requested. Pursuant to

10624 the unanimous consent agreement, we will postpone the

10625 recorded vote until we have finished debating this batch of

10626 seven amendments. Are there any other amendments?

10627 Ms. Jackson Lee. I have an amendment, No. 27.

10628 Mr. Rokita. This is amendment No. 27. The clerk will

10629 designate the amendment.

10630 The Clerk. Amendment No. 27 offered by Representative

10631 Jackson Lee to increase Pell Grants.

10632 [The amendment of Sheila Jackson Lee follows:]

10633 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10634 Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you. As I have listened to the
10635 debate, I believe I started out this morning by indicating
10636 that there is commitment in this room to the many positions
10637 that have been expressed. But there is certainly great
10638 divide and division on how we should invest in the American
10639 people.

10640 I do believe that there are those who benefited from
10641 the Great Society. Many of us in this room who are now
10642 members of Congress, who became Presidents of the United
10643 States like President Barack Obama, and even our Secretary
10644 of Housing and Urban Development who started in poverty, Dr.
10645 Ben Carson. That means I am committed to investing in
10646 people and the needs of people, in particular.

10647 And so my amendment, the Jackson Lee amendment, number
10648 27, will increase the maximum Pell Grant award by \$500 for
10649 the 2017-2018 school year and index it to inflation after
10650 2018. Student loan debt now is \$1.4 trillion, \$620 billion
10651 more than credit card debt. And a 2016 graduate will
10652 graduate with \$37,000-plus in student loan debt. The Pell
10653 Grants help students afford college. The maximum grant of
10654 \$5,920 in 2017-2018 school year will cover just 29 percent
10655 of the costs of college at a public university, compared to
10656 79 percent of those costs shortly after Congress created it
10657 40 years ago.

10658 Pell Grant will help boost college access for

10659 underserved students. As the costs of college rises, low-
10660 income minority and first-generation students face even
10661 greater challenges. To give them a hand helps them improve
10662 opportunities for a business or jobs. And when they have
10663 businesses or jobs, they churn the economy by investing in
10664 the economy.

10665 Pell Grants are good for boosting America's economy.
10666 Pell Grant programs is well targeted to students most in
10667 need of assistance. It is a primary Federal aid program.
10668 It has been the cornerstone for higher education. Since its
10669 inception, millions of low-income students have completed
10670 college, and it strengthens our economy and American's
10671 overall competitive. We do not compete against each other,
10672 my friends. We compete against the world.

10673 Any of us who have traveled know that there are bright,
10674 young people around the world competing against our young
10675 people. Why should we leave one low-income student behind
10676 who could be the next inventor of the next generation of
10677 technology that could change the world's perspective? Pell
10678 Grants help these low-income students get a helping hand.
10679 It says we, too, are America. We believe that the flag, the
10680 red, white, and blue, and all the stars represent those who
10681 may not have had the best start in life.

10682 I have seen these young people in community colleges
10683 and historically black colleges, Hispanic-serving

10684 colleges, Asian Pacific colleges, and public institutions.
10685 They are young. They are bright. They are eager and I am,
10686 for one, not going to say no to them because they do not say
10687 no to the United States of America when we ask them to
10688 serve.

10689 This is an important amendment. I ask my colleagues,
10690 in a bipartisan manner, to support the Jackson Lee
10691 amendment. Protect it, support it, and grow our economy.
10692 With that, I reserve.

10693 Mr. Diaz-Balart. [Presiding.] The gentlelady reserves.
10694 Is there a member who would like to claim time in opposition
10695 to the amendment?

10696 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Chairman, I claim the time.

10697 Mr. Diaz-Balart. Mr. Rokita is recognized for 4
10698 minutes.

10699 Mr. Rokita. Thank you, Chairman. The Pell Grant
10700 program is the largest source of Federal grants for college
10701 students. Congress and previous administrations have made
10702 repeated decisions to raise the program's maximum award and
10703 expand eligibility. But it has caused the program itself to
10704 be on risky financial footing.

10705 Between fiscal years 2006 and 2016, the Pell Grant
10706 program's discretionary costs ballooned from \$12.8 billion
10707 to \$22.2 billion. In fiscal year 2015, the program provided
10708 a total of about \$31 billion to nearly 8.2 million

10709 undergraduate students. Pell Grants have intermittently
10710 seen big increases in recent years. And this amendment
10711 seeks to increase that funding even more.

10712 Due to these reckless increases, CBO now predicts the
10713 program will face a multibillion dollar shortfall in coming
10714 years. Increasing the maximum award will only exacerbate
10715 this problem and will make the Pell Grant program even more
10716 financially unsustainable, putting it at risk for future
10717 generations of students.

10718 Increasing the Federal subsidies for college tuition
10719 through Pell Grants will not solve the college cost problem.
10720 In fact, it has likely led to large tuition hikes and
10721 administrative costs. Consider this: Since 1980, Pell Grant
10722 funding has increased 475 percent. Since 1982, the cost of
10723 attending college has increase 439 percent, more than 4
10724 times the rate of inflation. Common sense tells us that
10725 this is not a coincidence.

10726 More funding means more money that colleges and
10727 universities can capture through higher tuitions. This
10728 amendment would increase subsidies for colleges, who would
10729 then raise their tuition and demand more money from their
10730 government through Pell Grants. As long as the Federal
10731 Government is willing to pay the money, tuition will
10732 continue to rise, and we will not get the expected results.
10733 At this time, I would like to yield to my friend from

10734 Minnesota, Mr. Lewis, for his comments. And he is welcome
10735 to take the remaining 2 minutes.

10736 Mr. Lewis. I thank the gentleman. And let me concur
10737 with your comments. It is the oldest rule in economics. If
10738 you subsidize something, you get more of it. And as we
10739 subsidize college tuition, we get higher costs. In fact,
10740 the Federal Reserve Bank of New York found the sticker
10741 prices at colleges with lots of borrowers increased after
10742 Federal student loan programs and grants expanded.

10743 For every additional dollar in subsidized loans or
10744 grants, colleges raised their sticker prices by 65 cents.
10745 In fact, if you take a look at those areas like community
10746 college where tuition is free in many States, one-third of
10747 the students from the bottom income quartile, who started at
10748 community colleges in 2003, finished their degree by 2009
10749 even though the Federal grants covered the price of tuition.
10750 So the problems we have with workforce training have little
10751 to do with the lack of access to higher ed. It is more in
10752 the way we do it.

10753 A poll conducted by Meeting Street Research suggests 68
10754 percent of manufacturing respondents in my home State of
10755 Minnesota found it difficult to attract qualified candidates
10756 to fill the vacancies. And yet as the gentleman previously
10757 noted, Pell Grant funding has been skyrocketing. If you
10758 look at 1997, 8.6 billion. By 2011, 40 billion. From 2007

10759 to 2011, a real increase of 158 percent, recipients up 80
10760 percent.

10761 Now, you know, if you take a look at the discretionary
10762 funding of Pell Grants, about \$4,860 per student last year,
10763 then you look at the mandatory spending, 955, it is not as
10764 though we are underfunded here. What we have got is a
10765 failure to address the fundamental workplace, workforce
10766 training problem, and that is all too often we are
10767 subsidizing kids and encouraging them to go into areas in
10768 the economy that do not have great demand. We need to
10769 rethink that and not just throw more money at it. I urge a
10770 no vote, and I yield back.

10771 Mr. Diaz-Balart. The gentleman yields. Ms. Jackson
10772 Lee is recognized for 1 minute to close.

10773 Ms. Jackson Lee. I urge a yes vote for the Jackson Lee
10774 amendment. And all throughout this time of our debate, one
10775 theme runs high: the Trump tax plan. Massive tax cuts for
10776 millionaires and billionaires, tax increases for millions of
10777 people, working families. That is the crux of the
10778 opposition of my good friends on the other side.

10779 Our students are paying between 4 and 7 percent
10780 interest rates to be educated. As I indicated, the monies
10781 from Pell Grants now take up only 29 percent of the cost.
10782 We can work to bring down tuition rates. We can work to
10783 correct some of the elements that should be corrected.

10784 Young people want to be directed towards those end
10785 professions that are now current in the 21st century. They
10786 are not rejecting that, but they simply want to go to
10787 college.

10788 But yet the whole theme of this budget hearing tonight,
10789 this markup, is all about giving rich people taxes.
10790 Otherwise, we would be committed to some of the amendments
10791 that have been offered by my friends. We would be committed
10792 to fixing some of the elements, so that it could be a better
10793 offering to the American people. I put my money on the
10794 American people and their needs. I will not put my money on
10795 a tax plan --

10796 Mr. Diaz-Balart. The gentlelady's time has expired.

10797 Ms. Jackson Lee. -- for the big, big rich while we go
10798 to heck in a basket. I yield back. Vote for the Jackson
10799 Lee amendment.

10800 Mr. Diaz-Balart. Question is on agreeing to the
10801 amendment offered by Ms. Jackson Lee.

10802 All those in favor, say aye.

10803 Those opposed, no.

10804 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

10805 A roll call vote is requested. Roll call is requested
10806 pursuant to the unanimous consent agreement. We will
10807 postpone the recorded vote until we have finished debating
10808 the batch of seven amendments. Are there any other

10809 amendments?

10810 Ms. Schakowsky. Mr. Chairman, I have amendment 28, I
10811 think it is the last, at the desk.

10812 Mr. Diaz-Balart. This is amendment No. 28. The clerk
10813 will designate the amendment.

10814 The Clerk. Amendment No. 28, offered by Representative
10815 Schakowsky, to insert a policy statement on reducing
10816 prescription drug costs for Americans.

10817 [The amendment of Jan Schakowsky follows:]

10818 ***** COMMITTEE INSERT *****

10819 Mr. Diaz-Balart. Ms. Schakowsky is recognized for 3
10820 minutes.

10821 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you. This amendment is similar
10822 to one that was accepted unanimously in the Energy and
10823 Commerce Committee. And it says that it is a policy of this
10824 Congress to improve access to and affordability of
10825 prescription drugs for all. Every family in America has
10826 been impacted in some way by the rising costs of
10827 prescription drugs. And that is why 60 percent of Americans
10828 believe that addressing the costs of prescription drugs
10829 needs to be, "Top priority."

10830 Seventy-seven percent of Americans believe the price of
10831 drugs is unreasonable. And nearly 25 percent of Americans
10832 have skipped a dose of their medication due to the cost. It
10833 is time for all of us to work together to address real
10834 reforms to reduce drug price. This just states our
10835 intention to do that. I yield 1 minute to Congressman
10836 Higgins.

10837 Mr. Higgins. This budget proposal would decimate
10838 Medicare, putting private insurance companies back in
10839 control to dump older Americans from coverage and to charge
10840 excessive and unaffordable premiums. The amendment would
10841 use the leverage, the power, of 57 million Medicare
10842 enrollees to drive down the cost of prescription drugs.

10843 According to the Kaiser Family Foundation, Medicaid,

10844 which has 74 million beneficiaries, receives 24 percent drug
10845 discounts every year. The Veterans Administration, with 29
10846 million beneficiaries, would knock down drug prices by 24
10847 percent. The Department of Justice, also 24 percent. In
10848 Medicare, with 57 million beneficiaries, we should be using
10849 the powerful leverage of the Federal Government to drive
10850 down the cost of health care and up the quality. So I
10851 support my colleague, and I hope that others will as well.

10852 Ms. Schakowsky. Thank you, and I yield 1 minute to
10853 Congressman Khanna.

10854 Mr. Khanna. Thank you. Elisabeth Rosenthal wrote an
10855 outstanding book, American Sickness, that I recommend to
10856 everyone. And she talks there about three things that are
10857 driving up the costs of health care: pharmaceuticals,
10858 insurance companies, and hospitals. We all should agree
10859 that Americans should not be paying more for drugs than
10860 people almost anywhere else in the world. And there are
10861 basic things we can do to control these drug prices, as Mr.
10862 Higgins and Representative Schakowsky have suggested. They
10863 can give Medicare the ability to negotiate these drug
10864 prices. We can have reference pricing. If we really want
10865 to control the costs of health care, we ought to take a look
10866 at the outrageous drug costs and do something to contain
10867 those costs. I yield back my time.

10868 Ms. Schakowsky. Let me just say this amendment does

10869 not prescribe a particular solution, just that we all agree
10870 that we should work together to lower drug prices. And I
10871 yield back.

10872 Mr. Diaz-Balart. Is there a member who would like to
10873 claim time in opposition to the amendment?

10874 Mr. Johnson is recognized for 4 minutes.

10875 Mr. Johnson. I thank you, Mr. Chairman. And, you
10876 know, I actually like the title of this amendment: "Reduce
10877 Prescription Drug Costs for All Americans." And I agree
10878 with my colleague who offered it. We did do significant
10879 work last session in the Energy and Commerce to begin moving
10880 that ball forward. However, it is important to remember the
10881 impact of the Affordable Care Act on the rising cost of
10882 prescription drugs because individuals and families both are
10883 facing higher prescription drug costs under Obamacare.

10884 The average person with a plan in the exchange
10885 marketplace has to pay 46 percent of his or her total drug
10886 costs compared to 20 percent for someone with employer-
10887 sponsored health care. Consequently, researchers have found
10888 that Americans with plans purchased on the Obamacare
10889 exchanges fill fewer prescriptions to avoid out-of-pocket
10890 costs and, as a result, experience more serious medical
10891 problems. And therein, the costs go even higher over the
10892 long run.

10893 So I think we all agree that innovative cures and

10894 treatments are essential to patients living longer,
10895 healthier, and more productive lives. And this budget fully
10896 supports patient access to prescription drugs. This
10897 includes supporting a reduction in burdensome regulations
10898 that stymie innovation and reduce competition. This also
10899 includes supporting a swifter, yet sterile, careful process
10900 of review for new therapies by the Food and Drug
10901 Administration.

10902 This budget provides the necessary funding to invest in
10903 biomedical research. This is a key to unlocking new
10904 technology and new knowledge that can lead to better health
10905 and disease cures for everyone. This resolution calls for
10906 Congress to support the important work of medical innovators
10907 throughout the country through continued strong funding for
10908 the agencies that engage in life-saving research and
10909 development and the empowerment of innovation by removing
10910 obstacles that impede the adoption of medical technologies.
10911 The bureaucracy and red tape in Washington too often hold
10912 back medical innovation, increasing, rather than decreasing,
10913 costs, and prevent new life saving treatments from reaching
10914 patients.

10915 So as we say in our policy statement within this
10916 budget, the Nation's commitment to the discovery,
10917 development, and delivery of new treatments and cures has
10918 made the United States the biomedical innovation capital of

10919 the world. Since 2000, more than 500 new medicines to the
10920 U.S. market have been introduced. Spending on retail
10921 prescription medicines grew more slowly than healthcare
10922 spending overall in seven of the last 10 years and, in
10923 recent years, was the leading cause for slower healthcare
10924 cost growth.

10925 So we are making progress, Mr. Chairman. And we
10926 believe this budget helps us to continue making that
10927 progress. I urge my colleagues to vote no on this
10928 amendment. And with that, I yield back the balance of my
10929 time.

10930 Mr. Diaz-Balart. The gentleman yields. Ms. Schakowsky
10931 is recognized for 1 minute to close.

10932 Ms. Schakowsky. Yes, I would like to yield 30 seconds
10933 to the ranking member, Mr. Yarmuth.

10934 Mr. Yarmuth. I thank my friend. I just wanted to
10935 raise one point, and that is that, when so many peoples talk
10936 about the concept of free market in health care, when you
10937 look at the prescription drug industry and the entire cycle
10938 of prescription drug innovation and production, this is
10939 where the free market is totally incapable of dealing with
10940 reality.

10941 Virtually all prescription drugs benefit from taxpayer-
10942 financed research, and then they are turned over to
10943 commercial companies who are basically unrestrained and, in

10944 this country, can charge whatever they want, in many cases,
10945 10, 15 times what the same drug costs in other countries.
10946 So this is an example of where the free market totally fails
10947 American health care. I yield back.

10948 Ms. Schakowsky. I yield back.

10949 Mr. Diaz-Balart. The question is on agreeing to the
10950 amendment offered by Ms. Schakowsky.

10951 Those in favor, say aye.

10952 Those opposed, no.

10953 In the opinion of the chair, the noes have it.

10954 A recorded vote is requested pursuant to the unanimous
10955 consent agreement. We will postpone the recorded vote until
10956 we have finished debating the batch of seven amendments.

10957 With that, the committee will stand in recess subject
10958 to call the chair.

10959 [Recess.]

10960 Chairman Black. The committee will come to order.

10961 Mr. Sanford. Madam Chairman.

10962 Chairman Black. For what purpose does the gentleman
10963 seek recognition?

10964 Mr. Sanford. I would like to offer an amendment.

10965 Chairman Black. The gentleman would like to discuss an
10966 amendment?

10967 Mr. Sanford. Yeah. I recognize that there has been a
10968 gentlemen's agreement, at least on the Republican side, with

10969 regard to not offering amendments. And so, in that regard
10970 my discussion of this amendment is most ungentlemanly, and I
10971 offer it with the greatest of respect because it would take
10972 Solomon in all of his wisdom to get the balancing act right
10973 as you go to the final terms on a budget. I recognize that.
10974 But there have been a series of events that have sort of
10975 collided over the last couple of days that compel me to want
10976 to offer this amendment.

10977 One, it was earlier in the week that I saw an article
10978 wherein Cohn and Mnuchin were talking about how they were
10979 both fully committed to full expensing with regard to tax
10980 reform. Well, if you have full expensing I do not know how
10981 you pay for that without a BAT. Then, in the last 24 hours,
10982 healthcare blew up and, in essence, that creates more than
10983 another -- a trillion-dollar hole in getting to tax reform
10984 and I do not know how you do it, again, without a BAT.

10985 I was at dinner last night with a member of the Ways
10986 and Means Committee and their point was "look, we are not
10987 saying that this is the best to pay-fors, but until you can
10988 come up with another pay-for it is the only pay-for." And
10989 so, I just think that in the world of business it is about
10990 probabilities. I am not saying that there is a guarantee of
10991 a bat going forward, but I would say increasingly what I
10992 have seen over the last couple days would point in that
10993 direction.

10994 And I think that that puts myself and others on this
10995 committee in a bad spot. Because, you know, there are a lot
10996 of things that I do not like in this budget and I have been
10997 fairly clear about them, whether that is with regard to
10998 economic assumptions or some of the cuts or some of the add-
10999 ons. But I have looked past those because I believe the tax
11000 reform is vital to competitiveness in this country.

11001 I believe that, you know, it is important to economic
11002 growth. A long list of things had not happened in 30 years,
11003 but if the tax reform that we get is only a tax reform that
11004 is against the very tax reform that I believe ought to come
11005 next, again -- and I suspect the same would be true for
11006 other members of the committee -- it indeed puts us in a bad
11007 spot with regard to reconciliation.

11008 So, I would simply say that as a Conservative, you
11009 know, government just always has a way of growing and you
11010 know, if you leave an income tax in place and you have what
11011 looks, feels, and smells like a value-added tax, well, then
11012 you end up with both. That is a problem from the
11013 conservative side of the aisle.

11014 As a South Carolinian, you know, the port in Charleston
11015 is amazing what it imports and exports and I believe in
11016 openness to the world, and I think a bat is a step in the
11017 opposite direction.

11018 I think that, you know, as one who believes in open

11019 trade, you know, the World Trade Center has already said
11020 that they have got major concerns with regard to a BAT and
11021 for every action there is an equal and opposite reaction. I
11022 do not know what would come next if we were indeed to
11023 institute this in terms of what other countries say.

11024 And I would say, lastly, just as a consumer, you know,
11025 to my colleague from California who made the point -- Mr.
11026 Khanna earlier -- this amounts to \$1.2 trillion tax that
11027 ultimately would be borne by the consumer. So, I have a
11028 range of concerns that would compel me to want to offer this
11029 amendment and that is sort of where I am, and I am
11030 struggling with that. Pearls of wisdom from your end?

11031 Chairman Black. I thank the gentleman. The amendment
11032 is not on the list of amendments that had been exchanged
11033 pursuant to a unanimous consent agreement. And so now,
11034 since we have decided to do roll vote calls today, the
11035 committee will resume postponed votes of the following
11036 amendments. For what purpose does the gentlemen seek
11037 recognition?

11038 Mr. Khanna. I just wanted to ask whether there is any
11039 way to have an amendment on such a major issue considered
11040 where we can all vote on it, given that this is the Budget
11041 Committee and this is such a key issue. Or do the rules
11042 prohibit that?

11043 Chairman Black. The amendment is not on the list of

11044 the unanimous consent amendments that were agreed upon by
11045 the committee.

11046 Mr. Khanna. Can I ask unanimous consent that we allow
11047 Mr. Sanford to make an amendment for a vote?

11048 Mr. Rokita. I object to unanimous consent. I would
11049 like to call the roll.

11050 Ms. Jackson Lee. Madam Chairwoman?

11051 Chairman Black. For what does the gentlelady seek
11052 recognition?

11053 Ms. Jackson Lee. To make an inquiry, Madam Chair. I
11054 think the gentleman from South Carolina was thoughtful in
11055 his discussions. I think he was primarily possibly speaking
11056 to his Republican colleagues because I think he felt
11057 genuinely sincere about his thoughts of the amendment. But
11058 he did make an inquiry about moving this amendment forward.
11059 Do we have a ruling? Is it not feasible to suspend or waive
11060 the rules that have indicated that there has been an
11061 exchange of amendments and agreed upon by both the
11062 Republican and ranking member chairmen?

11063 And I am not speaking for the ranking member, but I am
11064 speaking for the idea that I did not hear a ruling on the
11065 gentleman from South Carolina's amendment as to whether or
11066 not he would have the ability to offer the amendment. All I
11067 heard was "move on to roll call" or "we are looking at the
11068 amendments that we have already discussed." Is it not

11069 feasible to waive the rules to allow the gentleman to at
11070 least present his amendment? I would interested in the
11071 details of his amendment, minimally speaking, since this is
11072 the Budget Committee.

11073 Chairman Black. This was not on the list of
11074 amendments. There was agreement; it was not on the list of
11075 amendments, and we are going to move forward.

11076 Ms. Jackson Lee. Well, let me just make a final point,
11077 Madam Chair.

11078 Chairman Black. Ma'am, it was not in the list of
11079 agreements. We had a list of agreements. It was not on the
11080 list of agreements, and we are going to move forward.

11081 Ms. Jackson Lee. Well, would you then rule, then, that
11082 he cannot submit his amendment? That --

11083 Chairman Black. The committee is going to move forward
11084 and since we have decided to have roll call votes roll
11085 today, the committee will resume the postponed votes on the
11086 following amendments.

11087 Ms. Jackson Lee. Thank you. I do not think you ruled
11088 on the record. Thank you.

11089 Chairman Black. The committee will now vote on the
11090 amendment offered by Ms. Wasserman Schultz and the clerk
11091 will redesignate the amendment.

11092 The Clerk. Amendment No. 22, offered by Representative
11093 Wasserman Schultz.

11094 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

11095 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11096 Mr. Rokita. No.

11097 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

11098 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11099 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

11100 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

11101 Mr. Cole?

11102 Mr. Cole. No.

11103 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

11104 Mc. McClintock?

11105 Mr. McClintock. No.

11106 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

11107 Mr. Woodall?

11108 Mr. Woodall. No.

11109 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

11110 Mr. Sanford?

11111 Mr. Sanford. No.

11112 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

11113 Mr. Womack?

11114 Mr. Womack. No.

11115 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

11116 Mr. Brat?

11117 Mr. Brat. No.

11118 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

11119 Mr. Grothman?
11120 Mr. Grothman. No.
11121 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
11122 Mr. Palmer?
11123 Mr. Palmer. No.
11124 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11125 Mr. Westerman?
11126 Mr. Westerman. No.
11127 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11128 Mr. Renacci?
11129 Mr. Renacci. No.
11130 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11131 Mr. Johnson?
11132 Mr. Johnson. No.
11133 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11134 Mr. Smith?
11135 Mr. Smith. No.
11136 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11137 Mr. Lewis?
11138 Mr. Lewis. No.
11139 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11140 Mr. Bergman?
11141 Mr. Bergman. No.
11142 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
11143 Mr. Faso?

11144 Mr. Faso. No.
11145 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
11146 Mr. Smucker?
11147 Mr. Smucker. No.
11148 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
11149 Mr. Gaetz?
11150 Mr. Gaetz. No.
11151 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
11152 Mr. Arrington?
11153 Mr. Arrington. No.
11154 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
11155 Mr. Ferguson?
11156 Mr. Ferguson. No.
11157 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
11158 Mr. Yarmuth?
11159 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
11160 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
11161 Ms. Lee?
11162 Ms. Lee. Aye.
11163 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
11164 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
11165 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
11166 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
11167 Mr. Moulton?
11168 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

11169 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
11170 Mr. Jeffries?
11171 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
11172 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11173 Mr. Higgins?
11174 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
11175 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
11176 Ms. DelBene?
11177 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
11178 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
11179 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
11180 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
11181 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
11182 Mr. Boyle?
11183 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
11184 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
11185 Mr. Khanna?
11186 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
11187 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
11188 Ms. Jayapal?
11189 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
11190 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
11191 Mr. Carbajal?
11192 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.
11193 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

11194 Ms. Jackson Lee?

11195 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

11196 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11197 Ms. Schakowsky?

11198 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11199 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11200 Madam Chairman?

11201 Chairman Black. No.

11202 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11203 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to

11204 change their vote or to vote? If not, the clerk shall

11205 report.

11206 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are

11207 14 and the noes are 22.

11208 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

11209 not agreed to. The committee will now that on the amendment

11210 offered by Mr. Boyle. The clerk will redesignate the

11211 amendment.

11212 The Clerk. Amendment No. 23, offered by Representative

11213 Boyle.

11214 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

11215 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11216 Mr. Rokita. No.

11217 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

11218 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11219 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

11220 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

11221 Mr. Cole?

11222 Mr. Cole. No.

11223 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

11224 Mc. McClintock?

11225 Mr. McClintock. No.

11226 TC. Mr. McClintock, no.

11227 Mr. Woodall?

11228 Mr. Woodall. No.

11229 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

11230 Mr. Sanford?

11231 Mr. Sanford. No.

11232 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

11233 Mr. Womack?

11234 Mr. Womack. No.

11235 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

11236 Mr. Brat?

11237 Mr. Brat. No.

11238 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.

11239 Mr. Grothman?

11240 Mr. Grothman. No.

11241 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

11242 Mr. Palmer?

11243 Mr. Palmer. No.

11244 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11245 Mr. Westerman?
11246 Mr. Westerman. No.
11247 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11248 Mr. Renacci?
11249 Mr. Renacci. No.
11250 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11251 Mr. Johnson?
11252 Mr. Johnson. No.
11253 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11254 Mr. Smith?
11255 Mr. Smith. No.
11256 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11257 Mr. Lewis?
11258 Mr. Lewis. No.
11259 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11260 Mr. Bergman?
11261 Mr. Bergman. No.
11262 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
11263 Mr. Faso?
11264 Mr. Faso. No.
11265 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
11266 Mr. Smucker?
11267 Mr. Smucker. No.
11268 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

11269 Mr. Gaetz?
11270 Mr. Gaetz. No.
11271 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
11272 Mr. Arrington?
11273 Mr. Arrington. No.
11274 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
11275 Mr. Ferguson?
11276 Mr. Ferguson. No.
11277 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
11278 Mr. Yarmuth?
11279 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
11280 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
11281 Ms. Lee?
11282 Ms. Lee. Aye.
11283 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
11284 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
11285 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
11286 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
11287 Mr. Moulton?
11288 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
11289 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
11290 Mr. Jeffries?
11291 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
11292 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11293 Mr. Higgins?

11294 Mr. Higgins. Aye.

11295 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.

11296 Ms. DelBene?

11297 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

11298 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

11299 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

11300 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

11301 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

11302 Mr. Boyle?

11303 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

11304 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

11305 Mr. Khanna?

11306 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

11307 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

11308 Ms. Jayapal?

11309 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

11310 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

11311 Mr. Carbajal?

11312 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

11313 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

11314 Ms. Jackson Lee?

11315 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

11316 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11317 Ms. Schakowsky?

11318 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11319 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11320 Madam Chairman?

11321 Chairman Black. No.

11322 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11323 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to

11324 change their vote or to vote? If not, the clerk shall

11325 report.

11326 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are

11327 14 and the noes are 22.

11328 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

11329 not agreed to. The committee now will vote on the amendment

11330 offered by Mr. Khanna. The clerk will redesignate the

11331 amendment.

11332 The Clerk. Amendment Number 24, offered by

11333 Representative Khanna.

11334 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11335 Mr. Rokita. No.

11336 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

11337 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11338 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

11339 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

11340 Mr. Cole?

11341 Mr. Cole. No.

11342 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

11343 Mc. McClintock?

11344 Mr. McClintock. No.
11345 TC. Mr. McClintock, no.
11346 Mr. Woodall?
11347 Mr. Woodall. No.
11348 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
11349 Mr. Sanford?
11350 Mr. Sanford. No.
11351 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
11352 Mr. Womack?
11353 Mr. Womack. No.
11354 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
11355 Mr. Brat?
11356 Mr. Brat. No.
11357 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
11358 Mr. Grothman?
11359 Mr. Grothman. No.
11360 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
11361 Mr. Palmer?
11362 Mr. Palmer. No.
11363 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11364 Mr. Westerman?
11365 Mr. Westerman. No.
11366 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11367 Mr. Renacci?
11368 Mr. Renacci. No.

11369 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11370 Mr. Johnson?
11371 Mr. Johnson. No.
11372 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11373 Mr. Smith?
11374 Mr. Smith. No.
11375 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11376 Mr. Lewis?
11377 Mr. Lewis. No.
11378 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11379 Mr. Bergman?
11380 Mr. Bergman. No.
11381 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
11382 Mr. Faso?
11383 Mr. Faso. No.
11384 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
11385 Mr. Smucker?
11386 Mr. Smucker. No.
11387 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
11388 Mr. Gaetz?
11389 Mr. Gaetz. No.
11390 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
11391 Mr. Arrington?
11392 Mr. Arrington. No.
11393 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

11394 Mr. Ferguson?
11395 Mr. Ferguson. No.
11396 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
11397 Mr. Yarmuth?
11398 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
11399 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
11400 Ms. Lee?
11401 Ms. Lee. Aye.
11402 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
11403 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
11404 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
11405 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
11406 Mr. Moulton?
11407 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
11408 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
11409 Mr. Jeffries?
11410 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
11411 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11412 Mr. Higgins?
11413 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
11414 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
11415 Ms. DelBene?
11416 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
11417 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
11418 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

11419 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

11420 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

11421 Mr. Boyle?

11422 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

11423 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

11424 Mr. Khanna?

11425 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

11426 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

11427 Ms. Jayapal?

11428 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

11429 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

11430 Mr. Carbajal?

11431 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

11432 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

11433 Ms. Jackson Lee?

11434 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

11435 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11436 Ms. Schakowsky?

11437 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11438 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11439 Madam Chairman?

11440 Chairman Black. No.

11441 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11442 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to

11443 change their vote or to vote? If not, the clerk shall

11444 report.

11445 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are
11446 14 and the noes are 22.

11447 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
11448 not agreed to. The committee now will vote on the amendment
11449 offered by Ms. Jayapal. The clerk will redesignate the
11450 amendment.

11451 The Clerk. Amendment No. 25, offered by Representative
11452 Jayapal.

11453 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

11454 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11455 Mr. Rokita. No.

11456 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

11457 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11458 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

11459 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

11460 Mr. Cole?

11461 Mr. Cole. No.

11462 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

11463 Mc. McClintock?

11464 Mr. McClintock. No.

11465 TC. Mr. McClintock, no.

11466 Mr. Woodall?

11467 Mr. Woodall. No.

11468 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

11469 Mr. Sanford?
11470 Mr. Sanford. No.
11471 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
11472 Mr. Womack?
11473 Mr. Womack. No.
11474 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
11475 Mr. Brat?
11476 Mr. Brat. No.
11477 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
11478 Mr. Grothman?
11479 Mr. Grothman. No.
11480 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
11481 Mr. Palmer?
11482 Mr. Palmer. No.
11483 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11484 Mr. Westerman?
11485 Mr. Westerman. No.
11486 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11487 Mr. Renacci?
11488 Mr. Renacci. No.
11489 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11490 Mr. Johnson?
11491 Mr. Johnson. No.
11492 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11493 Mr. Smith?

11494 Mr. Smith. No.
11495 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11496 Mr. Lewis?
11497 Mr. Lewis. No.
11498 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11499 Mr. Bergman?
11500 Mr. Bergman. No.
11501 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
11502 Mr. Faso?
11503 Mr. Faso. No.
11504 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
11505 Mr. Smucker?
11506 Mr. Smucker. No.
11507 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
11508 Mr. Gaetz?
11509 Mr. Gaetz. No.
11510 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.
11511 Mr. Arrington?
11512 Mr. Arrington. No.
11513 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
11514 Mr. Ferguson?
11515 Mr. Ferguson. No.
11516 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
11517 Mr. Yarmuth?
11518 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

11519 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
11520 Ms. Lee?
11521 Ms. Lee. Aye.
11522 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
11523 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
11524 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
11525 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
11526 Mr. Moulton?
11527 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
11528 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
11529 Mr. Jeffries?
11530 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
11531 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11532 Mr. Higgins?
11533 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
11534 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
11535 Ms. DelBene?
11536 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
11537 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
11538 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
11539 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
11540 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
11541 Mr. Boyle?
11542 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
11543 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

11544 Mr. Khanna?

11545 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

11546 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

11547 Ms. Jayapal?

11548 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

11549 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

11550 Mr. Carbajal?

11551 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

11552 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

11553 Ms. Jackson Lee?

11554 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

11555 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11556 Ms. Schakowsky?

11557 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11558 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11559 Madam Chairman?

11560 Chairman Black. No.

11561 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11562 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote

11563 or to change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

11564 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are

11565 14 and the noes are 22.

11566 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

11567 not agreed to. The committee will now vote on an amendment

11568 offered by Mr. Carbajal. The clerk will redesignate the

11569 amendment.

11570 The Clerk. Amendment No. 26, offered by Representative

11571 Carbajal.

11572 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

11573 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11574 Mr. Rokita. No.

11575 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

11576 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11577 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

11578 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

11579 Mr. Cole?

11580 Mr. Cole. No.

11581 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.

11582 Mr. McClintock?

11583 Mr. McClintock. No.

11584 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.

11585 Mr. Woodall?

11586 Mr. Woodall. No.

11587 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.

11588 Mr. Sanford?

11589 Mr. Sanford. No.

11590 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.

11591 Mr. Womack?

11592 Mr. Womack. No.

11593 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.

11594 Mr. Brat?
11595 Mr. Brat. No.
11596 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
11597 Mr. Grothman?
11598 Mr. Grothman. No.
11599 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
11600 Mr. Palmer?
11601 Mr. Palmer. No.
11602 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11603 Mr. Westerman?
11604 Mr. Westerman. No.
11605 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11606 Mr. Renacci?
11607 Mr. Renacci. No.
11608 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11609 Mr. Johnson?
11610 Mr. Johnson. No.
11611 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11612 Mr. Smith?
11613 Mr. Smith. No.
11614 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11615 Mr. Lewis?
11616 Mr. Lewis. No.
11617 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11618 Mr. Bergman?

11619 Mr. Bergman. No.

11620 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.

11621 Mr. Faso?

11622 Mr. Faso. No.

11623 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.

11624 Mr. Smucker?

11625 Mr. Smucker. No.

11626 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

11627 Mr. Gaetz?

11628 Mr. Gaetz. No.

11629 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

11630 Mr. Arrington?

11631 Mr. Arrington. No.

11632 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

11633 Mr. Ferguson?

11634 Mr. Ferguson. No.

11635 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

11636 Mr. Yarmuth?

11637 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

11638 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

11639 Ms. Lee?

11640 Ms. Lee. Aye.

11641 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

11642 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

11643 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

11644 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
11645 Mr. Moulton?
11646 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
11647 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
11648 Mr. Jeffries?
11649 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
11650 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11651 Mr. Higgins?
11652 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
11653 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
11654 Ms. DelBene?
11655 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
11656 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
11657 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
11658 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
11659 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
11660 Mr. Boyle?
11661 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
11662 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
11663 Mr. Khanna?
11664 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
11665 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
11666 Ms. Jayapal?
11667 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
11668 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

11669 Mr. Carbajal?

11670 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

11671 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

11672 Ms. Jackson Lee?

11673 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

11674 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11675 Ms. Schakowsky?

11676 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11677 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11678 Madam Chairman?

11679 Chairman Black. No.

11680 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11681 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote
11682 or to change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

11683 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are
11684 14 and the noes are 22.

11685 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
11686 not agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment
11687 offered by Ms. Sheila Jackson Lee. The clerk will
11688 redesignate the amendment.

11689 The Clerk. Amendment Number 27, offered by
11690 Representative Jackson Lee.

11691 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

11692 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11693 Mr. Rokita. No.

11694 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.
11695 Mr. Diaz-Balart?
11696 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.
11697 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.
11698 Mr. Cole?
11699 Mr. Cole. No.
11700 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.
11701 Mc. McClintock?
11702 Mr. McClintock. No.
11703 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
11704 Mr. Woodall?
11705 Mr. Woodall. No.
11706 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
11707 Mr. Sanford?
11708 Mr. Sanford. No.
11709 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
11710 Mr. Womack?
11711 Mr. Womack. No.
11712 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
11713 Mr. Brat?
11714 Mr. Brat. No.
11715 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
11716 Mr. Grothman?
11717 Mr. Grothman. No.
11718 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.

11719 Mr. Palmer?
11720 Mr. Palmer. No.
11721 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11722 Mr. Westerman?
11723 Mr. Westerman. No.
11724 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11725 Mr. Renacci?
11726 Mr. Renacci. No.
11727 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11728 Mr. Johnson?
11729 Mr. Johnson. No.
11730 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11731 Mr. Smith?
11732 Mr. Smith. No.
11733 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11734 Mr. Lewis?
11735 Mr. Lewis. No.
11736 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11737 Mr. Bergman?
11738 Mr. Bergman. No.
11739 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
11740 Mr. Faso?
11741 Mr. Faso. No.
11742 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
11743 Mr. Smucker?

11744 Mr. Smucker. No.

11745 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.

11746 Mr. Gaetz?

11747 Mr. Gaetz. No.

11748 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

11749 Mr. Arrington?

11750 Mr. Arrington. No.

11751 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.

11752 Mr. Ferguson?

11753 Mr. Ferguson. No.

11754 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.

11755 Mr. Yarmuth?

11756 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.

11757 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.

11758 Ms. Lee?

11759 Ms. Lee. Aye.

11760 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.

11761 Ms. Lujan Grisham?

11762 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.

11763 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.

11764 Mr. Moulton?

11765 Mr. Moulton. Aye.

11766 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.

11767 Mr. Jeffries?

11768 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.

11769 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11770 Mr. Higgins?
11771 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
11772 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
11773 Ms. DelBene?
11774 Ms. DelBene. Aye.
11775 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.
11776 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?
11777 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.
11778 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.
11779 Mr. Boyle?
11780 Mr. Boyle. Aye.
11781 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.
11782 Mr. Khanna?
11783 Mr. Khanna. Aye.
11784 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.
11785 Ms. Jayapal?
11786 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.
11787 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.
11788 Mr. Carbajal?
11789 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.
11790 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.
11791 Ms. Jackson Lee?
11792 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.
11793 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11794 Ms. Schakowsky?

11795 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11796 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11797 Madam Chairman?

11798 Chairman Black. No.

11799 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11800 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to

11801 change their vote or to vote? If not, the clerk shall

11802 report.

11803 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are

11804 14 and the noes are 22.

11805 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is

11806 not agreed to. The committee will now vote on the amendment

11807 by Ms. Schakowsky. The clerk will redesignate the

11808 amendment.

11809 The Clerk. Amendment No. 28, offered by Representative

11810 Schakowsky.

11811 Chairman Black. The clerk will call the roll.

11812 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11813 Mr. Rokita. No.

11814 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, no.

11815 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11816 Mr. Diaz-Balart. No.

11817 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, no.

11818 Mr. Cole?

11819 Mr. Cole. No.
11820 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, no.
11821 Mc. McClintock?
11822 Mr. McClintock. No.
11823 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, no.
11824 Mr. Woodall?
11825 Mr. Woodall. No.
11826 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, no.
11827 Mr. Sanford?
11828 Mr. Sanford. No.
11829 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, no.
11830 Mr. Womack?
11831 Mr. Womack. No.
11832 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, no.
11833 Mr. Brat?
11834 Mr. Brat. No.
11835 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, no.
11836 Mr. Grothman?
11837 Mr. Grothman. No.
11838 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, no.
11839 Mr. Palmer?
11840 Mr. Palmer. No.
11841 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, no.
11842 Mr. Westerman?
11843 Mr. Westerman. No.

11844 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, no.
11845 Mr. Renacci?
11846 Mr. Renacci. No.
11847 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, no.
11848 Mr. Johnson?
11849 Mr. Johnson. No.
11850 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, no.
11851 Mr. Smith?
11852 Mr. Smith. No.
11853 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, no.
11854 Mr. Lewis?
11855 Mr. Lewis. No.
11856 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, no.
11857 Mr. Bergman?
11858 Mr. Bergman. No.
11859 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, no.
11860 Mr. Faso?
11861 Mr. Faso. No.
11862 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, no.
11863 Mr. Smucker?
11864 Mr. Smucker. No.
11865 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, no.
11866 Mr. Gaetz?
11867 Mr. Gaetz. No.
11868 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, no.

11869 Mr. Arrington?
11870 Mr. Arrington. No.
11871 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, no.
11872 Mr. Ferguson?
11873 Mr. Ferguson. No.
11874 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, no.
11875 Mr. Yarmuth?
11876 Mr. Yarmuth. Aye.
11877 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, aye.
11878 Ms. Lee?
11879 Ms. Lee. Aye.
11880 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, aye.
11881 Ms. Lujan Grisham?
11882 Ms. Lujan Grisham. Aye.
11883 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, aye.
11884 Mr. Moulton?
11885 Mr. Moulton. Aye.
11886 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, aye.
11887 Mr. Jeffries?
11888 Mr. Jeffries. Aye.
11889 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, aye.
11890 Mr. Higgins?
11891 Mr. Higgins. Aye.
11892 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, aye.
11893 Ms. DelBene?

11894 Ms. DelBene. Aye.

11895 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, aye.

11896 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

11897 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. Aye.

11898 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, aye.

11899 Mr. Boyle?

11900 Mr. Boyle. Aye.

11901 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, aye.

11902 Mr. Khanna?

11903 Mr. Khanna. Aye.

11904 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, aye.

11905 Ms. Jayapal?

11906 Ms. Jayapal. Aye.

11907 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, aye.

11908 Mr. Carbajal?

11909 Mr. Carbajal. Aye.

11910 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, aye.

11911 Ms. Jackson Lee?

11912 Ms. Jackson Lee. Aye.

11913 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, aye.

11914 Ms. Schakowsky?

11915 Ms. Schakowsky. Aye.

11916 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, aye.

11917 Madam Chairman?

11918 Chairman Black. No.

11919 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, no.

11920 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote
11921 or to change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.

11922 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are
11923 14 and the noes are 22.

11924 Chairman Black. The noes have it, and the amendment is
11925 not agreed to.

11926 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Chairman, I move the committee adopt
11927 the budget aggregates, functional categories, and other
11928 appropriate matters.

11929 Chairman Black. The question is on the adoption of the
11930 budget aggregates, functional categories, and other
11931 appropriate matters.

11932 All those in favor, say aye.

11933 All those opposed, no.

11934 In the opinion of the chairs the ayes have it.

11935 Pursuant to committee rule No. 9, I now call up the
11936 text of the concurrent resolution on the budget. It is
11937 identical to what was distributed yesterday morning with
11938 several technical changes. The legislative tax incorporates
11939 the budget aggregates, functional levels, and other relevant
11940 items as previously agreed to. I recognize the gentleman
11941 from Indiana for a motion to order the resolution reported
11942 to the house.

11943 Mr. Rokita. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee on

11944 the budget order the concurrent resolution on the budget
11945 reported to the house with a recommendation that the
11946 resolution be adopted.

11947 Chairman Black. The question is on ordering the
11948 concurrent resolution on the budget to be favorably reported
11949 to the house.

11950 All those in favor, say aye.

11951 All those opposed, no.

11952 In the opinion of the chair, the ayes have it.

11953 A recorded vote is requested. The clerk will call the
11954 roll.

11955 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita?

11956 Mr. Rokita. Aye.

11957 The Clerk. Mr. Rokita, aye.

11958 Mr. Diaz-Balart?

11959 Mr. Diaz-Balart. Aye.

11960 The Clerk. Mr. Diaz-Balart, aye.

11961 Mr. Cole?

11962 Mr. Cole. Aye.

11963 The Clerk. Mr. Cole, aye.

11964 Mc. McClintock?

11965 Mr. McClintock. Aye.

11966 The Clerk. Mr. McClintock, aye.

11967 Mr. Woodall?

11968 Mr. Woodall. Aye.

11969 The Clerk. Mr. Woodall, aye.
11970 Mr. Sanford?
11971 Mr. Sanford. Aye.
11972 The Clerk. Mr. Sanford, aye.
11973 Mr. Womack?
11974 Mr. Womack. Aye.
11975 The Clerk. Mr. Womack, aye.
11976 Mr. Brat?
11977 Mr. Brat. Aye.
11978 The Clerk. Mr. Brat, aye.
11979 Mr. Grothman?
11980 Mr. Grothman. Aye.
11981 The Clerk. Mr. Grothman, aye.
11982 Mr. Palmer?
11983 Mr. Palmer. Aye.
11984 The Clerk. Mr. Palmer, aye.
11985 Mr. Westerman?
11986 Mr. Westerman. Aye.
11987 The Clerk. Mr. Westerman, aye.
11988 Mr. Renacci?
11989 Mr. Renacci. Aye.
11990 The Clerk. Mr. Renacci, aye.
11991 Mr. Johnson?
11992 Mr. Johnson. Aye.
11993 The Clerk. Mr. Johnson, aye.

11994 Mr. Smith?
11995 Mr. Smith. Aye.
11996 The Clerk. Mr. Smith, aye.
11997 Mr. Lewis?
11998 Mr. Lewis. Aye.
11999 The Clerk. Mr. Lewis, aye.
12000 Mr. Bergman?
12001 Mr. Bergman. Aye.
12002 The Clerk. Mr. Bergman, aye.
12003 Mr. Faso?
12004 Mr. Faso. Aye.
12005 The Clerk. Mr. Faso, aye.
12006 Mr. Smucker?
12007 Mr. Smucker. Aye.
12008 The Clerk. Mr. Smucker, aye.
12009 Mr. Gaetz?
12010 Mr. Gaetz. Aye.
12011 The Clerk. Mr. Gaetz, aye.
12012 Mr. Arrington?
12013 Mr. Arrington. Aye.
12014 The Clerk. Mr. Arrington, aye.
12015 Mr. Ferguson?
12016 Mr. Ferguson. Aye.
12017 The Clerk. Mr. Ferguson, aye.
12018 Mr. Yarmuth?

12019 Mr. Yarmuth. No.

12020 The Clerk. Mr. Yarmuth, no.

12021 Ms. Lee?

12022 Ms. Lee. No.

12023 The Clerk. Ms. Lee, no.

12024 Ms. Lujan Grisham.

12025 Ms. Lujan Grisham. No.

12026 The Clerk. Ms. Lujan Grisham, no.

12027 Mr. Moulton?

12028 Mr. Moulton. No.

12029 The Clerk. Mr. Moulton, no.

12030 Mr. Jeffries?

12031 Mr. Jeffries. No.

12032 The Clerk. Mr. Jeffries, no.

12033 Mr. Higgins?

12034 Mr. Higgins. No.

12035 The Clerk. Mr. Higgins, no.

12036 Ms. DelBene?

12037 Ms. DelBene. No.

12038 The Clerk. Ms. DelBene, no.

12039 Ms. Wasserman Schultz?

12040 Ms. Wasserman Schultz. No.

12041 The Clerk. Ms. Wasserman Schultz, no.

12042 Mr. Boyle?

12043 Mr. Boyle. No.

12044 The Clerk. Mr. Boyle, no.
12045 Mr. Khanna?
12046 Mr. Khanna. No.
12047 The Clerk. Mr. Khanna, no.
12048 Ms. Jayapal?
12049 Ms. Jayapal. No.
12050 The Clerk. Ms. Jayapal, no.
12051 Mr. Carbajal?
12052 Mr. Carbajal. No.
12053 The Clerk. Mr. Carbajal, no.
12054 Ms. Jackson Lee?
12055 Ms. Jackson Lee. No.
12056 The Clerk. Ms. Jackson Lee, no.
12057 Ms. Schakowsky?
12058 Ms. Schakowsky. No.
12059 The Clerk. Ms. Schakowsky, no.
12060 Madam Chairman?
12061 Chairman Black. Aye.
12062 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, aye.
12063 Chairman Black. Are there any members who wish to vote
12064 or change their vote? If not, the clerk shall report.
12065 The Clerk. Madam Chairman, on that vote the ayes are
12066 22 and the noes are 14.
12067 Chairman Black. The ayes have it and the motion is
12068 agreed to. The Concurrent Resolution on the Budget for

12069 Fiscal Year 2018 is ordered reported to the House of
12070 Representatives.

12071 I note for the record that the quorum is present; I
12072 would like to ask members to remain for a few minutes after
12073 for a few minutes for a series of perfunctory motions. I
12074 want to thank, first of all, our staff; they have been a
12075 tremendous help to both the majority and the minority. They
12076 certainly deserve that round of applause because they have
12077 been there to answer questions, to do whatever we need them
12078 to do, within the limits of what they are able to do.

12079 I also want to thank the Ranking Member Mr. Yarmuth and
12080 all the members of his committee, as well. It has been a
12081 good, congenial markup, and we certainly do appreciate the
12082 ability to be able to work together, even if we do not agree
12083 on everything, to make our points known.

12084 And so, I thank all of the members here for
12085 participating in this very important process.

12086 Mr. Rokita. Madam Chairman, I ask for the requisite
12087 number of days for the minority to file its views.

12088 Chairman Black. Without objection, I now recognize the
12089 gentleman from Indiana.

12090 Mr. Rokita. Thank you, chairman. I move pursuant to
12091 clause 1 of rule XXII of the rules of the House that the
12092 committee authorized the chair to offer such motions in the
12093 House as may be necessary to go to conference with the

12094 Senate on the concurrent resolution on the Budget for the
12095 Fiscal Year of 2018.

12096 Chairman Black. Without objection, so ordered. I,
12097 again, recognize the Gentleman from Indiana.

12098 Mr. Rokita. And Madam Chairman, I ask you now to
12099 consent that the staff be authorized to, one, make technical
12100 and conforming corrections, and, two, to calculate the
12101 remaining elements required in the resolution prior to
12102 filing of the resolution.

12103 Chairman Black. Without objection, so ordered. That
12104 concludes today's business of the House's Budget Committee.
12105 The committee stands adjourned.

12106 [Whereupon at 10:30 p.m., the committee was adjourned.]