

So in closing tonight, I agree with the President. We need good jobs. We need real jobs. They have to come back to this country, and we have to treat people in other countries with worth, with their worth as human beings. We need to get back to trade balances, not trade deficits.

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

NO TAX SUBSIDIES FOR STADIUMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. RUSSELL) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, it is official: the Oakland Raiders are moving to Las Vegas. Beginning in 2020, they will play in a shiny, new 65,000-seat stadium outfitted with a retractable roof that is expected to cost \$1.9 billion.

If you are an American taxpayer, you will help pay for it, even if you live nowhere near Nevada. About \$750 million for the project will be financed through municipal bonds, which are tax exempt. The Federal tax break is projected to amount to some \$120 million, according to a study by the Brookings Institution.

Congress and President Trump should take the Raiders' bad example as an impetus for reform. As the President considers a \$1 trillion plan to restore America's aging roads, rail, bridges, waterways, and airports, lawmakers should ask why so many stadiums are following the Las Vegas model, fleeing one bad economic State and using your tax dollars to go to another.

The alternative is what we did in Oklahoma City in 1993. Our residents passed a temporary 1 percent increase in sales tax to fund, without incurring a debt, a building spree called the Metropolitan Area Projects, or MAPS. Over 5 years, the plan raised \$350 million for nine projects, including a stadium now called the Chesapeake Energy Arena, home to NBA basketball's Oklahoma City Thunder. This pay-as-you-go approach may sound unremarkable, but it is nothing short of exceptional.

Most professional sports stadiums these days are financed with municipal bonds, something that they were never intended to be used for. But this kind of debt wasn't intended for lavish football stadiums or basketball arenas. Municipal bonds were supposed to give communities a way to build public projects—hospitals, schools, roads—without having to pay Federal taxes on the debt's interest. The point was to ease the financial burden on cities and States that invest in expensive but essential infrastructure.

Over the past 30 years, however, stadium financiers have exploited a loophole in the Tax Code to qualify professional sports arenas for municipal

bonds. Because Federal taxes aren't incurred on the interest of this debt, stadiums essentially receive a multi-million-dollar subsidy from Washington.

Last year, a Brookings study examined 45 stadiums built or seriously renovated since 2000; 36 were funded at least in part with municipal bonds, resulting in forgone Federal tax revenue of \$3.7 billion. That is enough money to employ 88,000 military staff sergeants or give each State a \$74 million block grant, or it could help reduce the national debt.

To solve this problem, I have introduced, along with my Democratic colleague, EARL BLUMENAUER from Oregon, H.R. 811. This bipartisan No Tax Subsidies for Stadiums Act would prohibit arena financiers from using municipal bonds. Instead of building enormous, lavish sports facilities on the backs of unsuspecting taxpayers across the Nation, financiers should ask communities to buy into their vision. If residents want a stadium to be built, fine. They should be willing to pay for it like we did in Oklahoma City; or sports franchises and leagues always have the option to finance construction like most businesses do, privately.

Funding an upgrade to America's core infrastructure will be a challenge. It shouldn't require Congress to use budget gimmicks or run up the national debt.

Closing loopholes, such as requiring stadium financiers to pay Federal taxes on bond interest that was intended to improve our decaying infrastructure, would ensure taxpayers get the best return on their dollars to improve public infrastructure that all Americans use.

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

DON'T CUT INTERNATIONAL AFFAIRS BUDGET

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CASTRO) for 30 minutes.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am here this evening joined by colleagues from the Foreign Affairs Committee to discuss President Trump's extreme, proposed cuts to the International Affairs Budget.

The President's budget proposal would reduce funding for the State Department and the U.S. Agency for International Development, what we know as USAID, by nearly a third. The proposal would reduce overall funding for the International Affairs Budget by \$17.4 billion, or 31 percent.

This would be a devastating reduction. U.S. diplomats and development experts work to shape a freer, more secure, and more prosperous world while advancing U.S. interests abroad. They build relationships with foreign counterparts and resolve disputes to preserve peace and reduce the need for military action.

They also provide critical services to U.S. citizens living and working overseas and screen people seeking visas to visit the United States. This work would all be compromised by the administration's funding cuts. These cuts could also undercut President Trump's purported priorities.

For example, these reductions could interrupt the Bureau of Counterterrorism and Countering Violent Extremism and U.S. efforts to disrupt money laundering and terror financing. Funding could be slashed for nonproliferation, counternarcotics, and consular affairs—efforts specifically focused on protecting Americans from foreign threats.

This work overseas is always important, but it is especially necessary now in this tumultuous time, when the United States faces complex challenges around the world.

In Asia, we see increased tensions in the South China Sea and an increasingly hostile North Korea.

In Africa, there is a devastating famine in East Africa, brutal civil wars, as well as terrorist organizations like Boko Haram and al-Shabaab.

The refugee crisis stemming from unrest in the Middle East continues, and we have just seen reports of more gas attacks on the Syrian people.

In South America, the people of Colombia have experienced devastating floods that claimed more than 270 lives, a breakdown in the rule of law in the Northern Triangle, and a government in Venezuela that has become an oppressive dictatorship.

Even in Western Europe, we continue to combat terrorist threats from organizations like ISIS, who 2 weeks ago inspired the attack in London.

These are challenging times for our world that require a fully funded International Affairs Budget. But America's unilateral diplomatic and development work is just one piece of our engagement overseas.

Following World War II, the United States helped lead the creation of several multilateral organizations to foster peace and stability in the world like the United Nations, NATO, and the World Bank. With its budget proposal and heated rhetoric, the Trump administration is threatening that architecture of peace and stability.

For example, the President recommends cutting funding for multilateral development banks by \$650 million over 3 years and capping United Nations peacekeeping contributions to 25 percent of total funding. These decisions will have a significant destabilizing impact on the global order. If America retreats from the international stage, other powers, like China, will step in to fill that void and exert their influence. We cannot afford for that to happen.

That is why my colleagues and I are here tonight, to speak out against the shortsighted, dangerous budget proposal and emphasize the importance of the United States' diplomatic and development work.

And with that, I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Sires).

Mr. Sires. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member of the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee, I am very concerned about these cuts. This undermines our leadership around the world and makes Americans less safe. When you consider that foreign aid is only 1 percent of our entire budget and helps keep Americans safe, it is an investment in our security.

Fully funding our State Department and ensuring our diplomats have the resources they need prevents conflicts, diffuses crises, and works to keep American soldiers out of harm's way.

U.S. foreign aid helps protect some of the world's poorest people from disease, starvation, and death. President Trump's own Secretary of Defense, General James Mattis, said: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition. . . ."

I signed onto a letter led by Ranking Member Engel, along with my Democratic colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, urging the Speaker to oppose these draconian cuts.

We are already hearing from our allies all over the Western Hemisphere how dangerous these cuts could be to the stability of the region. Countries like Colombia fought a 52-year-long war with the FARC guerrillas, and now, when they need us the most to implement the peace deal, the Trump administration has signaled it is ready to abandon one of our strongest partners in the world. The President claims to care about protecting our sovereign border, but this budget says otherwise.

Both Republican and Democrat administrations have pushed for a strong security, economic, and trade relationship with Mexico. Pushing our neighbors away could cost billions of dollars to our U.S. businesses.

□ 1830

Instead of working with our partners in the Western Hemisphere, President Trump is preventing us from maintaining a robust relationship with our neighbors to pay for this unrealistic and ineffective wall.

In Central America, we risk seeing a repeat of the 2014 crisis when nearly 70,000 children made the dangerous journeys from Guatemala, Honduras, and El Salvador after being threatened with violence, assault, and forced gang recruitment. Our engagement in Central America is helping to bring calm to the region, and abandoning our friends in their time of need puts America at risk. Retreating from the world will allow other countries like China and Russia to take our place as a global leader.

Instead of building a wall, the President should continue working with our neighbors to enhance cooperation instead of alienating friends who have stood by us for decades.

Mr. Castro of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I should have mentioned, of course, that

Congressman Sires is the ranking member on the Western Hemisphere Subcommittee on the Foreign Affairs Committee. His experience in that region in particular is vast.

I am glad that you mentioned that this is really part of a larger theme and a larger concern, because President Trump, in addition to proposing to cut a lot of funds for diplomacy and development around the world, has also shown a real hostility towards other nations, including some of our best allies and friends around the world, and that is of great concern.

For example, this issue with Mexico which you brought up, forcing Mexico to pay for the wall and constructing this wall along the 2,000-mile border that we have between the United States and Mexico and cutting aid if necessary, which he has threatened to do if Mexico won't pay for it, I have said very clearly that that creates an opportunity for China to step in or the Chinese President Xi Jinping to go into Latin America, go into Mexico and offer to give Mexico whatever Donald Trump takes away. That would strengthen China's hand in yet another region of the world.

Of course, China is a big economic competitor of the United States, and I relate to my Texas folks because Texas does an incredible amount of trade with Mexico, and we have been very fortunate over the years that Mexico buys a lot of our stuff. They buy a lot of our goods. But they don't have to just buy that stuff from Texas or the United States, generally. They could go buy it from Brazil. They could buy it from China or somewhere else.

So thank you for mentioning that.

Mr. Sires. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree more. Already we are starting to see the influence of China in most of the countries in South America.

You know, I had a conversation with one of the presidents of the colleges in Colombia on one of my trips. He was telling me how the influence of China in Colombia is so strong. He was telling me that the second most studied language in Colombia today is Mandarin. When you think of that, that is a frightening thought.

You talk about the influence in Nicaragua of the Chinese. They even think of building a canal, which many people think will never happen. But to have China so close to our borders is not good for America. To push away our neighbors is not good for America. We must work with our neighbors. People don't realize the amount of economic activity between the United States and the rest of Central America and Mexico.

I read something very funny the other day. Well, it is not funny, but it is really sad. They were discussing this wall that the President proposes. Some people say: Where are we going to put it? In the middle of the river? Or are we going to put it on the American side and give the river to Mexico? Or are we going to go invade Mexico and put the

wall on the Mexican side and keep the river to ourselves?

So I thought that was telling of the difficulty.

Mr. Castro of Texas. It has been a very thorny issue, as you can imagine, especially in Texas. Both Republicans and Democrats have expressed deep concern about building a wall and spending \$20 billion to \$30 billion to do it, and that concern, I think, has reached the U.S. Congress. I think that is part of why you see a reluctance on the part of the Senate, for example, to move forward with this in their appropriations bill, in their budget.

I yield to our ranking member on the Foreign Affairs Committee, the gentleman from New York (Mr. Engel).

Mr. Engel. Mr. Speaker, as the ranking member on the House Foreign Affairs Committee, I join with my colleagues. I want to thank the gentleman from Texas (Mr. Castro), who is a valued member of our committee, for his leadership on this critical issue, and also the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. Sires). I agree with everything that they have said heretofore about these draconian cuts.

I am here because I am rising to strongly reject the Trump Administration's draconian cuts to the International Affairs Budget. Now 2½ months into the Trump Administration, I find myself deeply troubled by the direction American foreign policy is heading on many fronts. I was particularly shocked when the White House released its fiscal year 2018 budget calling for a 31 percent cut to American diplomacy and development efforts.

In my view, cutting the International Affairs Budget by even a fraction of that amount would be devastating. We haven't seen many details, but a cut that drastic would surely mean that too many efforts and initiatives that do so much good would wind up on the chopping block.

Here is the bottom line: Slashing diplomacy and development puts American lives at risk. If we no longer have diplomacy and development tools to meet international challenges, what does that leave? It leaves the military.

Now, don't get me wrong. I have always supported a strong national defense, and I do support our military, and I do support giving them more money. But I also support using military force only as a measure of last resort. We should not send American servicemembers into harm's way unless we have exhausted every other option. If we are not investing in diplomacy and development, we aren't even giving these other options a chance.

We rely on diplomacy to resolve conflicts across negotiating tables at multilateral gatherings and in quiet corners so that we don't need to resolve them down the line on the battlefield. Our diplomats work to strengthen old alliances and build new bridges of friendship and shared understanding.

Just last week, the Foreign Affairs Committee held a hearing on the

Trump Administration's efforts to decimate our International Affairs Budget. In his testimony at the hearing, former Under Secretary of State for Political Affairs Nicholas Burns said that morale at the State Department is "at its lowest point in my memory."

It is deeply disturbing to hear that our diplomats, many of whom serve in dangerous places at high risk to themselves and their families, are so disheartened.

Of course it is not just former diplomats who reject these cuts. A recent letter signed by more than 120 retired generals and admirals to House and Senate leadership said: "We urge you to ensure that resources for the International Affairs Budget keep pace with the growing global threats and opportunities we face. Now is not the time to retreat."

Mr. Speaker, I include their letter in the RECORD in its entirety.

FEBRUARY 27, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
*Speaker of the House,
House of Representatives.*

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
*Minority Leader,
House of Representatives.*

Hon. MITCH MCCONNELL,
*Majority Leader,
U.S. Senate.*

Hon. CHUCK SCHUMER,
*Minority Leader,
U.S. Senate.*

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN, MINORITY LEADER PELOSI, MAJORITY LEADER MCCONNELL, AND MINORITY LEADER SCHUMER: As you and your colleagues address the federal budget for Fiscal Year 2018, we write as retired three and four star flag and general officers from all branches of the armed services to share our strong conviction that elevating and strengthening diplomacy and development alongside defense are critical to keeping America safe.

We know from our service in uniform that many of the crises our nation faces do not have military solutions alone—from confronting violent extremist groups like ISIS in the Middle East and North Africa to preventing pandemics like Ebola and stabilizing weak and fragile states that can lead to greater instability. There are 65 million displaced people today, the most since World War II, with consequences including refugee flows that are threatening America's strategic allies in Israel, Jordan, Turkey, and Europe.

The State Department, USAID, Millennium Challenge Corporation, Peace Corps and other development agencies are critical to preventing conflict and reducing the need to put our men and women in uniform in harm's way. As Secretary James Mattis said while Commander of U.S. Central Command, "If you don't fully fund the State Department, then I need to buy more ammunition." The military will lead the fight against terrorism on the battlefield, but it needs strong civilian partners in the battle against the drivers of extremism—lack of opportunity, insecurity, injustice, and hopelessness.

We recognize that America's strategic investments in diplomacy and development—like all of U.S. investments—must be effective and accountable. Significant reforms have been undertaken since 9/11, many of which have been embodied in recent legislation in Congress with strong bipartisan support—on human trafficking, the rights of

women and girls, trade and energy in Africa, wildlife trafficking, water, food security, and transparency and accountability.

We urge you to ensure that resources for the International Affairs Budget keep pace with the growing global threats and opportunities we face. Now is not the time to retreat.

Sincerely,

1. General Keith B. Alexander, USA (Ret.), Director, National Security Agency ('05-'14), Commander, U.S. Cyber Command ('10-'14)
2. General John R. Allen, USMC (Ret.), Commander, NATO International Security Force ('11-'13), Commander, U.S. Forces-Afghanistan ('11-'13)
3. Lt. General Edward G. Anderson III, USA (Ret.), Vice Commander, U.S. Element, North American Aerospace Defense Command/Deputy Commander, U.S. Northern Command ('02-'04)
4. Lt. General Thomas L. Baptiste, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee ('04-'07)
5. Lt. General Ronald R. Blanck, USA (Ret.), Surgeon General of the United States Army ('96-'00)
6. Lt. General H. Steven Blum, USA (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command ('09-'10)
7. Lt. General Steven W. Boutelle, USA (Ret.), Chief Information Officer and G6, United States Army ('03-'07)
8. Admiral Frank L. Bowman, USN (Ret.), Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion ('96-'04)
9. General Charles G. Boyd, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('92-'95)
10. General Bryan Doug Brown, LISA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Special Operations Command ('03-'07)
11. General Arthur E. Brown, Jr., USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff of the United States Army ('87-'89)
12. Vice Admiral Michael Bucchi, USN (Ret.), Commander of the United States Third Fleet ('00-'03)
13. Lt. General John H. Campbell, USAF (Ret.), Associate Director of Central Intelligence for Military Support, Central Intelligence Agency ('00-'03)
14. General Bruce Carlson, USAF (Ret.), Director, National Reconnaissance Office ('09-'12)
15. General George W. Casey, Jr., USA (Ret.), Chief of Staff of the United States Army ('07-'11)
16. Lt. General John G. Castellaw, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources ('07-'08)
17. Lt. General Dennis D. Cavin, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Army Accessions Command ('02-'04)
18. General Peter W. Chiarelli, USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff, U.S. Army ('08-'12)
19. Lt. General Daniel W. Christman, USA (Ret.), Superintendent, United States Military Academy ('96-'01)
20. Lt. General George R. Christmas, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Manpower and Reserve Affairs ('94-'96)
21. Admiral Vern Clark, USN (Ret.), Chief of Naval Operations ('00-'05)
22. Admiral Archie R. Clemins, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Fleet ('96-'99)
23. General Richard A. "Dick" Cody, USA (Ret.), Vice Chief of Staff, United States Army ('04-'08)
24. Lt. General John B. Conaway, USAF (Ret.), Chief, National Guard Bureau ('90-'93)
25. General James T. Conway, USMC (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('06-'10)
26. General John D.W. Corley, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Combat Command ('07-'09)
27. General Bantz J. Craddock, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. European Command and
- NATO Supreme Allied Commander Europe ('06-'09)
28. Vice Admiral Lewis W. Crenshaw, Jr., USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Resources, Requirements, and Assessments ('04-'07)
29. Lt. General John "Mark" M. Curran, USA (Ret.), Deputy Commanding General Futures, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command ('03-'07)
30. General Terrence R. Dake, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('98-'00)
31. Lt. General Robert R. Dierker, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. Pacific Command ('02-'04)
32. Admiral Kirkland H. Donald, USN (Ret.), Director, Naval Nuclear Propulsion ('04-'12)
33. Lt. General James M. Dubik, USA (Ret.), Commander, Multi National Security Transition Command and NATO Training Mission-Iraq ('07-'08)
34. Lt. General Kenneth E. Eickmann, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Aeronautical Systems Center, U.S. Air Force ('96-'98)
35. Admiral William J. Fallon, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Central Command ('07-'08)
36. Admiral Thomas B. Fargo, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Pacific Command ('02-'05)
37. Admiral Mark P. Fitzgerald, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe ('07-'10) and U.S. Naval Forces Africa ('09-'10)
38. General Ronald R. Fogelman, USAF (Ret.), Chief of Staff of the United States Air Force ('94-'97)
39. Lt. General Benjamin C. Freakley, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Army Accessions Command ('07-'12)
40. Lt. General Robert G. Gard, Jr., USA (Ret.), President, National Defense University ('77-'81)
41. Admiral Jonathan W. Greenert, USN (Ret.), Chief of Naval Operations ('11-'15)
42. Lt. General Arthur J. Gregg, USA (Ret.), Army Deputy Chief of Staff ('79-'81)
43. Lt. General Wallace C. Gregson, USMC (Ret.), Commanding General, Marine Corps Forces Pacific and Marine Corps Forces Central Command ('03-'05)
44. Vice Admiral Lee F. Gunn, USN (Ret.), Inspector General, U.S. Navy ('97-'00)
45. General Michael W. Hagee, USMC (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('03-'06)
46. Lt. General Michael A. Hamel, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Force Space and Missile Systems Center ('05-'08)
47. General John W. Handy, USAF (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Transportation Command and Commander, Air Mobility Command ('01-'05)
48. Admiral John C. Harvey, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command ('09-'12)
49. General Richard E. Hawley, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Combat Command ('96-'99)
50. General Michael V. Hayden, USAF (Ret.), Director, Central Intelligence Agency ('06-'09)
51. General Paul V. Hester, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Pacific Air Forces. Air Component Commander for the U.S. Pacific Command Commander ('04-'07)
52. General James T. Hill, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Southern Command ('02-'04)
53. Admiral James R. Hogg, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative, NATO Military Committee ('88-'91)
54. Lt. General Walter S. Hogle Jr., USAF (Ret.), Commander, 15th Air Force ('00-'01)
55. Lt. General Steven A. Hummer, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commander for Military Operations, U.S. Africa Command ('13-'15)
56. Lt. General William E. Ingram, Jr., USA (Ret.), Director, U.S. Army National Guard ('11-'14)

57. General James L. Jamerson, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. European Command ('95-'98)

58. Lt. General Arlen D. Jameson, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander in Chief, U.S. Strategic Command ('93-'96)

59. Admiral Gregory G. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe ('01-'04)

60. Admiral Jerome L. Johnson, USN (Ret.), Vice Chief of Naval Operations ('90-'92)

61. Lt. General P. K. "Ken" Keen, USA (Ret.), Chief, Office of the U.S. Defense Representative to Pakistan ('11-'13)

62. Lt. General Richard L. Kelly, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commandant, Installations and Logistics ('02-'05)

63. Lt. General Claudia J. Kennedy, USA (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Army Intelligence ('97-'00)

64. General Paul J. Kem, USA (Ret.), Commanding General, U.S. Army Materiel Command ('01-'04)

65. General William F. Kernan, USA (Ret.), Supreme Allied Commander, Atlantic/Commander in Chief, U.S. Joint Forces Command ('00-'02)

66. Lt. General Donald L. Kerrick, USA (Ret.), Deputy National Security Advisor to the President of the United States ('00-'01)

67. Lt. General Bruce B. Knutson, USMC (Ret.), Commanding General, Marine Corps Combat Command ('00-'01)

68. Vice Admiral Albert H. Konetzni, Jr., USN (Ret.), Deputy Conunander, U.S. Fleet Forces Command and U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('01-'04)

69. General Charles Chandler Krulak, USMC (Ret.), Commandant of the Marine Corps ('95-'99)

70. (Ret.), Lt. General William J. Lennox, Jr., USA (Ret.), Superintendent, United States Military Academy ('01-'06)

71. Vice Admiral Stephen F. Loftus, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations for Logistics ('90-'94)

72. General Lance W. Lord, USAF (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Air Force Space Command ('02-'06)

73. Admiral James M. Loy, USCG (Ret.), Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard ('98-'02)

74. Vice Admiral Joseph Maguire, USN (Ret.), Deputy Director for Strategic Operational Planning, National Counterterrorism Center ('07-'10)

75. Admiral Henry H. Mauz, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('92-'94)

76. Vice Admiral Justin D. McCarthy, SC, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Naval Operations, Fleet Readiness, and Logistics ('04-'07)

77. Lt. General Dennis McCarthy, USMC (Ret.), Commander, Marine Forces Reserve ('01-'05)

78. Vice Admiral John "Mike" M. McConnell, USN (Ret.), Director of the National Security Agency ('92-'96)

79. General David D. McKiernan, USA (Ret.), Commander, International Security Assistance Force in Afghanistan ('08-'09)

80. General Dan K. McNeill, USA, (Ret.), Commander, International Security Assistance Force (ISAF) in Afghanistan ('07-'08)

81. General Merrill A. McPeak, USAF (Ret.), Chief of Staff, U.S. Air Force ('90-'94)

82. Lt. General Paul T. Mikolashek, USA (Ret.), Inspector General, U.S. Army/Commanding General of the Third U.S. Army Forces Central Command ('00-'02)

83. Vice Admiral Joseph S. Mobley, USN (Ret.), Commander, Naval Air Force, U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('98-'01)

84. General Thomas R. Morgan, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant of the U.S. Marine Corps ('86-'88)

85. Lt. General Carol A. Mutter, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff, Manpower and Reserve Affairs, Marine Corps ('96-'98)

86. Admiral Robert J. Natter, USN (Ret.), Commander, Fleet Forces Command/Commander, U.S. Atlantic Fleet ('00-'03)

87. General William L. Nyland, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('02-'05)

88. Lt. General Tad J. Oelstrom, USAF (Ret.), Superintendent, U.S. Air Force Academy ('97-'00)

89. Admiral Eric T. Olson, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Special Operation Command ('07-'11)

90. Lt. General H. P. "Pete" Osman, USMC (Ret.), Commanding General II MEF ('02-'04)

91. Lt. General Jeffrey W. Oster, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Administrator and Chief Operating Officer, Coalition Provisional Authority, Iraq ('04), Deputy Commandant for Programs and Resources, Headquarters Marine Corps ('98)

92. Admiral William A. Owens, USN (Ret.), Vice Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ('94-'96)

93. Lt. General Frank A. Panter, Jr., USMC (Ret.), Deputy Commandant for Installations and Logistics ('09-'12)

94. Vice Admiral David Pekoske, USCG (Ret.), Vice Commandant, U.S. Coast Guard ('09-'10)

95. General David H. Petraeus, USA (Ret.), Director, Central Intelligence Agency ('11-'12); Commander, Coalition Forces in Afghanistan ('10-'11) and Iraq ('07-'08)

96. Vice Admiral Carol M. Pottenger, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Capability Development, NATO Allied Command Transformation ('10-'13)

97. Admiral Joseph W. Prueher, USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Pacific Command ('96-'99)

98. Lt. General Harry D. Raduege, Jr., USAF (Ret.), Director, Defense Information Systems Agency/Commander, Joint Task Force for Global Network Operations/Deputy Commander, Global Network Operations and Defense, U.S. Strategic Command Joint Forces Headquarters, Information Operations ('00-'05)

99. Vice Admiral Norman W. Ray, USN (Ret.), Deputy Chairman, NATO Military Committee ('92-'95)

100. Lt. General John F. Regni, USAF (Ret.), Superintendent, United States Air Force Academy ('05-'09)

101. General Victor "Gene" E. Renuart, USAF (Ret.), Commander, North American Aerospace Defense Command and U.S. Northern Command ('07-'10)

102. General Robert W. RisCassi, USA (Ret.), Commander in Chief, United Nations Command/Commander in Chief, Republic of Korea/U.S. Combined Forces Command ('90-'93)

103. Lt. General Norman R. Seip, USAF (Ret.), Commander, 12th Air Force/Air Forces Southern ('06-'09)

104. General Henry H. Shelton, USA (Ret.), Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff ('97-'01)

105. Admiral William D. Smith, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative, NATO Military Committee ('91-'93)

106. Admiral Leighton W. Smith, Jr., USN (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander in Chief, Allied Forces Southern Europe ('94-'96)

107. Lt. General James N. Soligan, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Transformation, Allied Command Transformation ('06-'10)

108. Admiral James G. Stavridis, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. European Command and NATO Supreme Allied Commander, Europe ('09-'13)

109. Lt. General Martin R. Steele, USMC (Ret.), Deputy Chief of Staff for Plans, Policies and Operations, U.S. Marine Corps ('97-'99)

110. General Carl W. Stiner, USA (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Special Operations Command ('90-'93)

111. Vice Admiral Edward M. Straw, USN (Ret.), Director, Defense Logistics Agency ('92-'96)

112. Vice Admiral William D. Sullivan, USN (Ret.), U.S. Military Representative to NATO Military Committee ('06-'09)

113. Lt. General William J. Troy, USA (Ret.), Director, Army Staff ('10-'13)

114. Admiral Henry G. Ulrich, USN (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Naval Forces Europe/Commander, Joint Forces Command Naples ('05-'08)

115. General Charles F. Wald, USAF (Ret.), Deputy Commander, U.S. European Command ('02-'06)

116. General William S. Wallace, USA (Ret.), Commanding General, U.S. Army Training and Doctrine Command ('05-'08)

117. Lt. General William "Kip" E. Ward, USA (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Africa Command ('07-'11)

118. General Charles E. Wilhelm, USMC (Ret.), Commander, U.S. Southern Command ('97-'00)

119. General Michael J. Williams, USMC (Ret.), Assistant Commandant, U.S. Marine Corps ('00-'02)

120. General Ronald W. Yates, USAF (Ret.), Commander, Air Force Materiel Command ('92-'95)

121. General Anthony C. Zinni, USMC (Ret.), Commander in Chief, U.S. Central Command ('97-'00)

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, in 2013, Secretary of Defense Mattis similarly said: "If you don't fund the State Department fully, then I need to buy more ammunition ultimately. So I think it's a cost benefit ratio. The more that we put into the State Department's diplomacy, hopefully the less we have to put into a military budget as we deal with the outcome of an apparent American withdrawal from the international scene."

That is from Secretary of Defense Mattis. I couldn't agree with him more.

Now, I believe that development helps to lift countries and communities up today so they can become strong partners on the global stage tomorrow. A lot of us think we have a moral obligation to help cure disease, improve access to education, and advance human rights. But even if it were not the right thing to do, it would be the smart thing to do because those efforts lead to greater stability, more responsive governments, and stronger rule of law—populations that share our values and priorities. Poverty and lack of opportunity, on the other hand, provide fertile ground for those who mean us harm.

All these efforts, by the way, cost cents on the dollar compared to military engagement. People think international affairs and foreign aid are a massive chunk of the Federal budget, but the chart right over here next to me shows how it actually stacks up: 1.4 percent. And we make that sliver of the pie even smaller. It will come back on us in spades. 1.4 percent of our Federal budget goes to all these programs.

The diseases we don't combat will reach our shores; the communities on which we turn or backs may be the next generation of people who mean us

harm; and the conflicts we fail to defuse may well grow into the wars we need to fight later at a much higher cost in terms of American blood and treasure. Just imagine having to tell the parents of a young American soldier that their son or daughter was killed in battle because we weren't willing to spend the tiny sums needed to prevent the conflict.

Finally, let me say that the American people don't want to see us slash diplomacy and development. In fact, recent data shows that 72 percent of Americans believe the country should play a leading global role. Nearly 6 in 10 believe funding levels at the State Department should stay the same or increase.

Fortunately, the Congress is a co-equal branch of government. I want to remind the executive branch of that. We in Congress decide how much to invest in our international affairs, not the White House.

For example, regardless of how this administration is playing footsie with Vladimir Putin, Congress will devote resources to push back against the Kremlin's efforts to spread disinformation and destabilize our allies, just like they did to the United States during last year's election campaign.

I am hopeful that, as we move forward with next year's spending bills, we continue to provide our diplomatic and development efforts the support they need and the support they have received under Republican and Democratic Presidents alike.

With the President's proposed cuts, I fear what message we are sending to the world. The United States is the global standard bearer for freedom, justice, and democracy. If we cede our role as a global leader, make no mistake, someone will step into the void. It could very well be another power that doesn't share our values or our interests. Think Russia or some country like that.

We cannot allow that to happen. I am committed to ensuring it doesn't, and I look forward to working with my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to firmly reject President Trump's cuts.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ENGEL for all of his years of work on behalf of the Nation on the Foreign Affairs Committee.

I know you may have a busy schedule this evening. We have got about 12 minutes left, so I thought we would just have a discussion on some of these issues. Stick with us if you can.

Mr. ENGEL. You are doing a fine job.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Congressman ENGEL mentioned maintaining the United States' position as a leader in the world and not ceding that to another country, whether it is China or Russia, who has been very aggressive, and it is not just maintaining a strong defense.

I represent what is known as Military City, USA: San Antonio, Texas. Once upon a time we had five military

bases in San Antonio. We still have Joint Base San Antonio, which is a large operation. So it is not just about a strong defense, which we all support, but also about the hard work of diplomacy and development.

The United States, who has been a leader for so long, if we back away from our commitments, then we not only cede it to somebody else, but there is a good chance that a lot of that work is not going to get done, that the peoples in many nations around the world are going to become poorer, more desperate; and from that, only bad things can happen both for those peoples, but also for the neighboring countries, for the United States, and for the world.

Thank you for lending your strong voice to support for the diplomatic budget.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I couldn't agree with him more. And, you know, it is especially interesting since, during the campaign, President Trump attacked the previous administration for not being strong enough, for not showing American presence. And now with this cut, with this proposed 31 percent cut, I couldn't think of anything that would make us weaker or make us unable to do what we need to do.

□ 1845

So I hope the President remembers what he said during the campaign and acts accordingly so that these massive cuts can be taken away.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. No, absolutely. And Congressman Sires, you recall that during those months, then-Candidate Trump talked about backing away from NATO; about allowing Germany, for example, to handle the issues between Russia and the Baltic States; about allowing or really forcing Japan and South Korea to go it alone or to develop even their own nuclear weapons to combat the threat of North Korea, to deal with China's aggressiveness in the South China Sea.

So the more we go down that road, not only do we abandon those nations who have been friends for so long and allies and supporters for so long in keeping the peace, but we also, in the long run, threaten our own security.

I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Sires. If I might, I couldn't agree with the gentleman more. Just to bring it even closer to home, we recently met with the attorneys general from the Northern Triangle. These attorneys general have been fighting corruption, have been fighting the cartel. We have assisted them with a small amount of money. These people put their lives every day in peril fighting the cartel, fighting this corruption.

In our conversation, they said to me: We need America's support to continue our work. If we stop now, all that we have accomplished until now is going to go for naught.

When you are talking about a small amount of money, the strong impact that it has on countries that, for decades, have experienced a great deal of corruption, and we finally have people that have stepped forward and want to fight this corruption and put their lives in peril every single day, I think we should support those people. Cutting and running away from these people can only hurt us.

This is just one small example of the impact that this 30 percent cut would have on this region.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. The gentleman mentioned the Northern Triangle countries of Central America. Especially over the last few years, thousands of women and children who are fleeing very desperate situations there, not only extreme poverty, but the threats of violence by drug gangs, for example, have come to the Texas-Mexico border seeking asylum.

Congress did, over the last few years, essentially, pass assistance for these nations. And we understood that, look, if you allocate \$600 million to three countries, that is not going to solve all of their problems. Nobody is under that illusion. But it can go a long way in being the seed funds to start to turn these things around and these nations around.

Mr. ENGEL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. I would add that we give foreign aid, and it is good for those countries, but it is also good for us. It also helps us. If there is a drug problem in Central America, it inevitably comes up to our border.

If there is some problem with some developing country, say, we have a disease that could—Ebola or something like that, and we give money to help eradicate it, well, that will prevent Ebola from coming into the United States. So it is really a win-win situation.

Again, if we are going to be the leaders of the world, certainly of the free world, and we want other countries to follow our lead, well, if you are a leader, you have to lead. What we are doing is in our own best interests, not only just in the other countries' best interests.

I think it is important to say that. And it is important to, again, say, 1 percent—1.4 percent of our total budget is all the foreign aid and all the money that we give in terms of eradicating diseases, in terms of crime, in terms of everything that is actually very important to us as well. The American people think it is much higher, but it is not.

So if you take the President's slashing of it, it would virtually make all of this impossible to do. So it is a program that is a win-win situation.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Congressman ENGEL, you mentioned Ebola, for example. Dallas, Texas, was the first American city to confront the challenge and

the problem of Ebola. So I couldn't agree with you more.

It should also be said that if you take away this aid and you have people becoming more desperate in nations around the world, they do become more susceptible to being employed by, for example, drug cartels, or being lured by terrorist organizations because these folks are desperate and need to survive. So these rogue alternatives become more attractive to them.

So it is important to point out that a lot of this development and a lot of this aid also prevents some of these things from happening.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Absolutely. Again, I want to reiterate that we are not the leaders of the world because we anointed ourselves. We are the leaders of the world because we provided leadership for all of these years, particularly after World War II, and it is important to engage with the world.

One of the gentlemen mentioned some of the things that the President said. You know, one of the things he did was he called NATO obsolete. That kind of talk worries me because it is our alliances that are the pillar of our foreign policy and the strength of the United States and our alliances which have worked so well since World War II.

So if we denigrate our alliances, and then we cut funding for all these programs that help various countries so we can be a leader by about a third, that doesn't say much for a robust foreign policy. You get to be a leader by acting like a leader, not by pulling away from the world.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Absolutely. I will give Mr. Sires the last word. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. Sires. Well, before we finish, I just want to compliment Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL on the recent resolution that we worked on together in encouraging Argentina to continue on the path under new President Macri. Former President de Kirchner decided that she was going to be an isolationist.

Argentina is too big. It is a country that could be a player in assisting us in any crisis that we have in South America. So this resolution did not cost any money, but it shows our friendship, it shows our support, and it shows that they are moving in the right direction.

So my compliments to the gentleman, my compliments to the people that signed this resolution.

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

INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE UNITED STATES

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. LAMALFA) for 30 minutes.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about several things to do with infrastructure in the United States and in California. I am a happy new member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee here in the U.S. House, and I am very interested and dedicated to things we can do to improve all of our types of infrastructure that are so important for the economy, for the people, for movement of goods, and for the people's own convenience in doing what they need to do in their personal lives, their business lives, et cetera.

So this is, indeed, a committee and issues that will affect all of our States and have a positive effect if we put good policy in place for all of our people. We have jurisdiction over quite a few areas. One of the important things we will be working on in the short term have to do with airports as well as reauthorization of the FAA, Federal Aviation Administration.

Airports, obviously, are coming more and more into play with the amount of passenger traffic that we are seeing. The FAA projects that by the year 2029 we could see 1 billion passengers using our airports per year, and that is just not that many years away. So airports will need to continue to have more upgrading, runway extensions, maybe additional runways, the infrastructure in them, the process for getting people through TSA. These are all things that we will be looking at within our committee as well as some of our other committees we partner with here in the House, because passengers are using more and more air service, whether it is urban or the rural airports that are very important to areas like my district, the First District of Northern California. They have equal weight to those that are using them in where they live and where they need to get to.

Obviously, a lot of discussion about infrastructure led by our President, Donald Trump, on highways being a key component of movement of goods and people and everything we need for our economy to be strong and the convenience for our people. Highways are breaking down. Bridges are breaking down.

We just saw the other day, in Georgia here, a fire caused by storage of things underneath that bridge. They are on the fast track trying to get that redone on I-85.

Now, was it a bridge that needed to be maintained?

Not sure. But certainly that is a situation that shows how acute the problem is when you lose one structure like that, what it can do to traffic, an inconvenience for people and commerce in an area like that.

So we have these problems all across the country with our bridges that are in dire need of repair. We need not have more accidents or more things that would endanger the public when they are not properly maintained or upgraded.

Just try driving in the right lane of a lot of our freeways here and with the truck traffic on them who pay weight fees and many other excise taxes, other forms of fees and taxes to be part of the solution. We see much damage to them because of the backlog of work that needs to be done on highways, on freeways, that have this traffic, that have this high flow that is really part of what we would expect for our highways and these systems.

But when we are not doing the work to maintain, when we are not putting the investment in there, when people pay their gas tax, when they pay the tax on diesel, when they pay their weight fees, when all those forms of compensation that are in place to help keep our highways and roads and bridges and all of our transportation structures up, when the money isn't getting there, then we have a real problem.

Again, being from California, we see that some of our highways and road systems are in some of the worst shape in the whole country. Right now, as they contemplate raising taxes on people at the State level, a gas tax increase, a per-car tax increase to get your license plate sticker, people are going to be wondering where are we going to make ends meet on that, because probably at least the average cost to a family would be somewhere around \$500 in new gas and new fees to register a vehicle and get their kids to school and go to work and things that they need to do.

We need to be part of the solution on that. I don't think more taxes, more fees upon working people who are trying to make ends meet—you know, \$500 out of a family's income is a pretty tough deal when we see that the jobs are not coming back as rapidly, especially in the State of California, that they need to for average working families, especially inland, that aren't part of the coast where most of the wealth seems to be centered in California.

We see that the drive in California is still pushing forward on the high-speed rail project, one that was passed all the way back in 2008 just under a \$10 billion bond by the voters of California, and supplemented a few years later by ARA funding, stimulus funding from the Federal Government, about \$3.5 billion.

Well, at this point, here in 2017, they have hardly even done anything on the construction of the high-speed rail, which is probably a blessing, because this a boondoggle of epic proportions. The original cost, as sold to the voters of the State of California, would be \$33 billion to put a high-speed rail system from San Francisco to Los Angeles going through the Central Valley.

Just a couple of years later, the true numbers started coming in on that, and they finally admitted that it was going to cost \$98.5 billion was the estimate, this in the fall of 2011.

So they scurried back, went to the drawing board once again and found a