

for all Nicaraguans, and we support their pursuit of a more open and democratic society.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my concern about the President's budget, and, in particular, the \$610 billion in proposed cuts to Medicaid over the next 10 years.

In my district on the central coast of California, Medicaid provides healthcare to over 280,000 people. These are people that need it the most, including low-income families, children, disabled, and pregnant women.

Clinics and hospitals, particularly in rural communities like my district, rely on Medicaid to provide patients with mandatory and preventative services. Employees from the number one industry in my area—agriculture—rely on those health clinics so that they can stay healthy and ultimately contribute to our economy and our culture.

If Medicaid is cut, as desired in the President's budget, it will hurt not just my community, it will hurt our country.

Throughout our Nation, millions would lose healthcare, healthcare clinics would close, and many insurance companies who partner with Medicaid would see cuts in their reimbursement rates substantially.

I realize that many of us in Washington have not been on Medicaid, but many of us need to realize that Medicaid benefits many of the Americans that sent us here. The least we can do is support them and their families by fighting against the President's budget and fighting to keep funding for Medicaid.

MARCH DEFICIT AND BALANCING TRADE

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, President Trump recently told *The Economist* that he is "absolutely a free-trader." Ohioans would be the first to tell you that free trade and fair trade do not mean the same thing.

Our trade deficit ballooned to \$43.7 billion in March of this year—more red ink and more lost jobs. That skewed gap is even more pronounced with NAFTA nations, where we have a huge negative imbalance, totaling over \$16 billion with Mexico and nearly \$7 billion with Canada. That yields over 115,000 more forfeited jobs in our country.

Yes, trade deficits translate into lost jobs and lower wages for our workers like steelworkers that have been battered in Lorain, Ohio. We must stop these trade practices that snuff out our jobs and hurt our communities.

That is why tomorrow I will be re-introducing the Balancing Trade Act. This bill requires an actual U.S. policy that takes the trade deficit seriously. It provides real achievable steps to balance our trade deficits with countries with which we hold a deficit of over \$10 billion for three consecutive years.

I urge President Trump to support this measure as a reasonable step forward. Let us help heal heartland communities, many of which elected him. Let us seek trade solutions that lift up our people and create new jobs on all sides of North America's borders, but starting here in the good old USA.

PRESIDENT TRUMP'S BUDGET

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

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I am delighted to be here this evening, and I am delighted to be hosting the Progressive Caucus Special Order hour. We have a number of Members who are going to join us to discuss the President's budget proposal, which appears to have been written at Trump Tower, primarily for the benefit of people spending the weekend at the Mar-a-Lago Club in Florida.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. POCAN), to kick off our analysis of the Trump budget.

□ 1730

Mr. POCAN. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity. I would like to thank the gentleman from Maryland.

The Progressive Caucus has its own version of a budget which we have discussed on the floor of Congress previously that we will be glad to put exactly next to the budget that has been produced by this President, because our budget takes a completely different course than the budget that has been put forth by the Trump administration.

We can tell you, now that we have seen the budget from the Republicans, it hits every fear that we thought was going to be in it. There are very few winners, and there are an awful lot of losers in the budget, and that is what we are going to try to show today, just who some of the winners are and who some of the losers are, just to give you a visual display of exactly what is in this Trump budget.

So what people need to know is that this is a budget that is not for the average person across the country. In fact, the average person will be hurt in multiple ways by the cuts that are in this budget. There are very few in this country who are going to applaud this, but it is very few because this is a budget that only benefits a very few. And we, in the Progressive Caucus, are going to do everything we can to fight this, tooth and nail, to make sure this doesn't become law.

Let me just show a few of the winners that we have on this. One of the winners are the wealthiest Americans. This is going to reduce trillions of dollars in taxes that are primarily paid by the wealthy. So clearly, the wealthy are going to do well.

Another group that does well is Wall Street and Big corporations. This budget slashes regulations for Big banks that caused the great recession, and it defunds the agency that is charged with protecting consumers.

Another beneficiary is defense contractors—a \$54 billion boost in defense spending at the expense of nearly every other program. That will increase money that will purchase unnecessary new weapons.

The border wall. This is going to put down a \$1.6 billion downpayment to build a wall across the Mexican border, something that truly is not necessary and not asked for.

And finally, the last beneficiary is polluters. This is going to roll back environmental regulations that protect our air and water.

So those are the winners on the Trump budget. But if you look on the other side of the equation, there are a whole lot more losers.

Let's start right up here with our friend, Big Bird. PBS funding. The Trump budget would cut funding for children's shows like Sesame Street.

Social Security. The Trump budget will get rid of the insurance to help people with disabilities.

Meals on Wheels. You know, I have had the great fortune of doing Meals on Wheels delivery in Madison, Wisconsin, which is in my district. And not only is it often the only meal, the healthy meal that that person is getting delivered who often can't leave their homes, but it is also that daily check-in to make sure that person is all right.

I just met with someone who works with Meals on Wheels, and they said that there is not a week that goes by that they don't find someone who has fallen in their home and needed that person to come by for help. Well, the Trump budget eliminates funding for programs like Meals on Wheels.

The children's health insurance and Medicaid funding specifically for kids is cut. He cuts dental care for kids, cancer care for kids, access to inhalers, and access to vital medical devices for children.

He cuts nursing home care. Families are going to be forced to pay more out-of-pocket for nursing home care.

The school lunch program. Now, I understand, everyone may not love everything on their tray at lunch, but this is cutting funding for subsidized lunches, causing kids literally to go hungry in this country.

It has education cuts to school and literacy programs, to teacher training and class-size reduction. Over 20 programs are going to be cut. Even Special Olympics gets a cut in this budget.

Today, we had Secretary DeVos at the Appropriations Subcommittee for

the Labor, Health and Human Services, Education and Related Agencies, and, unfortunately, she couldn't make a case for any of these cuts, which is truly disappointing, because they are going to add hundreds of millions of dollars to give money to people who have children attending private schools, but we are going to be slashing the very programs that make our public schools so strong.

They slash programs for the Department of labor for job training.

There is a \$6 billion-plus cut to the National Institutes of Health that works on lifesaving research for diseases like Alzheimer's and ALS and diabetes. And it cuts another billion for cancer research, specifically, in this budget.

Loan repayment programs. This is going to end the loan repayment programs for police officers, nurses, and teachers who work in a public setting.

This has massive cuts to the Environmental Protection Agency that protect our air and water, and it guts general funding that provides that clean air and water programs that are going to affect people across the country.

It cuts funding to prevent major outbreaks for diseases like Ebola and Zika by cutting the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention program budget.

Opioid addiction, something that this Congress has, in a bipartisan way, found ways to find additional funding for; in this proposal by the Trump administration, it leaves families that are dealing with addiction on the hook for the cost of treatment in many cases.

Border funding. It is not just that they are building a wall, but this also ramps up funding for deportation task forces which are going to tear families apart in this country; and it adds money to build more detention centers.

This budget will allow the government to sell off swaths of public land that is going to open up our national parks and public land to oil and gas development, including fracking operations.

And this budget, when it comes to women's healthcare, will go after protections in funding for women's healthcare by cutting Planned Parenthood.

Finally, for veterans, it makes it harder for veterans and low-income families of veterans to find housing.

That is just some of the losers, but we want to show the difference in the balance of the very few who benefit and the whole lot of people—and there is a whole lot of other areas that are going to be cut by this budget.

Now, the contrast really is the Progressive Caucus budget that we put forward that we will have a vote on, on this floor of Congress, where we do a completely different approach. Gone are the winners and losers of this case. And the winners would be a big category, being the American people, and the losers really being those, I think, who have abused the system for all too long.

We have a \$2 trillion investment in infrastructure that puts money into our roads and bridges, our schools, our waterworks, our broadband, and really makes sure that those are family-supporting jobs that people can get back to work and will create millions of new jobs, according to the Economic Policy Institute.

We make sure that we move forward in affordable healthcare by making it so we can negotiate for prescription drug prices and bring those costs down, as well as allow States to get closer to a single-payer system.

We specifically have comprehensive immigration reform that recognizes those who are aspiring Americans, not by building walls and more detention centers but really providing a path to citizenship so that we can find a way to still protect our borders, but also make sure that we have got a path for people who have lived here for so very long.

We close corporate tax loopholes and make sure that working families are getting the stronger benefit.

We have an investment to make sure that we can have universal child care for all families in this country, not like the proposal that President Trump has put forward that takes care of, quite honestly, President Trump and people like him and the wealthiest in this country, but making sure that every family will never pay more than 10 percent of their income to have child care for their family. And on and on and on is what our contrast is.

So as someone who has been very active in the Progressive Caucus, someone who comes from America's heartland in Wisconsin, we wanted to show the winners and the losers but, more importantly, to show the different path forward the Progressive Caucus is going to put for a vote on the floor of Congress. And I think if you get a chance to compare and contrast these budgets, you can see there is an alternative.

We don't have to slash funding for all sorts of programs just to get \$54 billion of new spending for defense. We can actually invest in America, invest in healthcare, invest in our schools, make sure that college is affordable, all the things that we offer in our contrast budget. It is the only budget that is out there right now, so we would love to be able to show that contrast.

But we ask people to take a look at this, and then you decide what is best for your family. I think you are going to decide the Progressive Caucus puts a positive path forward that will make your family prosper and won't just support a very few in this country.

I thank the gentleman from Maryland. I appreciate this opportunity to have this time.

Mr. RASKIN. Thank you so much, Congressman POCAN from Wisconsin, a distinguished leader in the House of Representatives, and the new co-chairman of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Mr. Speaker, a budget, as we like to say, is not just a bunch of numbers, but

it is an ethical document. It is a reflection of our values, and it is a plan of action for investment of our energy and our resources into the future.

The Progressive Caucus has drafted The People's Budget based on the actual needs of American society. So we have looked out, and we have seen that the great American infrastructure is ailing; it is crumbling. The bridges are falling down. The roads and the highways need repair. The transit systems are under tremendous stress, including the Metro system here in the Maryland, Washington, Virginia area.

The cybersecurity system is compromised. Our airports, our port structure, our water systems, like in Flint, Michigan, need desperate intervention and rescue and help. We propose a \$1 trillion plan of investment in the American infrastructure to create millions of jobs, putting people to work on restoring the strength and the vitality of America's basic institutions, the infrastructure that supports a strong and flourishing economy.

So that is the heart of it. But we are also working to defend the gains we have made in healthcare, to extend healthcare so that all Americans are included in our health insurance system so we can squeeze out the bureaucratic bloat and the money that is wasted on insurance bureaucracy and red tape.

We are also working for investment in quality child care so working families are not spending 30 or 40 or 50 percent of their family budgets on trying to just pay for babysitters and piece together a system.

America is the wealthiest society on Earth, and this is the wealthiest moment in our history. We can provide healthcare for everyone. We can create a childcare system that works for working families in America. We can reinvest in American infrastructure.

But right now, there is no leadership, and there is no vision. We are so disappointed that the White House did not come forward with a plan, a bipartisan plan, to try to reinvest in American infrastructure, which everybody says he or she supports so we could get behind that, but we don't see anything.

Proverbs says that where there is no vision the people will perish, and so we have offered a vision. And instead, they have come with a plan that lacks all vision, lacks any plan for reinvesting in American infrastructure, lacks any investment in the vital services that people need and, on the contrary, works to dismantle healthcare services, Medicaid, education, community development grants, senior workforce, jobs training, you name it, the Peace Corps, National Endowment for the Arts, National Endowment for the Humanities; slashed \$6 billion from NIH in order to undermine scientific research and medical progress on colon cancer and breast cancer and Alzheimer's disease and asthma and bipolar disorder.

We have been making progress on all of these things, and, for some reason,

the Trump administration says they want to pull the plug on it and slash \$6 billion from NIH and all of the institutions around the country that NIH supports.

Well, we have invited Congressman RO KHANNA to be with us tonight. He is a leading expert on the economy and on the manufacturing sector, and we have asked him to talk about investment in infrastructure and manufacturing, what we need and what, instead, we have gotten from the Trump budget.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

Mr. KHANNA. Thank you, Congressman RASKIN, and thank you for your leadership with the Progressive Caucus and in articulating a positive vision of what the American people need with a budget.

I want to address the issue of manufacturing because this President went around the country campaigning on bringing manufacturing jobs back. And there is a simple philosophical difference in what the Progressive Caucus believes and the President's budget. If you believe, as the Republicans do, that we need to cut taxes and have less spending, you would be for this President's budget.

But if you believe, as we do, that the big issue facing this country is good-paying jobs and higher wages, you would be for the progressive budget.

□ 1745

Let me give you a concrete example. One of the programs that the President cuts in the name of less government and lower taxes is the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Now, what does this do? What does the Manufacturing Extension Partnership do? It actually works with small- and medium-sized manufacturers across this country, many in the Rust Belt, to help them be competitive, to help them compete against currency manipulation, against unfair trade deals, to help them compete against lower cost labor.

How does the program do this? It partners them with leading technology companies to say, look, if you are a small- or medium-sized manufacturer, maybe you should have cloud technology. Move your technology off the factory floor and use the cloud to be more cost-competitive so that you can compete. Basically, the program helps to bring and keep manufacturing jobs in the United States.

Now, here is the irony. You would think, oh, is this a liberal idea? Is this the idea of Democrat, or a liberal Democrat? The irony is this was Ronald Reagan's idea. It was actually a program instituted by President Reagan in 1988 to help American manufacturers compete for the 21st century, and every administration has supported it.

One would think this President who ran on bringing manufacturing jobs would say, okay, let's quadruple funding for the Manufacturing Extension Partnership. Instead, he zeroed it out,

zeroed out the funding for manufacturing programs. The progressive budget says we want to increase our investment in manufacturing. We want to actually help the small- and medium-sized manufacturers create jobs in the United States.

I have one more concrete example before I hand it back over to my colleague, Mr. RASKIN.

The Appalachian Regional Commission invests in helping to create jobs across the parts of this country that most need that investment. I was down in Appalachia visiting HAL ROGERS' district, a distinguished Republican who chaired the Appropriations Committee, and we saw the Appalachian Regional Commission's investment in helping coal miners' kids get jobs.

This Republican budget, this administration zeros out the funding for the Appalachian Regional Commission. Instead, we ought to be increasing funding in programs that are going to help transition folks from the industrial to the digital economy.

I think my colleague, Congressman RASKIN, will explain that the Progressive budget is not just a moral document. It very much is, and it keeps our commitment to seniors and to those in need, but it is also a blueprint for job creation and good wages and for creating jobs in precisely the places that need them most.

This is the big division in this Congress. Do you believe that the big issue is that we need more tax cuts for the investor class, that we need simply to cut government, or do you believe we need government to partner with local leaders, with businesses, to create jobs and better wages?

If you believe the latter, I urge you to take a look at the Progressive budget and see our vision for job creation and higher wages.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman KHANNA for that excellent discussion.

You would think, with all of the domestic budget of the country being dismantled and slashed and reduced by the Trump administration that we would end up saving money, but they don't in any way at all because the money is just being shifted over to the Pentagon.

So the proposal is to slash \$56 billion from things like Meals on Wheels, NIH research into eating disorders and asthma and Alzheimer's disease and heart and lung disorders and breast cancer and colon cancer, and environmental cleanup like the Chesapeake Bay cleanup, which they want to zero out, and then to shift the money over to the Pentagon at a time when the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform received a report and had a hearing on a McKinsey report which showed that there was \$125 billion in immediate savings available at the Pentagon in waste, fraud, abuse, and contractor overruns.

So, at a moment when the Pentagon is drowning in money that they don't

know what to do with and all of the beltway bandits are buzzing around in order to get their slice of the pie, President Trump decides it is a good moment to try to dismantle services for the elderly and to stop job training for young people, to stop job training in location for retired citizens, wipe out funding for the Chesapeake Bay cleanup, and roll back or abolish preschool development grants to the States.

The litany of attacks on the American people is really quite astounding, and I invite everybody just to go and read the specifics of this budget, which can be read as nothing more than an assault on the health and the well-being and the security of the American people.

For example, the Department of Education budget proposes to cut \$578 billion in title I, part A to support services for disadvantaged students. It reduces IDEA funding by \$113 million, seriously jeopardizing special education services for students with disabilities all across the country.

It eliminates title II, part A, which provides Federal funding for teacher support and class size reduction. It eliminates or reduces more than 20 additional programs promoting literacy in our communities. It cuts Perkins Career and Technical Education funding by 15 percent. That is just on the education side.

Department of Health and Human Services, it eliminates the Community Services Block Grant. It eliminates the Low Income Home Energy Assistance Program. It cuts the National Institute for Occupational Safety and Health by 40 percent. It reduces funding for Child Care and Development Block Grant programs by tens of millions of dollars. It reduces support for Federal job training for adults by 40 percent, job training for dislocated workers and youth.

It ends the Senior Community Service Employment Program, an excellent program that has located work, meaningful work, for tens of thousands of older Americans. It closes Job Corps centers. It eliminates funding to counter the worst forms of child labor through the Bureau of International Labor Affairs. It eliminates \$11 million in OSHA safety training grants for high hazard industries.

You have got to read it to believe it, but the amazing thing is, despite pulling the plug on all of these essential domestic programs that have been proven to work, it doesn't save us any money because the money is just thrown at the Pentagon and is being saved to throw up the wealth ladder in the country, send it up the wealth ladder through tax cuts to the largest corporations and the wealthiest Americans.

That is the name of the game. Everybody understands it, which is why this is the good news. At least we are hearing from both sides of the aisle that the President's budget written in gold

at Trump tower for the people at Mar-a-Lago is DOA, dead on arrival. Everybody is saying it, that there is no way that America could absorb the shock of letting this budget come anywhere near to reality.

But the message that we get from President Trump and his administration is very simple: Let them eat emoluments. Let them eat emoluments. Now, of course, we don't get them; he gets them. But the American people are left empty-handed at the end of this.

We don't get any meaningful investment in the infrastructure of the country. There is no jobs program that is in here. There is no attempt to guarantee the solvency and the strength and the resilience of the Social Security program. We have got that as part of our plan in 'The People's Budget for the Progressive Caucus.

It is far from trying to stabilize and strengthen Medicare and Medicaid, those two great victories of the Great Society. There is an attempt to undermine and ravage Medicaid and Medicare, again, to send all of the wealth up the income ladder, all of the wealth to the people who need it the least in the country, pulling the plug on everybody else.

Well, our hope is that we are going to be able to organize people to stop it, but the tragedy here is that there are so many needs in America that need to be addressed. Working people have seen a major erosion in their living standards over the last several decades. Working people have lost pension security.

Working people need to have retirement sources stabilized. We have got to use Social Security as a way to make sure that everybody can experience a decent and dignified retirement. Social Security is a great accomplishment, maybe the greatest antipoverty program ever created in the history of the Earth. It lifted millions of senior Americans out of poverty; and despite the opposition of the GOP at the time, now everybody concedes that Social Security was a brilliant idea with administrative bureaucratic overhead less than 1 percent, and it lifts millions of seniors to a state of at least a modicum of dignity in retirement. And there are millions of children who are on Social Security because of survivors benefits and disability benefits.

So we need to strengthen the Social Security system. We need to reinvest in it, and we need to expand it, because it used to be that there were supposed to be three pillars for people's old age: one was Social Security, another was a defined pension, and another was personal savings.

But the pensions from private employment are increasingly gone. They have been scattered to the winds. And people's personal savings have been eroded by the dramatic increase of economic inequality in the country and the erosion of the living standards of working people.

Tens of millions of Americans are relying exclusively on Social Security now, so we have got to reinvest in Social Security and make sure it works, and we have got plans for doing that, too.

But the point is that the real problems of the country have been ignored. There is no vision. There is no program. There is no policy for reinvesting in America coming from the Mar-a-Lago set, from this Cabinet of billionaires.

We are not getting any of it. Instead, we get an almost laughable, comical, cartoon version of rightwing GOP economics, which proposes to slash everything and to uproot the basic programs that the American people rely on for a civilized society. We can do better than this.

I see I have been joined by my very distinguished colleague who will pursue the discussion. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. ELLISON).

Mr. ELLISON. Mr. Speaker, I just want to say thank you to Congressman RASKIN for holding down this Special Order. You do such an excellent job, you and PRAMILA JAYAPAL, and we are grateful for it.

Mr. Speaker, here are just a few headlines from the budget that the Trump administration just released:

"Trump Budget Leaves Working Class Base Behind"; that is the Detroit Free Press.

"Meatloaf Again: Christie Meekly Accepts Trump's Medicaid Cuts"; that is the New Jersey Star-Ledger.

"Trump Budget Replicates Disastrous Kansas Approach. This Won't End Well"; that is the Kansas City Star, Mr. Speaker.

"No Help from Trump"; that is the Houston Chronicle.

"Trump Meets the Pope While His Budget Threatens the Least of Us"; that is The Sacramento Bee.

"The Harsh Budget Americans Voted for"; that is the Charlotte Observer.

"Another Bad Budget from Trump Targets the Poor," The Washington Post.

"Trump's Assault on Working Voters"; that is the Baltimore Sun.

"Surprise, Surprise: Trump's Budget Punishes the Sick and the Poor While Rewarding the Wealthy"; that is the LA Times.

"A Slash-and-Burn Budget," New York Daily News.

"Budget Cuts Include U.S. Heart"; that is northjersey.com;

The New York Times: "A Budget That Promises Little But Pain."

Bloomberg View: "Trump's Budget is a Waste of Everybody's Time."

Financial Times, no beacon of liberalism there, Mr. Speaker: "Trump's Implausible Plan for the U.S. Budget."

So whether you are talking about conservative instruments in the news or more liberal ones or more middle-of-the-road, it is really kind of amazing: Everyone seems to share one feeling about the Trump budget. We all hate

it. It is bad. It is not a good thing, and there are plenty of reasons why people don't like it.

And so I just want to add that the OMB is led by one of our former colleagues, Mick Mulvaney, and I think Mick is a nice guy. I can't tell people that I personally dislike Mick. He is nice to me. But that is not what this is about.

□ 1800

This is about how we are operating in our public lives. In our public lives and discharging our public responsibility, I have to quote the Director of the Office of Management and Budget. He says: Meals on Wheels sounds great. We're not going to spend money on programs that cannot show that they actually deliver on promises that we've made to people.

I will submit to you that Meals on Wheels is a very meritorious program, it costs very little money, and it allows vulnerable seniors and people with disabilities to live at home. Deep cuts.

Actually, Mick said as well: Deep budget cuts are actually one of the most compassionate things we can do.

I wonder, Mr. Speaker, compassionate for who?

Maybe those billionaires at Mar-a-Lago—maybe they need a little love, too, sometimes—or the people who occupy Trump Towers.

Regarding HUD, or Housing and Urban Development, he said: It doesn't work very well. Tell that to the people who rely on low-income housing tax credits, section 8 voucher programs, and all types of housing programs that allow people to afford their housing.

On the issue of school nutrition programs, he says: Guess what. There's no demonstrable evidence that they're actually doing that. There's no demonstrable evidence that we're actually helping kids to do better in school. This is about school nutrition.

Here is another one: We can't ask single mothers to continue to pay for the Corporation for Public Broadcasting.

Well, single moms might rely on the Corporation for Public Broadcasting to help their kids learn how to read. I think that Sesame Street is a pretty good outfit. That might be their only avenue.

Here is another one: If you ask, 999 people out of 1,000 would tell you that Social Security disability is not part of Social Security. It is an old-age retirement that they think of when they think of Social Security.

Quite the contrary. People do think of Social Security disability when they think of Social Security.

Here is another quote: "Are there folks on SNAP who shouldn't be?"

That is the question.

So we are, again, trying to focus on fraud in SNAP, rather than worrying about hungry Americans.

Here is another quote: "Maybe it's reasonable to ask if there are folks who are on there that shouldn't be. That is a reasonable question to ask."

You know what? I think it is focusing on the wrong part of the problem. Hunger, Mr. Speaker, is the problem in the richest country in the history of the world. At its richest point in its own history, we are being told by the Director of the Office of Management and Budget that we cannot afford SNAP, Meals on Wheels, and public broadcasting. Amazing.

I think that, honestly, Mr. Speaker, it is often said that you should speak truth to power. I think we must speak truth to power. I think the gentleman from Maryland would agree with me that we have got to speak truth to power. But it occurs to me, Mr. Speaker, that the power knows exactly what the truth is: this budget is going to hurt hungry children. The budget is going to cut seniors. It is going to cut veterans. It is going to cut public broadcasting, which is one of the major ways people get news in South Dakota and rural America. It is going to cut the Appalachian Regional Commission. It is going to leave devastation almost everywhere. It is going to cut the EPA by a third.

The power knows—and I am talking about Trump and his administration—the devastation that they are going to inflict on people. In fact, that is why they are doing it. They just don't believe the government has any role in helping to make Americans lives better.

Their idea of freedom, Mr. Speaker, is a billionaire being able to pollute anywhere and everywhere he wants. Their idea of freedom is amassing great fortunes at the expense of everyone else, all the while relying on our Nation's military, our Nation's police, the road system; all the while relying on clean water, clean air; all the while relying on public schools to educate their workforce.

They say: I did it all by myself. Yet everything they have done has been with the help of the government of the people of the United States of America. It is really outrageous, Mr. Speaker.

I think that we are in a moment when we have got to speak truth to each other, Mr. Speaker. We have got to go all across this Nation and talk to people in the barbershops, the VFW halls. We have got to talk to people in the church basement, the mosque basement, the synagogue basement. We have got to talk to people on the corners and tell them about this budget. If they hear about this Trump budget, they will be outraged.

Nobody can support this budget, not even a millionaire or a billionaire, unless you believe that you are not your brother's keeper, that you have no obligation to other people around you, that everything around you should be amassed to accumulate wealth for yourself. That is the only possible way anybody can stand next to this budget.

I really do hope that the Republican caucus puts this budget up for a vote. I want to see who is going to stand next to this monstrosity of a budget. I am

curious to see who, representing southern Ohio, Kentucky, or Tennessee, is going to vote to zero out the Appalachian Regional Commission; who, representing a northern-tier State, is going to cut, zero out, LIHEAP. I want to see the Republican who is going to do that. I think that will be a pretty gutsy move. I guarantee you, your constituents will know exactly what you did. They are watching, Mr. Speaker. People watch C-SPAN and they read the news. They read the headlines that I read off, Mr. Speaker, and they are aware of what is happening in the people's House at this very hour.

I want the people to know that it is the government's responsibility to take care of the least of these. If you are too poor, too old, or too sick to work, we should help people. We should do it. I believe it is the right thing to do.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care if they call me a bleeding heart liberal—they can call me anything they want—but I am going to be there for low-income people who are too old, too sick, or too young to work. I am going to be there to make sure that people who are out of work but who are able-bodied have the support that they need to get to work, to have clean air, to have clean water, to promote jobs and infrastructure.

We are going to be there to do those things, Mr. Speaker, because we believe in them.

Do you know what else, Mr. Speaker?

We don't believe "tax" is a four-letter word. It is actually a three-letter word. It is not a bad word at all. In fact, it is the dues that you pay to live in a civilized society. If you think tax is some kind of a curse word, you can move to Somalia, because they don't have many there.

Here, we have the protection of our police. We have the protection of our courts. We have the protection of our Nation's military. We have the protection of people who inspect the meat, the water, the air, and everything else, and these people look after us as they discharge their public responsibility and they get paid in our tax money. There is nothing wrong with it. We stand on that.

I believe there has got to be a few Republicans who agree with what I just said. I believe there has got to be a few Republicans who believe that it is a good idea for the public to spend money on figuring out the vexing diseases that are ravaging people all over America, like ALS, Parkinson's, and Alzheimer's. We should research these diseases. And if we need public money to do it, Mr. Speaker, we should spend that money. But I don't think this Trump budget reflects that.

I want to see my friends on the Republican side of the aisle join us and say we should not cut the Corporation for Public Broadcasting; we should not cut critical programs that help people; we should not cut supplemental assistance programs, SNAP, and food stamps for hungry Americans; we should not

cut Medicaid, leaving families on the hook to pay more for the care of their loved ones with disabilities.

I don't believe they believe these cuts are right. I just think that it is going to take a lot of political courage to stand up and say: You know what? Sometimes the government does good for people—we have spent decades saying the government is the problem—and now people actually believe it sometimes, except they don't believe it when you are cutting their healthcare, basic research, cutting money for our parks, and literally cutting everything, except the military.

Oh, by the way, I am the proud father of a military son. My son is a veteran. He just finished 4 years of service in the United States Army, Mr. Speaker. He was a combat veteran. My whole family is proud of him. But I am going to tell you one thing: the money didn't go to him. He made less than \$25,000 a year. He didn't mind. He is serving his country.

Where is all this Big Money going to go? Who is getting it?

I don't know. People who make the machinery, the weapons industry, they are going to make out like bandits, you better believe that.

At the end of the day, Mr. Speaker, even the money that they are asking us to spend is going to hurt veterans. I know they are trying to plus-up a little on the VA, but there are a whole lot of other services that veterans benefit from, and they are going to get hurt.

Mr. Speaker, this Trump budget is wrong, and I believe that every Democrat knows it is wrong, and I even believe a few Republicans know that it is wrong. We should stand up and say that it is wrong.

It is wrong to slash the earned income tax credit and child tax credit by \$40 billion. This is money that goes to people who actually work for a living.

I heard one of our Nation's leaders in the administration say: Oh, you are crying about these people who are going to get cut. What about the people who pay all the taxes?

Mr. Speaker, if we would raise the minimum wage, you would have more people paying taxes, because people's pay would be higher. It is no comfort to say that half the people don't pay taxes. They do pay taxes. They pay payroll taxes, they pay sales taxes, they pay property taxes, they pay all kind of taxes, Mr. Speaker. It is wrong to try to imply that they are freeloaders because they don't pay income taxes. They would be glad to pay those income taxes if their income were higher, which it would be if we invested in America, which this budget does the opposite of. It divests America.

I just want to say to you as we begin to wrap up that our Nation is the greatest Nation in the world not because of bombs and guns and military. It is the greatest Nation because we believe in liberty and justice for all, and not just a millionaire's and a billionaire's liberty to pollute all they want,

escape taxes all they want, do whatever they please, without any ramifications.

Mr. Speaker, justice is also a part of that equation. Justice means doing right by people. Justice means being fair to people. This budget is the exact opposite of it. This budget leaves out people like our veterans. It cuts almost a billion dollars from housing assistance programs to keep a roof over people's heads. It cuts Social Security by \$72 billion by restricting enrollment in disability insurance programs.

It hurts our national security. It spends over \$2 billion to build an unnecessary border wall. Oh, this wall. Mr. Speaker, in his campaign, the wall was among the most offensive things, because what it really said is we don't really want folks from south of the border around here. That is what it said. That is how they felt. Yet here we are spending money to prove that point.

It cuts the State Department and USAID by almost 32 percent. Generals will tell you that it is better to talk it out than to shoot it out. Yet here we are cutting down our ability to talk it out. What an outrage.

It eliminates international family planning.

Let me wrap up by saying this. I was talking to some of my Republican friends—and I do have many, and I am proud to say so—and one of them said to me: KERTH, this thing probably is never going to see the light of day.

I said: Maybe it will and maybe it won't. But this Trump budget is a direct reflection of what he would do if he could do it. And that is scary.

Mr. RASKIN. I thank Congressman ELLISON for his eloquent remarks and extraordinary service as co-chair of the Progressive Caucus. He has been replaced this week by Congressman POCAN, who we heard from earlier this evening, but it was in deference only to the busyness of his schedule, since he has also become, in addition to the distinguished Congressman from Minnesota, the vice chairman of the Democratic National Committee.

Let's begin to wrap this up. Let's review some of the extraordinary assaults on the health and the well-being of the American people that are embodied in this atrocious budget.

First, the President says: let's cut children's health insurance by more than \$600 billion.

This would strip countless children of dental care, asthma treatment, and other medical visits.

It eliminates over \$190 billion to the SNAP program, a supplemental assistance program that is the food assistance program which helps prevent 42 million working families from going hungry in America.

It calls for billions in cuts to Medicaid. It, unbelievably, in the middle of an opioid crisis across the country, would reduce access to drug addiction treatment and drug prevention services with a \$1.2 billion cut to the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

□ 1815

At a time when we need to be doubling down on investment in drug prevention and drug treatment and dealing with the opioid crisis, the Trump administration simply hides under the bed.

The budget would cut the Department of Labor's job training programs by an astonishing two-thirds—that is job training for our people at a time when we are going through dramatic structural shifts in the nature of the economy with robots and mechanization, and they want to cut by 65 percent the Department of Labor's job training programs.

They want to sell off our national parks and public lands for oil drilling, gas exploration, and fracking. They want to sell the land of the American people—the trust that we have had for centuries—that a great Republican President, Teddy Roosevelt, once insisted on. They want to sell it off to their friends at Exxon Mobil and the frackers across the country.

They have spent \$10 billion building their stupid wall—a 14th century answer to a 21st century problem. Maybe they will have a moat and some alligators to go with it. But didn't I hear somebody say on the campaign trail that Mexico was going to pay for that wall? I heard millions of people chanting that at rallies, and the President was saying: Mexico—you can believe me—Mexico is going to pay for it.

Already they are putting \$2 billion in our budget while they are stripping schoolchildren of their lunches. While they are slashing scientific and medical research in the country, they want to put \$2 billion into a wall that nobody needs at a time when illegal immigration from the southern border is at a decade's record low. They want to take \$2 billion and put it into that.

They want to cut billions of dollars from afterschool programs, from teacher training, and from student loans. They want to eliminate funding for Planned Parenthood, which millions of women and men depend on not just for family planning but also for basic medical attention, purely out of animosity toward Planned Parenthood which has not received one penny for abortion services in many decades. They just want to dismantle it. They would destroy it if they could, despite the fact that millions of Americans depend on Planned Parenthood.

They want to cut Social Security—which they promised not to touch—by \$72 billion by restricting enrollment in the disability insurance program—and on and on. You name your favorite, most important Federal program, and I guarantee you, unless you are a Big Business beltway contractor defense bandit, it is going to be cut in this budget. You can go and check it out.

Now, if a foreign power—a foreign repressive power—like Putin's Russia or Duterte's Philippines or Orban's Hungary set out to injure and demoralize the American people, they could not

have done better than the budget which President Trump sent to Capitol Hill this week. This is a budget that is drafted seemingly by an enemy of the American people.

It is not the media that is the American people's enemy, as the President insisted, it is whoever drafted this budget. That is the enemy of the American people.

Let them eat emoluments, they are telling us with this. Let them eat emoluments. They have got all the emoluments. They are the ones taking the money from the foreign governments. But they are saying, Let them eat emoluments, because the American people have been robbed by this budget if it were ever to see the light of day.

Mr. Speaker, a great Republican President once spoke of government of the people, by the people, and for the people. Abraham Lincoln was a Member of this body. He sat where we have the honor of sitting in this body, and he talked about government of the people, by the people, and for the people. This is a budget of the super rich, by the super rich, for the super rich. It was drafted by a Cabinet of billionaires for the people who are lounging at Mar-a-Lago today, and they give the finger to the rest of the country. That is what this budget says.

If my friends on the other side of the aisle are smart—and I know they are—and they know what is good for them—and I know they do, Mr. Speaker—they will say immediately this document is DOA and they have got nothing to do with it and very quickly distance themselves from it. We need to return to that great vision of a government that is of the people, by the people, and for the people. That is who we are as a country.

The government right now is experiencing a hostile takeover by a tiny elite, and that is what is taking place around the world today. If you look at Putin's Russia, if you look at Orban's Hungary, if you look at Duterte in the Philippines, if you look at what they tried to do with Le Pen in France, there is a new model, my friends, all over the world. Government is a money-making operation for a tiny elite in each society. They want to go back to something like kings and queens where the government serves the tiniest portion of the people.

They might get elected spouting populist rhetoric and slogans, but the minute they get in, Wall Street takes over. We have got a President who campaigned against Goldman Sachs, and his Cabinet is dominated by Goldman Sachs. How long are people going to fall for that magic trick? Not very long if anybody still believes in it out there. I don't think anybody's faith or confidence in this President as a populist will survive this budget—what a joke, and what an insult to the great populists of American history like the populist movement in William Jennings Bryan, that they would dare to associate themselves with populism.

This is a budget that is based on elitism and class warfare, top-down class warfare: the richest people in this country against everybody else. That is what this budget represents. That is what it embodies.

So check out the Progressive Caucus' People's Budget. It is a real reinvestment in the infrastructure of the country: our bridges, our roads, our highways, our transit systems, our port systems, our airports, and cybersecurity—where America really needs investment, not stealing from poor people, not stealing from the working class, and not ripping off NIH and the Centers for Disease Control in order to put money in the Pentagon for a bunch of beltway bandits and defense contractors who have so much money they don't know what to do with it anymore. That is not what we need. We need a real investment in America.

This budget is an affront, and it is an insult to the American people. We should reject it immediately. I call on all of our colleagues, Mr. Speaker, to repudiate this document in a bipartisan fashion, and let's get down to work for the American people.

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

MEMORIAL DAY

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, on Monday we observe Memorial Day to honor members of America's Armed Forces who have died in service to our Nation. For those who have lost a loved one, a friend, a neighbor, or a comrade, this day has added significance, remembrance, and sadness.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, many of us in this House will attend Memorial Day ceremonies over the weekend as we honor those who have died in the service to this great Nation.

Certainly, in this office, one of the more difficult but one of the most honored opportunities is to be at the grave site of our fallen heroes as they are laid to rest and that American flag, which flies over our Capitol, is draped over their coffin.

On this Memorial Day, I really want to highlight my brother-in-law, Larry

Emerman, who in the fall of 1980, in the service of this country as a pilot in the United States Navy as a lieutenant commander, lost his life in the service of our Nation.

Memorial Day is observed on the last Monday of May. Memorial Day is one of America's most solemn occasions. The tradition of Memorial Day dates back to 1864 in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania, which is considered to be the birthplace of Memorial Day. Three ladies decorated the graves of fallen Civil War soldiers, and the custom has continued every year since then.

It was an early fall day, in 1864, when Emma Hunter and her friend, Sophie Keller, picked flowers and went to the old cemetery to lay them on the grave of Emma's father, Reuben Hunter. Dr. Hunter was a young Boalsburg doctor at the time of the Civil War. When he volunteered to serve with the Army of the North, he was assigned to the hospital in Baltimore. In addition to attending the wounded soldiers, he also cared for the men who had contracted yellow fever while fighting in the southern swamplands. Dr. Hunter became ill. He died of yellow fever, and his body was buried in the Boalsburg Cemetery.

On their way that day in that early fall, the two girls met Mrs. Elizabeth Myers, whose young son, Amos, had been killed the last day of the Battle of Gettysburg and was also buried in the old cemetery. Learning where the girls were going, Mrs. Myers asked to join them. They shared the flowers, and they placed them on both graves. It was decided then and there that they would meet the following year with flowers for all who had died in the Civil War. The three young women told their friends of the plans, and when the day came around, most of the villagers joined them.

From that simple beginning came the observance of Memorial Day in Boalsburg, Pennsylvania. Every year since then, the people have met on the Diamond in Boalsburg Square for the walk to the old cemetery to lay flowers on the graves of all the soldiers dead.

They are led by a hometown band. All ages join in the walk and participate in the simple service of remembering. I have been proud to participate in that tradition which has spanned more than 150 years.

Boalsburg still puts on a traditional Memorial Day celebration complete with a parade, a community walk to the cemetery, speeches, military reenactments, and much more.

On Memorial Day, communities across the country will pay tribute to our fallen veterans who never returned home. Many of us will gather with family members, friends, and neighbors as we keep those we lost in our hearts.

Unfortunately, for many of our Nation, Memorial Day has become a day of picnics and family gatherings, which is not a bad thing, but we must always remember truly where Memorial Day came from and its purpose, that we not forget those sacrifices.

So as we raise the Stars and Stripes and as we lay wreaths at the monuments, memorials, and cemeteries, let us remember that our freedom is thanks to those who have died in sacrifice. We celebrate Memorial Day in honor of so many who are no longer with us. May God bless them, and certainly God bless the United States of America.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership and putting this opportunity today for us to gather on the floor to speak on the topic of not just Memorial Day but the service and the sacrifice that warranted its origination.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Memorial Day on May 29, 2017. On this day, Americans across our Nation pay respects to and honor members of the U.S. Armed Forces who have sacrificed their lives defending the freedoms that we so gratefully enjoy.

The decision to leave families and friends, travel to a land that is utterly unfamiliar, and risk their lives protecting the lives of others is among the most selfless acts one can make.

Roughly 1.5 million Americans are currently serving in one of the five branches of the Armed Forces. Of these Americans, nearly 90,000 are assigned to one of Georgia's numerous military bases which are scattered throughout our great State.

Georgia's First Congressional District that I have the honor and privilege of representing is particularly important to our Nation's Armed Forces as it includes Fort Stewart Army Base, Hunter Army Airfield, Kings Bay Naval Base, and Moody Air Force Base.

The service provided by our Nation's armed services is invaluable. Throughout our history, millions have paid the ultimate price for freedom—they have given their lives in order to save ours. I ask that you please keep these brave men and women in your prayers, not only on Memorial Day but every day.

It is an honor to represent a State and a district with such a strong tie to our Nation's defense. I ask that you pray for our troops, and I ask that you pray for our Nation. God bless each and every one of you as we observe this great Memorial Day. God bless America.

□ 1830

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to yield to my colleague from North Carolina (Mr. HUDSON).

Mr. HUDSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today because this week is All American Week, the annual celebration of the 82nd Airborne Division's mission and the paratroopers who serve to uphold it.

Based in my district at Fort Bragg, North Carolina, the 82nd Airborne Division is the Nation's Global Response