Special Counsel appointed by the Department of Justice so that he can perform a thorough and nonpartisan investigation of Russia's campaign to affect the 2016 U.S. presidential election and any individuals in the United States that may have colluded in those efforts.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) and a Member opposed each will control 15 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Kentucky.

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

Mr. Chairman, Democrats and Republicans are looking at the same challenges facing our country and American families. Education, healthcare, and housing costs have all increased while wages stay stagnant.

It used to be that the two parties would debate different strategies to address the problems facing the American people. Sadly, those times are behind us.

In giving millionaires, including the majority of this Congress, the President, and wealthy donors a giant tax cut, the Republican budget does not even pretend to address the problems facing the American people. Not only does it ignore working families, it increases their challenges.

The Democratic budget alternative, in stark contrast to the Republican budget, begins to address the real challenges our country faces now and in the long term.

□ 1015

We are less than a decade removed from the worst economic crisis in most of our lifetimes, and we have a chance to rebound in a way that builds a foundation for our country to thrive for generations, but we have to seize that opportunity.

Rather than giving resources to people and businesses that already have them, we are calling for targeted investments in programs that grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, and provide real support for working families and real security in retirement.

Rather than sending thank-you notes to the corporations that bankroll campaigns, we have an opportunity to make vital public investments that lead to a brighter future rebuilding roads, bridges, and other critical infrastructure, all of which lead to good jobs now and in the long run.

Rather than giving the President a multimillion-dollar refund on taxes he refuses to disclose, we can invest in retirement security for seniors who didn't inherit millions. We can invest in affordable education so young people do not have to grow up wealthy to have a shot at earning it in their future careers.

Instead of taking healthcare away from people, straining emergency rooms, and making Americans sicker, we have an opportunity to continue investing in affordable quality healthcare for all of us, finally eliminating a great burden on American families, a burden that no other developed nation shares.

This budget is an opportunity for our country to invest in our future, and if we adopt the Republican budget plan, we will have squandered it.

Democrats believe in a government that prioritizes American families, and they should be the priorities of this Congress. I, therefore, urge my colleagues to oppose the Republican budget and support the Democratic alternative.

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

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I claim the time in opposition to the amendment.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentlewoman from Tennessee is recognized for 15 minutes.

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

Mr. Chair, I rise in opposition to this budget substitute, which is, put simply, an abdication of our fiscal responsibility as a governing body.

Our country is $20 trillion in debt, with $9 trillion added to the national debt during the Obama years. We have the responsibility to our children and our grandchildren to stop this Congress' addiction to spending. It is a responsibility that I take seriously; it is a responsibility that the members of my committee take seriously; and it is a responsibility that Republicans in the House take seriously.

Clearly, it is not a responsibility that our friends across the aisle take seriously. Our budget works to end the addiction to spending that has dominated Washington for far too long.

The House budget, passed out of committee with unanimous Republican support in July, begins to address our spending addiction by balancing the budget over 10 years so that we can start paying down our national debt, and it addresses mandatory spending in a significant way for the first time since 1997.

This budget substitute does quite the opposite. The Democrats' budget raises taxes by $2.7 trillion, which would be the largest tax increase in U.S. history. It increases spending by $6.2 trillion, compared to the budget passed by my committee. It never balances, with a deficit in 2027 of $852 billion.

What we hear from the other side of the aisle and what we see in this budget is simply more of same: more spending, more tax increases, and more debt. I don't think that is acceptable, and neither do the American people.

Since we began this budget debate yesterday, my counterparts on the other side of the aisle have been throwing out misleading numbers about our budget and our tax reform effort in order to hide the fact that they offer no new solutions to the most pressing problems our country faces.

Here is a number that they should keep in mind while they discuss this fiscally irresponsible substitute. The national debt for every person is over $63,000. Every man, woman, and even child in our country has a $63,000 weight hanging over their heads. Our budget takes real steps to fix this crisis. This budget substitute does not. Honestly, it is as simple as that.

Mr. Chair, I urge my colleagues to reject this Democrat substitute, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Chair, once again, House Republicans are determined to visit cruel and unusual punishment on the American people by presenting a budget that is reckless, regressive, and reprehensible. It is a budget that will hurt working families, middle class folks, senior citizens, the poor, the sick, the afflicted, veterans, and rural America.

It is a budget that will eradicate the social safety net, end Medicare as we know it, rip away health insurance from 23 million Americans, and impose billions and billions of dollars in life-altering debt on younger Americans.

It is outrageous that this is all being done to enact tax cuts for the wealthy and the well-off, tax cuts for the privileged few, tax cuts for special interests here in Washington, D.C.

This parade of horribles is being jammed down the throats of this country so that everyday Americans can subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless.

We deserve better. The Democratic budget will invest in transportation and infrastructure, invest in education and job training, invest in the social safety net, invest in research and development, invest in affordable housing, and invest in the wellbeing of everyday Americans.

The Republican budget is a raw deal. The Democratic budget is a better deal, focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future. It is worthy of our support.

The Acting CHAIR. The Committee will rise informally.

The Speaker pro tempore (Mrs. HANDEL) assumed the chair.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate by Ms. Byrd, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate has passed without amendment a bill of the House of the following title:

H.R. 1117. An act to require the Administrator of the Federal Emergency Management Agency to submit a report regarding certain plans regarding assistance to applicants and grantees during the response to an emergency or disaster.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Committee will resume its sitting.

CONCURRENT RESOLUTION ON THE BUDGET FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

The Committee resumed its sitting.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Florida (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY).

Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Chair, with all respect, the cruel and unusual punishment is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment. The raw deal is the Democratic-proposed substitute amendment that increases spending $6.2 trillion over our budget.

This thing raises taxes—$2.7 trillion, the largest tax increase in American history, at a time when we are drowning in debt and stagnant wage growth.

It requires a one-to-one match of defense and nondefense discretionary spending at a time when we can't keep our F–18s flying and we have airplanes crashing around the country for lack of maintenance.

This is unconscionable. This budget never balances. It will leave us with an $852 billion deficit by fiscal year 2027. It expands ObamaCare, the most disastrous and heinous trick played on the American people that I can remember. It prioritizes amnesty over security.

We are never going to get our country straight and preserve our sovereignty if we don't protect our security. On the other hand, we have got the Republican budget that offers to do a lot of things. One thing it offers to do is put a work requirement for able-bodied adults with no dependent children into welfare.

Mr. Chair, I include in the RECORD an article by Nicholas Eberstadt of AEI talking about the horrible condition of our labor force now and how drastically important this is and how much it will improve the opportunities for people to rise out of poverty. We have got three 25- to 54-year-old males sitting out of the labor force collecting benefits for every one that is unemployed. The unemployed rate is 4.7 percent. That makes the total 20 percent. It is almost over 5 million people that we owe them a moral obligation to offer them an opportunity to rise out of poverty through work, and that is what the Republican budget does.

[Commentary, Feb. 15, 2017]

ECONOMY: OUR MISERABLE 21ST CENTURY

(By Nicholas N. Eberstadt)

On the morning of November 9, 2016, America's elite—its talking and deciding classes—woke up to a country they did not know. To most privileged and well-educated Americans, especially those living in its bicoastal bastions, the election of Donald Trump had been a thing almost impossible even to imagine. What sort of country would go and elect someone like Trump as president? Certainly not one they were familiar with, or understood anything about.

Whatever else it may or may not have accomplished, the 2016 election was a sort of shock therapy for Americans living within what Charles Murray famously termed ''the bubble'' (the protective barrier of prosperity and self-selected associations that increasingly shield our best and brightest from contact with the rest of their society). The very fact of Trump's election served as a truth broadcast about a reality that could no longer be denied: Things out there in America are a whole lot different from what you thought.

Yes, things are very different indeed these days in the ''real America'' outside the bubble. In fact, things have been going badly wrong in America since the beginning of the 21st century.

It turns out that the year 2000 marks a grim historical milestone of sorts for our nation. For whatever reasons, the Great American Escalator, which had lifted successive generations of Americans to ever higher standards of living and levels of social well-being, broke down around then—and broke down very badly.

The warning lights have been flashing, and the klaxons sounding, for more than a decade and a half. But our pundits and prognosticators and professors and policymakers, ensconced as they generally are deep within the bubble, were for the most part too distant from the distress of the general population to see or hear it. (So much for the vaunted ''information era'' and ''big-data revolution.'') Now that those signals are no longer possible to ignore, it is high time for experts and intellectuals to reacquaint themselves with the country in which they live and to begin the task of describing what has befallen the country in which we have lived since the dawn of the new century.

Consider the condition of the American economy. In some circles people still widely believe, as one recent New York Times business-section article cluelessly insisted before the inauguration, that ''Mr. Trump will inherit an economy that is fundamentally solid.'' But this is patent nonsense. By now it should be painfully obvious that the U.S. economy has been in the grip of deep dysfunction since the dawn of the new century. And in retrospect, it should also be apparent that America's strange new economic maladies were almost perfectly designed to set the stage for a populist storm.

Ever since 2000, basic indicators have offered oddly inconsistent readings on America's economic performance and prospects. It is curious and highly uncharacteristic to find such measures so very far out of alignment with one another. We are witnessing an ominous and growing divergence between three trends that should ordinarily move in tandem: wealth, output, and employment.

Depending upon which of these three indicators you choose, America looks to be heading up, down, or more or less nowhere. From the standpoint of wealth creation, the 21st century is off to a roaring start. By this yardstick, it looks as if Americans have never had it so good and as if the future is full of promise. Between early 2000 and late 2016, the estimated net worth of American households and nonprofit institutions more than doubled, from $44 trillion to $90 trillion.

Although that wealth is not evenly distributed, it is still a fantastic sum of money—an average of over a million dollars for every notional family of four. This upsurge of wealth took place despite the crash of 2008—indeed, private wealth holdings are over $20 trillion higher now than they were at their pre-crash apogee. The value of American real-estate assets is near or at all-time highs, and America's businesses appear to be thriving. Even before the ''Trump rally'' of late 2016 and early 2017, U.S. equities markets were hitting new highs—and since stock prices are strongly shaped by expectations of future profits, investors evidently are counting on the continuation of the current happy days for U.S. asset holders for some time to come.

A rather less cheering picture, though, emerges if we look instead at real trends for the macro-economy. Here, performance since the start of the century might charitably be described as mediocre, and prospects today are no better than guarded. The recovery from the crash of 2008—which unleashed the worst recession since the Great Depression—has been singularly slow and weak. According to the Bureau of Economic Analysis (BEA), it took nearly four years for America's gross domestic product (GDP) to re-attain its late 2007 level. As of late 2016, total value added to the U.S. economy was just 12 percent higher than in 2007. The situation is even more sobering if we consider per capita growth. It took America six and a half years—until mid-2014—to get back to its late 2007 per capita production levels. And in late 2016, per capita output was just 4 percent higher than in late 2007—nine years earlier. By this reckoning, the American economy looks to have suffered something close to a lost decade.

But there was clearly trouble brewing in America's macro-economy well before the 2008 crash, too. Between late 2000 and late 2007, per capita GDP growth averaged less than 1.5 percent per annum. That compares with the nation's long-term postwar 1948–2000 per capita growth rate of almost 2.3 percent, which in turn can be compared to the ''snap back'' tempo of 1.1 percent per annum since per capita GDP bottomed out in 2009. Between 2000 and 2016, per capita growth in America has averaged less than 1 percent a year. To state it plainly: With postwar, pre-21st-century rates for the years 2000–2016, per capita GDP in America would be more than 20 percent higher than it is today.

The reasons for America's newly fitful and halting macroeconomic performance are still a puzzlement to economists and a subject of considerable contention and debate. Economists are generally in consensus, however, in one area: They have begun redefining the growth potential of the U.S. economy downwards. The U.S. Congressional Budget Office (CBO), for example, suggests that the ''potential growth'' rate for the U.S. economy at full employment of factors of production has now dropped below 1.7 percent a year, implying a sustainable long-term annual per capita economic growth rate for America today of well under 1 percent.

Then there is the employment situation. If 21st-century America's GDP trends have been disappointing, labor-force trends have been utterly dismal. Work rates have fallen off a cliff since the year 2000 and are at their lowest levels in decades. We can see this by looking at the estimates by the Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) for the civilian employment rate, the jobs-to-population ratio for adult civilian men and women. Between early 2000 and late 2016, America's overall work rate for Americans age 20 and older underwent a drastic decline. It plunged by almost 5 percentage points (from 64.6 to 59.7). Unless you are a labor economist, you may not appreciate just how severe a falloff in employment such numbers attest to. Postwar America never experienced anything comparable.

From peak to trough, the collapse in work rates for U.S. adults between 2008 and 2010 was roughly twice the amplitude of what had previously been the country's worst postwar recession, back in the early 1980s. In that previous steep recession, it took America five years to re-attain the adult work rates recorded at the start of 1980. This time, the U.S. job market has as yet, in early 2017, scarcely begun to claw its way back up to the work rates of 2007—much less back to the work rates from early 2000. U.S. adult work rates never recovered entirely from the recession of 2001—much less the crash of '08.

And the work rates being measured here include people who are engaged in any paid employment—any job, at any wage, for any number of hours of work at all.

On Wall Street and in some parts of Washington these days, one hears that America has gotten back to "near full employment." For Americans outside the bubble, such talk must seem nonsensical. It is true that the oft-cited "civilian unemployment rate" looked pretty good by the end of the Obama era—in December 2016, it was down to 4.7 percent, about the same as it had been back in 1965, at a time of genuine full employment. The problem here is that the unemployment rate only tracks joblessness for those still in the labor force; it takes no account of workforce dropouts. Alas, the exodus out of the workforce has been the big labor-market story for America's new century. (At this writing, for every unemployed American man between 25 and 55 years of age, there are another three who are neither working nor looking for work.) Thus the "unemployment rate" increasingly looks like an antique index devised for some earlier and increasingly distant war: the economic equivalent of a musket inventory or a cavalry count.

By the criterion of adult work rates, by contrast, employment conditions in America remain remarkably bleak. From late 2009 through early 2014, the country's work rates more or less flatlined. So far as can be told, this is the only "recovery" in U.S. economic history in which that basic labor-market indicator almost completely failed to respond.

Since 2014, there has finally been a measure of improvement in the work rate—but it would be unwise to exaggerate the dimensions of that turnaround. As of late 2016, the adult work rate in America was still at its lowest level in more than 30 years. To put things another way: If our nation's work rate today were back up to its start-of-the-century highs, well over 10 million more Americans would currently have paying jobs.

There is no way to sugarcoat these awful numbers. They are not a statistical artifact that can be explained away by population aging, or by increased educational enrollment for adult students, or by any other genuine change in contemporary American society. The plain fact is that 21st-century America has witnessed a dreadful collapse of work.

For an apples-to-apples look at America's 21st-century jobs problem, we can focus on the 25–54 population—known to labor economists for self-evident reasons as the "prime working age" group. For this key labor-force cohort, work rates in late 2016 were down almost 4 percentage points from their year-2000 highs. That is a jobs gap approaching 5 million for this group alone.

It is not only that work rates for prime-age males have fallen since the year 2000—they have, but the collapse of work for American men is a tale that goes back at least half a century. (I wrote a short book last year about this sad saga.) What is perhaps more startling is the unexpected and largely unnoticed fall-off in work rates for prime-age women. In the U.S. and all other Western societies, postwar labor markets underwent an epochal transformation. After World War II, work rates for prime women surged, and continued to rise—until the year 2000. Since then, they too have declined. Current work rates for prime-age women are back to where they were a generation ago, in the late 1980s. The 21st-century U.S. economy has been brutal for male and female laborers alike—and the wreckage in the labor market has been sufficiently powerful to cancel, and even reverse, one of our society's most distinctive postwar trends: the rise of paid work for women outside the household.

In our era of no more than indifferent economic growth, 21st-century America has somehow managed to produce markedly more wealth for its wealthholders even as it provided markedly less work for its workers. And trends for paid hours of work look even worse than the work rates themselves. Between 2000 and 2015, according to the BEA, total paid hours of work in America increased by just 4 percent (as against a 35 percent increase for 1985–2000, the 15-year period immediately preceding this one).

Over the 2000–2015 period, however, the adult civilian population rose by almost 18 percent—meaning that paid hours of work per adult civilian have plummeted by a shocking 12 percent thus far in our new American century.

This is the terrible contradiction of economic life in what we might call America's Second Gilded Age (2000—). It is a paradox that may help us understand a number of overarching features of our new century. These include the consistent findings that public trust in almost all U.S. institutions has sharply declined since 2000, even as growing majorities hold that America is "heading in the wrong direction." It provides an immediate answer to why overwhelming majorities of respondents in public-opinion surveys continue to tell pollsters, year after year, that our ever-richer America is still stuck in the middle of a recession. The mounting economic woes of the "little people" may not have been generally recognized by those inside the bubble, or even by many bubble inhabitants who claimed to be economic specialists—but they proved to be potent fuel for the populist fire that raged through American politics in 2016.

So general economic conditions for many ordinary Americans—not least of these, Americans who did not fit within the academy's designated victim classes—have been rather more insecure than those within the comfort of the bubble understood. But the anxiety, dissatisfaction, anger, and despair that range within our borders today are not wholly a reaction to the way our economy is misfiring. On the nonmaterial front, it is likewise clear that many things in our society are going wrong and yet seem beyond our powers to correct.

Some of these gnawing problems are by no means new: A number of them (such as family breakdown) can be traced back at least to the 1960s, while others are arguably as old as modernity itself (anomie and isolation in big anonymous communities, secularization and the decline of faith). But a number have roared down upon us by surprise since the turn of the century—and others have redoubled with fearsome new intensity since roughly the year 2000.

American health conditions seem to have taken a seriously wrong turn in the new century. It is not just that overall health progress has been shockingly slow, despite the trillions we devote to medical services each year. (Which "Cold War babies" among us would have predicted we'd live to see the day when life expectancy in East Germany was higher than in the United States, as is the case today?)

Alas, the problem is not just slowdowns in health progress—there also appears to have been positive retrogression for broad and heretofore seemingly untroubled segments of the national population. A short but electrifying 2015 paper by Anne Case and Nobel Economics Laureate Angus Deaton talked about a mortality trend that had gone almost unnoticed until then: rising death rates for middle-aged U.S. whites. By Case and Deaton's reckoning, death rates rose somewhat slightly over the 1999–2013 period for all non-Hispanic white men and women 45–54 years of age—but they rose sharply for those with high-school degrees or less, and for this less-educated grouping most of the rise in death rates was accounted for by suicides, chronic liver cirrhosis, and poisonings (including drug overdoses).

Though some researchers, for highly technical reasons, suggested that the mortality spike might not have been quite as sharp as Case and Deaton reckoned, there is little doubt that the spike itself has taken place. Health has been deteriorating for a significant swath of white America in our new century, thanks in large part to drug and alcohol abuse. All this sounds a little too close for comfort to the story of modern Russia, with its devastating vodka- and drug-binging health setbacks. Yes: It can happen here, and it has. Welcome to our new America.

In December 2016, the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC) reported that for the first time in decades, life expectancy at birth in the United States had dropped very slightly (to 78.8 years in 2015, from 78.9 years in 2014). Though the decline was small, it was statistically meaningful—rising death rates were characteristic of males and females alike; of blacks and whites and Latinos together. (Only black women avoided mortality increases—their death levels were stagnant.) A jump in "unintentional injuries" accounted for much of the overall uptick.

It would be unwarranted to place too much portent in a single year's mortality changes; slight annual drops in U.S. life expectancy have occasionally been registered in the past, too, followed by continued improvements. But given other developments we are witnessing in our new America, we must wonder whether the 2015 decline in life expectancy is just a blip, or the start of a new trend. We will find out soon enough. It cannot be encouraging, though, that the Human Mortality Database, an international consortium of demographers who vet national data to improve comparability between countries, has suggested that health progress in America essentially ceased in 2012—that the U.S. gained on average only about a single day of life expectancy at birth between 2012 and 2014, before the 2015 turndown.

The opioid epidemic of pain pills and heroin that has been ravaging and shortening lives from coast to coast is a new plague for our new century. The terrifying novelty of this particular drug epidemic, of course, is that it has gone (so to speak) "mainstream" this time, effecting breakout from disadvantaged minority communities to Main Street White America. By 2013, according to a 2015 report by the Drug Enforcement Administration, more Americans died from drug overdoses (largely but not wholly opioid abuse) than from either traffic fatalities or guns. The dimensions of the opioid epidemic in the real America are still not fully appreciated within the bubble, where drug use tends to be more carefully limited and recreational. In Dreamland, his harrowing and magisterial account of modern America's opioid explosion, the journalist Sam Quinones notes in passing that "in one three-month period" just a few years ago, according to the Ohio Department of Health, "fully 11 percent of all Ohioans were prescribed opiates." And of course many Americans self-medicate with licit or illicit painkillers without doctors' orders.

In the fall of 2016, Alan Krueger, former chairman of the President's Council of Economic Advisers, released a study that further refined the picture of the real existing opioid epidemic in America: According to his work, nearly half of all prime working-age male labor-force dropouts—an army now totaling roughly 7 million men—currently take pain medication on a daily basis.

We already knew from other sources (such as BLS "time use" surveys) that the overwhelming majority of the prime-age men in this un-working army generally don't "do civil society" (charitable work, religious activities, volunteering), or for that matter much in the way of child care or help for others in the home either, despite the abundance of time on their hands. Their routine, instead, typically centers on watching—watching TV, DVDs, Internet, hand-held devices, etc.—and indeed watching for an average of 2,000 hours a year, as if it were a full-time job. But Krueger's study adds a poignant and immensely sad detail to this portrait of daily life in 21st-century America: In our mind's eye we can now picture many millions of un-working men in the prime of life, out of work and not looking for jobs, sitting in front of screens—stoned.

But how did so many millions of un-working men, whose incomes are limited, manage en masse to afford a constant supply of pain medication? Oxycontin is not cheap. As Dreamland carefully explains, one main mechanism today has been the welfare state: more specifically, Medicaid, Uncle Sam's means-tested health-benefits program. Here is how it works (we are with Quinones in Portsmouth, Ohio):

[The Medicaid card] pays for medicine—whatever pills a doctor deems that the insured patient needs. Among those who receive Medicaid cards are people on state welfare or on a federal disability program known as SSI. . . . If you could get a prescription from a willing doctor—and Portsmouth had plenty of them—Medicaid health-insurance cards paid for that prescription every month. For a three-dollar Medicaid co-pay, therefore, addicts got pills priced at thousands of dollars, with the difference paid for by U.S. and state taxpayers. A user could turn around and sell those pills, obtained for that three-dollar co-pay, for as much as ten thousand dollars on the street.

In 21st-century America, ''dependence on government'' has thus come to take on an entirely new meaning.

You may now wish to ask: What share of prime-working-age men these days are enrolled in Medicaid? According to the Census Bureau's SIPP survey (Survey of Income and Program Participation), as of 2013, over one-fifth (21 percent) of all civilian men between 25 and 55 years of age were Medicaid beneficiaries. For prime-age people not in the labor force, the share was over half (53 percent). And for un-working Anglos (non-Hispanic white men not in the labor force) of prime working age, the share enrolled in Medicaid was 48 percent.

By the way: Of the entire un-working prime-age male Anglo population in 2013, nearly three-fifths (57 percent) were reportedly collecting disability benefits from one or more government disability program in 2013. Disability checks and means-tested benefits cannot support a lavish lifestyle. But they can offer a permanent alternative to paid employment, and for growing numbers of American men, they do. The rise of these programs has coincided with the death of work for larger and larger numbers of American men not yet of retirement age. We cannot say that these programs caused the death of work for millions upon millions of younger men: What is incontrovertible, however, is that they have financed it—just as Medicaid inadvertently helped finance America's immense and increasing appetite for opioids in our new century.

It is intriguing to note that America's nationwide opioid epidemic has not been accompanied by a nationwide crime wave (excepting of course the apparent explosion of illicit heroin use). Just the opposite: As best can be told, national victimization rates for violent crimes and property crimes have both reportedly dropped by about two-thirds over the past two decades. The drop in crime over the past generation has done great things for the general quality of life in much of America. There is one complication from this drama, however, that inhabitants of the bubble may not be aware of, even though it is all too well known to a great many residents of the real America. This is the extraordinary expansion of what some have termed America's ''criminal class''—the population sentenced to prison or convicted of felony offenses—in recent decades. This trend did not begin in our century, but it has taken on breathtaking enormity since the year 2000.

Most well-informed readers know that the U.S. currently has a higher share of its populace in jail or prison than almost any other country on earth, that Barack Obama and others talk of our criminal-justice process as ''mass incarceration,'' and know that well over 2 million men were in prison or jail in recent years. But only a tiny fraction of all living Americans ever convicted of a felony is actually incarcerated at this very moment. Quite the contrary: Maybe 90 percent of all sentenced felons today are out of confinement and living more or less among us. The reason: the basic arithmetic of sentencing and incarceration in America today.

Correctional release and sentenced community supervision (probation and parole) guarantee a steady annual ''flow'' of convicted felons back into society to augment the very considerable ''stock'' of felons and ex-felons already there. And this ''stock'' is by now truly enormous.

One forthcoming demographic study by Sarah Shannon and five other researchers estimates that the cohort of current and former felons in America very nearly reached 20 million by the year 2010. If its estimates are roughly accurate, and if America's felon population has continued to grow at more or less the same tempotraced out for the years leading up to 2010, we would expect it to surpass 23 million persons by the end of 2016 at the latest. Very rough calculations might therefore suggest that at this writing, America's population of non-institutionalized adults with a felony conviction somewhere in their past has almost certainly broken the 20 million mark by the end of 2016. A little more rough arithmetic suggests that about 17 million men in our general population have a felony conviction somewhere in their CV. That works out to one of every eight adult males in America today.

We have to use rough estimates here, rather than precise official numbers, because the government does not collect any data at all on the size or socioeconomic circumstances of this population of 20 million, and never has. Amazing as this may sound and scandalous though it may be, America has, at least to date, effectively banished this huge group—a group roughly twice the total size of our illegal-immigrant population and an adult population larger than that in any state but California—to a near-total and seemingly unending statistical invisibility. Our ex-cons are, so to speak, statistical outcasts who live in a darkness our polity does not care enough to illuminate—beyond the scope or interest of public policy, unless and until they next run afoul of the law.

Thus we cannot describe with any precision or certainty what has become of those who make up our ''criminal class'' after their (latest) sentencing or release. In the most stylized terms, however, we might guess that their odds in the real America are not all that favorable. And when we consider some of the other trends we have already mentioned—employment, health, addiction, welfare dependence—we can see the emergence of a malign new nationwide undertow, pulling downward against social mobility.

Social mobility has always been the jewel in the crown of the American mythosand ethos. The idea (not without a measure of truth to back it up) was that people in America are free to achieve according to their merit and their grit—unlike in other places, where they are trapped by barriers of class or the misfortune of misrule. Nearly two decades into our new century, there are unmistakable signs that America's fabled social mobility is in trouble—perhaps even in serious trouble.

Consider the following facts. First, according to the Census Bureau, geographical mobility in America has been on the decline for three decades, and in 2016 the annual movement of households from one location to the next was reportedly at an all-time (postwar) low. Second, as a study by three Federal Reserve economists and a Notre Dame colleague demonstrated last year, ''labor market fluidity''—the churning between jobs that among other things allows people to get ahead—has been on the decline in the American labor market for decades, with no sign as yet of a turnaround. Finally, and not least important, a December 2016 report by the ''Equal Opportunity Project,'' a team led by the formidable Stanford economist Raj Chetty, calculated that the odds of a 30-year-old's earning more than his parents at the same age was now just 51 percent: down from 86 percent 40 years ago. Other researchers who have examined the same data argue that the odds may not be quite as low as the Chetty team concludes, but agree that the chances of surpassing one's parents' real income have been on the downswing and are probably lower now than ever before in postwar America.

Thus the bittersweet reality of life for real Americans in the early 21st century: Even though the American economy still remains the world's unrivaled engine of wealth generation, those outside the bubble may have less of a shot at the American Dream than has been the case for decades, maybe generations—possibly even since the Great Depression.

The funny thing is, people inside the bubble are forever talking about ''economic inequality,'' that wonderful seminar construct, and forever virtue-signaling about how personally opposed they are to it. By contrast, ''economic insecurity'' is akin to a phrase from an unknown language. But if we were somehow to find a ''Google Translate'' function for communicating from real America into the bubble, an important message might be conveyed:

The abstraction of ''inequality'' doesn't matter a lot to ordinary Americans. The reality of economic insecurity does. The Great American Escalator is broken—and it badly needs to be fixed.

With the election of 2016, Americans within the bubble finally learned that the 21st century has gotten off to a very bad start in America. Welcome to the reality. We have a lot of work to do together to turn this around.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a distinguished member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Chair, the other day, a young man who lives in my neighborhood came over, and he asked me to try to teach him how to drive a car. And I told him: Son, it is real easy to drive a car. It is just kind of like these budget proposals you will see in Congress. If you want to go forward and do things down the road, you put the car in D, like Democrat, for drive, and your car will go forward. But if you want to go backwards and reverse back to the 1950s, you put it in R, like a Republican.

He learned quick, and that is what these budgets are about. If you want to go forward, you go with the Democratic budget—forward on building highways, school construction, broadband expansion; research, research on the deadly diseases that are killing each and every one of us and our children in time to come, and research by the National Institutes of Health that are cut by the budget. There is nothing more important that can be in the budget than moneys for the National Institutes of Health, yet they are being cut. Cancer, Alzheimer's, AIDS, stroke, diabetes, all are going to come at us and our relatives.

Some will say, and I said this one time before, and Mr. Kingston on the other side said: Well, our children and our grandchildren will have to pay for it. Who do you think is going to get the cures and the treatments? Our children and our grandchildren and generations to come.

And they cut research. They cut opportunities for America. You talk about taxes and the debt, the Republican plan gives billionaires the biggest cuts in history, over $50 billion with estate tax elimination for people like the Koch brothers and the Waltons and all those folks, and that money will never come back.

The alternative minimum tax is eliminated. That is the only thing that made clear that President Trump paid any taxes in the only tax return we know about. If it weren't for that, he wouldn't have paid anything. We are talking multimillion- and billion-dollar tax cuts for the richest that create deficits in the future, but that is okay when it is giving money to those who already have it.

Franklin Roosevelt was right. You judge a society not by what it does for those who have an abundance, but you judge it by what it does for those who have the least.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I do want to say to my good friend and colleague from Tennessee that I think the D stands for debt for Democrats, and I think the R stands for Republicans and recovery.

Mr. Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. WOMACK), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee and the Appropriations Committee.

Mr. WOMACK. Mr. Chair, I thank the distinguished chairwoman of the Budget Committee for her outstanding work.

My friend from Tennessee talks about driving forward. I think we need to pump the brakes. You are driving right off a cliff with this budget.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition. It is my strong belief that our Nation has a debt crisis on its hand, and I am astonished by how many people on the other side of the aisle, Mr. Chairman, just refuse to acknowledge the problem. It is as if the problem doesn't exist.

Under their plan, taxes are going to be raised nearly $3 trillion. We are going to continue to raise spending to the tune of over $6 trillion. We will have a meager $2.6 billion in deficit reduction, by the way, compared to our budget that does well over $6 trillion in deficit reduction.

Our Nation is $20 trillion in debt, and it is a complete absurdity to think that we could begin to relinquish this process if we enacted such a burdensome budgetary proposal that is being offered by our friends on the other side of the aisle.

This budget would also diminish our national security apparatus. It would end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. Let's go ahead and telegraph that we are going to end the global war on terrorism fund by 2019. The only people who I know who would support that would be our adversaries.

It seeks to promote the collapsing Affordable Care Act by keeping those burdensome mandates in place. This resolution before us right now refuses to do anything about the runaway entitlement programs that are the primary drivers of the deficit and debt in the country.

Mr. Chairman, their budget just will never balance. Never.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. SIMPSON). The time of the gentleman has expired.

□ 1030

Mrs. BLACK. I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. WOMACK. It will give no reconciliation instruction so that we can finally get control and protect for long-term sustainability the social safety net program that many depend on.

The bottom line is, you either acknowledge we have a deficit and a debt crisis, or you do not. And if you believe as I do, you will refuse this budget, and you will support ours.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. NOLAN), a distinguished member of the Agriculture Committee.

Mr. NOLAN. Mr. Chairman, members of the Committee, I rise in support of the Democratic budget alternative and in opposition to the Republican budget that has been proposed.

It has been often said that gracious living and good politics is all about gratitude. Paying something forward is how you show your gratitude.

Quite frankly, the simple truth about this Republican budget is that it rolls back a century of progress. It sets the stage for the dismantling of Social Security, which lifted more people out of poverty than anything, and for Speaker RYAN's plan to turn it over to Wall Street.

It sets the stage for turning Medicare over to the insurance industry—Medicare that provided our elderly with insurance and life opportunities that heretofore had not existed.

This century of progress that this budget rolls back includes clean air and water. It includes healthy, safe working places and conditions. It includes an opportunity society that invests in our people.

And guess what? In a little over a century, we doubled life expectancies. Wow, what a marvelous accomplishment.

We created the best and biggest middle class in the history of the world. We became a model for the world; jobs with living wages and healthcare benefits and pension benefits.

This Republican budget proposes to roll back that entire century of progress. It is nothing about paying it forward. It is nothing about paying things back. It is about rolling back a century of progress, and we can not let that happen.

That is what the Democratic budget is really all about, investing in people, investing in infrastructure, investing in America, and investing in people's jobs and living wages, and in their benefits. That is how you show your gratitude, and we have got a lot to be grateful for.

Let's vote and enact this Democratic budget proposal which invests in America, which invests in people, which invests in opportunities. That is what this debate is really all about.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Mr. Chairman, I saw recently, and I remember Ronald Reagan said something when he finally got his tax reform package done back in 1986—why it took so long and why it was so difficult. And at the end the day, he said: You know, the lawmakers and the policymakers forgot one important factor in their calculations that brought us to this point; they forgot to include what the American people have to say about this.

That is what is happening here today, Mr. Chairman. The American people have told us they want economic growth. They want opportunities for their kids and their families, a better quality of life. They want Washington to live within its means and stop taking more and more and more from them out of their paychecks.

So let's do a little bit of comparison. Let's look at, my colleagues, the Democrat budget. It raises taxes by $2.7 trillion, compared to the CBO January baseline. That is almost $3.8 trillion more than revenue levels in our House Republican budget. It increases spending by $6.2 trillion, compared to the Republican budget over that 10-year period. It increases the debt held by the public by $3.9 trillion, almost $4 trillion relative to the House Republican budget.

And what is important, Mr. Chair, it never balances. There is not even an attempt to balance; not to mention that there are no reconciliation instructions that would give us an opportunity to deal with healthcare and other economic growth reforms.

Mr. Chairman, this is not a responsible budget that is being offered by our colleagues on the other side. I urge my colleagues to oppose it and to support the House Republican budget later today.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I yield 3 minutes to the gentlewoman from Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE), a distinguished member of the Budget Committee.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank the gentleman from Kentucky for his astute analysis on what the American people really want. I thank the manager, the chairwoman of this bill, and I acknowledge the position that they take.

But what America really wants is for Washington, for America, for the government, to stand by them in their time of need.

I am very grateful to be part of a party that is not about politics but is about values. We are the better choice party. We offer a better deal on this project that we have worked so hard on called the American budget.

The American budget, in contrast to our friends on the other side of the aisle, recognizes, as I visited the National Institutes for Health, that 80 percent of their budget that we are going to lose goes for research and researchers—looking those researchers in the eyes when they explain the research in medical science to help save lives, and to know that the Republican budget cuts the NIH, the Centers for Disease Control, and takes up the TrumpCare that cuts trillions in Medicaid and $500 billion in Medicare. That is the story of this bill.

Then, as my good friend from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN) indicated, we invest in infrastructure, and we help this young man, not only with his healthcare but with education. Do we realize how many jobs go unable to find individuals in this country? Hundreds of thousands because of the lack of training.

So if my friends want growth, you know how you get growth? You invest in the American people. Or you tell the American people when tragedies strike, whether it is the Virgin Islands, or Puerto Rico, or Florida, or Texas, or tragically, in Nevada, that you will stand by them. You provide them with the infrastructure to be able to overcome.

Not the Republican budget, because the Republican budget is giving trillions in tax cuts, and the distribution of those moneys will not see the front door of low-income, moderate-income, middle class working Americans.

That is the distinction between the Democratic budget. It increases opportunity through a higher minimum wage. It believes in equal pay for equal work. It knows that immigration reform will bring in billions of dollars. It will create opportunities for work.

Then, of course, we know that the Democratic budget strengthens our healthcare, and it provides that her Social Security, her Medicare, will not be in jeopardy. The Medicare trust fund will not lose with a Republican budget and the trillions of dollars of tax cuts, her life, as she continues to seek some balance of good life will be lost.

We are the right direction. We are for the American people. We are standing by the American people with the Democratic budget. I ask my colleagues to vote for the Democratic alternative.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentlewoman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX), the chairman of the Education and the Workforce Committee.

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Chairman, I want to thank my colleague from Tennessee, the chair of the Budget Committee, for the wonderful work she has done on bringing us to this position.

Mr. Chairman, I rise in opposition to this substitute amendment.

As chair of the Education and the Workforce Committee, my priority this Congress is to ensure that our policies promote a climate of job creation through economic growth, a sound fiscal policy, and a global economic competitiveness.

Our budget helps achieve all of these priorities by laying the foundation for a robust and comprehensive simplification of our burdensome Tax Code. The Democrat substitute not only fails to do so but would decimate America's workforce.

Our budget reforms our broken Tax Code so that it works for every American at every income level, regardless of where they live or how much money they earn.

The top U.S. tax rate for individuals has been as high as 90 percent and as low as 28 percent. At the same time, income tax revenue has remained fairly steady, despite these sharp rate swings. It turns out that the biggest driver of Federal revenue is not higher tax rates but economic growth.

In fact, a sizeable majority of economists point out that a broad base and low rates are key in a tax system that fosters economic growth and competitiveness. Legislators on both sides of the aisle agree on this basic principle, and history has shown it to be true.

Instead of raising taxes, we should, instead, embrace the policies contained in this budget resolution that encourages economic growth, like reducing regulatory burdens, welfare reform, and comprehensive tax reform for all individuals, not just a select few.

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. SANFORD), a member of our Budget Committee.

Mr. SANFORD. Mr. Chairman, I rise, as well, in opposition to the substitute amendment, and I do so because I am struck by the ways in which you can, at times, agree on the diagnosis but disagree on the cure.

I think we would all agree, Republicans and Democrats alike, that we have a real problem in the way that wages have indeed stagnated over the last 30 years. A lot of my Democratic colleagues are nailing it in terms of that diagnosis.

The question though, is the cure. And the question there is: Can we fix that problem by raising taxes by $2.7 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing spending by $6.2 trillion? Can we fix that problem by increasing the debt by $3.9 trillion and, in essence, having a budget that never balances?

I would argue, no, and I would say, instead, what we have to look at is the basics, which we have been dancing around, which is the mathematic formula that says: Savings drives investment, which drives productivity gain which, ultimately, impacts standard of living or wages. And what we don't focus on enough is this notion of the investment part of investment; if you want to increase productivity, you have got to increase investment.

In fairness to my Democratic colleagues, part of that is public investment, but another part is private.

What my colleague from Virginia was just getting at a moment ago was, for 50 years, regardless of tax rate, 90 or 28 percent, the take to government has been about 18 percent of GDP very consistently.

So what I would argue is we, indeed, need more public investment, but we also need private investment to go with it. And if we don't watch out, what is being contemplated with this Democratic substitute is a process that will ultimately crowd out that much more in the way of private investment so key to increasing productivity.

The Acting CHAIR. The gentleman from Kentucky has 3½ minutes remaining. The gentlewoman from Tennessee has 1¼ minutes remaining.

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

Mr. Chairman, in closing, it is clear that we have a very different budget and a very different understanding of the challenges facing our country. We see that so many Americans are working harder and longer and can't remember the last time they got a raise.

We know families are worried about how to pay for college, or if their parents' retirement is secure, or if they will ever be able to afford to stop working. And we know that trillions of dollars in tax cuts for millionaires and large corporations will turn these fears of hardworking Americans families into reality.

□ 1045

Just a few minutes ago, my Republican colleague from Ohio talked about what the American people want. On many of those things, we agree. But I know one thing the American people don't want. They don't want massive tax cuts for the top 1 percent of Americans.

The Democratic budget rejects tax cuts for the wealthy. We invest in programs that will grow our economy, create good-paying jobs, provide real support for working families and real security in retirement. We make education and childcare more affordable, and we support policies to help every American get the healthcare that they need.

Those are the priorities of our budget, and they are the priorities of the American people.

I, therefore, urge my colleagues to support the Democratic alternative, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Chair, I look into my children's and grandchildren's eyes, and I say: I want you to know that right now you owe $63,000 for your part of the debt of this country.

What we are doing in Congress right now, if we were to vote on and accept this amendment, we would be increasing that burden on our children and grandchildren.

I, for one, cannot do that, and I think that we have got to be responsible. We have got to look at how we in this country can get back to the place, as has already been said, that we ask families and businesses to do, and that is to live within their means.

Mr. Chair, I urge a ''no'' vote on this amendment, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. The question is on the amendment in the nature of a substitute offered by the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. YARMUTH. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 156, noes 268, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 556]

AYES—156

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Correa
Courtney
Crowley
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Frankel (FL)
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Roybal-Allard
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—268

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bera
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Cooper
Costa
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Delaney
Denham
Dent
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jones
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
O'Halleran
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schneider
Schrader
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozzi
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine
DeSantis
Doyle, Michael F.
Kihuen
Murphy (PA)
Napolitano
Rosen
Titus
Walz

□ 1111

Ms. SINEMA, Messrs. GAETZ, MARSHALL, MAST, BANKS of Indiana, and FRANKS of Arizona changed their vote from ''aye'' to ''no.''

Mses. VELÁZQUEZ, WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Messrs. KEATING, and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from ''no'' to ''aye.''

So the amendment in the nature of a substitute was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mrs. WALORSKI). Pursuant to the rule, it is now in order to consider a final period of general debate, which shall not exceed 10 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on the Budget.

The gentlewoman from Tennessee (Mrs. BLACK) and the gentleman from Kentucky (Mr. YARMUTH) each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Tennessee.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. PALMER), who is a member of the Budget Committee.

Mr. PALMER. Madam Chairman, I appreciate the hard work the Budget Committee has put forth to produce a budget that prioritizes our national defense and sets forth bold policy reforms that will get this country back on track to fiscal responsibility.

Specifically, I am pleased to see that this budget commits to reducing the substantial amount of improper payments throughout the Federal Government. The Government Accountability Office estimates that there were $144 billion—I want to emphasize $144 billion—in improper payments in 2016 alone, and that is not even a complete estimate. In fact, 18 Federal programs did not report their improper payments, so the total is undoubtedly higher.

To make matters worse, since 2013, the amount we have been incorrectly sending out has been trending upwards. Instead of reducing our fraudulent payments, the rate at which we pay them out has been increasing. Since 2003, there has been a total of $1.2 trillion in improper payments. Let me repeat, that is $1.2 trillion plus interest.

□ 1115

Because we have been running deficits over that timeframe, we have literally had to borrow that money to send it to fraudsters and others who would not have received it. This is unacceptable.

As you can see from this chart, this represents improper payments for 2016 alone. It is money borrowed that we pay interest on to send to people who are not supposed to get it. We are borrowing money and adding to our debt through improper payments.

This budget, for the first time, sets forth a bold strategy for cutting these payments in half over the budget window, saving us $700 billion over our 10-year window.

While I hope, in the near future, we can zero these payments out, I am thrilled to see that we are beginning to tackle a problem that is putting an additional strain on this country's fiscal problems.

Madam Chair, I urge my colleagues to vote ''yes'' on this budget.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chairwoman, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Madam Chairwoman, I suppose I should be saying thank you. I will get a huge tax cut under the Republican tax cut plan, as well the majority of those people sitting here—the majority of our colleagues in Congress—who are, like me, fortunate enough to be millionaires already.

Forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you, because I was elected not just to represent millionaires, but to represent aspiring millionaires, working families, seniors, and veterans. For all of them, for anyone who isn't already a millionaire, this budget is a slap in the face.

With all of the problems facing our country right now, all the people struggling to get ahead, it is unfathomable to me that this Congress could look at people like me and say: Hey, that guy, let's give him more money. In fact, let's give all millionaires hundreds of thousands of dollars in tax cuts.

Really, I am small potatoes. President Trump, according to his financial disclosure, will get hundreds of millions of dollars in tax cuts.

Where is all that money coming from? If you are listening to this and you are not a millionaire, probably from you.

To pay for our own tax cuts and the tax cuts for wealthy donors, Republicans are going to increase taxes on 45 percent of American families with children. That is just the start. Seniors, people with disabilities, and low-income families will see their healthcare cut.

Poor seniors will lose benefits that help them keep food on the table and their homes heated in the winter. Veteran benefits, meals for hungry schoolchildren, programs that make education affordable and job training available, investments that generate economic growth and create good-paying jobs are all at risk in this budget.

They are also cutting corporate tax rates, which we will be paying for by plunging our Nation into deeper and deeper debt, giving multinational giants another advantage over small- and mid-size businesses in the name of perpetuating the myth of supply-side economics.

Supply-side failed. They renamed it trickle-down, but nothing trickled down. Now it is job creators. When that fails, maybe they will call it ''I get mine now; you get yours later—maybe.'' But whatever they name it, it is a sham. This plan is a hoax on the American people, and it will make most people's lives more difficult.

So forgive me if I am in no mood to say thank you for the extra money in my pocket. With millions of Americans struggling and scraping to get ahead, and with my tax cut increasing their challenges, I cannot begin to justify my extra money, and, quite frankly, I cannot fathom how my Republican colleagues are able to justify theirs.

With this budget, Republicans aren't just passing the buck, they are pocketing it. Madam Chair, I strongly urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the Republican budget.

Madam Chair, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), the distinguished minority leader.

Ms. PELOSI. Madam Chair, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I thank him for his great leadership as the ranking member on the Budget Committee in the House, and I thank all of the members of the Budget Committee for their great work to make the budget that was proposed earlier, the Yarmuth budget, a statement of our values. That is exactly what a budget should be.

A Federal budget should be a statement of our national values, and what is important to us as a country should be reflected in the priorities that we place into that budget. The budget before us, proposed by the Republicans, is just the opposite of that. It is accompanied by a tax proposal that they put in, one of the biggest transfers of wealth to the wealthiest people in our country in our country's history. Every time they do it, they make it worse.

I let you be the judge: Is a statement of our national values to cut a trillion dollars from Medicaid, cap and take Medicaid down a bad path, in order to give tax cuts to the richest people in our country?

Is it a statement of our values to take a half trillion dollars out of Medicare to give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in our country?

Our distinguished ranking member has listed some of the things that would be cut if we went down this unfortunate path posed by our colleagues on the other side.

This is a budget that steals from the middle class. It steals hundreds of billions of dollars from critical job-creating, wage-increasing investments, infrastructure, job training, and clean energy. It harms veterans, it cuts education, it abandons rural America, and it guts education.

This is really a mystery to me. When you cut education, with the stiff competition we have, this is one of the worst budget decisions that you have made. Nothing brings more money to the Treasury than investing in education: early childhood, K–12, higher education, postgraduate, and lifetime learning for our workers.

That is how you grow the economy. That is how you bring money to the Treasury, and not by cutting it in order to give tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country.

Is it a statement of values to cut education so that you have a tax cut that benefits 80 percent?

I know you don't want the public to hear this, and I can understand why. How could it be a statement of the values of the American people to cut the education of our children in order to have a tax cut where 80 percent of it benefits the top 1 percent of people in our country? It is just not right.

As they do that, the deficit hawks, who seem to be an endangered species on the Republican side of the aisle these days, are adding close to $2.4 trillion to the deficit, not counting debt service or interest on that national debt. Then they say: Oh, that is okay; we need to increase the national debt by trillions of dollars so that we can give tax cuts.

Where do the tax cuts go? $2.6 trillion goes to corporate America.

Guess what happens to the middle class. There are $470 billion in tax increases to the middle class, about a half trillion dollars in increases to the middle class, $2.5 trillion in tax cuts for corporate America. Again, it is adding so much to the deficit.

Now they say: Oh, trickle-down economics is going to pay its own way. We will get that money back.

Not so. It never happens. Nonsense. But don't take it from me. No less a figure than Bruce Bartlett, who worked for Congressman Jack Kemp, a real supporter of supply-side economics—and, as was said, supply-side turn into trickle-down, et cetera. As a proponent of supply-side economics, he said: We never said it would pay for itself. We just advocate it as an economic approach.

But anyone who says, and this is from him, that the whole supply-side dynamic scoring pays for itself—part of this argument—is all nonsense. It is not true. He went on to say that it was bull—you finish the sentence.

So, here we are at a place where we can increase the deficit, decrease job creation, hurt the middle class, benefit the top 1 percent, and add to the national debt in historic proportions that will be very hard to collect from deficit hawks—if any of you exist over there.

Instead, we have an opportunity today for a better deal for the American people—better jobs, better pay, better wages, and a better future—where we lower costs for America's working families and middle class families, and where we prepare them with the tools for the economy of the 21st century.

I thank the distinguished gentleman from Kentucky, the chair of the Bourbon Caucus, for his great leadership in bringing a better budget that is a statement of our national values, that supports American workers with responsible tax reform, calls for parity between defense and nondefense, and strengthens the ACA and protects Medicare.

Every time the Republicans come to the floor and try to stack the deck even further for their wealthy friends, we have to have this conversation. Democrats will fight these tax cuts and this unfortunate, deceptive budget that they have on the floor. I urge my colleagues to start by voting ''no'' today and to continue the conversation with the American people to fight this unfortunate path they want to take us down: the road to ruin.

I urge a ''no'' vote.

Mr. YARMUTH. Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. BLACK. Madam Chairman, I am going to be brief in my closing comments.

I do want to ask my colleague to consider this: Are we proud of a country where we are leaving our children and grandchildren in further and further debt?

During our discussion in this Chamber, we have shared our ideas for building a better America, an America that we would be proud to entrust to future generations. While it requires confronting real challenges along the road ahead, it is, undoubtedly, worth the journey.

First, our budget forces the Federal Government to live within its means, just like hardworking Americans and small businesses do on a daily basis.

Second, our budget identifies wasteful spending and finds much-needed savings and reforms for unsustainable mandatory spending. In fact, our committee has put forward the largest reform package for mandatory programs that has been seen in 20 years.

Third, it calls for a robust funding of our military, ensuring the resources that will allow us to be ready and protect our mainland. It also starts the process of restoring our military readiness, which suffered dramatically during the Obama administration.

Finally, our budget is the golden key that unlocks progrowth tax reform and takes us one step further to the great ideas unveiled in the framework last week.

Without question, our budget plan reflects American values and shared priorities. I urge my colleagues to join me in their support for a win for all Americans, because doing so will begin to ensure a brighter and better future for generations to come, and I urge a ''yes'' vote.

Madam Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

The Acting CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to House Resolution 553, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. NEWHOUSE) having assumed the chair, Mrs. WALORSKI, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the concurrent resolution (H. Con. Res. 71) establishing the congressional budget for the United States Government for fiscal year 2018 and setting forth the appropriate budgetary levels for fiscal years 2019 through 2027, and, pursuant to House Resolution 553, she reported the concurrent resolution back to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is adoption of the concurrent resolution.

Under clause 10 of rule XX, the yeas and nays are ordered.

Members will record their votes by electronic device.

Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on adoption of the concurrent resolution will be followed by a 5-minute vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 219, nays 206, not voting 9, as follows:

[Roll No. 557]

YEAS—219

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Cramer
Crawford
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jenkins (KS)
Jenkins (WV)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lewis (MN)
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McMorris Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Noem
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Renacci
Rice (SC)
Roby
Roe (TN)
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Royce (CA)
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (WI)
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NAYS—206

Adams
Aguilar
Amash
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buck
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Comstock
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Dent
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espaillat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Fitzpatrick
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Katko
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
King (NY)
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCollum
McEachin
McGovern
McKinley
McNerney
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascrell
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Ros-Lehtinen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (NJ)
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—9

Bridenstine	Kihuen	Titus
DeSantis	Murphy (PA)	Walz
Doyle, Michael F.	Napolitano	
	Rosen	

□ 1148

Mr. HOYER changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

So the concurrent resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NAPOLITANO. Mr. Speaker, I was absent during roll call votes No. 556 through 557 due to my spouse's health situation in California. Had I been present, I would have voted aye on the Yarmuth of Kentucky Substitute Amendment No. 4, and no on final passage of the Budget Resolution.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the question on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

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

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. HOYER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCARTHY) for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

(Mr. MCCARTHY asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, on Monday, no votes are expected in the House on account of Columbus Day. On Tuesday, the House will meet at noon for morning hour and 2 p.m. for legislative business. Votes will be postponed until 6:30 p.m. On Wednesday and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning hour and noon for legislative business. On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business. Last votes of the week are expected no later than 3 p.m.

Mr. Speaker, the House will consider a number of suspensions next week, a complete list of which will be announced by close of business tomorrow.

In addition, the House will consider S. 585, the Dr. Chris Kirkpatrick Whistleblower Protection Act, sponsored by Senator RON JOHNSON. Dr. Kirkpatrick was a psychologist who was fired from the VA medical center where he worked after raising concerns about patients' medications. He committed suicide the day he was fired.

This bill will enhance whistleblower protections while ensuring supervisors who retaliate against whistleblowers are punished. I look forward to the House passing this bill and continuing our work to fundamentally change the culture of the VA.

Mr. Speaker, I also expect the House to make a motion to go to conference on the National Defense Authorization Act.

Finally, Mr. Speaker, I expect the House to consider an additional supplemental package to assist the ongoing recovery efforts following Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

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

I would ask him, Mr. Speaker, will the supplemental that the gentleman mentioned—which is, as I understand, approximately $29 billion, which will take care of forest fires in the West; $16 billion, as I understand it, in debt relief, which will raise the borrowing level for FEMA; and then, of course, money directly for the victims of the hurricanes. Can the gentleman tell me whether or not there will be any, what I will call, extraneous matters that might be controversial, or will this be a straight supplemental without controversy? We all want to make sure that we have the resources to help.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

The gentleman is correct. The White House has sent up a supplemental, and I do not believe this will be the last of the supplementals, based on the damage that has been done from the numerous hurricanes. But, yes, there will be more money for the Disaster Relief Fund to help throughout Texas, Florida, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

As you know, too, the West had devastating forest fires, so there is roughly $577 million there. And the National Flood Insurance Program has hit a ceiling. To deal with all of the flooding that has gone on, we have to deal with that, as well.

The Appropriations Committee has just received that last night. They are working through it now. I don't intend on seeing other things with it. I look forward to the Member working with me on that to make sure we get it right from what the President has asked.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his thought that there will not be anything in there that would make it a partisan bill. I think, as the President sent it down, it is, obviously, something that we need to do quickly and in a bipartisan way.

Mr. Speaker, the majority leader and I have talked about the Dream Act. Another week has gone by and, therefore, the 6-month deadline is closer, and the President has urged us to pass legislation.

Can the gentleman tell me what the expectations are to address the Dream Act?

As you know, MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM, the chair of the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, has filed a discharge petition on the bill sponsored by LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD and ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN. Can the gentleman tell me what progress we are making on that?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Yes, we are dealing with the DACA situation and the situation along the border.

As you know, the Speaker has put together a task force. They have met numerous times. I have had dinner with the President just this week dealing with this issue, and you and I have talked, as well.

I think the best way to solve this problem, to make sure we get to the root cause, we have to secure the border, we have to deal with DACA, and, more importantly, I think we do it in a manner where we are all working together.

I am, as you know, not a fan of a discharge petition. I think the best way to handle this is continuing to work through the matter with the committees—and on your side of the aisle, as well—to solve this problem. The President gave us 6 months. I would like to get this done before then.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answer.

Let me, if I might, Mr. Speaker, simply suggest to the gentleman, we certainly understand, and this side agrees, we want to have secure borders. There is, obviously, a disagreement on the President's proposal of a wall, I think, frankly, on your side as well as on my side of the aisle. I would hope that we would not, in effect, hold hostage the 800,000 students, workers, and young people brought here as children who know no other country.

In my discussions with Mr. RYAN, and his public comments have indicated, he is sympathetic to making sure that we address that issue. He urged, as you know, President Trump not to rescind DACA. The President did anyway.

I am hopeful that we can deal with the DREAMers, which I think certainly has very robust support on both sides of the aisle, in my view, Mr. Leader. I hope we can deal with that without clouding it with an issue, i.e., the wall. Not security; security I think we can reach agreement on. But I am hopeful that we can do that.

The DREAMers are extraordinarily anxious. I presume you have met with some of the DREAMers. They are really very impressive people and are enhancing our communities and our country.

So I would hope that we could do that. I look forward to talking to you personally about how we move forward and, hopefully, move quickly. I would like to have done it by next week.

As you know, I said that it would be nice to do it in this work period, to lay to rest the anxiety of the 800,000-plus people who will be affected. But, if we can't do that, certainly I would hope that we could do it shortly after we get back after the next district work period.