

Let me give you a little history.

As Congressman BUCK pointed out, back in 1986, which was an eternity ago when you start talking about the digital age, Congress passed legislation to protect the emails that people had on their server for 6 months. The idea was that people wouldn't keep their emails. They would delete them, and 6 months was a good enough time to protect those emails from the spies in our government—I will use that phrase, that is my phrase—and that is the current law. But here is what has happened over that 30 years.

Many Americans stored their emails after that 6-month period. They store them in the cloud, for example. Americans store their schedules in the cloud. They store photographs in the cloud.

When Americans store those items that are over 6 months old in the cloud, they are not protected against the search by our government of that email, of those photographs, of that schedule. In fact, searches can take place without the knowledge of the person whose email is being searched, without the approval of that individual, and the government never notifies that individual that that email stored in the cloud was searched because, under current law, the American citizen is only protected for emails stored on their server up to 6 months.

So after about 4 years of working on this legislation with my friend ZOE LOFGREN from California, bipartisan, we presented to Congress H.R. 387, the Email Privacy Act. As Congressman BUCK said, on February 7, to be exact, of this year, that passed by voice vote on this floor, and we sent it down the hallway to the siesta Senate to take a vote over there, and they have yet to vote on it.

So what does that legislation do? It protects the right of privacy of Americans. It requires government to follow the Constitution.

I was a former criminal court judge in Texas for 22 years. Like Mr. BUCK, I was also a prosecutor in the DA's office in Houston.

The Fourth Amendment of the Constitution—remembering that this is unique to America—protects Americans, their persons, their houses, their papers, and their personal effects from the intrusion of government unless government has probable cause and government gets a search warrant. That is the law. That is the Fourth Amendment.

If government has a probable cause, go get a warrant from a judge. I signed hundreds of warrants from law enforcement as a judge.

A simple example: the government can't search our mail, snail mail as it is now called. When you put a letter in the mailbox and the postmaster picks it up and sends it across the fruited plain and it lands in somebody else's mailbox, government cannot generally go into that letter and seize it for any purpose unless they have a warrant to do so.

There are some exceptions, but government can seize your emails after 6 months if they are stored in the cloud, as I already mentioned, without a warrant. So this legislation basically requires government to follow the Constitution.

We have heard about the widespread abuse—that is my opinion—of the NSA over the last several years, the government agencies that felt like they had a blank check to search and seize Americans' information without their knowledge, without their approval, and without a warrant. This legislation goes to prevent that and simply requires that information stored in the cloud—emails, photographs, schedules, or whatever—the government can go get it, but the government has got to get a search warrant to seize that information.

That is what this legislation does. It protects the Fourth Amendment. It protects Americans. It is simple legislation. It passed the House on voice vote, yet the Senate refuses to protect Americans from unlawful searches without the knowledge of Americans. We need to pass the legislation that ZOE LOFGREN and I have sponsored that has passed the House to protect that basic right.

Mr. Speaker, I think our Senators would all vote "yes" for the legislation. They believe in the Constitution like the rest of us. They believe in the Fourth Amendment like the rest of us.

So let's get a vote. Another piece of legislation the House has passed. We have done our job. We want the Senate to follow up and pass this good legislation to make it the law of the land so Americans are more secure in their papers and their effects and their homes.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1915

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his hard work and persistence on this very important issue.

Mr. Speaker, this year, the House completed all 12 appropriations bills. It is the first time in decades that that has happened. I am proud that our Chamber worked hard to return to a regular appropriations process, and I can tell you that there were many late nights spent looking through amendment after amendment both in the Rules Committee hearing room and on the House floor. We thoughtfully considered these bills and offered them for votes on the House floor.

But the Senate hasn't approved any of these 12 bills. Not one. Republicans, month by month, crisis to crisis, were appropriating of the Obama administration era. But now Republicans are in charge, and without Senate action, we are staring down the barrel of another omnibus or continuing resolution. This isn't fair to the American public.

The Founders gave to Congress the power of the purse so that 435 men and women in this Chamber and 100 men and women in the Senate Chamber can

spend weeks at a time thoughtfully discerning how to spend taxpayer dollars. That is our job. The House has finished its work for this year, and now we beg the Senate to finish theirs.

The House has done good work. We have listened to our constituents, worked with our stakeholders, and met each other in the middle on many bills. Now we are left just talking about these great bills because they are all stuck in the Senate.

I want to take a minute in closing to remind the Senate why we are here and why the voters offered the Republican Party control of both Chambers and the House.

We are here because Americans want fewer regulations. We are here because Americans want lower healthcare premiums and costs. We are here because Americans want a stronger stance against the world's bullies. We are here because Americans want a respect for the rule of law. We are here because Americans want our veterans to have the best care. We are here because Americans want better access to credit. They want to protect unborn life. We are here because Americans expect us to improve their lives, to work on meaningful legislation that limits government, that stewards taxpayer dollars effectively, and that guards family values.

Americans should know that the House of Representatives has heard them. We have passed bills to address these concerns. Now we turn to the Senate and ask them to do the same.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). All Members are reminded to avoid engaging in personalities toward Members of the Senate.

TAX REFORM

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here this evening on the floor of the United States House of Representatives and talk about a timely issue that is an issue that is most important to most of the American people, and that is the issue of the economy, globalization, automation, and all of the issues that are coming down on many communities across the United States.

I want to take this opportunity to spend the next 30 minutes walking through for the American people a little bit about what has happened and talk very clearly about the differences in approach on how we deal with these issues, how the Republican Party is trying to deal with these issues, and how those of us on the Democratic side want to deal with these issues.

I don't want to get into a discussion at all, Mr. Speaker, about who hates whom, and who is bad and who is good,

and who is this and who is that. I want to talk about the facts, I want to talk about the historical facts, and I want to talk about what is happening to average families across these United States.

Clearly, given the volatility of the elections over the past 15 years or so, I would argue that most of those elections have been about the economy, and that most of those elections have been about wages, pensions, security, and stability for families.

My district is from Akron, Ohio, over to Youngstown and points in between, right up against the Pennsylvania border. And what we have seen over the last 20 or 30 years—for a while you think that all of this is just happening to your community, and then you realize as you read and travel, you begin to see that, unfortunately, most communities are facing very similar circumstances as the ones that I represent.

So here on this chart we have an outline of what has happened in communities with regard to foreign trade and automation. The red are the States that have been hardest hit. As it moves from red to brown to purple to blue, and then a lighter blue, red is the most down to the least affected by globalization and automation.

You will see on this chart the industrial Midwest, you will see up in New England, you will see down South, you will see as you move more to the central part of the country and then up into the Northwest, the hardest hit are manufacturing States, and the hardest hit by globalization and automation are the Deep South.

So the big question facing the United States of America today in 2017 is: How do we fix this problem?

These are States that have had significantly lower growth, and they have been hit hard with wages that have been stagnant for close to 30 years. We have seen an erosion of their pensions.

So what are we going to do about this?

The topic today in Washington, D.C., is the issue of tax reform. So we talk about tax reform in the context of the last time we had tax reform, 31 years ago. Mr. Speaker, since then, we have seen that 96 percent of income growth has gone to the wealthiest 10 percent of families in the United States. So in 30 years, 96 percent of income growth in the country—almost all of it—has gone to the top 10 percent. So the average family is getting squeezed.

When you look back at the elections going back to, I think, 2006—I thought 2004—2002 and 2004 were going to be elections about the economy, too, but after 9/11, that had an impact on what the national conversation was about with regard to our elections. But I would argue—and I have been here since 2003. I would argue that, in 2006, that election putting Democrats in was about the economy.

I would say that 2008, during the Presidential election and, again, for

Congress, was about the economy. We had a complete collapse. The American people didn't think the Democrats fixed things fast enough, so in 2010 they put the Republicans in Congress. In 2012 things were getting better, and the election went for President Barack Obama, thinking that he was moving things slightly in the right direction. But they thought he would probably be better than Mitt Romney, who would have let the auto industry collapse and who was perceived as being more in line with the financial institutions in the United States. So they voted for President Obama.

Then in 2014, President Obama wasn't doing things fast enough, still the squeeze, and then obviously in 2016, America voted for President Trump, thinking that he was promising expansion of healthcare, opening up the coal mines and opening up the steel mills. He was going to get the economy back, he was going to do it. It was going to be beautiful, and he was going to do it with the waving of a magic wand. It was going to be easy. So all of those elections were about the economy.

So we still have this squeeze happening in the United States. We still have 63 percent of American families who could not withstand a \$500 catastrophe in their family with their car, with their health insurance, with someone's health in their family, or with an accident. \$500 in an emergency would send 63 percent of the families in the United States spinning out of control.

We see with pensions, for example, that the average person 65 years-plus only has \$60,000 in a 401(k), which means they can drop out \$3,000 a year—not a month, a year—out of their 401(k) for 20 years. Their average Social Security is a little over \$1,000. Their pension isn't much. And all of this averages to about \$25,000 a year. So you are squeezed with your pension. You have had stagnant wages. You don't have much of a savings. And most families can't withstand even a \$500 emergency.

This constant squeeze over the last 30 years from globalization and automation has put many of the communities on the last chart behind the eight ball, unable to get and keep their nose above water for them and their families.

So our job is to figure out what the heck are we going to do about that. So the Republicans today proposed a new program of tax cuts. Here is what their tax cuts look like. Remember, I said 96 percent of income growth over the last 31 years went to the top 10 percent. So the Republican plan—again, we are not mad at them. This is just what they think is going to work.

Their idea is: Why don't we give a tax cut to people making more than \$1 million a year? They will see a good chunk of the tax cut. The next group, people making between \$500,000 and \$1 million a year, will see the next part—the biggest chunk of the tax cut.

So the people who are making all of the income gains over the last 30 years,

that huge concentration of wealth in the last 30 years, the Republicans think if we give them a tax cut, then they are going to take that tax cut, and it is going to trickle down to those red States that I had up here earlier in the industrial Midwest, in the South, moving into the central part of the country, and in the New England States that aren't really surrounded and based on finance. Let's give them a tax cut and hope it makes its way and trickles its way down to Youngstown, Ohio. That is their solution. That is what they think is going to work.

So let's ask ourselves: Have we tried this before?

We have. When I was early in my career, we tried this approach of supply-side economics. We are going to cut taxes for the wealthy. They are going to take that money. It is going to make its way back into the economy, and it is going to get wages up, secure pensions, and all the rest.

So with the Republican plan, they have done things to do that. Not just cut taxes for the wealthy, they get rid of the alternative minimum tax, which means no matter how many loopholes you are able to take advantage of, there is a minimum you are going to have to pay. And if they get rid of that minimum tax, and if that minimum tax wasn't in place a few years back, President Trump would have reduced his tax burden by \$30 million—just so we can wrap our heads around this stuff.

Under the plan that they have now, the top 175,000 richest families in the country will see a \$700 tax cut. That is their plan. We really can't afford it because we have got to borrow \$1½ trillion to pay for all this stuff.

So that is where we are. That is their solution. Huge challenges with the middle class, huge challenges with pensions, huge challenges with wages and retirement and cost of healthcare and education, and their plan is to cut the taxes for the wealthy and hope it helps everyone else. That is their plan.

We have tried this before. When President Bush got in, there were two rounds of tax cuts that he passed in the early part of the first decade of this century. He gave most of the taxes, in the same way, to the top 1 percent of earners. They got a huge chunk of what we called the Bush tax cuts.

□ 1930

That was their strategy back then.

What happened in that decade following the Bush tax cuts?

Well, we see that, after the Bush tax cuts, we had the slowest economic growth in the United States post-World War II, the slowest growth across the board in the United States. They cut taxes for the wealthiest in the hopes that it would somehow help the economy. They also deregulated the financial markets because that was going to help, too.

So what happened was that we had very low growth: employment only increased by 0.3 percent, and the real

GDP only grew by 2.6 percent; wages were stagnant.

As we all remember, in 2007 and 2008, things started to unravel in the economy, and we had a huge collapse in the housing market that was deregulated. We didn't have any cops on the beat watching what was going on.

Stagnant growth ends in the collapse, and then Democrats came in and, quite frankly, fixed the problem, stemmed the tide, and did what we did. That is a whole other story.

The whole idea that cutting taxes for the wealthy is really going to bump employment and really bump GDP growth is shown in recent economic history to not be true.

Now, what do we have to compare this with?

If we go back another decade to 1993, when President Bill Clinton got into office, he had a different strategy and the Democrats had a different strategy. We started to run up the deficits coming out of the eighties. We had to get our financial house in order.

President Clinton came in and raised some taxes on the wealthiest people in the country, not because we don't like them, but the country needed revenue. We reinvested that money, balanced the budget, and what happened? A totally different strategy than our friends on the other side—right?—totally different. What we saw in the 1990s was employment at 2.4 percent, and we saw real GDP growth at 3.7 percent.

The red is the Bush tax cut that we have already tried in the historical analysis of that, ending in a financial collapse and stagnant wages. What we saw with President Clinton's economic plan is real growth, and we saw an improvement in employment. Wages went up in every single bracket, from the poorest to the wealthiest. Everybody made more money. We had a balanced plan on how to do it.

When we look at what happened with the Bill Clinton plan—oh, by the way, it ended the decade with a \$5.6 trillion surplus. That is a \$5.6 trillion surplus that we had here in the United States that, when President Bush got in, he gave it all away in tax cuts. I just told you that story.

What the Democrats are saying is kind of what President Trump was saying during the campaign. There has been this huge concentration of wealth at the top, and they have seen all the income gain.

We have got debt and deficits to pay for. We have got to rebuild the United States. We have got to lay broadband in every corner of the country. We need a new energy grid. We need a resilient economy to prepare ourselves for the storms and the hurricanes and the ups and downs from climate change. We have got to reinvest back into our neighborhoods. We have thousands of blighted homes in communities all across the United States that need to come down.

What we are saying is: Don't borrow \$1.5 trillion from China and then take

the money that you are borrowing from China, pay interest on it, and give it to primarily the top 1 percent of the wealthiest people in the United States. That doesn't make any sense.

In good times, I don't know if that makes any sense, but certainly not when we are already running huge deficits, not when we have the baby boomers moving into our healthcare programs for the elderly, not when we have an opioid epidemic where we lost more people in 1 year, last year, than we lost in the entire Vietnam war. That doesn't make any sense.

We have got to rebuild the country. We are competing with China. We have to make sure that our military is equipped, our students are educated, and that we are investing in research and development to develop wind and solar, the next generation of renewable energy, the next generation of jobs.

And we are borrowing money from China to the tune of \$1.5 trillion to give to the wealthiest people in the country? Does that make any sense?

Mr. Speaker, it does not.

This is the most irresponsible tax proposal I have seen. I will even say it is more irresponsible than the Bush tax credits. At least with the Bush tax credits, we had a \$5.6 trillion surplus. Many of us were saying to put that into Medicare, put it into Social Security. In the Al Gore campaign, it became a joke: Put it in a lock box; don't touch it; save it for a rainy day.

A few months later, 9/11 happened, and we could have used some of that for the next decade. We could have rebuilt the economy, moved the economy forward, reinvested it back into the United States. At least we had it coming.

The economy was growing and President Bush said: Well, we will give it back in tax cuts primarily to the rich.

Now we don't even have it. Now we are going to go out and borrow it and bring it in from China and say: Okay, China, we will owe you another \$1.5 trillion because we don't owe you enough already. We are not going to give it to the middle class, who has not seen a pay raise for 30 years. We are going to give it to the top end.

I just think this is very irresponsible for us as we are trying to get the economy to work for everybody and we have all of these challenges that we are trying to get our arms around here in the United States that will take some public investment.

I am not here to say that the government can solve all of our problems, because it can't. I am not saying that every solution is about writing a check from Uncle Sam and putting it into a program, because it is not. But what we do have to do is make some investments on the public side that are going to allow for growth.

When you talk about things like broadband penetration to make sure that rural America or small towns or certain parts of our cities have access to high-speed broadband, high-speed

internet access, you will see that, for every 10 percent penetration, you see, I think it is, 1, 1.3, 1.4 percent growth in the GDP. It sounds like a pretty good investment.

So let's figure out how we can do a public-private partnership with the telecommunications companies and the public to make sure that we have high-speed internet access all over the United States. Let's sit down with the power companies, the energy companies, and figure out how we redo our energy grid so that we can have a 21st century, efficient, secure energy grid.

And, oh, by the way, ask all of these people who are underemployed today to help us build out this new America. Whether it is broadband or the energy grid, it is in the ground. These jobs can't be outsourced. The same with renewable energy. Many of the jobs related to renewable energy cannot be outsourced. These are the investments we need to make.

Again, we are competing with China. This, my friends, is a very important point. When you look at what China is doing militarily with North Korea, not helping as much as we want them to, moving out, actually building islands in the South China Sea, further projecting their force, moving into Africa, already in Africa, establishing bases in Africa, building relationships, getting minerals and other resources out of Africa, moving ahead with battery-powered cars in China and here, moving and spending \$360 billion on renewable energy initiatives by 2020, creating 13 million jobs, China is on the move.

What are we doing? What does the Republican Party want to do? What does the Trump administration want to do, Mr. Speaker, while China is investing billions of dollars in renewable energy, creating 13 million new jobs? This genius idea is to go and borrow \$1.5 trillion from them and take it and give it to the wealthiest people in the United States in the form of a tax cut that they don't need.

We are going to further position ourselves behind them in the race for the green economy. This could mean jobs in places like Youngstown, Ohio, investments in places like Youngstown, Ohio, driving up wages in Youngstown, Ohio, increasing and securing pensions in these industrial States and in the South. That, to me, makes sense. That, to me, is a smart plan.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am deeply frustrated with this tax cut. I think it is irresponsible. I don't think it makes economic sense. As we start to peel through it, other than the big picture of \$1.5 trillion that we are going to borrow from the Chinese to pay for it, they are going to get rid of people's ability to deduct student loans. Medical emergencies will no longer be deductible.

They are providing instability in the wind sector with the wind tax credit, which has about \$50 billion in investments. About 50,000 jobs are at stake and 500 factories participating in this new economy.

There is a way to do this. There is a way to be smart. We can't let our ideology determine our public policy if it doesn't make any sense. If we can have a balanced approach, we pay for the spending; and because of the situation we are in, we ask the wealthiest in the United States to help us pay for this because they have seen 96 percent of the income growth over the last 30 years.

If we do it right and we do it smart, we will position the next generation of Americans to be in an economy that they can thrive in, that provides stability for them, security for them and their families, and it will also help us deal with the great challenge of our time: global climate change.

Mr. Speaker, I hope that, as this process moves forward, we recognize that this tax cut bill is not the solution to the economic problems. It has gone against what the President of the United States campaigned on, and I believe it is the very betrayal of his campaign, a betrayal of what that campaign meant to so many people, and a betrayal of those very people whom he said he was going to help.

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

□ 1945

ISSUES OF CONCERN

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

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, our American way of life and our Judeo-Christian values are under attack as never before. People understand that there is the threat out there, but perhaps the magnitude keeps coming home of how bad and what a great threat it really is.

Radical Islamic terrorists with a backward, evil, 7th century view of the world are out to destroy and kill us. They seek to terrorize Western countries and Americans, in particular, into retreat.

Well, instead, we must stand tall. We must have the courage to do what is necessary because it does depend on us, as it always has been. As when Nazism and Japanese militarism threatened the world, it was the United States that carried the day for the decent people of the world.

When communism threatened to establish atheistic dictatorships throughout the world and was on the march, yes, it was the American people who stood strong and had those policies necessary to hold off the communist menace until it collapsed, basically, of its own inconsistencies and its own evil nature.

Well, we had great leadership at those other battles, and I say, thank goodness that today we now have a President who actually can speak the words against and condemn this hor-

rible force that threatens our country and the people of the world.

Yes, we have a President who can actually say those words, "radical Islamic terrorism." For 8 years, we had a President who couldn't use those words, much less do those things that were necessary to defeat this threat and to make sure our people were secure.

Some, if not many, of our leaders have been afraid to confront the basic nature of those who have made repeated terrorist attacks and assaults. Anyone who is not signing on to their fanatical religious agenda becomes a terrorist target, not only Christians, but Jews and other Muslims.

President Trump is, at long last, providing the courageous leadership in this historic battle. Congress needs to support our President. We need to stand with him and to stand united against this evil, and yes, defend ourselves. We must not be afraid, and we must not only defend ourselves but also do what is necessary to defeat and extinguish this ghoulish adversary and end his bloody assault on Western civilization, and yes, on moderate Islam.

Words are not enough. Our homeland is under attack; people are in danger; our families, our country, and our way of life are under attack. These attackers come from many countries, both men and women. But in common—these people who have been murdering people and the mayhem they have been creating throughout the Western world, whether it is in France or in the United States or elsewhere, these men and women who participate in these evil acts of terrorism have something that they have in common. They all pledge allegiance to radical Islam.

That is our enemy, not Islam, not Islam itself, but the radical fanaticism that terrorists and the Islamic psychopaths that are out there murdering in the worst possible and ghoulish ways, people, in order to—yes, in order to have—to shock us and in order to intimidate the West into retreat.

This week, a 29-year-old Uzbek immigrant plowed a truck into people walking and cycling in a New York City pathway. He killed 8 people, and he proclaimed that he was inspired by Islam. In fact, he said he was proud of what he had done and even requested the display of his Islamic state flag in his hospital room.

We need to ask ourselves: Why are we allowing Islamic terrorists like this into our country in the first place? How much longer will we close our eyes and bury our heads in the sand?

We have even witnessed horrendous terrorist attacks even in my home State. We know that. We have seen it. On December 2, 2015, in San Bernardino, 14 innocent and wonderful people were brutally slaughtered and 22 seriously injured by an immigrant from Pakistan—a hotbed of radicalism. And yes, his motive was his fanatic belief in what he considers to be Islam. It

was truly one of the most evil attacks in our State's history.

In Orlando, on June 12, 2016, 49 nightclubbers out having a good time, enjoying themselves as Americans—life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness—they were having a good time, and 49 of these nightclubbers were brutally murdered and mowed down.

All of these innocent lives were slaughtered. Americans who were blown apart at the Boston marathon is no different.

We have American victims staring us in the face saying: What are you going to do to bring justice and to protect the Americans that we left behind, our families? These horrific crimes of cowards mirrors what has happened to innocent people throughout the world.

Yes, we Americans are suffering. And as I say, we have seen it in France, we have seen it in Europe, we have seen it in Muslim countries where these fanatics take Christians out and behead them. But they also, of course, attack moderate Muslims. They are out to try to topple the government of el-Sisi and Egypt and all the other governments there that are not committed to the fanatic view of Islam that they hold.

The most recent attacks in New York should, at least, open our eyes to things that we can do here. Maybe we can't stop it all over the world, but the least we can do is to take steps to protect our own citizens from this type of fanatical threat that hangs over us.

Well, we need to take specific steps that can and should be done to help deal with this danger. I have, in fact, discussed a plan with the President—and this is a few months ago—and we have had a lot of work and a lot of things under the bridge since then, but his commitment to border security includes placing a wall on the Southern border.

Yes, making sure that we have border security, and yes, if it takes a wall on our Southern border, the President is right on target. A wall and beefing up our border will, of course, be expensive. That is why I laid out a plan to the President and have since offered legislation that would pay for President Trump's proposed border wall.

The car attack in New York has alerted many Americans and alerted many Americans to something they didn't know about before, and that is that we have an immigration system, an immigration law that permits 50,000 people to immigrate into our country every year—50,000 people who are chosen by lottery, not by some really looking at them, some examination of their credentials, seeing what they could contribute, no. A lottery.

And, of course, Senator SCHUMER in the Senate, I guess, was the man who actually insisted on this. Well, I am sure he was well-intended, but what we have now are people—instead of bringing in the people who can most contribute to our country, he has insisted we leave 50,000 of them up to a lottery system.