

INDIVIDUAL TAXES WILL NOT GO UP

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

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I want to share with you a letter that was received in the Rules Committee last night.

It is a letter actually addressed to Chairman KEVIN BRADY of the Ways and Means Committee. It is from the Joint Committee on Taxation. It is a long letter. I will not read all of it. Some of it is difficult to understand, but let me pick out the important points.

In each case, the taxpayers' total income tax liability is lower. Here is their concluding paragraph:

In its totality, the combined effect of the tax rate and the income threshold and amendments made by the bill, along with the increase in the standard deduction, would not, in and of themselves, result in an increase in the amount of tax imposed on virtually any filer as a result of these changes.

Translation: no one's taxes go up; not 36 million; not 3,600; not 36. According to the Joint Committee on Taxation, that number is zero, Mr. Speaker.

SAVE HEALTHCARE, REJECT REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, this wretched Republican tax bill threatens the health of millions. That is why Republicans are rushing this sham through in record pace. They want to pass it before most Americans know what has hit them.

It is amazing that, on this Alzheimer's Awareness Month, they celebrate it by imposing a new Alzheimer's tax. Families paying thousands of dollars to care for a loved one would lose the right that they have today to deduct those huge expenses. It is not just a tax on Alzheimer's, but on any substantial healthcare expense.

As if that were not bad enough, they pursue with their fanatical zeal the destruction of ObamaCare. Again, they would remove one of the key pillars that will lead to denying coverage for those with preexisting conditions because their insurance premiums will soar.

It will mean that millions of Americans will lose their healthcare coverage. Protect your health. Reject this sorry Republican tax bill.

BRING DEPORTED VETERANS HOME

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

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to thank all those who have served our great Nation in the Armed

Forces. On Veterans Day, we reflected on the sacrifices these brave men and women have made to keep us safe. Yet few Americans realize that U.S. citizenship is not required for military service, and even fewer know that our Nation has gone as far as deporting veterans.

My colleagues and I in the Congressional Hispanic Caucus visited the Deported Veterans Support House in Tijuana, Mexico, to learn more about this issue. We heard stories about their service, deportation, and separation from family members.

Ivan Ocon was born in Mexico and came to the United States when he was 7 years old. He enlisted in the Army after high school, "to serve the only country he knew to be his home." Ivan deployed to Iraq, Jordan, and Korea and received an honorable discharge. Ultimately, he was deported to Mexico and had to leave his family behind, including his U.S.-born daughter.

Congress can and should pass legislation that brings these deported veterans home.

HONORING THE LIFE OF STEVEN BERGER

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

Mr. KIHUEN. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to remember the life of Steven Berger, a loving son, brother, and father of three. Growing up in Wisconsin, Steven was active in many sports. At 6'6", Steven was a standout basketball player in high school and later played in college.

Steven lived in Minnesota where he worked as a financial adviser and was a loving father to his three children. His friends and family describe him as charismatic, full of energy, and larger than life—the type of man who breathed life into every room.

He was also an avid fisherman and loved talking about stocks and competitive sports.

Steven traveled to the Route 91 Harvest music festival in Las Vegas with friends to celebrate his 44th birthday.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to extend my condolences to Steven Berger's family and friends. Please know that the city of Las Vegas, the State of Nevada, and the whole country grieve with you.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, November 15, 2017.

Hon. PAUL D. RYAN,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of

the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on November 15, 2017, at 11:34 a.m.:

That the Senate passed S. 534.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 1, TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM NOVEMBER 17, 2017, THROUGH NOVEMBER 24, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 619 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 619

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 1) to provide for reconciliation pursuant to title II of the concurrent resolution on the budget for fiscal year 2018. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. In lieu of the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill, an amendment in the nature of a substitute consisting of the text of Rules Committee Print 115-39 shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) four hours of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions. Clause 5(b) of rule XXI shall not apply to the bill or amendments thereto.

SEC. 2. Upon passage of H.R. 1, the amendment to the title of such bill recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from November 17, 2017, through November 27, 2017—

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), my dear friend, pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

□ 1245

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I want to start by saying that I would offer my thanks and collegial admiration and respect to the members of the Rules Committee who, last night, once again, on an expedited basis, spent time devoted to the duty that they have not only to their party, but also to the House of Representatives acting on behalf of the American people.

The gentlewoman, Ms. SLAUGHTER; the gentleman, Mr. HASTINGS; the gentleman, Mr. POLIS; and certainly our friend from Worcester, Massachusetts, the gentleman, Mr. MCGOVERN, conducted themselves not only in the highest of spirit, but they also produced what I believe was a fair argument, a product that they could be proud of. Each of the witnesses that came before us, including Democratic Members of Congress and Republican Members of Congress, provided, I believe, top-notch testimony and information on behalf of their ideas.

I personally want to thank Judge HASTINGS for his time last night, which was late into the night, and today. My admiration and respect for his collegial activity is to be respected and appreciated.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this rule and the underlying legislation. The rule provides for consideration of H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Last November, the November which was 1 year ago, the American people spoke, and they spoke clearly. I believe they stood up and demanded change and action on our economy. They demanded an increase in understanding about America's lack in GDP growth, and they saw all across the country companies that continue to move overseas. They saw movement in our economy where people moved from one State to another seeking better opportunities.

I believe that the American people have spoken. We not only heard that, but we are trying to make decisions now that would not only help every single area of the country by picking those businesses that might be in the city, in the town and location that they want to be, but by infusing them with the opportunity to stay, to stay because they can not only make a go of it, but they can be competitive in the world market.

Lowering tax rates in this country will help the middle class of this country. It will help jobs and job creation. That is why we are here today. We are here today as a Republican Party where we are trying to work with the President of the United States, the

United States Senate, and the House of Representatives to speak clearly about not only what we stand for, but our hopes and dreams for a better opportunity for all Americans tomorrow and in the future.

Mr. Speaker, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act delivers on those promises that I just spoke of. This is a bold, progrowth bill that will overhaul our Tax Code and unleash the free enterprise system not just in my home State of Texas or in my city of Dallas, but, really, everywhere where business wants to be, it can flourish in an unfettered way because we are now going to be competitive. It lowers tax rates on all businesses of all sizes so job creators can focus on not only their product and sales, but they can hire more people, increasing paychecks and growth.

Growth actually is the key to what we are talking about today. Economic growth brings abundant opportunity: opportunity for people not only to have a job, but to have a career, control their own lives and make sure they can live where they want to live and so they can make their community stronger. That is this Republican viewpoint of what we are trying to get at, Mr. Speaker.

With the highest corporate tax rate in the industrialized world, today's broken Tax Code here in America forces many businesses to move their jobs, research, and headquarters overseas seeking opportunities in a world environment of competition where they can survive and they can become more competitive. A corporate tax rate of 20 percent encourages American companies to bring their jobs back to the United States, opening up opportunity. This decrease is fundamental to making the United States more competitive once again.

The number one reason why America is not competitive in the world is no longer because of energy costs; it is no longer because we have the highest priced employees, no, sir. It is because Uncle Sam, State, and local taxes make it noncompetitive, which creates a higher cost as we compete around the globe.

This legislation will modernize the international Tax Code, also bringing back opportunities for American companies that want to bring their profits back home and encourage U.S. businesses to bring foreign earnings home, unleashing what will be, over some period of time, trillions of dollars that can come back home.

It reduces the tax burden on all pass-through businesses regardless of their structure or their sector. This legislation provides tax relief for job creators and creates capital investments, investments that will drive growth, once again, of paychecks and opportunities for growth. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is a direct and immediate boost for middle-income Americans who have been struggling to get by, let alone get ahead.

Mr. Speaker, you will hear today how we are going to have a new tax brack-

et. All Americans until they, as individuals, earn \$12,000 and two working people at home earning \$24,000 worth of income will not pay tax on that. It is intended entirely to help the middle class of this country.

H.R. 1 is about the entrepreneur, the family of four, the small-business owner, and the American people. The United States is already the greatest place in the world to live. We are proud to be Americans. But we have to be competitive in the world marketplace.

Mr. Speaker, 70 percent of the tax benefits in this legislation go directly to the middle class. The American people want and need, I believe, to learn not only more about this bill, but how it will incentivize them to Make America Great Again.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I am very pleased that the gentleman from Texas, my good friend, yielded me the customary 30 minutes for debate.

Once again, my Republican colleagues have decided that the best way to govern is through obfuscation, mathematical gimmicks, and a rushed and closed process, and all in an obvious attempt to hide from the American people the devastating consequences the Republican-led tax scam bill will have on working class and middle class Americans.

Just so we are all crystal clear on this point: Who, under this tax bill, benefits on the backs of working and middle class Americans? Yes, folks, it is the wealthy corporations and the richest among us.

The Republican majority has made lofty claims about their bill, saying that because of this legislation, everyone gets a tax cut, jobs will be plentiful, and that the economy will grow exponentially and astronomically. The White House has even said that the tax cuts would result in each household receiving an additional \$5,000 to \$9,000 in annual income.

Mr. Speaker, it seems there isn't anything that Republican leadership won't say to get their own Members to vote for this bill.

Mr. Speaker, they can make all the claims they want, but the actual tax experts who have analyzed this bill paint a much darker picture about the consequences of this legislation. According to one nonpartisan tax analysis, today's Republican plan will result in a tax increase for 38 million middle class Americans.

Not to worry, though. While these hardworking middle class families have to deal with the tax increase, the richest 0.2 percent of Americans will get a windfall. In fact, the estate provision in this bill alone would allow the heirs of just 11 ultrawealthy individuals to pocket up to \$67.5 billion. An estimated 80 percent of the tax cuts in this legislation will go to wealthy corporations and the richest 1 percent.

Mr. Speaker, even more astonishing, a recent analysis by the nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office indicates that this Republican tax bill could trigger automatic cuts to mandatory spending to the tune of \$136 billion, including \$25 billion in the Medicare cut.

Let that sink in, because actually what is getting ready to happen here is we are going to have a \$1.5 trillion deficit, and these deficit hawks on the other side are then going to turn right back around and say that we need to pay for these things. Then watch out Medicare, Social Security, and Medicaid, because that is the objective, in my view, in the first place.

In order to cut taxes for the ultrawealthy and corporations, my Republican colleagues are not only raising taxes on the middle class, but are now potentially triggering a \$25 billion cut to Medicare.

If this inequity were not staggering enough, Americans also have to keep in mind that today's Republican tax giveaway to corporate America and the ultrawealthy is not only on the backs of the middle class, but also future generations, as this bill will explode our national debt by an estimated \$1.5 trillion over the next 10 years.

Not surprisingly, Republicans are making the tired excuse that these cuts will pay for themselves. If they did, then we would have the easiest jobs in the world. Just cut taxes, and magically we will have even more revenue to pay for the important needs of our country. That sounds a lot like the old trickle-down-which-never-worked economics. It sounds that way to me, and we all know that as far as economic theories go, that one was and is a complete and total dud.

Mr. Speaker, to summarize the majority's attempt to overhaul our Tax Code for the first time in 30 years: they raise taxes on middle class Americans, cut taxes for the wealthiest Americans and corporations, and manage to explode the debt all at the same time—all this while also leading the most closed Congress in history and shutting out Members of Congress who represent nearly half of the American people.

Hear that, America: a lot of your Representatives had no opportunity to say or do anything regarding the measure that we are discussing.

Mr. Speaker, let us step back and really get a full view of how callous this bill is for our Nation by looking at how the bill treats middle class Americans versus its treatment of the ultrawealthy and corporate America.

Under this Republican tax scam bill, a working class schoolteacher who buys supplies for his or her students would not be able to deduct that expense, but a corporation that buys supplies for itself would be able to use such a deduction.

Under this Republican tax bill, a middle class homeowner would see their property tax deduction capped at \$10,000, but a corporation would not face the same cap.

Under this Republican tax bill, if a worker was forced to relocate for his or her job—footnote there, including the military—because the company moved or, in the case of the military, they were relocated, he or she would not be able to deduct that moving expense; but if a corporation decided to relocate, even to relocate overseas, it will be able to deduct its moving expense.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on. But we shouldn't be surprised. As the old adage goes, bad process makes for bad policy.

Not since the Republicans' failed attempt to strip healthcare away from millions of Americans have we seen a process that is this bad.

Take, for example, the last time Congress passed major tax reform legislation in 1986 and what that process looked like. During that effort, the Ways and Means Committee held a month of public hearings and took testimony from over 450 witnesses.

□ 1300

The legislation before us now has had no—zero—public hearings and testimony from no—zero—expert witnesses.

During the last tax reform overhaul, the Ways and Means Committee spent 26 days marking up the framework of the legislation. This time around, Republicans spent only 4 days marking up the legislation.

The 1986 legislation framework was released a year before it was passed in the House. In contrast, the framework for this bill was released less than a month before they started today's process of jamming their final bill through the House. There were no hearings and no amendments made in order. From start to finish, there was less than a month of actual consideration.

Much like the majority's rushed healthcare processes that produced an abysmal, destructive bill that would hurt working class Americans, this rushed process has produced a tax bill that benefits corporations and the wealthiest Americans, all while managing to raise taxes on the middle class and adding \$1.5 trillion to the deficit.

Mr. Speaker, the Republican majority is lurching from one bad bill to the next with speed—not thoughtful policy—seemingly being the only goal. It begs the question: What is the rush?

As a matter of fact, I don't even think we need a tax bill of this consequence. According to them, the economy is roaring, unemployment is low, interest rates are low. So what is wrong with certainly leaving the wealthy in the category that they are in?

Why are my Republican colleagues setting an arbitrary deadline of passing a tax bill by Thanksgiving, instead of focusing on thoughtful policy and getting the substance right in a bipartisan fashion?

Everyone agrees that we need to do something about the Tax Code. Democrats have been ready to work with Re-

publicans on this effort, but have been shut out of the process at every turn. Why?

The only logical conclusion is that this has nothing to do with policy and everything to do with politics. It has nothing to do with helping the middle class, but instead is a callous political maneuver aimed at salvaging a stalled and ever-failing Republican agenda.

We are about to end the year with nothing having been done of consequence. Mr. Speaker, don't take my word for it. This conclusion is not based on my own opinion. Some of my Republican colleagues have admitted as much.

When asked about the need to move on to tax reform quickly, one of my esteemed colleagues on the other side of the aisle was heard to say: "My donors are basically saying, 'Get it done or don't ever call me again.'"

Likewise, on the other side of the Capitol, one Republican has stated that, if the Republicans fail on tax reform, just as they did on healthcare, financial contributions will stop.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think politics should dictate our efforts to reform something as significant as the Tax Code. Our guiding light should be to help working folks get a leg up. The only way to do that is to work in a bipartisan, deliberate manner, hearing from experts and the American people, as they did in 1986, and not as my Republican friends have done this time around, spending a mere 3 weeks, with no hearings, no bipartisan efforts, simply to give us something done before Thanksgiving.

That approach only gets you what we have here before us today: a bill that, in my opinion, does more harm than good to middle class Americans and puts our country further into debt.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman's observations. We don't have 4½ years to work through the process that he talked about. The American people want and need something done right now.

I say to the gentleman that he is right, the economy is roaring—and it has been roaring since the day Donald Trump won the election—with an expectation of performance.

Why are we doing this now? Why at Thanksgiving? Why at the end of the year?

We are going to see that American business, as it makes plans for the future, is going to look up and say: We have got a better shot at keeping jobs here. We have got a better shot at being competitive here.

I think what is going to happen is you are going to see this boom, this big opportunity that is already well underway, to continue. But it is up to us to deliver that. It will be one party. It will be those pesky Republicans that will get it done. We are going to get it done, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BURGESS), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee for yielding.

Today, the House of Representatives is considering tax reform for the first time since 1986.

In the last 31 years, the world has changed a lot and it is time that we bring the Tax Code into the 21st century. This needed tax reform will put our country on a path to long-term economic stability and help hard-working families around the country get ahead.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will help American families in important ways. First, it focuses on Americans in the middle of the earning scale by doubling the standard deduction and creating a new family flexibility credit for non-dependents. Taxpayers will be able to deduct even more from their taxable income, reducing the need for tedious itemization.

In addition, the bill repeals the alternative minimum tax. This tax was never intended to be as broad as it has become, but because it was not indexed for inflation when it was introduced, many of us find ourselves having to calculate our taxes twice to see if we are ensnared by the alternative minimum tax. It is time for this one to go away.

With decreased taxation, American families have more money in their pockets, resulting in greater contributions to the economy.

The bill also alleviates some of the cost of raising children by expanding the child tax credit. It preserves the adoption tax credit so parents can continue to receive additional tax relief as they open their hearts and their homes to an adopted child.

This bill reduces the number of tax brackets from seven to four, with rates of zero, 12, 25 and 35 percent for most taxpayers. It does preserve the 39.6 percent rate of the previous administration for the highest earners. These reforms will help simplify the Tax Code and make it more competitive for hardworking American families.

I am grateful the Ways and Means Committee kept the step-up in basis, despite repealing the estate tax by 2024. The step-up in basis is an important component of estate planning when people are planning for future generations. This will allow people who may experience a tragedy to continue ownership of family property without bearing excessive penalties.

Mr. Speaker, I am a supporter of the flat tax. I have introduced H.R. 1040 in every term that I have been in office, but I recognize this bill makes a lot of needed reforms and repeals some credits while maintaining those important to American taxpayers.

Donors will still be able to make tax-exempt charitable contributions, employers will still be able to contribute to 401(k) retirement savings accounts,

new homeowners will be able to deduct the interest expense on up to \$500,000 of a mortgage, and no changes are made as to Social Security.

I was actually hoping we could lower Social Security taxes. We couldn't. But we certainly do not increase Social Security taxes, despite what some of the fake news says.

Students will continue receiving a credit through the consolidated American opportunity tax credit.

Simply put, this bill will promote growth at middle-income levels, create a more favorable business environment, and continue important tax credits.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Vermont (Mr. WELCH), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. WELCH. Mr. Speaker, I have a question for my colleagues: What do you have against students?

This tax bill means that if an employer provides tuition assistance, the student is going to have to pay income tax on that. Students who borrow money for school have to pay interest on the loan. Students who want to get low interest rates are going to have to pay high interest rates because of the elimination of the private activity bond.

The second question I have is this: What do you have against democracy?

This bill was written in secret. There were no public hearings on this bill. Nobody had a chance to have any input. That is why, if you ask 435 Members of Congress, if they want to raise taxes on students, the answer from 435 would be "no." But you have rigged this bill so that we have literally no opportunity to offer a single amendment. That is wrong.

This bill was written by and for the donor class. Let's defeat this bill and stand up for the middle class.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. YODER). Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair and not to other Members.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman of the Rules Committee, my friend, for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of this rule as well as the underlying legislation, H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

This legislation demonstrates a commitment to my constituents and all of the American people to provide relief.

Our current Tax Code contains over 70,000 pages of rules and provisions. Within these pages are hundreds of loopholes and carve-outs that only special interests can fully understand and access.

At the very core of this legislation is a matter of fairness. By passing this rule and supporting the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we will be making a profound reform of our Tax Code toward a sys-

tem that is simpler, flatter, and fairer to American families across the country.

According to analysis by the Tax Foundation, which is an independent, nonpartisan tax policy nonprofit, this legislation would stimulate GDP growth up to 4 percent and provide more than 3 percent of a wage increase.

In my home State of Washington, it is projected that almost 22,000 new jobs will be created and a middle class family in my State is projected to gain over \$3,000 in after-tax income, should this bill be signed into law.

This means real and significant economic growth, with tens of thousands of new jobs in my State alone, and more money staying in the pocket of central Washingtonians.

Mr. Speaker, I have been disappointed in the dialogue surrounding this legislation from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle. The accusations that this will be a massive tax hike on the middle class are patently false.

Unfortunately, these claims are being made by Federal officials right here in Washington, D.C., all the way to my State capital in Washington State.

In my congressional district, over 80 percent of the people file their taxes using the standard deduction. This bill actually doubles the standard deduction for middle class families and for all Americans. This allows families I represent in Moses Lake, Omak, and Tri-Cities to save more money on their tax bill without having to jump through complicated loopholes and pore over their tax preparations for hours. However, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle refuse to acknowledge that fact.

This bill lowers individual tax rates for low- and middle-income Americans and continues to maintain the highest rate of 39.6 percent for the wealthiest of Americans. It eliminates special interest deductions, expands the child tax credit, establishes a new family credit for families taking care of a loved one, and it preserves the adoption tax credit.

It allows a small business in Othello or a farmer in Yakima to immediately write off the full cost of new equipment. It repeals the unfair estate tax, which hurts family farms and small businesses.

Mr. Speaker, the American people need relief, the people of central Washington need relief, and this bill provides it. I proudly rise in support of the bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a member of the Ways and Means Committee. He happens to be a Democrat, so he didn't have much input here. He is the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, only 1 minute?

Well, one minute is longer than all of the hearings that have been held by

Republicans on this sham of a tax bill that is so very broad in impact and so shallow in analysis.

Only one minute?

That is more than all of the Trump Administration officials who did not have the courage to come and face our committee and be questioned about this lousy proposal.

□ 1315

Mr. Speaker, one minute? That is more time than all of the businesses in America and economists were given to explain the nature of these corporate giveaways.

Why should a tax bill that is so broad get less time than it takes to microwave popcorn? Haste does make waste. This tax plan, born in the shadows and rammed through here 90-to-nothing will lay waste to family budgets, lay waste to affordable healthcare, and undermine our national debt.

This tax scam must be rejected. They want it through here before the American people know what hit them, but if we speak out and remain firm in our resolve, we will defeat this sham of a bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BYRNE), a gentleman who participated for hours in the Rules Committee debate last night and is one of our most valuable young Members.

Mr. BYRNE. Mr. Speaker, those of us in Washington are really good at talking in big general statements that don't mean much to the average American. I want to tell you what the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will actually do for the families I represent back in southwest Alabama.

According to data from the IRS, almost three-fourths of the tax filers in my district claimed the standard deduction instead of itemizing. Well, under our plan, the standard deduction will be doubled.

Just consider the medium family of four in southwest Alabama. That family earns a little over \$77,000 a year. If that family takes the standard deduction, as most do, they will see a tax cut of \$1,739 a year. That comes out to almost an extra \$150 a month.

Now, that may not sound like real money in Washington, but for families in Bay Minette or Citronelle or Monroeville, that is important. That is extra money for a car payment. That is additional savings for a child's college. That is money to help pay for home repairs. That is real money.

When you add in the fact that we are fixing our corporate and business Tax Code to make it fairer and simpler, then we can truly make America boom again. President Trump has called it the "middle class miracle."

By making our Tax Code more competitive, we can unleash our full economic potential, bring jobs back to America, raise wages, and ultimately get more money in the pockets of working Americans. Mr. Speaker, this is exactly what President Trump prom-

ised and what the American people sent him and us to Washington to do.

Now, my colleagues on the other side like to say this bill helps the 1 percent, and they vehemently defend the current Tax Code.

You know who benefits from the current Tax Code? The 1 percent—people who can hire lawyers and lobbyists to help them get a special tax break, people who can spend thousands of dollars a year on specialty accountants. If you want to help the 1 percent, then keep the current complicated and confusing Tax Code that only helps the elite and well connected. We can do better than that.

We can pass the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we can put more money in people's pockets, and we can unlock America's full economic potential.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, last night, I pointed out to my colleague from Alabama, whom I greatly admire, that he has a number of people claiming medical expense deductions who won't be able to do so under this tax measure. The number of them, in fact, is 22,052, and the total amount claimed under medical expense deduction by them previously was \$186 million.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2½ minutes to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. POLIS), a distinguished colleague who I sit next to on the Rules Committee.

Mr. POLIS. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the rule and the underlying bill. When I was growing up, I am sure, like most of us here in this body, I was fortunate to be surrounded by hard-working, dedicated teachers who cared about me, challenged me, and helped me succeed.

Throughout our public schools in any State and across the country, there are teachers who are giving everything they have to help students thrive.

Carolyn, a teacher from Louisville, is a great example. Carolyn shared with me how she spends her own personal money on school supplies for students who can't afford to buy their own. To help mitigate this cost, there is a Federal tax deduction that allows teachers to get back up to \$250 of their personal money they put towards supplies in their classroom, but the bill before us denies Carolyn and all of the other teachers that deduction and eliminates the tax benefits in the name of cutting taxes for wealthy international corporations.

This bill also rolls back a critical education tax benefit that allows employers to provide up to \$5,250 of tuition assistance, pretax.

In practice, it encourages workforce training and apprenticeship programs. In fact, this very week is National Apprenticeship Week, and yet the Republican tax bill pulls the rug out from under businesses and workers, actually discouraging apprenticeships by stopping this tax benefit.

Mr. Speaker, I was privileged to serve, before I came here, as the chair-

man of our State Board of Education and school superintendent. I wanted to be the ranking member of the Early Childhood, Elementary and Secondary Education Subcommittee. I have really seen how important these tax benefits are to teachers and students.

I offered amendments last night in Rules to simply restore these important tax credits for children. Unfortunately, in a party-line vote, my amendments were denied.

These damaging provisions are just a small part of the overall harmful, misguided attempt at tax reform. Let us reset and let us begin a bipartisan discussion about tax reform that values education, educators, and kids. For this reason and so many others, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill, and I suggest a "no" vote.

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

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, what a delight it is for me to stand up and say that, the work we are going to do today, the President of the United States will sign. He is encouraging what we are doing today.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a letter of support from the National Federation of Independent Business—that is "The Voice of Small Business" in America—and also what is called a Statement of Administration Policy from the Executive Office of the President of the United States.

NATIONAL FEDERATION OF
INDEPENDENT BUSINESS,
Washington, DC, November 14, 2017.

DEAR REPRESENTATIVE: On behalf of the National Federation of Independent Business (NFIB), the nation's leading small business advocacy organization, I am writing in support of H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This legislation will provide much needed tax relief to America's job-creating small businesses. H.R. 1 will be considered an NFIB Key Vote for the 115th Congress.

Small business is the engine of the economy, and tax reform should provide substantial relief to all small businesses so they can reinvest their money, grow, and create jobs. Ninety-nine percent of all American businesses are small businesses; the average NFIB member has just 10 employees. Taken in sum, however, small businesses create half of all private-sector jobs in the U.S. and contribute half the nation's gross domestic product.

Three-quarters of small employers are structured as pass-through entities, meaning their owners are taxed at the individual rate as opposed to the corporate rate. Crucially, H.R. 1 reduces the tax rate on the smallest pass-through businesses to 9 percent over five years, without industry exclusions or restrictions.

NFIB supports passage of H.R. 1 and will consider it an NFIB Key Vote for the 115th Congress.

Thank you for your consideration. We look forward to working with you to protect small business.

Sincerely,

JUANITA D. DUGGAN,
President & CEO, NFIB.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY
H.R. 1—TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT—REP. BRADY,
R-TX, AND 24 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly supports House passage of H.R. 1, the Tax Cuts and

Jobs Act. Passing the bill is an important first step in achieving comprehensive tax reform that cuts taxes for hard-working families and puts the Nation's economy on a path of higher economic growth. The President's priorities for tax reform have been consistent from day one: (1) cut taxes for middle-income families; (2) simplify the Nation's complicated tax system; and (3) reduce business taxes so that American employers can create jobs, raise wages for their workers, and better compete with foreign businesses.

H.R. 1 would deliver meaningful tax cuts for middle-income families by nearly doubling the standard deduction, lowering tax rates, increasing the child tax credit, and creating a new Family Flexibility credit. It would simplify tax filing so that the large majority of Americans could file their taxes on a single page. The bill would also cut the corporate tax rate to 20 percent—below the average tax rate in the Organisation for Economic Co-operation and Development. Finally, H.R. 1 would lower taxes for millions of S corporations, sole proprietors, and partnerships that pay taxes at individual rates.

Based on a review of more than 100 academic papers, the White House Council of Economic Advisors (CEA) estimates that the corporate provisions in H.R. 1 would grow the economy by between 3 and 5 percent over the next 10 years, which if applied to 2027 Gross Domestic Product projections, would result in an additional \$700 billion to \$1.2 trillion in economic output per year. CEA also found that the same provisions would increase average household income by at least \$4,000 annually.

If H.R. 1 were presented to the President, his advisors would recommend that he sign the bill into law.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, the President's priorities and tax reforms are consistent and have been from day one.

Tax cuts for middle class families, simplifying the Nation's complicated tax system, and reducing the burden of taxes so that American employers can create jobs, raise wages, and better compete with foreign businesses, that is what we are going to do.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, it is like old home week from the Rules Committee people.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. MATSUI), a good friend who used to serve on the Rules Committee.

Ms. MATSUI. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to H.R. 1. When I was home last weekend, my constituents shared how devastating this bill would be for them.

A fifth grade teacher, Sarah, talked about how harmful the elimination of the deduction to purchase classroom supplies will be for teachers. She said:

How out of touch do you have to be to cut a tax credit for public school teachers?

A senior citizen, Mark, spoke about how devastating the repeal of the medical expense deduction would be for him and his wife with Alzheimer's.

How can House Republicans justify helping corporations over families in need?

A father, Devin, who works two jobs to support his family, spoke about how he counts on the student loan interest

deduction to plan for his future. He said:

All I ask is that Congress keep the promise they made to us. We planned based on the promises they made. I hope they don't break that promise. I hope they don't make life a little bit harder on our families.

How can Republicans defend making the lives of middle class families like his more difficult?

To make matters worse, this bill will explode the deficit and lead to devastating cuts to Medicare. I ask my Republican colleagues to think about the families that will be hurt by this bill instead of prioritizing handouts to billionaires and corporations.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I am waiting for a speaker, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 11 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 12½ minutes remaining.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, like I said, it is old home week here with the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. CASTOR), another former member of the Rules Committee.

Ms. CASTOR of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding and thank him for being a champion for working families across the country.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to the rule and the GOP tax bill because it is so fundamentally unfair. It is unfair that it raises taxes on tens of millions of middle class families while giving huge tax breaks to big corporations and the superrich. It does this, also, by adding over \$1.5 trillion to the national debt.

The Center for a Responsible Federal Budget said this is a step backwards for fiscal responsibility, largely because it passes the tab on to our kids and our grandkids. They estimate that that will cost about \$12,000 per household, just the debt portion of it—not even a mention.

Here is why middle class families get hurt:

Republicans eliminate the deduction for medical expenses. That is over 630,000 Floridians in my home State.

They eliminate the tax deduction that helps make college more affordable by being able to deduct the interest on your student loan.

They eliminate all these deductions for the middle class and give all the breaks to the superrich and big corporations. It is fundamentally unfair, and I urge a “no” vote on the bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI).

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in opposition to this disastrous partisan tax plan that cuts rates for wealthy corporations and millionaires

while leading to higher taxes for about 38 million working families.

There is a lot to not like about this bill. It actually eliminates the student loan interest deduction. That will increase the financial burden for about 12 million Americans who are juggling their student loan debt with housing, groceries, and childcare. The cost of higher education is already out of reach for too many. We should be making it easier, not harder for Americans to access higher education.

On top of that, removing the State and local tax deduction threatens funding sources for public education and will most certainly lead to cuts to America's public school budgets.

Mr. Speaker, across the country, families are working hard to get ahead. Let's not take away their opportunity. We need a Tax Code that leads to better jobs, better wages, and a better future for America, for our children and our grandchildren. This bill fails the test, and we should reject it and get back to working together.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. EVANS), who served in the Pennsylvania Legislature and was chair of appropriations. He really understands this stuff.

Mr. EVANS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity.

I am not on the Rules Committee or the Ways and Means Committee, but I am on the Agriculture Committee. I think it is extremely important to recognize what Feeding America has expressed about this package.

Feeding America has concluded that H.R. 1 will undermine efforts to assist those who struggle with adequate access to food. I strongly oppose that in a day and age where there is so much poverty and so much hunger across this country.

We need to face up to the fact that we should oppose this because it goes in the wrong direction.

But let's be clear. The people who this bill will affect, too often, do not have a voice. I am here to be their voice. Enough is enough. This horrible bill needs to be stopped, and it needs to be stopped now.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON), a real champion and a mentor of mine.

□ 1330

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, a picture is worth a thousand words, so is a graph. Following the blue line, the tax scam works this way:

For average taxpayers, the blue line—the blue line is for blue and red States—shows taxes for individual taxpayers go down for one full year. Then look what begins to happen at 2019. They begin to go up. By 2020, they continue. Follow the blue line for average

taxpayers. Their taxes are continuing to go up, they reach a real high, and steeply go up for the entire 10-year period. For business tax credits, they go down, too. That means business taxes go down. And then they, too, go up.

So the scam shows both look like they are doing the same thing, but 2024 is a dividing line. Then business income taxes plummet, but income taxes for average Americans go up.

Who is paying for these business tax cuts? Individual taxpayers.

Defeat this Republican tax scam.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I continue to reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN), my good friend.

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

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

Mr. Speaker, I rise, today, in strong opposition to this House Republican tax bill, which was developed in secret without a single public hearing.

Despite repeated calls for Republicans to engage in a bipartisan process with Democrats, this bill was written without Democratic input and with enormous giveaways to wealthy interests.

It makes you wonder, doesn't it, Mr. Speaker?

To pay for them, Republicans have eliminated critical tax provisions that are important to the middle class—such as deductions to medical expenses, for State and local taxes, for student loan interest, and other expenses—on which middle class families rely. What Republicans can't pay for, they add to the Nation's credit card to the tune of \$1.7 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, we are out to support this plan, but most Americans are only given the crumbs of this tax reform pie.

Mr. Speaker, I cannot, in good conscience, vote for this bill. We need a fair and balanced tax reform package that helps everyday Rhode Islanders and that helps everyday Americans get ahead, not just the well-off and well-connected.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this bill.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. ROTHFUS), a gentleman who serves on the Financial Services Committee and a distinguished young Member of our majority.

Mr. ROTHFUS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this rule and the underlying legislation.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act we are considering today is the culmination of years of work, years of listening to the concerns of hardworking taxpayers at home, and several elections where the people spoke out for relief from a broken, special-interest laden Tax Code.

Here are the questions we need to be asking today:

Are you tired of the status quo?

Do you think we can do better than the slowest economic recovery since the Great Depression?

Do you want a healthier economy that creates the opportunities that offer you a real chance to get ahead, puts more money in your pocket, and helps you fulfill your American Dream?

If you answered yes to any of these questions, then the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is for you.

As I travel across my district, I hear story after story from families with nothing left over at the end of the month, who are struggling to save for retirement, pay off loans, or simply make ends meet.

It doesn't have to be this way. There is a better way.

We have a once-in-a-generation opportunity to fix this. We can act now to put more money back into the hardworking taxpayers' pockets, make American business more competitive, and create a much healthier economy.

Americans have toiled under a broken Tax Code filled with loopholes and special interest carve-outs for far too long. This legislation—the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act—is a giant step for everyday Americans looking to get ahead.

This is for the family of four, making \$59,000 a year, who can save \$1,182 a year in taxes. This is for the single mom, making \$30,000 working night and day to support her two children, who will also save more than \$1,000 a year in taxes.

Our legislation doubles the standard deduction, so people won't have to itemize their tax returns. It expands the child tax credit from \$1,000 to \$1,600 and provides a \$300 credit for adult dependents living at home. It will create more jobs in Pennsylvania and raise Pennsylvania's families' incomes.

It will bring dollars back to America to be invested in American companies with American workers. It will empower the people of America who want to get ahead, and it will lessen the power of Washington, D.C.

Vote for freedom, vote for prosperity, vote for this rule and this bill.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentleman from Connecticut (Ms. DELAURO), my good friend.

Ms. DELAURO. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong opposition to the rule and to the Republican tax scam.

The biggest economic challenge of our time is that too many people who play by the rules are in jobs that do not pay them enough to live on. Wages are not keeping up with rising costs. Too many families today struggle to make ends meet. They have the rising cost of healthcare, of child care, and of housing.

Meanwhile, big corporations, millionaires, and billionaires write the rules to make government work for them—and Republicans are their comrades in arms in rigging the game against the middle class. Enough is enough.

It cuts taxes for the wealthiest Americans, raises taxes on the middle class, and it increases the deficit. And worse, it encourages companies who outsource American jobs. Congress must put middle class families and jobs before corporations that have not been loyal to their employees and to our country. When you outsource jobs, you drive wages down here at home.

Let me mention the child tax credit to you. The Republican proposal leaves behind vulnerable families—military families, rural families, large families, minimum wage workers, and those with the youngest children.

Do not let them get away with this scam. This is not reform. It is tax cuts for the wealthiest, and I oppose it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining on each side?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Florida has 5 minutes remaining. The gentleman from Texas has 10 minutes remaining.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), from the Ways and Means Committee. At this time, we are putting the A-team up.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the rule and the underlying legislation.

Sometimes, in order to understand what is going on in the present and then what could happen in the future, you need to go to the past.

Let me read something from a true Irish-American President who said:

"Our true choice is not between tax reduction, on the one hand, and the avoidance of large Federal deficits on the other. It is increasingly clear that no matter what party is in power, so long as our national security needs keep rising, an economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough revenues to balance our budget—just as it will never produce enough jobs or enough profits. . . ."

" . . . only full employment can balance the budget, and tax reduction can pave the way to that employment. The purpose of cutting taxes now is not to incur a budget deficit, but to achieve the more prosperous, expanding economy which can bring a budget surplus."

I understand that there are differences of opinion on what we are trying to do, but, please, let's talk about the facts. Let's talk about a piece of legislation that is a rising tide that will lift all boats.

We are going to cut taxes for every American at every income level. We are going to reduce taxes by almost \$1,200 for every average-sized, middle-income American family. This puts more money in the pockets of our families. I don't care how they vote or how they registered. They are Americans.

It reduces by almost \$2,000 for every average-sized, middle-income family in Pennsylvania's Third District. That is a \$2,000 reduction for them.

It will grow our national GDP by 3.6 percent.

It will increase average American wages by 3.1 percent.

In the long run, it will increase after-tax incomes for American taxpayers by 4.4 percent.

I also want you to think about what we talk about back home where I am from. We talk about take-home pay. "This is my take-home pay." In Pennsylvania, Pennsylvanians—Republican Pennsylvanians, Democrat Pennsylvanians, Independents, Libertarians—are going to have about \$2,700 more in their pockets after this legislation goes through.

Let's talk about jobs. Nobody spoke better about jobs than President Reagan when he said: It is about jobs, jobs, jobs, and more jobs. What is good for the American worker is good for America.

This will create 1 million new American jobs.

I want you to think about this: In the United States of America, we are now currently rated as the 23rd best country to do business in. The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act will change that. I want you to think about that.

I am a hometown guy; I am a home team guy. It is hard for me to sit back and say that we have allowed ourselves to fall that far in the world when people think: Where should I start that business? Twenty-third, are you kidding me? With all of the assets that we have been given by the Lord? And to sit here today and have an argument over something else other than that doesn't make any sense at all.

What we are trying to do with our tax plan is make sure that the United States just doesn't participate in a global economy, it dominates a global economy, it leads the way in a global economy, it makes American workers stronger, it makes American families stronger, and it allows us to rebuild our military and our infrastructure. It allows everything good to happen.

We cannot stay with the status quo. There is so much good in this bill for every single American. I did not say every single Republican, I said every single American. You can bat that one back and forth and try to make it a political story, but it is not. It is truly an American story. America has never dodged that responsibility.

Now, let me read you one other quote, again, from an Irish-American President, who I hold in such great esteem, and one of the greatest people I have ever listened to. Let me read this to you. It says:

"I do not underestimate the obstacles which the Congress will face in enacting such legislation. No one will be satisfied. Everyone will have his own approach, his own bill, his own reductions. A high order of restraint and determination will be required if the 'possible' is not to wait on the 'perfect.' But a nation capable of marshaling these qualities in any dramatic threat to our security is surely capable, as a great free society, of meeting a slower and more complex threat to our eco-

nomics vitality. This Nation can afford to reduce taxes, we can afford a temporary deficit, but we cannot afford to do nothing. For on the strength of our free economy rests the hope of all free nations. We shall not fail that hope, for free men and free nations must prosper and they must prevail."

Think of who it is that we are. This is America's house. Yes, this is a GOP tax plan, but it helps every single American. It is not a blue plan or a red plan; it is a red, white, and blue plan. The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. I will challenge you to go home next week for Thanksgiving and tell people all of the positives about this, and say: I am so sorry. I could have voted for that.

It is time now for America to rise to the challenge. As I said earlier, we exist in a global economy. I am tired of being somebody who happened to participate, when we have the opportunity to dominate. Never before, in our history, have we had the chance to change the future for every single American.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to direct their remarks to the Chair, not to other Members.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I will go home this week and tell people I voted against this horrible bill. And I will wonder if the last speaker would go home and tell the 11,249 people who utilize \$131 million in medical deductions who will not have that under this bill, understanding that it could be different if they chose.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY), a newfound friend and a rising star.

Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY. Mr. Speaker, I oppose the rule and the underlying bill.

This is a tax increase on the middle class, and it drops a ticking tax bomb on the American people. While it falsely claims to provide tax relief for working families and the middle class, in reality, it will raise taxes on 38 million Americans, and it will explode the deficit by over \$1.5 trillion.

□ 1345

A typical family in my district in Illinois would see their taxes increase by over \$1,100.

According to the CBO, H.R. 1 is so irresponsible, that it will result in an immediate \$25 billion cut to Medicare.

Americans recognize that incomes are not keeping pace with the cost of living, and parents question whether their children will have the same opportunities they had.

Our constituents need responsible tax reform that strengthens the middle class and raises wages for working families. They do not need a tax increase, and this bill does just that. It increases taxes on the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this ticking tax bomb.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time until the gentleman has closed.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time. I am prepared to close and would advise the chairman of that regard.

Mr. Speaker, a new Quinnipiac poll out yesterday shows the American people aren't falling for the Republican tax scam. Only 25 percent approve of this plan, just 16 percent think it will reduce their taxes, and only 24 percent said the Republican plan will help the middle class the most.

Mr. Speaker, we should listen to the American people, throw this dangerous plan in the trash can, where it belongs, and let's work together on a bipartisan plan to help all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment that will prohibit any legislation from limiting or repealing the State and local tax deduction, which prevents millions of families from being taxed twice on the same income.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. First, my Republican colleagues attempted to jam an abhorrent healthcare bill through Congress. They failed. After that failure, they moved on to today's attempt to jam an abhorrent tax bill through Congress. For the sake of middle and working class Americans, I hope my Republican friends ultimately meet defeat once again.

Mr. Speaker, we set the record with this particular measure of 51 closed rules in this session, the most closed rules in the history of Congress. What that means is a lot of the Representatives who had good ideas, more than 100 of them that offered amendments last night, were unable to be heard because of closed rules.

After this closed, disgraceful process, this Republican majority has presented, in this instance, a piece of legislation that skews tax cuts in favor of the ultrawealthy and rich corporations.

Now, let's make it very clear. Wealthy people shouldn't be disrespected for their wealth, but I don't know any wealthy people who are knocking down my doors, saying that they need a few more thousand dollars. But I know a lot of poor people who need a few hundred dollars, and this particular measure is not doing many of the things that would allow for them to be able to get on that last rung of that ladder and lift themselves up.

I heard the gentleman say a rising tide lifts all boats. They had the Fort Lauderdale International Boat Show,

the largest one in the world, the week before last. All those yachts were lifted, but those little dinghies with the people fishing out in Lake Okeechobee were not lifted one doggone bit by this particular measure.

This bill does so on the backs of middle and working class people and future generations.

With this bill, the former deficit hawk Republican majority would add \$1.5 trillion to the debt while potentially triggering \$25 billion in cuts to Medicare. I might add that is where they are headed. Look out Medicare, look out Social Security, look out Medicaid.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a “no” vote on the underlying bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague, the gentleman from Florida, Judge HASTINGS, for his exemplary work and the work of his colleagues on the Rules Committee and my colleagues also on the Republican side.

Mr. Speaker, our previous speaker, the gentleman from Butler, Pennsylvania, MIKE KELLY, had it best when he said: “. . . an economy hampered by restrictive tax rates will never produce enough revenue to balance our budget, just as it will never produce enough jobs or enough profits. Only full employment can balance the budget, and tax reduction can pave the way to that employment.”

What he did not say is—that will be in the record—is that John F. Kennedy said this on December 14, 1962, 55 years ago, in an address to the Economic Club of New York.

Mr. Speaker, in fact, there have been a lot of people here who have given testimony, I think testimony that they intended to sway the voters and those listening in this country that the Tax Code that we have works just fine, but then they spoke about the frailties of that and they talked about jobs going offshore, they talked about jobs and economic activity going somewhere else.

I, being from Dallas, Texas, hear stories every day about people who are coming to Texas, coming to north Texas, coming because of the economic climate that will allow them and their companies to have a better shot at not only being competitive, but, as MIKE KELLY said, to be winners in this economy, at the very top of the heap rather than at the bottom of the heap.

What this common denominator is, is that my State of Texas does do the things that this bill does also. It keeps taxes low, it creates opportunity.

By the way, how many poor people create jobs?

I don't know.

How many of those who really have incentive and entrepreneurship create jobs?

A ton of them.

We are going to grow entrepreneurs out of today. We are going to grow

young people getting out of college, veterans leaving the military coming back and seeing where they can make a go of it. Instead of it being a 95 percent failure rate of new business—which is what it is, it is a heavy bar because of rules, regulations, and taxes—we are going to make it easier.

The White House Council of Economic Advisers based their review, as they provided the economic outlook to us, on more than 100 academic papers, estimates that corporate provisions in this tax bill alone will grow our economy, not leave us in 23rd place, as MIKE KELLY said.

Who wants to be in 23rd place?

If you want to be in the top 25 and you are comfortable, sorry.

We want to be at the top. We want to Make America Great Again. We want to be able to say that businesses all over the United States stand a chance, and that is what this does.

The Council of Economic Advisers says that this will grow the economy between 3 and 5 percent.

Whoops. They got comfortable with 1.2 over 8 years. I am not comfortable and the American people aren't comfortable either.

We are going to add some \$700 billion to the economy this next 10 years. That is the guess, that is what Republicans want to do, but it is based on a lot of factors, it is based on hard work.

America has the best, most innovative workers in the world. We want to put this together with an opportunity, because we have a great place to be: the United States of America, any of our States. We have the best energy policies in the world and we have the best price. We have the best workers. We have tool kits with our universities. Our industry will grow back and reinvest in themselves.

We are going to take our Tax Code and take what is \$5.6 trillion worth of tax areas and move that where it will boost our economy. We will become pro growth again. Yes, we heard that it was John F. Kennedy, it was Ronald Reagan, and it is going to be making America great again.

Mr. Speaker, for that reason, I urge my colleagues to support this rule and the underlying legislation in order to boost middle class Americans.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to speak in opposition to the Rule for Rules Committee Print 115–39, to H.R. 1, “Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.”

The underlying bill will cut funding for programs that the American people need by \$5.4 trillion over 10 years.

It will raise the deficit by \$2.2 trillion 10 years.

This is bad for America.

The chief motivation for House Republicans brings this bill before the House is to say they had a win before we break for the Thanksgiving Holiday.

This rule if adopted will allow the House to take up consideration of a bill that will cost taxpayers because it:

Eliminates the \$4,050 personal exemption allowed to each taxpayer for their self, spouse, and each dependent child;

Raises the lowest individual income tax rate from 10 percent to 12 percent

Reduces the tax rate corporations pay on existing offshore profits from 35 percent to 10 percent; and

Cuts the corporate tax rate paid by large companies.

The Jackson Lee Amendments to Rules Committee Print 115–39 were offered as means of improving the bill:

(1) The first Jackson Lee Amendment would delay the effective date of all revenue-reducing provisions in H.R. 1 until the Secretary of Homeland Security submits to Congress a report certifying that the areas covered by Presidential Natural Disaster Declarations for Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria have fully recovered economically, as measured by a gross domestic product that exceeds by 10 percent the gross domestic product for such areas in the fiscal year preceding the Presidential Disaster Declaration; and the deficit is zero.

(2) The second Jackson Lee Amendment would delay the effective date of all revenue-reducing provisions in H.R. 1 until the Secretary of Health and Human Services submits to Congress a report certifying that the number of U.S. adults without health insurance has not exceeded five percent for three consecutive quarters; and the deficit is zero.

(3) The third Jackson Lee Amendment preserves current law for deductions of student loan interest and other educational incentive.

(4) The fourth Jackson Lee Amendment preserves current law for taxpayer deduction of mortgage interest.

Our work should be focused on lifting people up and not taking opportunities away.

The \$4,700 standard deduction for families will be eliminated by the bill governed by this rule to give a tax cut to corporations.

The recovery from Hurricanes Harvey, Maria and Irma which impacted the Texas, Florida, U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico have long gone, but the efforts of people to reclaim their lives continues.

These families will need that \$4,700.

In the State of Texas Hurricane Harvey is on record as the worst disaster to hit homeowners in the United States with over 148,000 homes and 163,000 apartments just in Houston impacted.

There are still 9,100 families in hotels and are in need of assurance that they will be able to return to their own homes.

We know that the costs of recovery will far exceed any natural disaster in memory.

We should set a national goal for extending health insurance coverage not looking for ways to destabilize the health insurance marketplace.

Because of the Affordable Care Act in the state of Texas:

3.8 million Texas residents receive preventative care services.

7 million Texans no longer have lifetime limits on their healthcare insurance.

300,731 young adults can remain on their parents' health insurance until age 26.

5 million Texas residents can receive a rebate check from their insurance company if it does not spend 80 percent of premium dollars on healthcare.

4,029 people with pre-existing conditions now have health insurance.

Today, insurance companies are banned from:

discriminating against anyone with a pre-existing condition

charging higher rates based on gender or health status

enforcing lifetime dollar limits

enforcing annual dollar limits on health benefits

Savings for Texas Seniors on Their Prescription Drugs, Thanks to ACA:

Total Savings: \$551,694,997

Total Gap Discount Amount: \$201,876,665

Total Number of Beneficiaries: 233,114

Average Discount per Beneficiary: \$866

Congress should support expansion of access to healthcare because it will save lives and relieve suffering of those who would otherwise not have care when they need it most.

Our nation is in the midst of an affordable housing crisis. Growing demand for rental housing has resulted in higher rents. More families than ever before struggle to pay their rent each month, and every Congressional district and state across the nation is impacted.

The federal should continue its investments in homeownership that reduce homelessness and housing poverty are sorely underfunded:

Just one in four low income families eligible for federal housing assistance receives the help they need.

Comprehensive tax reform provides one of the best opportunities to end homelessness and housing poverty once and for all. As Congress considers comprehensive tax reform legislation, we urge you to seize this opportunity by reinvesting any savings derived from changes to the mortgage interest deduction into rental housing solutions for people with the greatest needs—not to offset the cost of tax breaks for the wealthy and corporations.

In doing so, we can make the critical investments that our nation needs to help America's families, our local communities, and our national economy thrives.

We know the key to reducing poverty and increasing economic mobility is access to safe and affordable homes. Increasing access to affordable homes bolsters child and family success, economic growth, wages, and productivity. And each dollar invested in developing and preserving affordable homes boosts local economies by leveraging public and private resources to generate income—including resident earnings and additional local tax revenue—and supports job creation and retention.

Congress as in the past should continue to champion homeownership because the benefits that comes to families and communities.

Our nation should be reinvesting these housing dollars into deeply targeted programs that serve people with the most acute housing needs.

Mr. BURGESS. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD the following letter from Thomas Barthold to Chairman KEVIN BRODY:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION,
Washington, DC, November 14 2017.

Hon. KEVIN BRADY,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN BRADY: You asked me to comment on the changes made by H.R. 1 as ordered reported by the House Committee on Ways and Means in the context of Clause 5(b) of Rule XXI of the House of Representatives.

Clause 5(b) of Rule XXI sets special passage requirements for measures that amend sub-

sections (a), (b), (c), (d), or (e) of section 1 or section 11(b) or 55(b) of the Internal Revenue Code in a manner that imposes a new percentage rate of tax and thereby increases the amount of tax imposed by such section. H.R. 1 amends the relevant sections by eliminating the 10-percent bracket, which is obviated as a marginal rate as a result of the increase in the standard deduction provided in section 63(c) and makes general changes to the income thresholds at which the varying tax rate brackets apply and eliminating several other tax rates of present law. These changes combined with the increased value of the child tax credit (in section 24) result in virtually every taxpayer who formerly would have been in the 10-percent tax bracket having a lower tax liability under the changes that would be effectuated by H.R. 1 than they would under present law.

Similarly, H.R. 1 eliminates the present-law 33-percent marginal tax bracket. As a result there are some taxpayers who would claim the standard deduction and had his or her last dollar of income taxed in the 33-percent tax bracket under present law but under H.R. 1 after claiming the increased standard deduction would have their last dollar of income taxed in the 35-percent tax bracket. However, in each such case the taxpayer's total income tax liability is lower under H.R. 1 than under present law. For taxpayers who eschew the standard deduction under present law there is substantially greater variability in resulting tax liabilities. With the elimination of some deductions that taxpayers may elect to itemize under present law, it is not possible to say in all cases that these taxpayers have lower total income tax liability under H.R. 1 than under present law. However, by comparison to the case of a taxpayer claiming the standard deduction, the variability of these results is clearly a consequence of the changes to the tax base effectuated by H.R. 1 rather than a consequence solely of the elimination of the present-law 33-percent bracket.

Because the House rule does not contemplate changes to the Internal Revenue Code as a whole and the interactions such changes have on tax liability, H.R. 1 requires a waiver of the rule's provisions. In its totality, the combined effect of the tax rate and income threshold amendments made by the bill, along with the increase in the standard deduction, would not, in and of themselves, result in an increase in the amount of tax imposed on virtually any filer as a result of these changes.

I hope this discussion is helpful. Please contact me with any questions.

Sincerely,

THOMAS A. BARTHOLD.

The material previously referred to by Mr. HASTINGS is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 619 OFFERED BY
MR. HASTINGS

At the end of the resolution, add the following new section:

"SEC. 5. POINT OF ORDER AGAINST ANY TAX BILL THAT RAISES TAXES ON MIDDLE-CLASS FAMILIES BY ELIMINATING OR LIMITING THE STATE AND LOCAL TAX DEDUCTION.

(a) POINT OF ORDER.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider any bill, joint resolution, motion, amendment, amendment between the Houses, or conference report that repeals or limits the State and Local Tax Deduction (26 U.S.C. § 164).

(b) WAIVER IN THE HOUSE.—It shall not be in order in the House of Representatives to consider a rule or order that waives the application of subsection (a). As disposition of a point of order under this subsection, the Chair shall put the question of consideration

with respect to the rule or order, as applicable. The question of consideration shall be debatable for 10 minutes by the Member initiating the point of order and for 10 minutes by an opponent, but shall otherwise be decided without intervening motion except one that the House adjourn."

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party offered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools

for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. SESSIONS. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 and clause 9 of rule XX, this 15-minute vote on ordering the previous question will be followed by 5-minute votes on:

Adopting the resolution, if ordered; and

Suspending the rules and passing H.R. 2331.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 234, nays 193, not voting 6, as follows:

[Roll No. 632]

YEAS—234

Abraham	Duncan (TN)	Knight
Aderholt	Dunn	Kustoff (TN)
Allen	Emmer	Labrador
Amash	Estes (KS)	LaHood
Amodei	Farenthold	LaMalfa
Arrington	Faso	Lamborn
Babin	Ferguson	Lance
Bacon	Fitzpatrick	Latta
Banks (IN)	Fleischmann	Lewis (MN)
Barletta	Flores	LoBiondo
Barr	Fortenberry	Long
Barton	Fox	Loudermilk
Bergman	Franks (AZ)	Love
Biggs	Frelinghuysen	Lucas
Bilirakis	Gaetz	Luetkemeyer
Bishop (MI)	Gallagher	MacArthur
Bishop (UT)	Garrett	Marchant
Black	Gianforte	Marino
Blackburn	Gibbs	Marshall
Blum	Gohmert	Massie
Bost	Goodlatte	Mast
Brady (TX)	Gosar	McCarthy
Brat	Gowdy	McCaul
Brooks (IN)	Granger	McClintock
Buchanan	Graves (GA)	McHenry
Buck	Graves (LA)	McKinley
Bucshon	Graves (MO)	McMorris
Budd	Griffith	Rodgers
Burgess	Grothman	McSally
Byrne	Guthrie	Meadows
Calvert	Handel	Meehan
Carter (GA)	Harper	Messer
Carter (TX)	Harris	Mitchell
Chabot	Hartzler	Moolenaar
Cheney	Hensarling	Mooney (WV)
Coffman	Herrera Beutler	Mullin
Cole	Hice, Jody B.	Newhouse
Collins (GA)	Higgins (LA)	Noem
Collins (NY)	Hill	Norman
Comer	Holding	Nunes
Comstock	Hollingsworth	Olson
Conaway	Hudson	Palazzo
Cook	Huizenga	Palmer
Costello (PA)	Hultgren	Paulsen
Cramer	Hunter	Pearce
Crawford	Hurd	Perry
Culberson	Issa	Pittenger
Curbelo (FL)	Jenkins (KS)	Poe (TX)
Curtis	Jenkins (WV)	Poliquin
Davidson	Johnson (LA)	Posey
Davis, Rodney	Johnson (OH)	Ratcliffe
Denham	Jordan	Reed
Dent	Joyce (OH)	Reichert
DeSantis	Katko	Rice (SC)
DesJarlais	Kelly (MS)	Roby
Diaz-Balart	Kelly (PA)	Roe (TN)
Donovan	King (IA)	Rogers (AL)
Duffy	King (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Duncan (SC)	Kinzing	Rohrabacher

Rokita	Simpson
Rooney, Francis	Smith (MO)
Rooney, Thomas J.	Smith (NE)
Ros-Lehtinen	Smith (NJ)
Roskam	Smith (TX)
Ross	Smucker
Rothfus	Stefanik
Rouzer	Stewart
Royce (CA)	Stivers
Russell	Taylor
Rutherford	Tenney
Sanford	Thompson (PA)
Scalise	Thornberry
Schweikert	Tiberi
Scott, Austin	Tipton
Sensenbrenner	Trott
Sessions	Turner
Shimkus	Upton
Shuster	Valadao
	Wagner

NAYS—193

Adams	Gabbard
Aguilar	Gallego
Barragán	Garamendi
Bass	Gomez
Beatty	Gonzalez (TX)
Bera	Gottheimer
Beyer	Green, Al
Bishop (GA)	Green, Gene
Blumenauer	Grijalva
Blunt Rochester	Gutiérrez
Bonamici	Hanabusa
Boyle, Brendan F.	Hastings
Brady (PA)	Heck
Brown (MD)	Higgins (NY)
Brownley (CA)	Himes
Bustos	Hoyer
Butterfield	Huffman
Capuano	Jackson Lee
Carbajal	Jayapal
Cárdenas	Jeffries
Carson (IN)	Johnson (GA)
Cartwright	Johnson, E. B.
Castor (FL)	Jones
Castro (TX)	Kaptur
Chu, Judy	Keating
Cicilline	Kelly (IL)
Clark (MA)	Kennedy
Clarke (NY)	Khanna
Clay	Kihuen
Cleaver	Kildee
Clyburn	Kilmer
Cohen	Kind
Connolly	Krishnamoorthi
Conyers	Kuster (NH)
Cooper	Langevin
Correa	Larsen (WA)
Costa	Larson (CT)
Courtney	Lawrence
Crist	Lawson (FL)
Crowley	Lee
Cuellar	Levin
Cummings	Lewis (GA)
Davis (CA)	Lieu, Ted
Davis, Danny	Lipinski
DeFazio	Loeb
DeGette	Loeb
Delaney	Lowey
DeLauro	Lujan Grisham, M.
DeBene	Luján, Ben Ray
Demings	Lynch
DeSaulnier	Maloney
Deutch	Carolyn B.
Dingell	Maloney, Sean
Doggett	Malone, Sean
Doyle, Michael F.	Matsumi
Ellison	McCollum
Engel	McEachin
Eshoo	McNerney
Española	Meeks
Esty (CT)	Meng
Evans	Moore
Foster	Moulton
Frankel (FL)	Murphy (FL)
Fudge	Nadler
	Napolitano

NOT VOTING—6

Bridenstine	Johnson, Sam
Brooks (AL)	McGovern

□ 1420

Mses. TITUS and BARRAGAN changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

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

Neal
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarella
Payne
Pelosi
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
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 (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

Ms. FOXX, Messrs. WALDEN, and JOYCE of Ohio changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. POE of Texas). The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—aye 235, noes 191, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 633]

AYES—235

Abraham	Fortenberry	Massie
Aderholt	Fox	Mast
Allen	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy
Amash	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Amodei	Gaetz	McClintock
Arrington	Gallagher	McHenry
Babin	Garrett	McKinley
Bacon	Gianforte	McMorris
Banks (IN)	Gibbs	Rodgers
Barletta	Gohmert	McSally
Barr	Goodlatte	Meadows
Barton	Gosar	Meehan
Bergman	Gowdy	Messer
Biggs	Granger	Mitchell
Bilirakis	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Bishop (MI)	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (UT)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Black	Griffith	Newhouse
Blackburn	Grothman	Noem
Blum	Guthrie	Norman
Bost	Handel	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Harper	Olson
Brat	Harris	Palazzo
Brooks (IN)	Hartzler	Palmer
Buchanan	Hensarling	Paulsen
Buck	Herrera Beutler	Pearce
Bucshon	Hice, Jody B.	Perry
Budd	Higgins (LA)	Pittenger
Burgess	Hill	Poe (TX)
Byrne	Holding	Poliquin
Calvert	Hollingsworth	Posey
Carter (GA)	Hudson	Ratcliffe
Carter (TX)	Huizenga	Reed
Chabot	Hultgren	Reichert
Cheney	Hunter	Rice (SC)
Coffman	Coffman	Roby
Cole	Cole	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Collins (GA)	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Collins (NY)	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Comer	Rohrabacher
Comstock	Comstock	Rokita
Conaway	Conaway	Rooney, Francis
Cook	Cook	Rooney, Thomas J.
Costello (PA)	Costello (PA)	J.
Cramer	Cramer	Ros-Lehtinen
Crawford	Crawford	Roskam
Culberson	Culberson	Ross
Curbelo (FL)	Curbelo (FL)	Rothfus
Curtis	Curtis	Rouzer
Davidson	Davidson	Royce (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Davis, Rodney	Russell
Denham	Denham	Rutherford
Dent	Dent	Sanford
DeSantis	DeSantis	Scalise
DesJarlais	DesJarlais	Schweikert
Diaz-Balart	Diaz-Balart	Scott, Austin
Donovan	Donovan	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Duffy	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Duncan (SC)	Shimkus
	Duncan (TN)	Shuster
	Dunn	Simpson
	Emmer	Smith (MO)
	Estes (KS)	Smith (NE)
	Farenthold	Smith (NJ)
	Faso	Smith (TX)
	Ferguson	Smucker
	Fitzpatrick	Marchant
	Fleischmann	Stefanik
	Flores	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
Westernman

Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—191

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Conyers
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Cummings
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Ellison
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Esty (CT)
Evans
Foster
Frankel (FL)
Fudge

NOT VOTING—7

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Johnson, Sam

McGovern
Pelosi
Pocan

Nolan
Norcross
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (WA)
Soto
Speier
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

CONNECTED GOVERNMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 2331) to require a new or updated Federal website that is intended for use by the public to be mobile friendly, and for other purposes, as amended, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, as amended.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 423, nays 0, not voting 10, as follows:

[Roll No. 634]

YEAS—423

Abraham
Adams
Aderholt
Aguilar
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barragán
Barton
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Bergman
Beyer
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (GA)
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blackburn
Blum
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Bost
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brady (PA)
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (IN)
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Bustos
Butterfield
Byrne
Calvert
Capuano
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Cartwright
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Coffman
Cohen
Cole

Collins (GA)
Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Connolly
Conyers
Cook
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Costello (PA)
Courtney
Cramer
Crawford
Crist
Crowley
Cuellar
Culberson
Cummings
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny
Davis, Rodney
DeFazio
DeGette
Delaney
DeLauro
DelBene
Demings
Denham
Dent
DeSantis
DeSaulnier
DesJarlais
Deutch
Diaz-Balart
Dingell
Doggett
Donovan
Doyle, Michael F.
Duffy
Duncan (SC)
Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Ellison
Emmer
Engel
Eshoo
Espallat
Estes (KS)
Esty (CT)
Evans
Farenthold
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foster
Foxy
Frankel (FL)
Franks (AZ)
Frelinghuysen
Fudge
Gabbard

Kilmer
Kind
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kuster (NH)
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Lance
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Latta
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lewis (MN)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Loebach
Lofgren
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lowenthal
Lowey
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
MacArthur
Maloney
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
Matsui
McCarthy
McCauley
McClintock
McCollum
McEachin
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Meehan
Meeks
Meng
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Moore
Moulton
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano

Neal
Newhouse
Noem
Nolan
Norcross
Norman
Nunes
O'Halloran
O'Rourke
Olson
Palazzo
Pallone
Palmer
Panetta
Pascarell
Paulsen
Payne
Pearce
Perlmutter
Perry
Peters
Peterson
Pingree
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Polis
Posey
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Ratchcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Rice (NY)
Rice (SC)
Richmond
Roby
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen
Rosen
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Roybal-Allard
Royce (CA)
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Russell
Rutherford
Ryan (OH)
Sánchez
Sanford
Sarbanes
Scalise
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schradner
Schweikert
Scott (VA)
Scott, Austin
Scott, David
Sensenbrenner
Serrano
Sessions

Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Sinema
Sires
Slaughter
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smith (WA)
Smucker
Soto
Speier
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Suozi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (CA)
Polls
Thompson (MS)
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tiberi
Tipton
Titus
Tonko
Torres
Trott
Tsongas
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Walz
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Welch
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (FL)
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yarmuth
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—10

Bridenstine
Brooks (AL)
Johnson, Sam
Kihuen
Krishnamoorthi
McGovern
Pelosi
Pocan
Renacci
Roe (TN)

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1435

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1429

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.