



United States  
of America

# Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115<sup>th</sup> CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 163

WASHINGTON, MONDAY, DECEMBER 4, 2017

No. 197

## House of Representatives

The House met at 6 p.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE).

### DESIGNATION OF THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,  
December 4, 2017.

I hereby appoint the Honorable BRADLEY BYRNE to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

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

### PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: God of wisdom, we give You thanks for giving us another day.

Prior to the Great Compromise, Benjamin Franklin addressed the Constitutional Convention: "We indeed seem to feel our own want of political wisdom, since we have been running about in search of it. . . . In this situation of this assembly, groping as it were in the dark to find political truth, and scarce able to distinguish it when presented to us . . . have we now forgotten our powerful friend?"

Lord, You are the powerful friend referred to by Franklin, and we turn again to You to ask that Your wisdom might break through the political discussions of these coming days.

Bless the Members of the people's House, and all of Congress, with the insight and foresight to construct a future of security in our Nation's politics, economy, and society. May they, as You, be especially mindful of those who are poor and without power.

May all that is done be for Your greater honor and glory.  
Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

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

### PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. FRANKEL) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

### 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, December 4, 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 December 4, 2017, at 11:25 a.m.:

That the Senate passed with an amendment H.R. 1.

With best wishes, I am,  
Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

### LEXIE HOLBROOK AND JAKE WAGONER

(Ms. FOXX asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to wish two very special constituents a happy birthday.

Mrs. Lexie Holbrook and her great-great-nephew, Mr. Jake Wagoner, of Wilkes County, recently celebrated their respective birthdays. Mrs. Holbrook observed her 110th birthday, and Jake enjoyed his 10th birthday.

Mrs. Holbrook is the grande dame of North Wilkesboro and holds the title of the oldest living person in the county.

While 100 years and 5 days may separate them in age, they share a strong bond. Jake is proud of Lexie's age, and he regards her experience as cool. Further, he believes her to be something of a celebrity. Jake reported to his fourth grade class about Lexie's upcoming birthday and exclaimed: "That's right, she's mine."

The pride and love Mr. Wagoner feels for Lexie is inspiring. Mr. Speaker, I hope their story will serve to inspire others to strengthen the ties of friendship across generational lines—as we should all hope to have such bonds within our families.

### DUE PROCESS

(Ms. FRANKEL of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. FRANKEL of Florida. Mr. Speaker, this Congress, with a unanimous voice vote, passed a resolution that mandates antisexual harassment training for Members and staff.

Of course, it is about time. But here is the thing, Mr. Speaker: it is pitiful and embarrassing that a Member of Congress would need an instruction manual that tells them that they must keep their pants on in their office.

What we need is to create an environment of a safe and respectful workplace and policies and procedures that will allow victims to come forward to be fully compensated, for Members to be held accountable, and to have fair due process.

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H9601

2017 NATIONAL BLUE RIBBON  
SCHOOL AWARD

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

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in recognition of Greenville Junior/Senior High School in Greenville, Pennsylvania, and Laurel Junior/Senior High School in New Castle, Pennsylvania, which were recently honored by the Department of Education as 2017 National Blue Ribbon Schools.

This award, given to only 342 schools in America this year, is based on a school's overall academic performance as well as its progress in closing achievement gaps among its students.

In her message of congratulations, Secretary DeVos commended the visionaries, innovators, and leaders who are preparing every child for a bright future. I am proud to join her in congratulating the teachers and administrators of Greenville and Laurel, as well as the families of these students, for the love and support they provide.

Most of all, I want to congratulate the students themselves for a job well done. They are truly a credit to Pennsylvania's Third District and to our country. It is an honor to represent them in the people's House.

EXPRESSING GRATITUDE TO THE  
MEN AND WOMEN IN FEDERAL  
LAW ENFORCEMENT

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

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I serve on the House Judiciary Committee and serve as the ranking member on the Crime, Terrorism, Homeland Security, and Investigations Subcommittee, which means that I deal with every single Federal law enforcement entity across the Nation.

I am disappointed and I am outraged by the language from the Commander in Chief to suggest that the FBI is in tatters. We have agreements and disagreements with the chief law enforcement agency, but these men and women protecting us in this Nation, but also against domestic terrorism and even beyond, are called around the Nation to investigate heinous crimes. Their expertise is respected.

I remember when there was a child molester in my community. I worked with local police, but I insisted that the FBI get involved. They were willing to do so even though it was not a matter across State lines. Their very presence made a difference.

I think we owe them a better response, and I certainly think the Commander in Chief has a responsibility to do a better job.

I also believe that we have got to pass CHIP because thousands of children need healthcare. It is important for us to do our job.

## REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, at least Robin Hood stole from the rich and gave to the poor, but my Republican colleagues, with this Republican tax bill, are stealing from the poor and the middle class and giving to the rich. It is absolutely disgraceful. The tax bill boosts the rich and burdens the middle class.

I can say I have been here a long time, and this is one of the worst bills I have ever seen in all my years in Congress.

What happened to the Republican Party talking about fiscal responsibility? This blows a \$1 trillion hole in the Federal deficit and puts the burden on our children and grandchildren.

So let's not look at this tax scam. People should be getting together on both sides of the aisle. Tear up this one-sided bill, and let's put our heads together and come up with something good.

It was done during the Ronald Reagan years in a bipartisan way. Why can it not be done that way now?

My particular State of New York, my home State of New York, gets really attacked by this. High cost-of-living States get really attacked.

It is not right to play political games. You take a look at this, and you notice that blue States get attacked with this terrible bill.

Tear it up. Let's work together and come up with something good.

## RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

## AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BYRNE) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON  
H.R. 1, TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII, and by direction of the Committee on Ways and Means, I offer a motion.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. BRADY of Texas moves that the House take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 1, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I strongly support this motion to go to conference on the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, and I urge my colleagues to join me in voting to advance this progrowth, profamily tax reform legislation.

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

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY).

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 222, nays 192, not voting 19, as follows:

[Roll No. 653]

YEAS—222

Abraham	Franks (AZ)	McCarthy
Aderholt	Frelinghuysen	McCaul
Allen	Gaetz	McClintock
Amodei	Gallagher	McHenry
Arrington	Garrett	McKinley
Babin	Gianforte	McMorris
Bacon	Gibbs	Rodgers
Banks (IN)	Gohmert	McSally
Barletta	Goodlatte	Meadows
Barr	Gosar	Meehan
Barton	Gowdy	Messer
Bergman	Granger	Mitchell
Biggs	Graves (GA)	Moolenaar
Bilirakis	Graves (LA)	Mooney (WV)
Bishop (MI)	Graves (MO)	Mullin
Black	Griffith	Newhouse
Blackburn	Grothman	Noem
Blum	Guthrie	Norman
Bost	Handel	Nunes
Brady (TX)	Harper	Olson
Brat	Harris	Palazzo
Brooks (AL)	Hartzler	Palmer
Brooks (IN)	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	Hurd	Roby
Cole	Issa	Roe (TN)
Collins (GA)	Jenkins (KS)	Rogers (AL)
Collins (NY)	Jenkins (WV)	Rogers (KY)
Comer	Johnson (LA)	Rohrabacher
Comstock	Johnson (OH)	Rooney, Francis
Conaway	Johnson, Sam	Rooney, Thomas
Cook	Jordan	J.
Costello (PA)	Joyce (OH)	Ros-Lehtinen
Cramer	Katko	Roskam
Crawford	Kelly (MS)	Ross
Culberson	Kelly (PA)	Rothfus
Curbelo (FL)	King (IA)	Rouzer
Davidson	Kinzinger	Royce (CA)
Davis, Rodney	Knight	Russell
Denham	Kustoff (TN)	Rutherford
Dent	Labrador	Sanford
DeSantis	LaHood	Schweikert
DesJarlais	LaMalfa	Scott, Austin
Diaz-Balart	Lamborn	Sensenbrenner
Duffy	Lance	Sessions
Duncan (SC)	Latta	Shimkus
Duncan (TN)	Lewis (MN)	Shuster
Dunn	Long	Simpson
Emmer	Loudermilk	Smith (MO)
Estes (KS)	Lucas	Smith (NE)
Farenthold	Luetkemeyer	Smith (TX)
Faso	MacArthur	Smucker
Ferguson	Marchant	Stefanik
Fitzpatrick	Marino	Stivers
Fleischmann	Marshall	Taylor
Fortenberry	Massie	Tenney
Fox	Mast	Thompson (PA)

Thornberry	Walden	Wilson (SC)
Tiberi	Walker	Wittman
Tipton	Walorski	Womack
Trott	Walters, Mimi	Woodall
Turner	Weber (TX)	Yoder
Upton	Webster (FL)	Yoho
Valadao	Wenstrup	Young (AK)
Wagner	Westerman	Young (IA)
Walberg	Williams	

NAYS—192

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

NOT VOTING—19

Beatty	Gutiérrez	Renacci
Bishop (UT)	Kennedy	Rokita
Bridenstine	Kihuen	Scalise
Buchanan	Loeb sack	Stewart
Conyers	Love	Walz
Curtis	Pocan	
Flores	Quigley	

□ 1904

Mses. JAYAPAL, WILSON of Florida, and Mr. THOMPSON of California changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Messrs. MEADOWS, DESJARLAIS, MASSIE, BIGGS, NORMAN, BUDD, BUCK, GOSAR, JORDAN, and HARRIS changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion was agreed to. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted “yea” on rollcall No. 653.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to instruct at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to instruct.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Neal moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 1 be instructed to—

(1) disagree with section 11081 of the Senate amendment (relating to elimination of shared responsibility payment for individuals failing to maintain minimum essential coverage), and

(2) recede from section 1303 of the House bill (relating to repeal of deduction for certain taxes not paid or accrued in a trade or business).

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentleman from Massachusetts (Mr. NEAL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BRADY) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Massachusetts.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. NEAL. 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 Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 4 minutes.

Mr. Speaker, this could be a long few days if they can't agree on a motion to go to conference. That is not exactly the most heightened controversy we have.

Mr. Speaker, I want to stand in support of the Democratic motion to instruct conferees on the Ryan-McConnell tax package and in strong opposition to the Republican tax plan.

Behind me is a replica of the national debt clock. This clock was just reconfigured. New features have been added just in time for the Republicans to acknowledge that they are about to add \$1 trillion to this national debt clock, which they tortured Democratic Presidents on for years about the debt.

So let me provide you with some historical perspective. In January of 2001, when Bill Clinton said good-bye, we were looking at a \$5.4 trillion surplus, four straight balanced budgets, and record economic growth. The CBO said that the surplus might even go beyond \$5.6 trillion.

But what really happened during that period of time?

After the Bush administration left, we were staring at \$6.1 trillion worth of debt.

So what happened?

In 2001, the Republican Party cut taxes by \$1.3 trillion and said it was all about economic growth. Then they came back in 2003 and said: Well, the growth hasn't been substantial enough, so we are going to cut taxes by another \$1 trillion, \$2.3 trillion of tax cuts, and a repatriation tax holiday where the money is returned at 5.25 percent on the promise of economic growth and job creation; none of which happened.

So where are we tonight?

We are back to the same old pattern and playbook that they continue to utilize. They promised job growth. In a meeting with the President recently, he said he didn't understand why we couldn't have job growth of 4, 5, or 6 percent. I don't know an economist who thinks we are going to have 6 percent economic growth, but they use that as the linchpin, the excuse for a tax cut that is going to add \$1 trillion to the budget deficits, all based on the following economic assumption: maybe.

Maybe we will have growth that will help us to pay down the debt. All of the mainstream economists say maybe a return of one-third on the tax cuts in terms of revenue. Joint Committee on Taxation, The Wharton School, the Tax Policy Center, moodys.com, they all say the same thing: None of this is going to happen.

So we are also back to a familiar argument that they hear, and I think you should pay some attention to this for the moment.

They will say things repeatedly like: It is the people's money. The people know what to do with it.

Well, let me say this as well tonight: It is the people's veterans hospitals; one million new veterans after Iraq and Afghanistan who are going to be in need of long-term care. That is the people's responsibility.

In addition, 10,000 baby boomers retire every single day in America. Social Security is part of their retirement system, even as it averages about \$15,000 for American citizens.

We are going to live longer, and we herald that achievement regularly, but it is also going to mean more Alzheimer's and more dementia that families are going to have to reconcile, and they are going to come back and say at the right moment: Oh, because there is less revenue, we are going to have to have cuts in social spending.

So they are going to say at the right moment: Oh, we are going to have to now change the way we calculate Medicare and Social Security.

This is a missed opportunity above everything else. Everybody agrees on what is wrong with the Tax Code.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself an additional 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, there was a chance here to do some investment in human capital: community colleges, vocational education, internship programs. The

Labor Department reported 3 weeks ago, 6 million jobs go unanswered in America every single day.

I hope tonight, as the Republicans confer, they can tell us where they are actually conferring because, between the paste and the bubble gum, they keep putting on a new dimension to their proposal.

This should be a debate that included both parties. Before I reserve my time, for the moment, I want to say this: We had a chance to really do something big. They have, unbelievably, proposed to take the entire revenue architecture of this country in 3 weeks without one hearing, without one witness. They are going to change it all, and the middle class is about to get it in the neck to take care of people at the top.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise in strong opposition to the motion to instruct. Today, we are moving to the crucial final stage in delivering once-in-a-generation tax reform to the American people. The choice we face now is clear.

Do we want to stick with this complex, costly, unfair system that, today, caters to special interests and drives American jobs overseas?

Do we want to stick with the slow-growth Tax Code that keeps our economy in second gear and all but guarantees rising debt and deficits?

Or do we think it is time to go in a new direction? Do we think it is finally time to provide our workers, our families, and our job creators with a Tax Code that is simple, that is fair, that is built to create jobs and leapfrog America back into the lead pack around the world?

□ 1915

Do we think it is time to get our economy growing again, I mean, truly growing, where better jobs, bigger paychecks, and more opportunity are available to people throughout this country?

Many in Washington say they support tax reform, yet every argument we hear is about keeping taxes higher, keeping the growth of jobs and paychecks lower, and keeping more of this broken Tax Code that is so complex and so unfair to everyday Americans.

It almost seems too many in Congress are rooting against a growing and prosperous American economy. Too many who claim to be concerned about the deficit today joyfully added trillions of dollars to the national deficit when it meant Washington could spend more.

When our friends on the other side took control of the House, in the first year, they doubled the deficit. In the second year, they tripled the deficit. They then went on a roll of \$1 trillion of more debt every year. In fact, they voted for a \$1 trillion stimulus, absolutely unpaid for, that did nothing to

grow the economy. That was when Washington could spend. But now, when it comes to letting families and our Main Street businesses spend more of their own hard-earned money, all of a sudden they say “no.”

Come on.

If you ask my constituents in Texas, they will tell you, without a doubt, it is time to go in a new direction. It is time to be progrowth. It is time to leave this slow-growth status quo behind us for good.

Without a doubt, my constituents and so many Americans throughout our country are rooting for a healthier, stronger economy and a simpler, fairer Tax Code that allows them to keep more of their hard-earned money. That is why, right now, it is time for us to come together in a conference committee and finalize the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act for the American people.

When the Ways and Means Committee started working on tax reform over 6 years ago, we knew this road would be long and difficult. We have had our share of ups and downs along the way, but we stuck with it because we knew the American people were counting on us. We know they are counting on us now.

So, with this conference committee, we are going to come together to give the American people the best of what our two bills have to offer. At every step, we are going to ask ourselves:

How can we truly deliver the Tax Code Americans deserve?

How do we drive rates lower for families?

How do we encourage more investment in job creation on Main Street?

How do we bring jobs back to America from overseas?

How can we better support parents and students and homeowners and retirees?

How can we make our economy stronger and healthier than ever?

How can we improve lives across our country?

We have all worked hard to get to this point in the process. I am proud of the bill we have delivered in the House, and I want to congratulate the Senate as well.

Right now, we are closer than ever to delivering on our tax reform promise to the American people, but some of our most important work is still ahead of us.

Now is the time for us to dig deep on behalf of the people we were sent here to serve. Now is the time for us to come together in a conference committee and unite behind one historic tax cut bill that will help Americans in all walks of life.

This truly is the moment and the opportunity that we and so many Americans have worked for and waited for and deserve. Now is the time to seize it. Working truly together, I am confident we will.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose this motion to instruct that kills tax reform, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. LEVIN), who announced this past weekend that he is going to leave this institution. He has served this institution with distinction and grace for a long period of time.

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

Mr. Speaker, the chairman of the committee says: Come together.

You have done it alone. You have snubbed your nose at the American people as well as the process of this institution.

The GOP tax bill combines the Republicans' long-term faith in trickle-down economics with a new, brazen disregard for the facts that have become the hallmark of the Trump Presidency.

This bill is mostly about cutting taxes for the very wealthy, not the middle class. Making the very wealthy even richer is not the path to broad-based economic prosperity and growth. Tax cuts for the very top do not pay for themselves; instead, they increase the debt. These are the facts that have been presented by the Joint Committee on Taxation, and so many others have called the Republican bill a boondoggle and delusional.

Republicans say the facts be damned as they rush this legislation out of desperation, not deliberation.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that a family of four in Michigan's Ninth District will save over \$1,700 each and every year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ROSKAM), the chairman of the Tax Policy Subcommittee and a leader on the tax reform effort.

Mr. ROSKAM. Mr. Speaker, I direct the membership's attention to an argument the ranking member made a couple of minutes ago where he criticized repatriation efforts in the past. He is right; they underperformed.

Why did they underperform?

They were a holiday. It was temporary. So we learned from that. I wasn't around when it happened, but we have learned from that, Mr. Speaker, and we are saying let's not do that again. Let's have a permanent policy that unlocks American dollars that are locked out overseas right now. Most folks think it is between \$3 trillion and \$4 trillion that can come back home.

Where does that come back home?

It will come to the Sixth Congressional District of Illinois. It will go to Massachusetts. It will go to Texas. It will go to all of these places to be reinvested.

Why?

This is a dynamic, vibrant economy that can become better. This is an attractive place. We just need to make it better.

The other argument that he made, essentially, is: Look, is this really going to create growth?

He is right to point out that not all tax cuts are created equal as it relates to growth. The whole purpose, though,

is not simply growth. It is also tax relief.

I have got a constituency that got jammed by Democrats in the Illinois General Assembly this year with a massive tax hike on the middle-income folks in Illinois. They need relief. So part of this is to offer relief.

The way that we have approached this is to say let's create this as it relates to the investment and expensing. If you look at the Tax Foundation and the nonpartisan work that they have done, they will tell you, that investment that we are making—that is, throwing away depreciation schedules and telling small businesses, if you invest, you can write it all off in year one—that creates activity.

So, we ought to shed and shun this motion to instruct and, instead, let's work through the normal conference process.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, let me give you one quick anecdote. A manufacturer in my district told me this. They are planning to invest \$30 million in their manufacturing plant. Next year, if we do this bill, they are not going to invest \$30 million in that facility; they are going to invest \$50 million.

That is one company in one cul-de-sac in one subdivision in suburban Chicago. If you ripple that throughout the entire economy, great things happen.

Vote "no" on the motion, and let's proceed to conference.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, more than a bill, this is a lie wrapped in lies, a sneak attack on America ramming through here at warp speed before the truth catches up with the lies. A very thin sugarcoating of tax changes for some in the middle class conceals massive special interest giveaways.

But I am convinced that the reckoning will come. Americans will demand accountability for a scheme that showers its benefits overwhelmingly on corporations and those at the top of the economic ladder, including the Trump family personally benefiting.

The reckoning will come when students and the sick find out they are paying not less taxes, but more taxes, under this bill.

The reckoning will come as Republicans use the huge debt burden that they are deliberately creating by this bill as an excuse to cut Medicare, educational opportunities, and other vital investments.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from Texas an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. DOGGETT. This sham of a bill provides rewards to corporate tax dodgers and creates a giant new loophole for outsourcing American jobs abroad.

The only coming together here is the coming together between the master of distraction, the big tweet down the

street, who is joined here by the masters of deceit in Congress. They ignore any wrong he commits. He can embrace child molesters; he can attack our law enforcement officers; he can challenge the very basis of the free press in our country, using any means necessary, whatever deception, to try to foist off this sham of a bill on America.

It should be rejected.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would note that the average family of four making \$59,000 a year in the 35th District of Texas will see a tax cut of over \$1,100.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New York (Mr. REED), a key leader of the Ways and Means Committee who knows what it is like to create jobs in New York.

Mr. REED. Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman BRADY for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into my speech this evening, I just want to take a moment.

I just heard a colleague on the other side of the aisle call me, essentially, a master of deceit. This country is sick and tired of this type of divisive rhetoric. I am here to tell you that it is time to put the American people first.

I understand that we sit sometimes in this Chamber in the biggest political theater in the United States of America, but at some point in time I have got to say enough is enough.

To my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, I would ask us and the American people back home to look at the legislation that we have done in the committee.

The bottom line, in the House bill, hardworking taxpayers in my district are going to see \$1,600 of their hard-earned dollars remain in their pocket with the government not taking that money away from them.

There are differences between the House bill and the Senate bill. I think there are legitimate parts to the Senate bill we should consider in this conference committee that we are going to entertain here very shortly. They are things like the medical expense deduction, things like, potentially, the historic tax credit. But that is how legislation is drafted. We have a body in the Senate, we have a body in the House, and we come together to put the best product forward for the American people.

I will tell you, as I have heard from my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, if reducing taxes is not a part of economic growth, then you disagree with every Governor in the United States of America, because every Governor's economic development plan across this country, what does it do?

You see the commercials as you travel around this country: Come to New York State; we are open for business because we have lowered our taxes for opportunities and growth. I see it in Il-

linois. I see it in California. I see it in Texas.

So what we have done with the proposal in the House is exactly that. We have focused relief on hardworking taxpayers, and we have lowered the tax burden overall so that people can invest in their businesses, invest in their families, and grow the economy, which, at the end of the day, do you know what that means for an American person?

It means more money for them, but, most importantly, it means a job—a job not only to make money, but it is good for the soul. It is good for the heart. It brings you pride in knowing that you did an honest day's work to get an honest day's amount of pay. That is what growth is about. It is not about numbers. It is about people and opportunity.

I ask my colleagues, join us in rejecting this motion to instruct, and let's get to the business of the people and finish the job once and for all.

□ 1930

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. THOMPSON), a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. THOMPSON of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this motion.

The underlying bill raises taxes on millions of middle class working Americans; it adds over \$2.3 trillion to our national debt; and if the Senate has its way, 13 million people will lose their healthcare.

This bill was written behind closed doors by a handful of Republicans to give massive permanent tax breaks to corporations at the cost of our middle class working Americans. Not one legislative hearing was held in the House on this bill. The Senate bill was passed in the dark hours of the night with scribbles in the margins.

Every single person in our country should know how their Member of Congress voted on this, because you and your children will be paying for it for decades to come.

This is a bad bill. I hope this will be a serious conference to improve this reckless piece of legislation.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the average family of four in the Fifth District of California will see a tax cut of over \$2,370.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. RICE), a key leader of tax reform who has a terrific accounting and business background.

Mr. RICE of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, the American Dream is what separates us from the rest of the world. It promises that, with hard work and determination, you can improve your station in life and that your children have the opportunity for a better life than yours; but for many in the generation coming of age in the past decade, the American Dream has been a little tarnished, just out of reach.

The last time we did tax reform was 30 years ago. At that time, we were the world's uncontested economic leader, our economic system and Tax Code were competitive; but for decades, we have sat idly as the world restructured to pass us by.

As we became less competitive, more and more American companies and American jobs left our shores. What has been the result? We have lost millions of middle class jobs.

In 1990, the middle class comprised 50 percent of American families, today only 40 percent. Today the middle class makes just about the same take-home pay as they did in 1990, 27 years later.

When we all worry about income disparity and the gulf between the rich and the poor in this country, this is the source of the problem. The American middle class is smaller and has not had a raise in 30 years.

How could this happen? It has everything to do with this bloated, overregulating, and overtaxing Federal Government, a government that sucks the life out of the economy and forces our companies, our innovators, and our job creators out of the country to survive.

Some folks say it doesn't matter that we have the highest business tax rate in the world; that is not why companies left. They say those jobs aren't coming back.

Well, I say the outdated Tax Code is an anchor around the neck of American business, our innovators, and our American middle class. I say the American worker can compete with anyone on a level playing field if we just get government out of the way.

Since January, we have been working to correct that. We have made dramatic steps in reducing regulation, and you are already seeing the economic lift.

Today we continue to advance a tax cut which will restore economic growth, put more take-home pay into the pockets of hardworking Americans, and restore opportunity for a generation. It will bring American jobs back to America, which will grow our middle class, and finally, after 30 years, give the middle class the pay raise it deserves.

If you really wish to grow the economy, you should support this tax reform package. If you really wish to give the middle class a raise, you should support tax reform. If you really wish to reduce income disparity, you should support this tax reform package. If you really wish to give hope to Americans who have given up and left the workforce, and reduce crime and addiction in this country, you should support this tax reform package. If you want America to have the economic strength to remain a force of peace and stability in the world, you should support this tax reform package.

Finally, if you support the American Dream, you should support this tax reform package.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Con-

necticut (Mr. LARSON), a neighbor and a good friend.

Mr. LARSON of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I will submit for the RECORD at a later time a notice from both the comptroller and the commissioner of Revenue Services for the State of Connecticut, who notes that a married family with a kid in college would see a \$767 tax increase next year and a \$1,667 increase in the year 2027.

Mr. Speaker, we have already protested what we think about this bill, what they have done to this process, the stain that this is on this institution.

1986 has been cited. No public hearings. We had 30 hearings, 12 subcommittee hearings, 456 witnesses. We have none, and now you do a bill in double secret probation. You make Dean Wormer look good from "Animal House". This is what is wrong with this process here today.

The cruelest cut is that you perpetrate a \$25 billion cut in Medicare that you don't even have to vote on. That is the worst cut. Talk about a cowardly act in the night: a \$25 billion cut to our seniors. No wonder the AARP has spoken out so strongly against it.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All Members are reminded that they should address their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to remind the House that a family of four in Connecticut's First District will see a tax cut of \$3,858 each and every year.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT), a new member and a key member of the Ways and Means Committee.

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

Mr. Speaker, before I start, what I wanted to share is I have been blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee now for 11 months. I have found the members on the left, the right, a group of folks with pretty high IQs. It is a smart bunch. We have different views, even within our own, within your own, but it is fascinating. It is joyful to be on a committee where when you do argue with each other, particularly when we have conversations in the back, they happen at a fairly high level.

Can I give you sort of a personal global view of how I am viewing this tax reform? I truly believe this will be the single biggest, most important vote I make in my life.

We all know what status quo is. Status quo, in many of the models, basically says, in about 15, 18 years, we hit a debt crisis. Are we arguing here for status quo or our change, or are we having an argument here that you don't like our changes, but you also agree we need to have a revolution in our economic growth?

If we build our lives as it is set right now with a 1.8, 1.9 percent GDP growth

for the next three decades, my 2-year-old's future is miserable. Those very seniors whom someone was just speaking about, do you understand what happens to those earned entitlements? There is no money. We hit a debt crisis. We are just a few years away from publicly held debt equaling the size of our entire economy.

If you love people, if you care about this country keeping its promises, we have got to grow. We have seen the attempts at sort of managed economy, managed control, managed targeted.

How about something much more elegant: let's make us competitive in the world again; let's get rid of all the lobbyist-created little special deals in the Tax Code, or as many as we can politically, and do everything we can to get this economy growing.

Yes, it is going to require more, in my view of the world, than tax reform. We are going to have to deal with immigration, we are going to have to deal with technology, we are going to have to deal with regulation, but we all know around here that if we do not have a revolution in this Tax Code, our future is pretty dark.

With economic growth, our future is actually really bright. When you see the Atlanta Fed telling us, just in anticipation of tax reform, we have crossed 3½ percent GDP growth right now, maybe that 1.8 percent misery of economic growth isn't our future, isn't the future for my little girl, isn't the future for every American, but it is an opportunity for this country to start looking as it should: a land of opportunity.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Oregon (Mr. BLUMENAUER), a particular champion of all renewable energy forms.

Mr. BLUMENAUER. Mr. Speaker, I listen to my friend from Arizona, and I wonder what planet he is on. He is concerned about his little 2-year-old, yet they finance the largest transfer of wealth in our Nation's history by adding more debt on the backs of his children, our grandchildren, and generations to come.

They want the public to have more of their money, yet they are not supporting our motion to instruct that would stop this notion that we are going to jack up premium prices 10 percent a year by destabilizing the insurance markets, the notion of these ugly surprises that the lobbyists have snuck in, and we will find out about them every single week going forward.

Reject this misguided approach. Let's work together.

Rebuild and renew America? The States can raise a gas tax. We refuse to acknowledge a straightforward proposition to do that here.

Let's reject this atrocity.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would note that a family of four in Oregon's Third District will see tax savings of \$2,256.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL), a very important member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, the President himself will see a financial windfall. If the majority wasn't helping him hide his tax returns, the American people could see the truth.

The bill exacerbates dramatic and historic health inequality, wealth inequality. Adding \$1.5 trillion to our national debt, as this bill does, without benefiting the middle and working class is legislative malpractice.

So while Republicans tout this as a middle class tax cut, some taxpayers at every income level will pay more on this bill. A middle-aged married couple with no children earning \$80,900 a year who itemize could end up paying \$4,330 more in 2018. Many of my constituents will see a big tax increase after losing the full State and local tax deduction. That is absurd.

The authors of this bill said all of the individual tax cuts will expire after 2025, as well as change the measure of inflation, which will slowly bump taxpayers into higher income brackets. Are we kidding, and who are we kidding?

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, that family of four in New Jersey's Ninth District making \$90,000 a year, two workers, will see a tax cut of \$2,044.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. CROWLEY), a member of the leadership of the Democratic Party. I think he is going to tell us about what the elimination of the State and local tax deduction means to the people of New York.

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

Mr. Speaker, I want to point out to my colleague and friend from Texas that the specifics he is talking about are temporary as they are applied to personal income tax, but they are permanent for corporations. All of your tax cuts are permanent for the corporate world, but not for individuals.

He talks about a family of four. Take it for \$1,100 a year, divide it by four, it is \$250.

□ 1945

They are going to borrow \$1.5 trillion. Divide it by 300 million, and that is \$5,000 per American. Do the math. They are spending the future of our country to give the biggest tax cut to corporations and the wealthiest—\$4 billion alone to the Trump family. You do this on the backs by double taxation in places like Pennsylvania, New York, California, and New Jersey, where you are double taxing through the SALT provision, State and local taxes.

This is going to have an incredible impact on the lives of your constituents. How anyone with a conscience on

the Republican side of the aisle could support this bill in California, New York, Pennsylvania, Illinois, and all the other tax States in this country is unconscionable.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded that they should direct their remarks to the Chair.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to report that the median family of four in New York's 14th District making \$63,000 a year working hard will see a tax cut of \$1,251.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS), who is a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee. The gentleman is also a great champion of new markets tax credits and the historic tax credit which is eliminated in the Republican tax plan.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, in every place that I went yesterday, people asked me: What are you going to say to the conferees?

I said that I am going to join with my colleagues and say to the conferees: Help the needy and not the greedy.

I am going to say to the conferees: Why give 50 percent of the tax break to the wealthiest 1 percent of the population in this country?

I am going to say: Why cut Medicare, Medicaid, and provisions of the Affordable Care Act that have kept millions of people from having the agony, pain, and frustration of not being able to find healthcare?

I am going to say: Save the children; save the veterans; save the center cities that are decayed; save the infrastructure; save the safety net; and save America.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that that median family of four with two kids in the Seventh District of Illinois making \$73,000 really working hard where every dollar counts will see a tax cut of \$1,546.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. HIGGINS), who is a valued member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, it has been said by the U.S. Treasury Secretary that tax cuts pay for themselves. He says that not only will these corporate taxes pay for themselves, they will add an additional \$2 trillion in economic activity. Nobody believes that. There is no credible report that supports that contention.

What do pay for themselves are tax credits, particularly the Federal historic tax credit. That is one that returns generously to the Federal Treasury. The Federal historic tax credit returns more to the Treasury than it costs. In fact, \$25 billion in credits have returned \$29 billion to the Federal Treasury; \$5 of private investment is made for every dollar in the Federal historic tax credit program.

Nationally, \$132 billion in private investment has been made because of \$25 million in Federal historic tax credits. Over 43,000 buildings in downtown areas like my community of Buffalo, New York, have benefited tremendously from this valuable program.

It is eliminated in the House bill; it is eliminated in the Senate bill; and the conference should restore it as an issue of fairness.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that that median family of four making \$74,000, blue-collar workers in the 26th District of New York, will see a tax cut of \$1,562.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from Alabama (Ms. SEWELL), who is a great champion of the middle class and a Marshall Scholar.

Ms. SEWELL of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, we are not ready for conference. The Senate bill was written by lobbyists in the dead of night when Republicans hoped no one was paying attention. There was no CBO score, no debate, no time to even read the bill, and now the majority thinks this bill is ready to go to conference? Really? Not.

The House and Senate bills will put us at least \$1.4 trillion into debt, will cause cuts to Social Security and Medicare, and will raise taxes on 82 million Americans.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bad deal for Americans, and it is an even worse deal for my constituents in Alabama. In my State of Alabama, over 500,000 families making \$80,000 a year or less will see a tax increase. It will result in \$205 million being taken away from teachers and students, and it will put \$168 million in charitable donations at risk.

These bills are not for the middle class. These bills will do enormous damage to the middle class.

Mr. Speaker, we are not ready for conference.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that the median family of four making \$65,000 in Alabama's Seventh District would see a tax cut of \$1,311.

I would also point out that the Congressional Budget Office doesn't score a tax reform bill. That is the Joint Committee on Taxation. That score was available to Ways and Means Committee members the day we voted on this bill and available, again, to House Members before we approved it as well.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the distinguished gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE).

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, over the past few weeks, Republicans have been cutting backroom deals that benefit the wealthy and well-connected out of the light of day, piling hurt onto people who won't be able to speak for themselves.

Now we are on the verge of being force-fed a bill in which corporations

get massive tax cuts while hardworking Americans are forced to pick up the tab. Over the life of the Ryan-McConnell plan, 36 million middle class families struggling to pay for healthcare, education, childcare, housing, and retirement are going to see their taxes go up. Now millions may lose healthcare coverage as well.

What happened to fiscal responsibility?

Economists are telling us that the increased debt won't be paid for by economic growth, and CEOs are openly sharing their plans to reward their shareholders with their new tax breaks—not create jobs.

This bill is reckless, and I urge my colleagues to support this motion.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I point out that a median family of four with two kids in Washington's First District will see a tax cut of \$5,008.

I would also remind my colleagues that President Obama raised the national debt by \$9 trillion in new Washington spending.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. SÁNCHEZ), who is a distinguished member of the Ways and Means Committee.

Ms. SÁNCHEZ. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask a simple question: What is the rush? Why are we rushing to vote on a \$1.7 trillion tax bill that will end up being paid off the backs of working Americans?

Don't be fooled. Working Americans will pay for this bill. That is why the National Association of Realtors warned that the typical homeowner in my State could see their home value drop between \$37,000 and \$57,000. That is why the Joint Committee on Taxation has said the Republican bill would increase costs to college students and their families by \$71 billion.

We all know whose retirement Republicans will raid when their overly optimistic growth numbers don't materialize. They are going to go after your Medicare and Social Security.

The American people deserve better than this Republican tax scam. Instead of rushing to get this done, let's work together to get it done right.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that that hardworking family of four in California's 38th District would see a tax cut of \$1,870.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. JUDY CHU), who is the former revenue commissioner of California and who knows something about revenue projections.

Ms. JUDY CHU of California. Mr. Speaker, this tax scam is one of the greatest cons I have seen in my time in Congress, and Republicans know it. Why else would they rush to vote without giving the public time to review or understand legislation that impacts 100

percent of our economy? In the Senate, they even shattered regular order to pass this bill with handwritten, illegible changes in the dead of night on Saturday. Perhaps it is because they don't want anybody to see how far this bill strays from their promises.

They promised historic tax cuts, but unless you are already rich or a corporation already seeing record profits, you are unlikely to benefit. Instead, you and your children will be paying to make the rich richer.

Republicans don't even deny that individuals get less than corporations. But it is okay, they claim, because that money will get to you eventually. They keep citing these magical numbers of money that you will get, but we know these dollars won't come.

Whether losing deductions for State and local taxes, paying more for student loans, or facing higher healthcare prices, thanks to the repeal of the mandate, the GOP tax scam will hurt millions.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I would point out that that hardworking family of four in the 27th District of California will see a tax cut of \$2,249.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. KELLY), who is a key member of our Tax Policy Subcommittee and a businessperson himself.

Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to speak tonight because I was just trying to figure out what it is that we are trying to get here and if it is always going to be the same thing as if it is not our bill, just not the bill we want.

When we talk about a rush to judgment, for 31 years, we have postponed the inevitable. We no longer can compete globally because of our corporate tax rates and the regulations.

Our people—and I don't care if they are Republican voters or Democratic voters or people that don't vote at all—isn't it time to give them a little bit more money in their take-home pay? Isn't it time to let them get up in the morning with an idea that "I can actually be better at the end of the day than when I started"? Isn't it time for us to talk about bringing millions of jobs back to the United States as opposed to sitting here and trying to battle back and forth about something that politically doesn't make any sense?

For the folks who are sitting at home, do they realize how far we are getting away from what we pledged we would do for them: a dynamic and robust economy that allows for more take-home pay, a dynamic and robust economy that allows corporations to flourish and not flounder, and a tax plan that absolutely puts America back where it so deservedly belongs?

With all the assets that we are blessed with, with all the talent that we are blessed with, and with all the opportunity that we are blessed with, can we really think that tonight is the night to turn this into a political bat-

tle, to make one side look good and one side look bad?

Is it always going to be the war on the wealthy? Is it always going to be the war on some entity? Does it have to be some type of identity before we can actually back away and say: Tonight we are going to do something for every single hardworking American?

Please, refrain from using the term "middle class." There is nothing, I think, that flies more in the face of who we aren't as a society than classifying people: "Oh, they are middle class"; "Oh, they are upper class," which leads people to think: "Oh, there must be a lower class."

I am asking, tonight, not for either side of the aisle, but for America to look at what is going on and say: It is not time for us to get back in the game.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from South Carolina (Mr. CLYBURN), who is the assistant Democratic leader.

In reference to my friend, Mr. KELLY, Mr. CLYBURN is a real champion of the middle class.

Mr. CLYBURN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding me this time.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania, it is time to do all of those things that he just spoke about, but this piece of legislation does none of those things. In fact, it raises taxes on 87 million middle-income families, cuts \$25 billion a year from Medicare, kicks 13 million people off of their health insurance, makes it easier for companies to ship jobs overseas, eliminates long-held deductions for teachers, students, and the chronically ill, makes individual tax cuts temporary but corporate tax cuts permanent, and increases the deficit by more than \$1.5 trillion.

□ 2000

The hypocrisy of so-called conservatives is staggering. Corporations will save billions and shareholders will get richer, while our children and grandchildren foot the bill.

The Democratic motion would instruct conferees to protect deductions for State and local taxes and restore the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate. Doing so will stop 13 million Americans from losing their health insurance and put a halt to the 10 percent premium hike that CBO estimates the Ryan-McConnell tax scam would cause.

Mr. Speaker, the individual mandate is at the heart of the Affordable Care Act. Repealing it—as the GOP tax scam does—is a deliberate attempt to undercut the law, create chaos in the health insurance marketplaces, increase premiums, and decrease choice and coverage.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to restore State and local tax deductibility and the individual mandate.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I point out that a middle class family



making \$74,000, in the Fifth District of South Carolina, will see a tax cut of \$1,568.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER), one of the best legislators in the House, the Democratic whip.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. NEAL for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, as he well knows, is one of my favorite Members. He is a good friend. He is a man of great integrity. But, Mr. Speaker, both the House and Senate bills are bad bills, and this is a sad day in the House.

Hypocrisy is on stark display. Responsibility is absent, and politics—and donors—have subverted policy.

This conference is a sham: an attempt to make it appear that the House and Senate are going through regular order. Sadly, we have not gone through regular order. The thought is we will reconcile the two versions of the dangerous Republican tax increase and deficit bill. I call this a death tax because it will explode the deficit, as happened in 1981, when, under Ronald Reagan for 8 years, we increased the debt of this country 189 percent.

The chairman of the Ways and Means Committee mentions Mr. Obama, who increased it 88 percent, or less than half of the Reagan increase in the debt. And we were promised then, as we are promised now, that cutting these taxes would grow the economy. It would if that were the case.

But there won't be any real regular order in this conference, just as there hasn't been throughout this entire process. There will only be further closed-door, backroom antics by Republican leaders on their own, asking Republican Members to take it or leave it. And this motion to instruct, of course, will be defeated.

But Democrats are offering it because, from the very beginning, we have made clear that we are here to work toward the kind of tax reform that the American people want: tax reform that I worked with in 1986.

And they don't want an elimination of the deduction for State and local taxes, which our motion would instruct the conferees not to do. The deductions for State and local taxes support schools and first responders in our communities, and the American people don't want to kick 13 million people off of their health insurance coverage.

So our motion would instruct conferees to take that dangerous provision out. But no motion to instruct can address all of the ways that the Republican tax bill has put our people, and our future, in danger.

The Senate bill raises taxes on somewhere around 78 million middle class households, not as a pejorative, but as an income spectrum. Why? To offset massive tax cuts for those not with whom we are at war, but who are doing very well and don't need our help.

It plunges our children and grandchildren—of which I have a number—an additional \$1.7 trillion in debt—and I think that is the minimum—making them pay tomorrow for what Republicans refuse to pay for today.

And for what? For what, Mr. Speaker, are we being asked to do all of these things? For economic growth? For jobs?

We know it won't grow our economy in any substantial way faster. Why? Because almost every economist tells us that. And we know that the few jobs the Senate bill would create—and listen to this: that they claim that they will create—will cost \$1.9 million per job.

The vast majority of Americans won't benefit from this plan; but those who are already extremely wealthy will benefit greatly—as a matter of fact, 52 times what the gentleman will tell us.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from Maryland.

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, there is a saying that Texans like to use: "That dog won't hunt." It doesn't do what it is purported to do. It doesn't take Einstein to predict what will happen this time around, when he defined insanity as "doing the same thing over and over again and expecting different results."

I have been here. I have seen this. I have heard this argument. It has always resulted in the same thing.

I have more to say, but my time is up.

Mr. Speaker, let me say to the gentleman from Texas, the chairman of the committee—he is going to tell me how much people in my district get a tax break—tell me about my children and my grandchildren whose debts he will pile on them to borrow money from China, or someplace else, to give this tax cut that they will then have to pay off in their time. Tell me how much my children will have their taxes raised.

He apparently doesn't know. That is sad.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 1 minute.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to report that a median, hardworking, middle class family in the Fifth District of Maryland, will see a tax cut of \$4,158.

Mr. Speaker, I will remind everyone here tonight that the first year our Democrats took over the majority in the House, they doubled the deficit. The second year, they tripled the deficit. In the third year, it went above \$1 trillion a year, and it stayed there until Republicans took control of the House. My friends on the other side of the aisle added \$9 trillion to this deficit. But that was when Washington was spending.

Today, we want to give people back control of their money, and, all of a sudden: Whoa, wait a minute. Deficits suddenly matter?

I believe that claim is the hypocrisy in this debate.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, apparently the gentleman forgets the difference between the Clinton years and the Bush years, as it relates to the deficits.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Ms. PELOSI).

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding; and I thank him, and the Democratic members of the Ways and Means Committee, for being committed to the truth: to the facts.

To hear the distinguished chairman of the committee say what he said about the budget is almost ludicrous, almost laughable, if it weren't so serious, in terms of the impact that it has on America's future. He knows that, in the last 4, and maybe even 5, years of the Clinton administration, the budget was in balance or in surplus—the operational budget—and it was on a path to reducing the national debt, until President Bush came in, gave tax cuts to the high end, a giveaway to the pharmaceutical industry with the Medicare part D legislation, and three unpaid for wars.

That is what the experts will tell you increased the deficit that was on a path of the national debt going down. It was a swing, Mr. Speaker, of \$11 trillion: to date, the biggest swing in history.

When President Obama came into office, he was inheriting a deficit—I am not talking about the national debt; I am just talking about the annual deficit—of \$1.4 billion. When he left office, it was about a third of that.

So don't try to mislead the American people. We owe them the truth. We owe them facts. That is why what is happening tonight in this body is so important: the violence that the Republicans are doing with their legislation on the economy of our country, robbing from our children's future to reward the wealthiest people and biggest corporations in America.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to ask my colleagues a simple question: Who do we represent when we come to this floor?

The American people, overwhelmingly, oppose the GOP tax scam—they see it as that—and they are making their voices heard.

The American people are calling the Republican Congress to abandon the House and Senate bills, which pillage the middle class and pad the pockets of big CEOs and GOP donors.

The American people want us to start over and, actually, put the middle class first.

We should be working in a bipartisan way in order to do that, so that it will not only be right, but that it will be sustainable, and that there will be some certainty in our economy that this is a path forward that has bipartisan support.

But have the Republicans in the people's House listened to the American people? No.

Last month, House Republicans voted to raise taxes. In this House, House Republicans voted to raise taxes on 36 million middle class American families: stripping deductions from students and teachers, children and seniors, and homeowners and workers. They kept saying they were going to work it out with the Senate.

Last week, in the dead of night, Senate Republicans voted to raise taxes on 78 million middle class families, while also spiking health premiums, and exploding the ranks of the health uninsured.

Tonight, heading into this conference on the House and Senate bills, Republicans have sent an unmistakable message to middle class America: Pick your poison. Because, with either bill, middle class families lose; the American people lose.

According to an analysis by The Washington Post, the GOP tax scam is “probably the most regressive tax cut in the past 50 years. . . . It is hard to find a tax plan that has done less for the middle class.”

That is what we talked about. Who are we here to represent? Why are they doing this?

Well, they are doing this to give a tax cut to the top 1 percent. Sixty-two percent of the benefits of the Senate bill go to the top 1 percent in our country.

Is that fair, to give nearly \$1.5 trillion in tax cuts to corporate America, while heaping other benefits on them to make it easier for them to send jobs overseas. Why? Well, some of their people have told us why.

Congressman CHRIS COLLINS said: My donors are basically saying, “Get it done or don’t ever call me again.”

Senator LINDSEY GRAHAM has said the “financial contributions will stop,” if the tax scam fails. “Scam” is my added word.

The Director of National Economic Council, Gary Cohn, has said: “The most excited group out there are the big CEOs, about our tax plan.”

This is interesting to see the Freedom Caucus, which I thought was a values-based caucus, committed to reducing the national debt: a debt that is being added to here that we may never recover from.

What happened to the Freedom Caucus? Weren’t they supposed to be deficit hawks? Has that become an endangered species? No. It has become extinct. It does not exist on the Republican side, but it does exist on the Democratic side.

□ 2015

We intend to fight this robbing of the future of increasing the deficit into the trillions of dollars by fighting this bill to the end.

Where are all the Republicans who promised to reduce the deficit?

Where are our Republican colleagues who insist that we have no funds to spare for the healthcare of our children, the education of our young peo-

ple, the job-creating infrastructure of the 21st century unless we find offsets?

Yet \$1.5 trillion to corporate America, un-offset; tax cuts to the wealthiest people in our country, un-offset.

That means children have to pay for their healthcare with their immunizations. It is absolutely appalling. It isn’t a statement of values in any way.

Today, quietly, the Republicans—and some of them are admitting it with glee—are sharpening their knives for Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. Recognizing how they are increasing, they are soaring the national debt, now they have to find some ways to pay for it, so they are coming after Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security. The understanding of some is that it is only a question of whether they do it this year or a following year after the election.

Well, I think you are in a lose-lose situation. I think you lose with your donors if you don’t pass this bill, but you are going to lose with the American people if you do.

Democrats believe that people deserve better. We deserve bipartisanship in how we put this together so it is sustainable. We are offering a better deal, better jobs, better wages, and a better future.

The American people deserve real, bipartisan, permanent tax reform that puts the middle class first.

The truth is that our colleagues either choose to ignore or do not understand the gravity of the situation. As they say in “The Music Man,” this is a terrible assault on the middle class. So tonight, with the Democrats’ motion to instruct conferees, we want the Republicans to show where they stand.

Will Republicans vote “yes” to protect the vital State and local tax deduction that enables people to live in a safe place? Or will they vote to double-tax middle class families, drive down home values, and endangering key funding for firefighters, law enforcement, and schools?

Will Republicans vote to protect the healthcare of those with preexisting conditions?

No, no, no, no, no.

Or will they vote to spike families’ premiums and add 13 million more Americans to the ranks of the uninsured if this bill goes through?

I have said that this, with stiff competition by some of the other things they have put forth, is the worst bill in the history of the United States Congress.

Now, how can I make that claim?

Well, because it involves more money, hurts more people, increases the deficit by so much more. And just because everything is bigger in our country, the consequences of this bill, a multitrillion-dollar economy being addressed by a bill that had no hearings, no expert testimony, just with the speed of light, as JAMIE RASKIN says, the speed of light, in the dark of night, here we are.

Who else thinks this is not a good idea?

This is what the United States Conference of Catholic Bishops has said: “. . . this proposal appears to be the first Federal income tax modification in American history that will raise income taxes on the working poor while simultaneously providing a large tax cut to the wealthy. This is simply unconscionable.”

I believe them.

Let us remember the words of St. Augustine: “A State which is not governed according to justice would be just a bunch of thieves.” He said that 17 centuries ago.

When His Holiness Pope Benedict wrote about this in his first encyclical, God is Love, he went on to say: Sometimes you have to work hard to determine what justice is. But in doing so, you must beware of the dazzling blindness of money and power.

Apparently, you did not heed that.

Let us look honestly at the GOP tax scam before us. No justice.

I urge my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to vote “yes” on the motion to instruct conferees, to at least inject some element of fairness and common sense into this destruction, and then to reject this terrible bill.

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 30 seconds.

I would point out that a hardworking middle class family in the 12th District of California will see a tax cut of \$5,508.

I would point out as well that the claim that this is an attack on the middle class and received four Pinocchios is simply untrue by The Washington Post.

And while we are fact-checking, I will remind the American public that President Obama did inherit a deficit. He inherited it from a Democratic House and a Democratic Senate, and then he made it worse.

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, might I inquire as to how much time I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Massachusetts has 3¼ minutes remaining.

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, we have heard this discussion back and forth tonight about tax relief for the middle class; and we have heard the other side say that you are going to get \$1,189 for a family of four, I think, making \$59,000 a year.

But what they don’t say is that they are going to take away the State and local tax deduction; they are going to take away the ability of children to deduct interest payments on student debt; that they are going to shave back the mortgage interest deduction; get rid of the historic tax credit; that they are going to get rid of new markets tax credits.

And here is the best one of all: as champions of the middle class they are, they are going to repeal the estate tax.

The gentleman from Pennsylvania, who is my friend, said that we need to stop talking about wealth.

Well, how about approaching it this way? We are wealthy and we are not going to take it anymore, because that is essentially what this argument is about.

When you look at the distribution tables as to who gets what in this tax proposal, the concentration of wealth at the very top is highlighted time and again.

When we talk about tax relief for the middle class, when we examine what this is about to do to California, to New York, to Massachusetts, and to Connecticut, to name, but a few of the States that are going to pay a penalty for this tax plan—

And I dispute fully what the chairman said about the Obama years. Fourteen million jobs were created during the Obama years. Twenty-three million jobs were created during the Clinton years. The day that George Bush left, we were losing 800,000 jobs a month in America. That is the reality.

When you look at economic growth during those years, the 2 percent that we look at was not enough. But it has now been almost 13 years when middle class people have not had a pay raise and, time and again, we have heard the preposterous argument—and, boy, did it get us into trouble—that tax cuts pay for themselves.

You cannot find a mainstream economist that will say that tax cuts pay for themselves.

Now you hear the repeated argument that, if we cut taxes and we add dynamic scoring, based upon what might occur, or maybe, or if, then we are told that this is going to alleviate slow productivity and slow growth in America, all based upon the premise of tax cuts.

You know what we should be doing tonight, Mr. Speaker?

We should be talking about investing in human capital. We should be talking about the 6 million jobs that go unanswered in America every single day. We should be talking about community colleges. We should be talking about the idea of apprenticeship programs and, yes, investing in vocational education. We should be also talking about, finally, what to do about the 2 million people in America who have opiate addictions and don't go to work every day. We should be concerned about the labor participation rate in America.

Instead, the answer always becomes the Holy Grail of Republican economics; cut taxes for the people at the very top, and plead the case that what you are really doing is for people in the middle class.

The alternative minimum tax is devoted to people at the top, and the idea of repealing the estate tax for so few people in America is outrageous.

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

Mr. BRADY of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is a clear choice. Opponents of tax reform make this a

clear choice. They stand for business as usual, special interests as usual, losing our U.S. jobs overseas as usual, making it hard for young people coming out of school to find good-paying jobs as usual, and Washington having a greater claim over your earnings than you do as usual. That is what the opponents of tax reform stand for today.

Today is about no more of that. It is time to drain the swamp. It is time to drain this Tax Code. It is time for a fairer and simpler Tax Code that Americans deserve, to close loopholes and special interests and lower tax rates so hardworking Americans can keep more of what they earn.

Say "no" to the swamp. Say "yes" to a new Tax Code and a new era of American prosperity.

I urge a "no" on the motion to instruct.

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

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of this Democratic motion, and I thank the Gentleman from Massachusetts for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, it is clear that your desperation for a political win is more important than the needs of our nation.

For a few days, you will celebrate this holiday gift for the rich and wealthy. But in January, Mr. Speaker, the bill will come due.

To cover the costs of these tax cuts, you will destroy the hopes and dreams of the American people, of working families, of the young and old, and of generations yet unborn.

Make no mistake, Social Security, Medicare, and CHIP will be on the chopping block cuts.

Bipartisan solutions for transportation, affordable housing, and student debt will be out of reach.

And with this tax cut, every single federal program that matters to the American people will be dealt a crippling blow.

Mr. Speaker, you cannot get blood from a turnip, and you cannot justify robbing poor Peter to pay billionaire Paul.

I urge each and every one of my colleagues to remember this moment, to remember this time, and to support this Democratic motion.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am opposed to the House agreeing to conference with the Senate on their cruel and immoral \$1.7 trillion tax giveaways to wealthy corporations and the top one percent, but as a member of the Budget Committee, I rise in strong support of the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees appointed by the House to conference with the Senate on H.R. 1, the so-called "Tax Cut and Jobs Act," which more accurately should be called the "Republican Tax Scam Act."

The Motion to Instruct does two things: first, it directs House conferees to disagree with Section 11081 of the Senate amendment which would eliminate the Affordable Care Act's individual mandate by instructing conferees.

Second, the Motion to Instruct would also oppose eliminating the current tax deduction for state and local property, income, and sales taxes by instructing house conferees to recede from Section 1303 of the House bill.

Instead, we should junk this shameful legislation and start over in a bipartisan manner that provides relief to working and middle

class families, does not increase the deficit, and ensures that the government has the resources needed to make the investments required to keep our country strong, safe, healthy, and economically competitive.

H.R. 1, on the other hand, raises taxes on poor, working, and middle class families; explodes the deficit by adding an additional \$2.2 trillion over ten years; and will require an estimated \$5.4 trillion cut in funding for the programs ordinary Americans depend on for health security, educational opportunity, and economic progress.

Mr. Speaker, in the last several months we have witnessed and borne the brunt of several of the most powerful storms ever recorded, including Hurricanes Harvey, Irma, and Maria.

I remember so well that the President visited Texas and promised the people affected by Hurricane Harvey of his unwavering commitment to provide everything needed to recover.

We need that promise kept now, and approval of this reckless and immoral tax plan will make it virtually impossible to keep the promise.

Residents of Texas who are facing the long road to recovery need at least \$61 billion for home flood mitigation, repair, replacement, and home buyouts.

There are other states with pressing needs related to disaster recovery.

My colleagues across the aisle and the President should understand that the Texas and Florida congressional delegations are in full agreement regarding the need to meet the disaster recovery needs of the states and territories.

There are particular concerns for our seniors who survived the terrible storms that ravaged the Texas Coast, Florida, U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico because so many of them are alone, while trying to do the difficult and hard job of cleaning out their homes, or removing debris from their yards.

That work is nowhere near done in my State of Texas.

Thousands of families have no home because of the storm, and many more thousands are living in gutted out shells of structures they once called home and too many others are sleeping in cars.

Houston's response to the immediate disaster was impressive and all-encompassing for the size and complexity of the disaster caused by unprecedented flooding due to Hurricane Harvey.

The efforts of Houston Mayor Sylvester Turner and the work of the Public Works Department, Police, and First Responders, as well as Federal and State agencies that were joined by citizen volunteers helped save thousands of lives.

We have communities in Texas that are struggling to find the new normal that FEMA officials warned Texans would need to accept following the historic flood.

The effort is being made difficult by a lack of appreciation by the Administration of the true cost of recovery for Texas, Florida, the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico.

FEMA has proven that it is excellent at disaster response, but is showing that they are not very good at recovery management for individuals and families.

The Administration risks a shutdown over not adequately meeting the needs of hurricane impacted areas.

Mr. Speaker, Americans are not fooled; they know trickle-down economics has never worked, and they see right through this phony tax plan and recognize it for the scam that it is.

That is why Americans reject this Republican tax giveaway by an overwhelming 2:1 margin according to a poll released recently by Quinnipiac.

Specifically, 61 percent think the Republican tax scam will benefit the wealthy the most; only 16 percent say the plan will reduce their taxes.

59 percent think it a very bad idea to eliminate the deduction for state and local income taxes.

Nearly half of respondents (49 percent) think it a bad idea to lower the corporate tax rate from 35 percent to 20 percent.

This Republican tax plan is even more toxic to my constituents in the Eighteenth Congressional District of Texas.

Mr. Speaker, as you may know, my constituents and others in Texas are still struggling to recover from the devastation caused by Hurricane Harvey, the worst storm ever to make landfall in the continental United States.

My constituents understand that it is important that the United States has a tax system that is fair, balanced, smart, and provides the resources and opportunities to allow all Americans to reach their potential.

And by margins exceeding 90 percent, they reject:

1. Any cuts to Medicare or Medicaid to finance tax cuts for wealthy corporations and the top 1 percent;
2. Eliminating the mortgage interest deduction;
3. Eliminating the deductibility of state and local taxes;
4. Eliminating existing deductions for student loan interest or making taxable college endowment funds or college fellowships expenses.

Mr. Speaker, the average annual tax cut for the top one-tenth of one percent is \$320,000; for the top one percent it is \$62,000, and for those earning \$1 million a year it is \$68,000.

Nearly 25 percent of the tax cut goes to households in just the top one-tenth of one percent, who make at least \$5 million a year (2027).

While super-wealthy corporations and individuals are reaping windfalls, millions of middle-class and working families will see their taxes go up:

1. 13 million households face a tax increase next year.
2. 45 million households face a tax increase in 2027.
3. 29 million households (21 percent) earning less than \$100,000 a year see a tax increase.

On average, families earning up to \$86,000 annually would see a \$794 increase in their tax liability, a significant burden on families struggling to afford child care and balance their checkbook.

It is shocking, but not surprising, that under this Republican tax scam, the total value of tax cuts for just the top one percent is more than the entire tax cut for the lower 95 percent of earners.

Put another way, those earning more than \$912,000 a year will get more in tax cuts than 180 million households combined.

The core of this Republican tax scheme is a massive tax cut from 35 percent to 20 per-

cent for corporations, but that is not the only way that the wealthy are rewarded.

The massive tax cuts for corporations are permanent but temporary for working and middle-class families.

Another immoral aspect of this terrible tax scam is that it abandons families that face natural disasters or high medical costs by repealing deductions for casualty losses and medical expenses.

Mr. Speaker, in what universe does it make any sense to eliminate, as this bill would, a deduction for:

1. teachers who purchase supplies for their classroom;
2. moving expenses to take a new job and taxes employer-provided moving expenses; or
3. dependent care assistance, making it harder for families to afford day care, nursery school, or care for aging parents?

This Republican tax scam jeopardizes American innovation and competitiveness by eliminating the deduction for student loan interest, which affects 12 million borrowers, and cuts total education assistance by more than \$64 billion.

Under the extraordinary leadership of President Obama and the determined efforts of ordinary Americans, we pulled our way out from under the worst of the foreclosure crisis when the housing bubble burst in 2007.

Inexplicably, Republicans are now championing a tax scheme that will make the homes of average Americans less valuable because deductions for mortgage interest and property taxes are much less valuable than under current law.

A tax plan that reduces home values, as this one does, puts pressure on states and towns to collect revenues they depend on to fund schools, roads, and vital public resources.

Mr. Speaker, the \$5.4 trillion cuts in program investments that will be required to pay for this tax giveaway to wealthy corporations and individuals will fall most heavily on low-income families, students struggling to afford college, seniors, and persons with disabilities.

This tax scam is not a revenue policy adapted for the real world that real Americans live in but a fantasy resting on the monstrous belief that the wealthy have too little money and that poor, working, and middle-class families have too much.

Congressional Republicans continue to cling to the fantasy belief that their tax cuts for the rich will pay for themselves despite all precedent to the contrary and evidence that their tax scheme is projected by experts to lose between \$3 trillion and \$7 trillion.

Mr. Speaker, in evaluating the merits of a taxing system, it is not enough to subject it only to the test of fiscal responsibility.

To keep faith with the nation's past, to be fair to the nation's present, and to safeguard the nation's future, the plan must also pass a "moral test."

The Republican tax bill fails both of these standards.

That is why I support the Democratic Motion to Instruct Conferees, even though I strongly oppose the Motion to Go to Conference on H.R. 1, the "Republican Tax Scam Act."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 186, nays 233, not voting 14, as follows:

[Roll No. 654]

YEAS—186

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

NAYS—233

Abraham	Bishop (MI)	Burgess
Aderholt	Bishop (UT)	Byrne
Allen	Black	Calvert
Amash	Blackburn	Carter (GA)
Amodei	Blum	Carter (TX)
Arrington	Bost	Chabot
Babin	Brady (TX)	Cheney
Bacon	Brat	Coffman
Banks (IN)	Brooks (AL)	Cole
Barletta	Brooks (IN)	Collins (GA)
Barr	Buchanan	Collins (NY)
Bergman	Buck	Comer
Biggs	Bucshon	Comstock
Bilirakis	Budd	Conaway

Cook	Johnson (OH)	Roby
Costello (PA)	Johnson, Sam	Roe (TN)
Cramer	Jones	Rogers (AL)
Crawford	Jordan	Rogers (KY)
Culbertson	Joyce (OH)	Rohrabacher
Curbelo (FL)	Katko	Rokita
Curtis	Kelly (MS)	Rooney, Francis
Davidson	Kelly (PA)	Rooney, Thomas
Davis, Rodney	King (IA)	J.
Denham	King (NY)	Ros-Lehtinen
Dent	Kinzinger	Roskam
DesJarlais	Knight	Ross
Diaz-Balart	Kustoff (TN)	Rothfus
Donovan	Labrador	Rouzer
Duffy	LaHood	Royce (CA)
Duncan (SC)	LaMalfa	Russell
Duncan (TN)	Lamborn	Rutherford
Dunn	Lance	Sanford
Emmer	Latta	Scalise
Estes (KS)	Lewis (MN)	Schweikert
Farenthold	LoBiondo	Sensenbrenner
Faso	Long	Sessions
Ferguson	Loudermilk	Shimkus
Fitzpatrick	Love	Shuster
Fleischmann	Lucas	Simpson
Fortenberry	Luetkemeyer	Smith (MO)
Fox	MacArthur	Smith (NE)
Franks (AZ)	Marchant	Smith (NJ)
Frelinghuysen	Marino	Smith (TX)
Gaetz	Marshall	Smucker
Gallagher	Massie	Stefanik
Garrett	Mast	Stewart
Gianforte	McCarthy	Stivers
Gibbs	McCaul	Taylor
Gohmert	McClintock	Tenney
Goodlatte	McHenry	Thompson (PA)
Gosar	McKinley	Thornberry
Gowdy	McMorris	Tiberi
Granger	Rodgers	Tipton
Graves (GA)	McSally	Trott
Graves (LA)	Meadows	Turner
Graves (MO)	Meehan	Upton
Griffith	Messer	Valadao
Grothman	Mitchell	Wagner
Guthrie	Moolenaar	Mooney (WV)
Handel	Mooney (WV)	Mullin
Harper	Mullin	Newhouse
Harris	Newhouse	Noem
Hartzler	Noem	Norman
Hensarling	Norman	Nunes
Herrera Beutler	Nunes	Olson
Hice, Jody B.	Higgins (LA)	Palazzo
Higgins (LA)	Hill	Palmer
Hill	Holding	Paulsen
Holding	Hollingsworth	Pearce
Hollingsworth	Hudson	Perry
Hudson	Huizenga	Pittenger
Huizenga	Hultgren	Poe (TX)
Hultgren	Hunter	Poliquin
Hunter	Hurd	Posey
Hurd	Issa	Ratchliffe
Issa	Jenkins (KS)	Reed
Jenkins (KS)	Jenkins (WV)	Reichert
Jenkins (WV)	Johnson (LA)	Rice (SC)
Johnson (LA)		

NOT VOTING—14

Barton	Flores	Renacci
Beatty	Gutiérrez	Ruppersberger
Bridenstine	Kennedy	Scott, Austin
Conyers	Pocan	Walz
DeSantis	Quigley	

□ 2054

Mses. MCSALLY and HERRERA BEUTLER changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

Ms. MOORE, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, and Ms. SPEIER changed their vote from “nay” to “yea.”

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 1:

From the Committee on Ways and Means, for consideration of the House bill and the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BRADY of Texas,

NUNES, ROSKAM, Mmes. BLACK, NOEM, Messrs. NEAL, LEVIN, and DOGGETT.

From the Committee on Energy and Commerce, for consideration of section 20003 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. WALDEN, SHIMKUS, and Ms. CASTOR of Florida.

From the Committee on Natural Resources, for consideration of sections 20001 and 20002 of the Senate amendment, and modifications committed to conference: Messrs. BISHOP of Utah, YOUNG of Alaska, and GRIJALVA.

There was no objection.

ENCOURAGING JAMIE DUPREE AS HE BATTLES TONGUE PROTRUSION DYSTONIA

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

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to talk about Jamie Dupree, who serves as the radio news director of the Washington Bureau of the Cox Media Group.

I have had the privilege of knowing Jamie for more than two decades. With his professional coverage of both congressional and national politics, Jamie has become a trusted voice for radio listeners in Atlanta, as well as in my home State of Florida.

However, in the summer of 2016, Jamie, a radio reporter, lost his voice to tongue protrusion dystonia, a neurological condition which can create severe speech, swallowing, and breathing difficulties. This is a rare condition, which has no known treatment, and it prevents Jamie’s brain from connecting to his mouth and causes his throat to push his tongue out of his mouth when he attempts to speak, squeezing the sound out of his voice—a radio reporter.

However, in spite of his severe health problems, Jamie has remained active through Twitter and his news blog. Mr. Speaker, Jamie Dupree is a perfect example of the positive role that devoted and professional journalists play in our free society, and I wish him and his family all of the best during this most difficult time.

Thank you, Jamie. Godspeed.

CONGRATULATING THE HILLSIDE HIGH SCHOOL COMETS

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to congratulate my alma mater, Hillside High School, class of 1976, in Hillside, New Jersey. The Hillside Comets football team won their State championship against the Point Pleasant Boro Panthers on Saturday.

The Hillside Comets finished their season with a 9-3 record. They beat the top-seeded Panthers to bring home Hillside’s first State title since 1985.

The Comets are only the second football team from Union County to win a State title in central Jersey in 15 years.

Mr. Speaker, the Hillside Comets football team are winners both on and off the field. Sixteen players are on the honor roll, and five of them are members of the National Honor Society. The team’s successes are, no doubt, a testament to the high expectations set by their head coach, Barris Grant.

I was honored to join the Comets at their celebration on Sunday, and I am proud to have such outstanding students in my district. I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating the Hillside High School Comets, winners on and off the field.

□ 2100

STANFORD CHAMPION SWIMMER AND RAPIST BROCK TURNER: POSTER BOY FOR SWIMMING, POSTER BOY FOR RAPE

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

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, last year, Stanford rapist and champion swimmer Brock Turner was sentenced to a mere 6 months in prison for his disgusting crime: raping an unconscious young woman behind a dumpster in the darkness of night.

The judge claimed a prison sentence would have “a severe impact on him.” Never mind that a rape victim sometimes gets a life sentence of mental turmoil and anguish.

But apparently, the light punishment is still too tough for the rapist and his daddy dearest. Now they have gone crying and appealing to the courts, trying to avoid the designation that Turner earned as a registered sex offender.

Daddy’s high-dollar legal team is claiming the victim was intoxicated and Turner should get more leniency. It is the old defense: it was the victim’s fault.

The fact the victim was intoxicated and unconscious makes the crime worse. She was helpless. She could not consent or fight back.

Rape is never the fault of the victim—never.

Uphold the conviction and give Brock Turner the only title he deserves: sex offender and poster boy for rape.

And that is just the way it is.

REPUBLICAN TAX SCAM

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, the American public has caught on to our Republican colleagues’ tax scam. They know this bill takes from the struggling middle class and bountifully rewards the billionaire class and transnational corporations that ship our jobs overseas. In fact, the only permanent tax giveaways in their bill are

for rich corporations and those lovely Wall Street banks that care so much for the American people.

The Joint Committee on Taxation estimates a \$1 trillion addition to our national debt as a result of this bill. The Congressional Budget Office estimates that 80 percent of Americans, those making less than \$100,000 a year, will see a tax increase under their plan. But you know what? They will wait until after next year's election to lock it in.

There is very little in this bill good for average Americans. Our Republican colleagues are actually pushing America into deeper financial servitude to foreign investors from places like China and Saudi Arabia who are going to buy the Treasury debt securities, and our taxpayers will end up having to pay them principal plus billions and billions and billions in interest.

How does that servitude sound like making America great again, putting us in hock in greater and greater amounts to foreign interests?

#### BELLA, THE DEER

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

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a former constituent and local legend, Bella, the white-tailed deer.

Bella's saga as Pulaski's mascot began in 2009, when her mother was tragically hit by oncoming traffic. Alone, with nowhere to turn, a local farmer was kind enough to extend his barn to the motherless fawn. He took her in, cared for her throughout the cold months of winter, and named her Bella.

Bella has spent her life happily wandering the streets of Pulaski, joining residents on walks with their dogs, meeting fishermen along the banks of the nearby Salmon River, and posing for selfies on the porches of residents throughout the village.

The Village of Pulaski embraced and cared for Bella for 9 years. She was often seen wearing a bright orange dog collar so hunters would know who she was. Bella even had her own Facebook page with over 4,000 likes that kept residents up to date on her adventures and whereabouts.

Sadly, Bella hasn't been seen for several months, and the consensus among residents and the local media is that Bella has passed on.

Bella has brought joy to this beautiful community in the foothills of the Adirondack Mountains and the Tug Hill Plateau region and all who had the pleasure of meeting her. She was a village mascot and a symbol of the reciprocity of kindness shown by so many in our community.

One compassionate resident reached out to an orphaned Bella when she needed help the most, and Bella spent the rest of her life paying us all back with her cheerful greetings and the

warm spirit which reflects the grateful Pulaski community.

#### CONGRATULATING JOE LUTHER, CTE TEACHER OF THE YEAR

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

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate an instructor at Central Pennsylvania Institute of Science and Technology for being named the national technical education teacher of the year.

CPI's horticulture and landscaping instructor, Joe Luther, will be given the Carl J. Schaefer Memorial Award, which is presented annually to recognize career technical education teachers for their outstanding service. Mr. Luther will accept the award this Thursday at a ceremony in Nashville, Tennessee.

The award is presented by NOCTI, which is the largest provider of industry-based credentials and partner industry certifications for career and technical education programs across the Nation. It was named for Dr. Carl J. Schaefer, who was a lifelong champion of CTE. He gained national recognition as a CTE educator and author and was one of NOCTI's founding fathers.

This is the second time an instructor at CPI has received the award. In 2015, dental assistant instructor Mindi Tobias was selected as a top CTE teacher in the Nation.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the House Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am most proud of CPI and Mr. Luther for this outstanding recognition.

#### REPUBLICAN TAX BILL

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, we hear a lot of negative about the tax reform bill that is moving through. Gladly, tonight, we have moved to conference committee, where we can continue the process and the conversation. We can now take more and more opinions people have on how to make the bill better. It has been getting better as we go.

In my own district, the First District of California, when all is said and done, this will simplify the Tax Code for more and more tax filers. Already, 70 percent of taxpayers do not use the method of trying to itemize every single item. Instead, they use the standard deduction. That will save time in tax preparation, netting them a better tax situation for their families.

I see a direct guaranteed tax cut for most people in rural California, rural America, and those who earn \$100,000 or less. That is the middle-income folks we are targeting and who we need to

help. That is what this bill will do. It will also create more jobs by the job creators in this country.

This is a good step and a good direction for America's taxpayers.

#### TAX BILL FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. BACON). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) is recognized until 10 p.m. as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate my colleague pointing out that we have done something good here.

When people talk about the tax bill that was passed, it is not everything everybody wanted, that is for sure. It is not everything Republicans wanted, but it is going to do good for most every American.

I would love to have seen just an across-the-board tax cut. I would like to have seen a tax cut that brought everybody to pay the same exact percentage. You make more, you pay more; you make less, you pay less.

For those who believe in a tithe, that kind of always worked well for the Lord. Everybody pays the same percentage, whether it is a widow's mite or hundreds of billions of dollars or the billions that Warren Buffett refuses to have his company pay even though he says he would love to pay for taxes. He ought to tell his lawyers that.

In any event, there are people who were paying 10 percent who are now not going to pay any taxes. I don't see how anybody across the aisle could keep saying it is going to be worse for the poor, because those who were paying 10 percent tax are not going to pay any tax. It is good for them. It is great for them.

I would love to see everybody have something that they pay in—something—so that they have some investment in the income tax system. It seems to help focus people's attention on government when they see how much they are paying into the Federal Government when it is a real percentage. The bill cuts completely any income tax for those who were paying 10 percent.

For those who were paying 25 percent, they are being cut to 12 percent. It is a tremendous tax advantage for them. In fact, you see that all the way through the tax bill, the creation of which was led by KEVIN BRADY, chairman of the Ways and Means Committee. He did an incredible job bringing all the different interests together to get a great bill.

At the upper end, the 39.6 percent tax was not changed. I guess the reason the committee decided they wanted to leave the 39.6 for the wealthiest Americans in place is because that way the Democrats could not come in—I know this was the thinking: If the only tax rate we don't lower is for the wealthiest Americans, we leave that where it is, then they can't come in and say we

are cutting taxes for the wealthiest Americans and putting it on the backs of the poorest Americans.

Well, they have come in and said it anyway. We might as well have given everybody a fair tax break instead of leaving the wealthiest taxes right where they were, 39.6 percent, because they still came in and said it. Schumer is still saying it in the Senate.

The truth is, when you look at the tax rates that people will pay and the exemptions being doubled, it is going to be much better for most people.

There were some things in the Senate bill I liked. I didn't realize, but I heard from people back home, we do have some seniors who do pay so much in medical expense that takes such a tremendous amount of the small income they have that they do have enough to take deductions for their medical expenses. If they are not allowed to take those medical expenses as deductions, accountants tell me many of their clients will end up being bankrupt.

The Senate left that provision in, and I am hopeful that that will be in the final bill. We don't need to be hurting our seniors who are paying so much in medical expenses even though they were assured ObamaCare would cure all ills when it came to healthcare.

If you like your insurance, you can keep it. Well, that turned out to be a lie.

If you like your doctor, you could keep your doctor. That turned out to be a lie.

If you liked the medicine you were taking, you could keep taking that medicine. It turned out to be a lie.

In fact, there were actual incentives in ObamaCare for the insurance companies not to bring in the best cancer treaters, the best heart facilities, because that means people with cancer and heart problems would sign up for those policies, and they might have to pay too much.

So it was really deviously inventive by the architect of ObamaCare to create a system that is going to be so bad it is going to fail at some point. The hope was that, when that day came, people would throw up their hands say: This is awful. I never thought I would say this, but maybe we are better off just letting the government take over every bit of healthcare.

Well, the government was already close to taking over all healthcare under ObamaCare, but as Senator Obama told people on video, it is basically government running all phases of healthcare. They give it a deceptive name: single-payer. But we can't get there in one step. It will take a couple of steps.

□ 2115

Well, ObamaCare was step one, and a complete government takeover of people's healthcare was step two.

Fortunately, if we can add to the House bill what was added into the Senate bill, a complete repeal of the individual mandate, then we will be on

our way to bringing down premiums, to having people choose the health insurance policies they want.

Ultimately, we have got to encourage people to put their own money not in the pocket of the government, not in the pocket of the insurance company, but into their own health savings accounts and build that up. That is the hope for the future for young people: to have enough money in their account down the road that, by the time they become senior citizens, not only will they not want government intrusion, they won't need it.

Those that are chronically ill, chronically poor, and cannot work, we have got to reform welfare and return the requirements that were put in place that caused single moms for the first time in 30 years to start making much more than they had, when their income had been flat for 30 years when adjusted for inflation. I was surprised to see that on a chart—on a graph at Harvard, at a seminar up there; but sure enough, the facts spoke for themselves.

There are things we can do to help people return to work, to take care of themselves, make their own decisions, and I think this tax bill will help do that, especially if we put in the repeal of the individual mandate, as surprised as I am to keep hearing about how this tax bill is going to hurt the poor in America.

When the people who are paying 10 percent tax don't pay any tax, the people who were paying 25 percent start paying 12 percent tax, it is just really hard to accept someone saying that they are going to be paying more tax to help the rich when the rich did not get a tax reduction from the 39.6 percent.

I do want to take up a critically important decision by the Supreme Court of the United States. There is an article from Ian Mason today: "President Donald Trump's travel ban is once again to largely go back into effect after the Supreme Court of the United States stayed two lower courts' injunctions Monday."

"The orders come in response to filings by the Department of Justice Friday, asking the Supreme Court to stay the preliminary injunctions in the two main travel ban cases, *Hawaii v. Trump* in the Ninth Circuit and *International Refugee Assistance Project v. Trump* in the Fourth Circuit. These cases have been proceeding up and down the Federal court system for months."

I do think, in the Judiciary Committee, it is time that we start bringing in some of these renegade judges who were not content to wear black robes and be judges, but took on the role of being legislators and being elected executives. They took all three branches into themselves, because basically what power the President didn't have to fully invoke the travel ban, Congress had given him any extra that he needed. He had full authority to do what he did.

Anybody can see that people could come in from countries where radical Islam was destroying the countries, and there were messages from the leaders of those radical Islamic groups who said: We are getting our soldiers into these groups of refugees that are going into Western civilization so that we can destroy them.

I mean, they weren't even hiding what they were doing, although they didn't tell us which individuals were their soldiers.

We had heard previously about vetting of individuals. We heard testimony in our committee that at least people coming from Iraq, when they applied to be refugees, they had some background we could compare and contrast what they were saying about their reasons to come in. We even had fingerprints on IDs. We had their criminal records from Iraq. We had their government records from Iraq. But as they came from Syria, some other countries, when Yemen was in chaos, we did not have the government records. We didn't have fingerprints. We didn't have anything.

We were told by those charged with the obligation of vetting these individuals: We will vet them, but we have got absolutely nothing to vet them with, so they will end up coming in, because we have got nothing to say that what they are saying is not true, even when they are radical Islamists who want to kill Americans and destroy our way of life.

What President Trump did was exceedingly reasonable, yet we had a Deputy Attorney General, Sally Yates, step forward and say: I am going to take on the role of President and justice and legislator and tell you I am not going to defend this law because I have judged it not to be up to my standards.

Well, she was wrong. She was wrong then and she is wrong today as she talks about issues even after her judgment is shown to be so flawed, as the Supreme Court has.

I know the travel ban was changed somewhat, but still, from what the Supreme Court has indicated, the President had the power to do what he did to protect Americans, despite what "Justice" Sally Yates said, without her black robe on, when she defied orders and defied the Constitution and refused to carry out her duties.

So that is a bit of good news.

Sarah Carter has another great story today that she got out. It can be found on hannity.com: "FBI Supervisor Booted From Mueller Probe Interviewed Mike Flynn."

The article says: "A supervisory special agent who is now under scrutiny after being removed from Robert Mueller's special counsel's office for alleged bias against President Trump also oversaw the Bureau's interviews of embattled former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn, this reporter has learned. Flynn recently pled guilty to one count of lying to the FBI last week."

“FBI agent Peter Strzok was one of two FBI agents who interviewed Flynn, which took place on January 24 at the White House, said several sources. The other FBI special agent who interviewed Flynn is described by sources as a field supervisor in the ‘Russian Squad, at the FBI’s Washington field office,’ according to a former intelligence official with knowledge of the interview.

“Strzok was removed from his role in the special counsel’s office after it was discovered he had made disparaging comments about President Trump in text messages between him and his alleged lover, FBI attorney Lisa Page, according to *The New York Times* and *Washington Post*, which first reported the stories. Strzok is also under investigation by the Department of Justice Inspector General for his role in Hillary Clinton’s email server and the ongoing investigation into Russia’s election meddling. On Saturday, the House Intelligence Committee’s chairman, DEVIN NUNES, chided the Justice Department and the FBI for not disclosing why Strzok had been removed from the special counsel 3 months ago, according to a statement given by the chairman.

“The former U.S. intelligence official told this reporter, ‘with the recent revelation that Strzok was removed from the special counsel investigation for making anti-Trump text messages, it seems likely that the accuracy and veracity of the 302 of Flynn’s interview as a whole should be reviewed and called into question.’”

Now, the 302 is the section 302 report summary by the FBI agent of what was said by the witness.

So we have a biased witness at the FBI who is not recording what Mike Flynn said word for word. He is writing down in his notes his biased, skewed opinion of what Mike Flynn said. We know it is biased, it is skewed.

Since Mike Flynn worked faithfully for so many years under—and survived—the purges over and over of Commander in Chief Obama and very, very briefly worked for Donald Trump, it would appear that Mike Flynn should have had more credibility than this Strzok character who hated Donald Trump so much.

I have heard talk that Mike Flynn could have fought this, but he basically had been bankrupted by the Department of Justice. He could not afford the attorney’s fees anymore and, as sometimes happens, they threatened to go after his son. So he agreed to plea on this one count, since apparently the biased, prejudiced, partisan FBI agent Strzok had something different in his notes, his summary of what Mike Flynn said than what Mike Flynn said he said. So he pled out from under the terrible legal fees and this task force that seems to have unlimited authority, that doesn’t seem to be reined in by Mr. Rosenstein that appointed Mueller.

Then we found out, well, heck no, of course not, because Rosenstein and

Mueller were involved in getting files sealed; the facts of which, from what we understand, should have prevented the sale of American uranium from ever going forward.

So it only makes sense, gee, to convince Jeff Sessions to recuse himself. He says he talked to the career guys, like Rosenstein. He considered Rosenstein a career guy. Then he appoints his buddy who helped him in the Russian investigation over a number of years, which established that Russia was trying to corner the market, that they were bribing and they were committing crimes trying to get American uranium. For heaven’s sake, if all of that came out, then Hillary Clinton wouldn’t have been able to get her buddies to approve that sale so that Russia could end up with so much of our uranium.

□ 2130

Of course, if Russia didn’t end up with so much of our uranium, do you really think \$145 million from Uranium One—from the stockholders who ended up with the uranium and all the money that flowed with it, do you really think they would have given that to the Clinton Foundation? Because let’s face it, they haven’t given a dime since.

If they were all that charged up with all the good the Clinton Foundation was doing, doesn’t it make sense they would have kept giving after Hillary Clinton was no longer the Secretary of State and when there was still hope of her being President? Even though that is gone, gee, wouldn’t they have still contributed if it was all about the good the Clinton Foundation was doing?

Instead of a quid pro quo, if you get us this uranium, we will make you rich. You will hit the Russian lottery, the megamillions lottery for the Clintons. And hit the Russian lottery they did.

“A former FBI agent said the investigation into Strzok and the reported text messages between him and Page shows a ‘bias that cannot be ignored particularly if he had anything to do with Flynn’s interview and his role in it.’

“The former U.S. intelligence official questioned, ‘how logical is it that Flynn is being charged for lying to an agent whose character and neutrality was called into question by the special counsel.’

“According to an anonymous source in *The Washington Post*, Strzok and Page had exchanged a number of texts that ‘expressed anti-Trump sentiments and other comments that appeared to favor Clinton.’”

That was apparently between Strzok and his lover. So it is not because he is a man full of hate; apparently, he is a man full of love.

“McCabe told Flynn: ‘Some agents were heading over to the White House, but Flynn thought it was part of the routine work the FBI had been doing and said they would be cleared at the gate,’ the source said.

“‘It wasn’t until after they were already in Flynn’s office that he realized he was being formally interviewed. He didn’t have an attorney with him,’ they added.”

“According to another source with direct knowledge of the January 24 interview, McCabe had contacted Flynn by phone directly at the White House. White House officials had spent the ‘earlier part of the week with the FBI overseeing training and security measures associated with their roles so it was no surprise to Flynn that McCabe had called.’”

Snuck up on him. Apparently that is supposed to be a lesson: the FBI calls, you never know if it is somebody who hates you and hates the people you work for.

An article by Daniel Flynn of Breitbart: “The former Assistant Director of the FBI wonders who investigates the investigators in the wake of former Trump administration National Security Advisor Michael Flynn pleading guilty to lying to the FBI and agreeing to cooperate with special counsel Robert Mueller’s probe.

“‘Bob Mueller should have never been offered nor accepted the job as special counsel as he has a huge conflict of interest,’ Jim Kallstrom tells Breitbart News. ‘He should have recused himself.’”

It sounds like what I have been saying for many months now.

“Not only do observers describe Mueller and the man he recommended to replace him as FBI Director, James Comey, as close or even best friends, but the special counsel pursues an investigation heavily involving the Bureau he once led. How one maintains detachment in leading a team that includes numerous anti-Trump partisans in a probe involving one’s close friend and the former Bureau for which Mueller served as Director goes unexplained.

“Other problems Kallstrom sees include the means by which investigators obtained information and what constituted probable cause to obtain it.

“‘The Obama administration apparently had the advantage of using electronic surveillance, collecting information on the Trump campaign,’ Kallstrom explains. ‘That collection, in my view, may be found to be unlawful.’

“‘At the very least, one administration conducting surveillance on the opposition party looking to replace it strikes as unusual if not unprecedented. In 1972, for instance, President Richard Nixon’s political team relied on former agents of the FBI and CIA to gather intelligence on the Democratic Party.

“‘If the surveillance and investigatory methods prove unlawful,’ Kallstrom notes that this puts Mueller in an awkward position of looking into its close friend and perhaps the Bureau that both men once led.

“‘If they used the phony dossier as the predicate for the FISA order they obtained, that could be a huge problem,’ Kallstrom tells Breitbart News.



'If they knew the information was phony, that is a felony. If they did not know it was phony, they were incompetent.'

"The 'dossier,' which Americans belatedly discovered as an opposition research investigation funded by Hillary Clinton's campaign and other partisan sources, served as a justification in the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act court to obtain a wiretap to Trump campaign adviser Carter Page. Christopher Steele, the former British intelligence officer who compiled the opposition research dubbed an intelligence dossier in the media, admits that he neither traveled to Russia nor spoke to many of the sources for the anti-Trump document that the Clinton campaign funded and the FBI used in its investigation.

"This whole matter with the dossier and the investigations that ensued, including FISA surveillance and the unmasking of hundreds of names, in my view, will prove to be violations of the rules set down by the Congress for unmasking, or worse, will be found to be violations of Federal law,' Kallstrom concludes. 'The Justice Department should find out if the FBI paid for this phony dossier and should inspect the affidavit that was given to FISA court to determine the accuracy of their probable cause.'"

Hopefully, that is what is being done at this time, but, as I understand it, the pro-Hillary Clinton people still at the Justice Department have not been forthcoming with the information. That remains to be seen.

Other articles are talking about the anti-Trump text messages showing a pattern of bias on Mueller's team, by Chuck Ross today in the Daily Caller.

Jonathan Easley with The Hill: "FreedomWatch Sues to Remove Mueller."

Thank goodness for FreedomWatch doing so.

The article says: "A conservative group filed suit on Monday seeking to remove special counsel Robert Mueller from the Justice Department's investigation into Russian meddling.

"Conservative lawyer Larry Klayman, the founder of the watchdog group FreedomWatch, filed a complaint in U.S. District Court that seeks to force the Justice Department to investigate leaks from the special counsel, as well as 'the obvious conflicts of interest among staff.'

"The complaint against Attorney General Jeff Sessions and FBI Director Christopher Wray states that 'it is a criminal offense to leak grand jury information' and seeks Mueller's removal.

"Robert Mueller is not a 'man of integrity' as the Washington, D.C., Democrat and Republican political establishment like to spin,' Klayman said in a statement. 'He is just another pol who is representing his establishment benefactors in both political parties who want to see the Presidency of Donald Trump destroyed.'

"There is deep anger at Mueller on the right and growing calls for him to recuse himself from the special counsel investigation into whether Trump campaign officials had improper contacts with Moscow during the 2016 election.

"Klayman is hanging his legal effort on the notion that Mueller is too close to former FBI Director James Comey and allegations that his team has leaked damaging stories about those he's investigating to the press. The complaint also argues that Mueller has politicized the probe by hiring Democrats for his investigative team.

"Conservatives have also argued that Mueller's probe has extended beyond his mandate of investigating Russian meddling.

"More recently, conservative media and others on the right have drawn attention to Mueller's time as FBI Director, questioning why he didn't alert regulators that a subsidiary of a foreign uranium mining company was under investigation before a controversial deal for the sale of the company to a Russia-owned firm was approved.

"He must be held accountable to the law and should not be able to do as he pleases to further his and his friends', like former FBI Director James Comey's, political agenda,' Klayman said. 'We are hopeful that the court will order Justice to do its job and conduct an expeditious and impartial investigation and then order Mueller to step down as special counsel. There are others, perhaps who practice outside of the Washington, D.C., swamp, who could step in and do an honest and conflict-free investigation of so-called Russian collusion.'"

Quite interesting, but this article today from Samantha Schmidt, Washington Post, is quite ironic. "James Comey, Sally Yates and Eric Holder Defend FBI After Trump's Twitter Attack."

Now, this is the same Eric Holder who lied to us repeatedly in our Judiciary Committee hearings. He obfuscated, concealed evidence, refused to disclose evidence, was found in contempt, but he still has the unmitigated gall to step forward as if he is a paragon of virtue and can stand up for Mueller's character, I guess.

Comey also has taken to tweeting out Bible verses. I think that is wonderful. I applaud him reading the Bible. I wish he had been relying on the Bible a little more when he was FBI Director before he started preparing the statement that would indicate there was nothing to prosecute Hillary Clinton over before she was actually investigated and before he gave immunity to people, before he let her lawyer, who was a witness, sit in on conversations before he was part of exonerating her, even though the evidence that he recited made clear an offense had been committed.

There were stories that the only reason he came out before the election and said he was reopening the investigation was so that he could keep FBI agents

who had found all these tens of thousands of emails on Anthony Weiner's computer, Huma Abedin's—they said that this surely justifies because here are emails that she said didn't exist.

So he goes public and says they reopened. If that is true, they kept those FBI agents from coming forward, resigning, or saying that he was doing what it appears now, with more evidence, that he was apparently doing, exonerating Hillary Clinton, though evidence was there to go further.

I remember telling some media back then, well, we will know whether this is a serious reopening of the investigation, words like that. If he comes back in a week and says, "Oh, no," before the election, "nothing here," then clearly he would not have had enough time to go through all the emails. And they hadn't, but he came forward and exonerated her anyway.

The New York Post had an article yesterday, the editorial board: "Another Anti-Trump 'Smoking Gun' Turns Out to Be Nothing."

"Once again, a supposed big break in the drive to destroy President Trump over 'collusion' with the Russians during the 2016 campaign stands exposed as nothing more than bad reporting. Plus, the professionalism of the FBI looks compromised by anti-Trump bias."

As it does by the comments by people like Yates, Holder, and Comey.

It says: "The media went berserk Friday on news that former Trump confidante Mike Flynn had copped a plea deal with special counsel Bob Mueller. All the usual suspects launched an orgy of speculation on what beans Flynn 'must' have spilled.

"It all went into overdrive as ABC's Brian Ross reported that Flynn had been instructed to reach out to Moscow during the campaign: This seemed to be the long-awaited proof of collusion with Vladimir Putin against Hillary Clinton.

"Except that Ross retracted the claim hours later: The reach-out was only after election day, when any President-elect is expected to start connecting with other world leaders, U.S.-friendly or not."

□ 2145

That is the whole sad thing about Mike Flynn. It was not a crime for him to reach out to the Russians after the election. The claim was that there was some big collusion to bring down Hillary Clinton, when it appears we really don't know who hacked into the DNC server. It certainly could have been an inside job involving the Awan brothers, or at least Imran Awan. Pretty sad days.

The Hill reports dismissed FBI agent changed Comey's language on Clinton emails to "extremely careless." Olivia Beavers, today, reported:

"The former FBI official, who was recently fired from special counsel Robert Mueller's Russia team over messages critical of President Trump, reportedly edited a key phrase that removed possible legal implications in

former FBI Director James Comey's statement about his decision on the Hillary Clinton email investigation.

"Peter Strzok, who served as a counterintelligence expert at the Bureau, changed the description of Clinton's actions in Comey's statement, CNN reported Monday, citing U.S. officials familiar with the matter.

"One source told the news outlet that electronic records reveal that Strzok changed the language from 'grossly negligent' to 'extremely careless,' scrubbing a key word that could have had legal ramifications for Clinton. An individual who mishandled classified material could be prosecuted under Federal law for 'gross negligence.'"

Pretty tragic.

The article goes on to say:

"Strzok, who served as the No. 2 official leading the probe into the Clinton email server, has been thrust into the center of controversy after news of his dismissal from Comey's team.

"A group of people were part of the drafting process, using a red pen on Comey's statement before he publicly came forward, another U.S. official familiar with the matter told CNN.

"Senate Judiciary Chairman CHUCK GRASSLEY questioned the revised language change after receiving FBI records last month before CNN reported Strzok's edits.

"Mueller and his team are broadly investigating Russian interference in the 2016 election, including whether Trump campaign aides colluded with the Russians."

And, boy, "broadly investigating" is an understatement.

"In July 2016, Comey said that Clinton's use of a private email server while Secretary of State was 'extremely careless,' but he added that 'no reasonable prosecutor' would charge her."

Mr. Speaker—I want to finish on this note—Salem, Oregon; FOX News; Jonathan Easley reporting:

"A Mexican man, who was deported from the United States more than a dozen times was sentenced Friday in Oregon to 35 years in prison after pleading guilty to sodomy, kidnapping, sex abuse, and other charges in separate attacks on two women.

"Sergio Jose Martinez told victims' relatives he would see them in hell after sentence was pronounced Friday in a Portland courtroom."

And I would interject, there is a decent chance they may not be at the same place he is in the next life.

"Just a day earlier, another man who had also been deported multiple times for being in America illegally, Jose Ines Garcia Zarate, was found not guilty by a jury in San Francisco in the shooting death of a woman. That case that touched off a national immigration debate."

I just want to finish by saying that there is a lot of talk about amnesty, DACA, all these different things, but, Mr. Speaker, the truth is: until the border is secured, we should not even

be talking about amnesty, about any kind of legality for people who are here illegally, because it creates another swarm across our border. And if we are going to do this, we are going to have to keep doing it every few years because the people are going to keep coming.

We must build a wall where it is needed, and we must secure the border. When that is done, we can work these other things out. But until the border is secured, we should not even be talking about it.

People, like these criminals, these rapists, shouldn't even have been in this country. People are dead who should be alive. People have had their lives murderously tortured through horrendous sexual assaults. So many lives have been harmed or ended.

Let's secure the border, let's do what it takes, and then we can work the other things out.

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

#### ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, December 5, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

#### EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

3277. A letter from the Congressional Review Coordinator, Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's final rule — Importation of Fresh Mango Fruit From Vietnam Into the Continental United States [Docket No.: APHIS-2016-0026] (RIN: 0579-AE25) received November 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Agriculture.

3278. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Retention of Certain Existing Transition Provisions for Banking Organizations That Are Not Subject to the Advanced Approaches Capital Rules [Docket ID: OCC-2017-0012] (RIN: 1557-AE 23) received November 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3279. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's Major final rule — Mandatory Contractual Stay Requirements for Qualified Financial Contracts [Docket ID: OCC-2016-0009] (RIN: 1557-AE05) received November 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3280. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), Office of the

Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket No.: OCC-2017-0008] (RIN: 1557-AE15) November 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3281. A letter from the Director, Office of Legislative Affairs, Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation, transmitting the Corporation's Major final rule — Regulatory Capital Rules: Retention of Certain Existing Transition Provisions for Banking Organizations That Are Not Subject to the Advanced Approaches Capital Rules (RIN: 3064-AE 63) received November 30, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3282. A letter from the Director, Office of Congressional Affairs, Nuclear Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Clarification of Licensee Actions in Receipt of Enforcement Discretion per Enforcement Guidance Memorandum EGM 15-002, "Enforcement Discretion for Tornado-Generated Missile Protection Non-compliance" [Interim Staff Guidance, Revision 1] [DSS-ISG-2016-01, Revision 1] received November 29, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3283. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Secretary, Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting the 2017 Annual Report on the Benjamin A. Gilman International Scholarship Program, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2462 note; Public Law 106-309, Sec. 304; (114 Stat. 1095); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3284. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's 57th Semiannual Report to Congress on Audit Follow-up, covering the six-month period ending September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5(b) of the Inspector General Act, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3285. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Veterans Affairs, transmitting the Department's semiannual report from the Office of Inspector General for the period April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant Sec. 5(a) of the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3286. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's semiannual report to Congress from the Treasury Inspector General and the Treasury Inspector General for Tax Administration for the period of April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to the Inspector General Act of 1978, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3287. A letter from the Labor Member, Management Member, Railroad Retirement Board, transmitting the Board's semiannual report to Congress, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3288. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Small Business Administration, transmitting the Administration's Semiannual Report to Congress covering the period of April 1, 2017, through September 30, 2017, pursuant to Sec. 5 of the Inspector General Act of 1978, Public Law 95-452, as amended; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3289. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers

who were employed at the Carborundum Company in Niagara Falls, New York, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3290. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's determination on a petition filed on behalf of workers at the Rocky Flats Plant in Golden, Colorado, to be added to the Special Exposure Cohort, pursuant to the Energy Employees Occupational Illness Compensation Program Act, pursuant to 42 U.S.C. 7384q(c)(2); Public Law 106-398, Sec. 1 (as amended by Public Law 108-375, Sec. 3166(b)(1)); (118 Stat. 2188); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

#### REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. GOODLATTE: Committee the Judiciary. H.R. 38. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, to provide a means by which nonresidents of a State whose residents may carry concealed firearms may also do so in the State; with an amendment (Rept. 115-433). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HENSARLING: Committee on Financial Services. H.R. 2396. A bill to amend the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act to update the exception for certain annual notices provided by financial institutions; with an amendment (Rept. 115-434). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 3731. A bill to provide overtime pay for employees of the United States Secret Service, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-435, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

Mr. GOWDY: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 2897. A bill to authorize the Mayor of the District of Columbia and the Director of the National Park Service to enter into cooperative management agreements for the operation, maintenance, and management of units of the National Park System in the District of Columbia, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-436, Pt. 1). Ordered to be printed.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4530. A bill to provide that a person or governmental entity is not subject to civil or criminal liability under Federal law for gaming activity that is lawful under State law, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on the Judiciary, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4531. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to treat rents received by a real estate investment trust from a parking facility leased to a taxable REIT subsidiary in the same manner as rents from lodging and health care facilities leased to

such a subsidiary; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CURTIS (for himself, Mr. BISHOP of Utah, Mr. STEWART, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 4532. A bill to create the first Tribally managed national monument, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BARR (for himself, Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. GUTHRIE, Mr. MASSIE, and Mr. COMER):

H.R. 4533. A bill to designate the health care system of the Department of Veterans Affairs in Lexington, Kentucky, as the "Lexington VA Health Care System" and to make certain other designations; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4534. A bill to amend the interstate Compact governing the Washington Metropolitan Area Transit Authority, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure, and in addition to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Ms. SLAUGHTER, and Mr. GUTIÉRREZ):

H.R. 4535. A bill to establish limitations on the quantity of inorganic arsenic in rice and rice products under chapter IV of the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Agriculture, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4536. A bill to establish an Anti-Bullying Roundtable to study bullying in elementary and secondary schools in the United States, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. DUFFY (for himself, Mr. HECK, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. ROSS, Mr. BUDD, Mr. CAPUANO, Mr. ROTHFUS, and Ms. TENNEY):

H.R. 4537. A bill to preserve the State-based system of insurance regulation and provide greater oversight of and transparency on international insurance standards setting processes, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services, and in addition to the Committee on Rules, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. ELLISON (for himself, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. GRIJALVA):

H.R. 4538. A bill to require the Attorney General and the Federal Trade Commission to conduct regular merger retrospective reviews of the economic effects of mergers to which section 7A of the Clayton Act applies; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEATING (for himself and Mr. FOSTER):

H.R. 4539. A bill to require the Secretary of the Treasury to mint coins in commemoration of the 400th anniversary of the landing of the Mayflower and settlement of Plymouth Colony, the signing of the Mayflower Compact near Provincetown, and the role of the indigenous Wampanoag Tribes in the realization of the settlement; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4540. A bill to amend the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 to require

Members of Congress to reimburse the Treasury for amounts paid as awards and settlements under the Congressional Accountability Act of 1995 in connection with violations of such Act which were committed personally by the Members, to prohibit the imposition of nondisclosure agreements as a condition of the payment of an award or settlement in connection with a violation of such Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida (for herself, Mr. NEAL, and Mr. PALLONE):

H.R. 4541. A bill to extend funding for certain public health programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Ways and Means, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Miss RICE of New York (for herself and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY):

H.R. 4542. A bill to direct the Secretary of Transportation to establish a distracted driving education grant program, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 4543. A bill to establish a regulatory framework for the comprehensive protection of personal data for individuals under the aegis of the Federal Trade Commission, to amend the Children's Online Privacy Protection Act of 1998 to improve provisions relating to collection, use, and disclosure of personal information of children, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 4544. A bill to amend the Fair Credit Reporting Act to provide protections for consumers after a data breach at a consumer reporting agency, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. TIPTON (for himself and Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York):

H.R. 4545. A bill to amend the Federal Financial Institutions Examination Council Act of 1978 to improve the examination of depository institutions, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 123. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2018, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Ms. LEE (for herself, Ms. ROSLEHTINEN, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. COHEN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H. Con. Res. 96. Concurrent resolution supporting the goals and ideals of World AIDS Day; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. JONES (for himself and Mr. YOHO):

H. Res. 643. A resolution amending the Rules of the House of Representatives to observe a moment of silence in the House on the first legislative day of each month for those killed or wounded in the United States engagement in Afghanistan; to the Committee on Rules.

By Ms. BASS (for herself, Mr. ENGEL, Mr. POE of Texas, Ms. LEE, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. PAYNE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. CLYBURN, Ms. NORTON, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. CLAY, Mr. CLEAVER, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Ms. FUDGE, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mrs. BEATTY, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. O'ROURKE, Mr. POCAN, Mr. VEASEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Ms. PLASKETT, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mrs. LOVE, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. RUSH, Mr. PALLONE, and Ms. ADAMS):

H. Res. 644. A resolution strongly condemning the slave auctions of migrants and refugees in Libya, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

#### CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. PALLONE:

H.R. 4530.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article I, Section VIII.

By Mr. POE of Texas:

H.R. 4531.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mr. CURTIS:

H.R. 4532.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article IV, Section 3, clause 2  
Article I, Section 8, clause 18

By Mr. BARR:

H.R. 4533.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:  
Article 1, Section 8.

By Mrs. COMSTOCK:

H.R. 4534.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 (Interstate Commerce Clause)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 17 (District of Columbia; Federal Property Clause)

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 (Necessary and Proper Clause)

Article I, Section 9, Clause 7 (Appropriations Clause)

Article I, Section 10, Clause 3 (Compact Clause)

By Ms. DELAURO:

H.R. 4535.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DONOVAN:

H.R. 4536.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. DUFFY:

H.R. 4537.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general welfare of the United States);

and Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to the power to regulate interstate commerce).

By Mr. ELLISON:

H.R. 4538.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3, which states: "[The Congress shall have Power] To regulate Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes;"

By Mr. KEATING:

H.R. 4539.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. MARINO:

H.R. 4540.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. MURPHY of Florida:

H.R. 4541.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the United States Constitution, which gives Congress the power to regulate commerce among the several states and to make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution this power.

By Miss RICE of New York:

H.R. 4542.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 4543.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. SIREs:

H.R. 4544.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Pursuant to clause 3(d)(1) of rule XIII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee finds the authority for this legislation in article 1, section 8 of the Constitution.

By Mr. TIPTON:

H.R. 4545.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3 of the United States Constitution:

To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;

By Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN:

H.J. Res. 123.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states: "No Money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law . . ." In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides: "The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common Defence and general Welfare of the United States . . ." Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

#### ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 103: Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 173: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. HUIZENGA, and Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER.

H.R. 176: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 392: Mr. CRAWFORD.

H.R. 632: Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. CRIST, Ms. ROSEN, Mr. TONKO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. SOTO, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. MCEACHIN, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Mr. TROTT, Mr. JEFFRIES, and Mrs. MURPHY of Florida.

H.R. 681: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Mr. SHUSTER, and Mr. COMER.

H.R. 754: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania and Mr. FARENTHOLD.

H.R. 785: Mr. HARPER and Mr. DESJARLAIS.

H.R. 846: Mr. MULLIN.

H.R. 930: Mrs. HANDEL and Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 947: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1164: Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HARRIS, Mr. JOHNSON of Louisiana, Mr. MCEACHIN, and Mr. PALLONE.

H.R. 1178: Mr. MARINO.

H.R. 1229: Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California.

H.R. 1406: Mrs. DINGELL.

H.R. 1516: Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 1552: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 1676: Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. SMUCKER, and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 1861: Ms. CLARKE of New York and Mr. MCEACHIN.

H.R. 1890: Mrs. COMSTOCK.

H.R. 1897: Mr. PETERS.

H.R. 2024: Mr. JEFFRIES.

H.R. 2147: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 2162: Mr. SMUCKER.

H.R. 2290: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania and Mr. POLIQUIN.

H.R. 2310: Mr. FERGUSON.

H.R. 2327: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 2434: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH and Mr. MACARTHUR.

H.R. 2452: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 2475: Mr. HUFFMAN and Mr. YARMUTH.

H.R. 2589: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina.

H.R. 2740: Mr. FOSTER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. GARAMENDI.

H.R. 2796: Mr. HARRIS.

H.R. 2820: Mr. LANCE, Mr. COSTA, and Mr. SOTO.

H.R. 2838: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 2851: Mrs. HANDEL and Mr. BUDD.

H.R. 2942: Mr. VEASEY and Mr. SABLAN.

H.R. 2948: Mr. RENACCI, Mr. KILDEE, and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 2996: Mr. RORINGTON.

H.R. 3121: Mr. ROKITA.

H.R. 3139: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 3197: Ms. JAYAPAL and Mr. KIND.

H.R. 3320: Mr. KING of Iowa.

H.R. 3330: Mr. MCKINLEY and Mr. GROTHMAN.

H.R. 3380: Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mr. CAPUANO.

H.R. 3447: Mr. SMITH of Missouri.

H.R. 3545: Mr. LEWIS of Georgia.

H.R. 3596: Mr. YODER, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. DUNN, Mr. COMER, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, and Mr. BERGMAN.

H.R. 3602: Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 3635: Mr. HARRIS and Mr. BISHOP of Michigan.

H.R. 3642: Mrs. LAWRENCE.

H.R. 3712: Mr. NEWHOUSE.

H.R. 3759: Mr. ROUZER, Mr. BACON, Mr. FASO, and Mr. MAST.

H.R. 3773: Mr. KILDEE, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, Mr. HUFFMAN, and Mr. CÁRDENAS.

H.R. 3798: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, and Mr. AMASH.

H.R. 3827: Ms. ESHOO.

H.R. 3861: Ms. TENNEY and Mr. ROTHFUS.

H.R. 3956: Mr. GRAVES of Missouri.

H.R. 4007: Mr. HOYER, Mr. HECK, Ms. MOORE, Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, and Ms. CHENEY.

H.R. 4082: Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. WALZ, Mr. HIMES, and Mr. SCHNEIDER.

H.R. 4099: Mr. CORREA.

H.R. 4143: Mr. BACON, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. KING of Iowa, and Mr. VEASEY.

H.R. 4207: Mr. MITCHELL.

H.R. 4223: Mr. COFFMAN and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 4229: Mr. LUCAS, Mr. THORNBERRY, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, and Mr. PALAZZO.

H.R. 4253: Mr. POCAN and Mr. ELLISON.

H.R. 4267: Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Ms. TENNEY, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 4290: Mr. MCGOVERN.

H.R. 4300: Mr. COFFMAN, Ms. SPEIER, Ms. NORTON, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. GRAVES of Missouri, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. RASKIN, and Mr. HIGGINS of New York.

H.R. 4306: Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 4340: Mr. GOSAR and Mr. ADERHOLT.

H.R. 4345: Mr. RYAN of Ohio and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4396: Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. MCGOVERN, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. POCAN, Ms. ROSEN, Ms. HERRERA BEUTLER, and Mr. O'ROURKE.

H.R. 4431: Mr. COFFMAN.

H.R. 4446: Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 4462: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 4463: Ms. LEE.

H.R. 4471: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. LANCE, and Mr. LIPINSKI.

H.R. 4485: Mr. KIND and Ms. MCCOLLUM.

H.R. 4495: Mr. DUFFY.

H.R. 4521: Mr. ESPAILLAT.

H.R. 4522: Mr. COFFMAN.

H. Con. Res. 90: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. TENNEY, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. COSTA, and Mrs. LOWEY.

H. Con. Res. 95: Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mr. EVANS, Mr. MOULTON, and Mr. CORREA.

H. Res. 220: Mr. MEEHAN.

H. Res. 252: Ms. ESHOO and Mr. RUSH.

H. Res. 318: Mrs. BUSTOS.

H. Res. 593: Mr. DONOVAN and Mr. KIND.

H. Res. 621: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H. Res. 637: Mr. PITTENGER.

---

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,

69. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Mr. Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, Texas, relative to urging Congress to enact legislation that would prohibit the use of any Federal Government funds to settle out of court any allegation that any current or former elected or appointed official within the Federal Government, or any current or former Federal employee, committed sexual harassment while serving in the executive, judicial, or legislative branches of the Federal Government; which was referred jointly to the Committees on House Administration, the Judiciary, and Oversight and Government Reform.