

Already, working men and women pay for most of the infrastructure. They are the ones who are driving the cars, paying the fees and so forth. This, we have to tackle. We need to do it in a bipartisan way as Mr. JEFFRIES has suggested, but we ought to do it in a way that tries to claw back as much of that unnecessary wealth that has been transferred to the superwealthy.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I think that is exactly right. The gentleman's concerns and suspicions are well-founded based upon the approach that was taken by this Congress on the other side of the aisle in connection with the tax bill.

So the individual tax cuts, to the extent that there are any that will be felt by the American people, are modest; the corporate tax cuts are massive.

The individual tax cuts are temporary; the corporate tax cuts are permanent.

The ability of individuals to take a State and local tax deduction has been decimated; the ability of corporations to use the State and local tax deduction on their corporate tax return is untouched.

The moving expense deduction for individuals has been eliminated, but corporations can continue to take moving expense deductions for closing down a factory or a plant here in America and shipping those good-paying American jobs overseas to China, India, or other parts of the world.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, did I hear the gentleman correctly that an individual who lost their job, for whatever reason, and moves to another State can no longer deduct the moving expense? Is that correct?

Mr. JEFFRIES. That is correct.

Mr. GARAMENDI. However, a corporation that decides to close that plant, that facility, that laid off that individual, and open a factory in China can deduct the cost of doing that?

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Something is radically wrong here.

Mr. JEFFRIES. It is totally outrageous, and it is exactly why the gentleman's concern about what our colleagues may be attempting to do with respect to the infrastructure bill is real. Because what we have just seen is an effort to massively transfer wealth from individuals and from everyday Americans to wealthy Americans and incredibly well-off corporations in ways that should never be possible in the United States of America.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I was reading the tax bill yesterday, which is not a good read, and I found a provision that was of particular interest to me. Back in the 1990s, I was Deputy Secretary for the Department of the Interior, and we were trying to deal with the Exxon Valdez oil spill in Alaska.

We have also, since that time, had this little thing called the Deepwater

Horizon. There has been a small 9-cents-per-barrel fee that the petroleum industry has been paying for the clean-up of oil spills. The big ones, Exxon Valdez and Deepwater Horizon, there was even more money as a result of the legal action taking care of them.

Little oil spills in the rivers and lakes and harbors are cleaned up using that fee. It is about \$400 million a year—small, but absolutely essential. In the tax bill, they eliminated that small fee, and it is a \$400 million windfall to the petroleum industry.

You go: Why would you do that? Who, then, is left to clean up? It is going to be the taxpayer in the State.

Mr. Speaker, did the gentleman mention State and local taxes? He is from New York. I am from California. Perhaps the two of us can get in a bit of a rage that the tax bill forces Californians, New Yorkers, Pennsylvanians, and Illinoisans to pay a tax on a tax that they have paid.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Absolutely. And I found this sort of whole discussion of trying to punish taxpayers in California, New York, New Jersey, Connecticut, Illinois, and Pennsylvania to benefit States in the Deep South or other parts of the country that already receive more from the Federal Government than they give in return to taxes to be outrageous, and this will just continue the inequity.

New York regularly sends \$40 billion more to the Federal Government than we get back in return, and they have just made a bad situation worse. The same for California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, it is probably not really appropriate that we get into a rage about the way in which this tax bill purposefully harms contributor States and forces the taxpayers in those States to pay Federal taxes on the taxes that they have paid to the State governments.

We could probably go on and on here for some time about the inequities and the harm that this tax bill does, and we certainly should. We should probably come back tomorrow and every day thereafter and tell the American people what has happened to them as a result of this tax scam.

In doing so, I really want to thank the gentleman and his two colleagues for developing, within the Democratic Caucus, a set of proposals, legislative proposals, policy changes, that will give the American public a better deal. We can juxtapose that against the tax bill, which is a raw deal for the American working family, but the gentleman has developed a better deal.

In the days ahead, I would love to join the gentleman and his colleagues juxtaposing the tax bill against the proposal that it is beneficial to working men and women in America, so perhaps we can do that.

Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman would like to wrap up, I will follow him with a wrap-up.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, I look forward continuing to work together for the gentleman's advocacy. We will dissect this tax bill for the American people, continue to discuss it, expose its fraudulent nature, and also lay out in clear terms the better deal we are offering, focused on better jobs, better wages, and a better future.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, reclaiming my time, I thank Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. CICILLINE, and Mrs. BUSTOS for developing the Better Deal program for our caucus.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to end where I started. So, for the American people, I want them to know where we are coming from as Democrats: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little." If you want to know where I am coming from, read that sentence.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 140, AMENDING THE WHITE MOUNTAIN APACHE TRIBE WATER RIGHTS QUANTIFICATION ACT OF 2010

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-503) on the resolution (H. Res. 681) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 140) to amend the White Mountain Apache Tribe Water Rights Quantification Act of 2010 to clarify the use of amounts in the WMAT Settlement Fund, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF S. 139, RAPID DNA ACT OF 2017

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-504) on the resolution (H. Res. 682) providing for consideration of the bill (S. 139) to implement the use of Rapid DNA instruments to inform decisions about pretrial release or detention and their conditions, to solve and prevent violent crimes and other crimes, to exonerate the innocent, to prevent DNA analysis backlogs, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

DEFERRED ACTION FOR CHILDHOOD ARRIVALS

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we keep hearing about action that needs

to be taken on the Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals. I have spent a lot of time down on our Nation's southern border, and I was quite pleased, last year, when Border Patrol friends told me information indicated that, after President Trump was sworn in, the number of people coming into the United States illegally slowed to a trickle, that it was a dramatic decrease, and that continued for awhile. But, during the summer, as discussion about DACA started coming out, I was told, and, apparently, the numbers indicate, the surge began anew.

What I have heard over the years is anytime anyone in Washington starts talking about amnesty, legalization of any kind for people who have come into the United States illegally, there is a fresh surge across our border.

I have been told by border patrolmen, they hear people talking who have come in illegally—whether before processing, during processing, after processing, during the holding procedure, it is made very clear, since they are willing to come into the country illegally in violation of United States laws, that they want to get here before there is any legalization. And it makes sense, as I am told, that they are willing to come in in violation of U.S. law. They are also willing to say that they came in a previous time and, you know, backdate it, different identity, different date they came in, whatever is required in order to get legal status.

□ 1845

I appreciate hearing from my constituents, I always do, and I appreciate getting the opinions and thoughts of constituents from my district, the First District of Texas. They are always welcome.

In the last couple of days, I have gotten a stack of petitions in my office regarding a push to support what they are calling a clean Deferred Action for Childhood Arrivals reform, but it raises some questions. The best I can tell by the words "clean bill," they mean one that provides amnesty with no strings attached. However, all these petitions have been provided, actual names and addresses are only on a handful of them, many have names written in the same handwriting in ink, and there are numerous unsigned blank petitions in the stack we were provided.

In addition, I want to point out that, every time DACA legalization is mentioned, we have greater surges of people into our country illegally; and every time there is a surge, there are people who die trying to get into this country illegally, bodies found. We have the reports of a dramatic number of young girls, even some boys, who are pulled into sex trafficking, drug trafficking, as a way to pay off their debt to the drug cartels that control the area of the border that they were allowed to come across by the gang that brought them across.

It should be noted, every young person in America has dreams. The best

way to achieve the greatest number of dreams for the greatest number of people in the United States is if we enforce the law across the board fairly.

I keep being amazed, and I have asked questions at our hearings:

So why did these people come into the United States illegally?

Well, because there are more jobs and opportunity.

No, but why did they leave where they left, where they fled?

Well, there was no opportunity there.

Why was there no opportunity? Why were there no jobs there?

Well, there is so much corruption. They don't enforce the law fairly.

So what we are being asked to do, instead of using political efforts to get these countries that people have fled to fix their political system, we are supposed to change our laws here so that those who have been working—I have helped some people 17 years trying to get into the country legally—they will be treated unfairly, because they have been trying to do things legally, in favor of people who violated the law to get here.

It kind of seems like we are being asked to become the kind of country they fled, where the law is not enforced fairly across the board. It sounds like the ultimate irony.

Until our border is made secure, we should not be discussing passage of any legalization bill. We should stop talking about legalization until the border is secure. When the border is secure, then we can work things out.

It is so ironic to me, the very people who are demanding a big amnesty, legalization, whatever you want to call it, say, "We don't want a wall, we don't want the border secure," which means we will have to come back and have this discussion in the next couple of years all over again.

It was supposed to have ended in 1986. We will get border security in return for the amnesty. We got the amnesty, and we didn't get the border security.

I am joined by a friend, a very dear friend, who wrote speeches for his hero, a hero of mine, Ronald Reagan, who knows very well what happened in 1986.

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

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding. I also want to thank Mr. GOHMERT for the great courage that he has had on this issue, the fact that he has been willing to speak up for something that the establishment in this country is trying to shut us up about, trying to put blinders on the American people about what is going on and how we are losing our country.

I was there with Ronald Reagan, and, yes, he was sold a bill of goods in 1986. He was told there were 3 million illegals in the country; and that is what we are going to do, we are going to legalize their status. He had a good heart, Reagan had a wonderful heart, and he saw these people were being exploited and living in the shadows.

Three million people, you could take care of that, but the agreement has to be that we are now going to control our borders.

Of course, back then, there was never even any question about whether someone who is here illegally should be getting a government benefit or be able to be treated just like a U.S. citizen, that wasn't even in the works, but Ronald Reagan said: Okay. We will secure the border, and then we will make sure that we take these 3 million people and save them.

Instead, how did it end up? The border security was done not even halfheartedly. We ended up, when all was said and done, with not 3 million people, but 11 million people who eventually came here based on that amnesty program.

Well, today, it is a lot worse what we are facing. Today, the American people are being told a lie. Maybe someone is not just lying directly to them, but they are feeding them a false image of what the issue is today.

How many people have heard about the DREAMers, these wonderful young people, yes, who came here at an early age? The American people are not being told what we are talking about when we talk about the DREAMers. Most Americans think we are talking about 25,000 or 30,000 kids at the most. That is what most Americans think we are talking about.

What we are talking about is 850,000 young people, who, yes, have dreams, and most of them are fine young people, I am sure, but they are here illegally, they have been brought here illegally by their parents, and they want their status legalized.

What will that do? 850,000 young people, not 25,000, almost a million young people, and all right, what will happen when they are legalized? Well, what we are not being told is, as soon as they are legalized, they then have the rights of everybody else, as anyone who is residing here legally should, and, thus, they are eligible for family reunification, and their families that are now being brought in from other countries then have the right to bring in their families. So we have a family reunification that creates a snowball effect and millions and millions more.

Then, of course, we also have, with the legalization, the eligibility for government benefits, which, as I say, during Reagan's time, there wasn't any question you are not going to give benefits to illegal immigrants. Well, now we find illegal immigrants receiving education and healthcare benefits just as if they were American citizens.

In California, they have even treated criminals as if they are citizens, setting up sanctuary cities and sanctuary States.

Let me note that, with free education and free healthcare, there is no limit to the number of people around the world who will want to come here. By the way, there is no securing the border as long as we are giving education and

healthcare benefits to people who have come here illegally.

In fact, what we are talking about now is basically opening up major, major expenditures in our budget, that right now we can't afford even to take care of our own people, yet we are going to have an obligation not just for these 850,000 young people, but all of the people whom they will bring in as well, not to mention the millions of other young people throughout the world who will say: My gosh, if I could get there.

And mothers and fathers throughout the world: We have got to get our child there so they can get the education and healthcare that is being provided to young people even when they come there illegally.

Now, let us note, for funds for our education system, our own young people are suffering from a lack of funds for their education; we lack money to have a very good healthcare plan for our people, yet the millions of other people who have come here illegally, we are going to let them drain that money and invite millions more people to come here from overseas.

This is the most dishonest debate that we have had. That whole concept of having millions and millions more coming in because of DACA, the DREAMers? No, no. This is being kept out of the debate; this isn't going to be part of America's vision of what is going on.

The idea that we now have veterans whom we cannot afford to take care of, we have children of our own people whom we cannot afford to educate, we have seniors whom we are trying to take care of, all of these are expenses that we have, and we are already in the hole, yet we are going to take care of millions of other people who have come here illegally, starting with the DREAMers?

There are not just 10 million, by the way, 11 million people here illegally. Let me be clear. We have got, I am guesstimating, 20 million, but I bet there are other people who are much more sophisticated in their analysis than I am on this who say it is even more than 20 million people who have come here illegally.

So what happens? We are draining our resources for people who have come here illegally.

What does that mean? We don't care enough about our own people. That is what we are really saying. Those people are more important than our own people.

Then, of course, you have the fact that people are coming here, and, yes, they are able-bodied, yet they still get education and healthcare, but they get jobs, and, yes, they bid down the wages of people at the lowest end of our spectrum.

I used to be an ice cream scooper at Marineland snack bar. That is what I did when I was in high school. I scooped ice cream.

You know what, those jobs now, what we have got are people who have gone

into those jobs so that in order to get people to work for them, they haven't had to increase the wages of the people at that level. And if they have increased wages, they haven't increased the wages as much as they would have had to had they not had groups of people there who say: I will do that work at half the price.

Something else I was, I was a janitor in college. I was a janitor, and I cleaned toilets. There is nothing wrong with anybody, whatever work they have got. We know that we respect every working person in this country.

Yes, I cleaned toilets, and guess what? I looked back a few years ago and found that the salary, the wages, of people who clean toilets has not gone up, the janitors are not making more money.

Now, why is that? Are we saying that people who work at lowly jobs aren't worthy of having a pay raise, they shouldn't benefit? The income of our Nation now is three or four times higher than it was, yet those people in the lower scale have not been going up with that. The main reason is those lowly jobs that they get, they have been bid down, the salaries have been bid down by this massive flow of illegals.

Now, if we care about our people, we have to ask: What is America? America is not one race, not one religion, not one ethnic group. America is a country in which we believe in freedom and we have come from every ethnic group and race in the world.

What makes us Americans, then, is that we have to care for each other. We are an American family, but that being an American family means we must take care of those people who are less fortunate in our country before we spend and even borrow more money in order to take care of the needs of people who have come here illegally.

Let us just note the worst part of this whole debate is that Republicans and others who are concerned about this are being labeled like we are anti-immigrant. Well, in fact, we know that immigration is an important part of our country.

□ 1900

But this is the greatest lie of all because we believe that our country has been prospered by having a legal immigration system. We, in fact, take in a million legal immigrants a year. So anyone who is thinking about this should think about it. That represents more legal immigration into our country than all the other countries of the world combined, allowing people to immigrate into their country, all the other countries of the world.

Yet, because we don't want to destroy this system, we don't want it to go out of control, we are being labeled as anti-immigrant, even though we sing praises for those people who have come here legally.

In fact, the people who are the most anti-immigrant are the ones who mix

the title "illegal" and "legal" together. And what we have got now is the worst possible outcome in that we have limited resources being drained away from our own people of every race, religion, and ethnic group, and jobs that are being bid down by illegals; and everyone, including legal immigrants, are being hurt.

But what we have now is a recognition that we cannot even enforce the law. We have sanctuary cities in which criminals are being kept from being arrested by Federal agents.

What is that all about? Who do we care for?

Now we are saying our police can't even protect our families; and that if there is some criminal gang from another country that comes here, that we are going to have a sanctuary State or a sanctuary city for these people.

This is absolutely ridiculous. It is a horror story, and it is up to us to alert the American people that we are losing our country. We are losing our country. And when I say "our country," us, United States is us, every race, every religion, every ethnic group.

Let us care for each other. Let anybody who is saying we care more about someone who is coming here illegally from another country, I don't care how old they are, their children, yes, are less important than our children. Those people's well-being, yes, are less important than the well-being of all Americans, whatever their status in this society. We need to make sure we make that clear.

And DACA, if we bring in 850,000 young people and encourage millions more to come in by doing that, we have betrayed the interests of our own people, and they are looking to us to protect them.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman personally witnessed what happened after the amnesty of 1986. President Reagan rightly said that we can't have an amnesty unless we have proper border security. They put it in the same bill. They got the amnesty and there was no follow-up.

Let's say we want to do the best to help young people, the world over. My friend here has already illustrated what happens. There are rules for radicals. You want to bring down the United States, apparently you bring as many people into being totally reliant on the government, so you bankrupt the government, destroy the government. That is how you eliminate the greatest, most representative government in the history of the world.

Then what happens to young people around the world when there is no America to stand up against repressive regimes? What happens?

Who is benefited by bringing down the United States by overwhelming our system, running the \$20 trillion debt up much higher? Who is benefited?

Mr. ROHRBACHER. Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are people who, with sinister motives, are trying to destroy the United States of America. They are

there. There are people out there who hate us for what we stand for. They have always hated America. We have been what stood between the forces of evil on this planet for 200 years now.

If it wasn't for our guys—my mom and dad left North Dakota, these small farms—out to fight in World War II, we saved the world from Nazism and from Japanese militarism.

And then during the Cold War, we stood firm until communism—that evil that wanted to create atheistic dictatorships throughout the world, thinking that that is going to cleanse us from our profit motive, the idea that we are going to change human nature but we are going to establish dictators and dictatorships and murder millions and millions of people, we defeated that evil. We held firm until it had a chance to collapse on its own.

Now we face radical Islam, which is not a force, by the way, that—it is a powerful force. There are Muslims who hate us. There are Muslims who love us as well. But there are Muslims who hate us, who have lots of money and lots of oil. We cut deals with them, so they have lots of money and resources.

And what did they do?

They have financed terrorism to try to terrorize us into retreat. They hate America. They hate America. These are forces. And there are still forces in the world today that hate us, and that group is applauding when we lose control of our borders.

And you know darn well the terrorists of this world have seen those open borders to the South, and the terrorists are among us.

But we also have lost control of what you are talking about; that loss of control will destroy our chance to have an economic activity that succeeds in establishing a currency and a system in which prosperity and a good life for ordinary people can exist.

No, it is going to go down unless we stop this massive flow. And the massive flow is already gone, but it will become a flood of people if we send the message: Kids who get here get free education, free healthcare, legalized status, and they will bring their parents in.

We will have tens of millions of more people flooding our country. I can't agree to that.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman and I have been to Iraq a number of times together, to Afghanistan, to different places in the world. It seems pretty clear, after our effort to create a democratic republic in Iraq, that if a nation's people have not been properly prepared and educated to maintain a democratic republic, they won't keep it. It seems pretty clear from the places we have been together.

I will never forget Christian friends that I made in west Africa, who sat me down at the end of the week and said they wanted me to understand that they were so thrilled when we elected our first Black President. But since he was elected, they said: We have seen

America get weaker and weaker, and we wanted to make sure you took a message back to Washington that we are Christians, we know where we go when we die. But our only chance of having peace in this life is if America is strong.

I will never forget those words.

They said: Please stop getting weaker. We suffer when you are weaker.

And most of the people who are pouring across the United States for a better way of life, they are not coming to weaken us. They are coming with their own hopes and aspirations.

But I ask: What would be better? What better neighbor would we be to continue until so many come in, our system fails and goes bankrupt, as California is doing now?

Or would we be better to say: Let's build a wall where it is necessary. Let's totally secure our border. Let's cut off the 70 to \$80 billion that is flowing from the United States into the drug cartels of Mexico, that allows them to corrupt the Government of Mexico and the local governments and terrorist people and put police heads on stakes to terrorize us. Let's cut off that 70 to \$80 billion, however much it is.

Let's totally secure the border. And people who love their Mexican heritage are—other countries in Central and South America, they love their heritage, but they can't make it.

Why don't we help cut off the corruption by cutting off the flow of money out and drugs into our country? Why don't we work on that? Wouldn't that be a better neighbor to our friends to the South?

There is no reason Mexico is not one of the top 10 economies in the world. They have got the wonderful people, hardworking folks. They have got the resources. They have got a fantastic location. There is only one reason that they are not, and that is because of the corruption that their drug cartels bring from U.S. money flowing into Mexico.

Maybe we would be better off helping all of those millions of people who want to come here by helping them be a country that is one of the top in the world.

Mr. ROHRABACHER. Mr. Speaker, establishing the rule of law here will not only protect our own people, will not only make sure that our own less fortunate people are bid into low-paying jobs so that people who work as janitors, as I did, and as decent people are doing now, that their wages aren't bid down; they can live a decent life so their families can live with some security here. So by doing that, we will also take away this major instability that we are creating throughout the world by not obeying the rule of law.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I so much appreciate my friend. I don't like to use "colleague" with DANA ROHRABACHER because he is so much more than that. He is a dear friend and a brother, and I will treasure most of the times that we have spent together in

traveling, trying to do right for the United States and the world.

One other thing, Mr. Speaker, I want to touch on before we finish up, and that is the issue that is coming, we are told, this week, regarding Section 702 reauthorization.

We are told that the folks in the deep state have made very clear they want what they call a clean reauthorization. Nothing clean about it when you look at how 702 is spent.

So just spend a couple of minutes here, based on an article entitled "How the FBI and DOJ Intelligence Units Were Weaponized Around Congressional Oversight" from January 8, 2018. It goes through this scenario.

Sometime in early 2016, Admiral Rogers—talking about Admiral Mike Rogers, not the MIKE ROGERS that was here in Congress—became aware of an ongoing and intentional violation of Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act Section 702 surveillance, specifically item 17, which includes the unauthorized upstream data collection of U.S. individuals within NSA surveillance through the use of "about inquiries," where they do a surveillance of someone foreign, capture American citizens, which would violate our Fourth Amendment rights, except that those names are masked and, supposedly, all kinds of efforts to protect that, so it is not a violation of the Fourth Amendment, supposedly.

But this article points out that they get all of these conversations in the database, and then they can do inquiries about people, subjects, and capture that information about Americans, basically allowing them to get around the Fourth Amendment.

Mr. Speaker, I commend this article. We see what occurs when we don't have proper oversight. And Section 702, as being proposed, does not give us the proper oversight, and I hope that we will look further at that.

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

□ 1915

MULTIEMPLOYER PENSION CRISIS

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I stand with so many of my colleagues today in a call to action for this body to address a crisis that is at its breaking point for pensioners across our country, retired workers, who have come from the building trades, miners, truck drivers, so many more—actually, hundreds of thousands of Americans—losing their pensions or about to lose them.

Millions of American retirees have worked and earned pensions that they contributed to through the multiemployer pension programs. In fact, I met one retiree recently who paid over