

families, that I would fight for these kids, that I would fight for the future of America; the principles and the values that make this country strong. That is the reason why I ran for office in the first place. That is the reason why we are serving in office in the first place.

So I am here to call on the President to rescind the zero tolerance policy that is cruel, inhumane, and un-American.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. KIHUEN, I don't want you to stop. I want you to stay strong. I want your voice to be heard. I want your experiences to be known.

Eight years old, coming to America with your parents. In this room, there are very few who would share such an experience, who could understand first the excitement of being in America, and then the potential terror of being taken from your parents.

I want you to make your voice heard because it is the voice of experience. It is the voice of a recent family coming to America.

So as we go through these days, please come to the floor, tell the experience again, not only of your family, but also what you saw in those shelters, in those cages.

Will the gentleman do that?

Mr. KIHUEN. I will.

Mr. GARAMENDI. I am quite certain that across this country, every one of the 430-some Members of Congress saw this photo. Probably most have heard the audio recording of young children just like this calling out for their mommy or daddy, papa.

I suspect many of us have seen the pictures of young children, 3, 4, 5 with a Sharpie telephone number on their chest so that if somehow they were separated, there would be someone to contact.

I am certain that every Member, 430-plus of us, plus the Senate, that was a child, that at some point in their life, when they were young, 3, 4, 5 years of age, they were separated from their parent. And I am absolutely certain that each one of us knows the terror of that moment.

And most of us are now parents. Most of us are now parents, and we know the terror of a child who has disappeared, wandered off.

I don't believe there is one of us that knows the terror of this mother whose child was taken away by American police; the awesome power of this government imposed upon that young woman, a mother, taken from her child.

Is there one of us? Is there one of us that has endured that police power?

Okay. I get emotional about this because I am a parent.

No. I don't know the terror of the police state taking my child away. I don't know that. But I know the terror of that child who has wandered off.

This is a policy that has been imposed upon parents and their children by the President. This is not a law that requires this kind of cruelty. There is

no such law that requires this kind of cruelty. There is no law that requires the American government to cage children. There is no law that requires this. This is the policy of the President of the United States. This is his policy. Zero tolerance. His policy that cages children as though they were animals. His policy that puts the fear into a child.

It is the President's policy, not the law, that caused this young child to cry out for her mother and for the police to stand over her.

The Attorney General says it is the law. It is not the law. It is his policy, together with the President's policy, that has created this humanitarian crisis in the United States of America. It must end.

Martin Luther King—who was killed, murdered, assassinated 50 years ago—from the Birmingham jail spoke about justice and the law in his letter from the Birmingham jail.

So, Mr. Attorney General Beauregard Sessions, listen to what he had to say. He said: "A just law is a manmade code that squares with the moral law or the law of God."

He went on to argue: "An unjust law is a code that is out of harmony with the moral law."

And how should justice be defined? He answered this way: "Any law that uplifts human personality is just. Any law that degrades human personality is unjust."

Mr. Attorney General, by the words of Martin Luther King, your defense of what you say is the law is unjust, it is immoral, and it is not the law of God.

My wife, Patty, has what she calls cradle songs, songs that she sung to our children as they were young and growing.

One of those was written by Bobby Dylan, *Blowin' in the Wind*:

Yes, and how many times can a man turn his head

Pretending that he just doesn't see?

Yes, and how many ears must one man have
Before he can hear people cry?

And, Mr. President and Mr. Attorney General, the opening line of that song is this:

How many roads must a man walk down
Before you call him a man?

Mr. Speaker, I yield back.

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

SUCCESS OF THE TAX CUTS AND JOBS ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Minnesota (Mr. LEWIS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. 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 Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota. Mr. Speaker, I am here today to bring good news. Good news that often in this 24/7 media cycle goes unnoticed, unremarked.

□ 2015

It is the good news of legislation that works. It is the good news that creates a growing and rising tide of economic prosperity for all families, including, most importantly, the children of families who rely on their parents' income in a growing economy.

I am here tonight to talk about the unheralded success of something called the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. Rarely has one piece of legislation been so successful so quickly, and rarely have so many, at least on one side of the aisle, predicted its success with so much accuracy.

We are now, according to a number of analysts, including the Atlanta Federal Reserve, set to grow at over 4 percent the next quarter. Consider that over the last decade, if not longer, we have barely been able to scratch the surface at 2 percent GDP growth.

Now, after the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, after more investment in America, after more repatriation of profits coming home to invest, after labor and capital coming together because our Tax Code now incentivizes labor and capital to come together, we are seeing wages going up.

We are seeing more capital investment. We are seeing bigger paychecks. We are seeing economic growth over 4 percent. We are seeing utility companies offer rebates under the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act because they have to pass through the savings they got from tax reform to customers.

It is remarkable how so many of our friends in the fourth estate seem to have forgotten all the warnings about tax reform and tax relief. Oh, I remember it well, Mr. Speaker. Last fall, last winter: This is going to be crumbs. It is going to be Armageddon. It is going to be a disaster if we pass the greatest tax reform in over 3 decades.

Now, some of us on the other side of the aisle, the Republican side of the aisle, said: "Wait a minute." Secretary of the Treasury Andrew Mellon under Calvin Coolidge in the 1920s first embarked on increasing the return for labor for capital investment, for economic growth. What happened in the Roaring Twenties? It led to a balanced budget. Then, of course, in the 1960s—and this is what my colleagues on the other side of the aisle seem to forget—old-school Democrats like John F. Kennedy went to The Economic Club of New York in 1962 and said:

What this economy needs in 1962 to break out of the doldrums is a tax cut.

JFK said in that famous speech: "Our practical choice is not between a tax-cut deficit and a budgetary surplus. It is between two kinds of deficits: a

chronic deficit of inertia, as the unwanted result of inadequate revenues and a restricted economy, or a temporary deficit of transition, resulting from a tax cut designed to boost the economy, increase tax revenues, and achieve, I believe—and I believe this can be done—a budget surplus. The first type of deficit,” Kennedy warned, “is the sign of waste and weakness. The second reflects an investment in the future.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was an investment in the future, it is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. So JFK got his tax cut enacted after his tragic death, and what happened in the 1960s? We had lower rates, but we had more revenue. Now, how is that possible?

Our critics of our tax reform say: Oh, you can't cut rates and have more revenue.

It is amazing how many people know so little about modern business. If you are sitting in your local hardware store, if you have unwanted inventory, what is the first thing you do to move product? You lower the price. Why? Because you lower the price to sell more goods and services, albeit at a lower price, but a volume increase for more revenue.

It happened during the 1978 capital gains tax cut, the Steiger amendment, when we cut capital gains rates and, actually, revenue went up. Every single time we have cut tax rates in the modern era, the “revenue loss” has been nowhere near the predictions.

So in the 1960s, what happened? We had lower rates, and we had a balanced budget by 1969. Higher revenues grew.

Fast forward to the 1980s. We had the doldrums of the Carter-malaise era when we were told that the era of prosperity was over. We had to put on our cardigan sweaters, button them up, and turn down the thermostat because the good times were not coming back. Get used to it.

Ronald Reagan comes on board. He is pushed by the supply side movement of 1970s and 1980s, and the Kemp-Roth tax cut. And he enacts in 1981—in those days, a Democratic Congress when Democrats realized that economic growth was actually a good thing and you want to celebrate it, they enact Kemp-Roth, bringing the top rate down from 70 to 50 percent.

Now, there was a delay in 1982, you might recall, but then the tax cuts finally kicked in, in 1983. By 1984, it was morning in America again.

Revenues when Ronald Reagan took office were about \$580 billion. By the time the 1980s were over, Federal revenues were almost \$1 trillion. How could it be? How could it be that you cut tax rates and you almost double revenue?

This is an amazing phenomenon that our critics of tax reform just won't heed. They won't understand. They don't want to see it. They don't want to hear it. But it is ironic. What is the first thing that folks who say they want to reduce teenage smoking advocate? Mr. Speaker, they advocate rais-

ing the taxes on cigarettes. Why? Because when you raise taxes on something, you get less of it. You get less activity.

Why is it that if you buy a bond, a 30-year bond or a bond in the open market that is taxable, you demand a higher interest rate, but if you buy a tax-exempt bond you will take a lower rate? Because people do not work for pretax income. They work for after-tax income. And when you lower the marginal tax rates and you increase after-tax income, more people work. More people invest.

It happened in the 1920s. It happened in the 1960s. It happened in the 1980s. And guess what? It is happening right now.

We have a 4.8 percent growth, 4.5 percent growth. Who knows, it may just be 4 percent growth, but considering that we have been at 1.9 percent growth for so long, this is the miracle that keeps on giving and yet won't be acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why it won't be acknowledged by the other side, because not one of them voted for it. Imagine, a tax bill that doubles the childcare tax credit; a tax bill that lowers the tax rates for mom-and-pop pass-through businesses by letting them deduct the first 20 percent of income; a tax bill that says you don't have to itemize any more to get a bigger deduction, and we are going to double your standard deduction; a tax bill that puts America's corporations in line with the rest of the world, not penalizing America's corporations compared to the rest of the world.

Now we have foreign profits coming back. We have more mom-and-pop businesses expanding. And we have a rising tide of economic growth, a rising tide that lifts all boats.

I thought that is what this body was here to do. We are not here to pick out groups, pick out winners and losers, to have some sort of industrial policy where a command-and-control central government decides who wins and who doesn't. You only gain if you are a political entrepreneur.

The folks out in the real world, businesses and capitalists, they invest for an economic return. But government all too often invests for a political return. We have seen that form of crony capitalism, and it gave us 1.9 percent economic growth. Now, instead of carve-outs and loopholes, instead of favoring some States that like to tax their citizens over States that don't, we have lower rates, broader but lower rates for everyone, and loopholes for fewer, which means economic growth is going to be determined by an economic return.

I don't know how else to describe this. It is an amazing success story in the 115th Congress. Yet you would never know it listening to the other side, listening to our friends in the fourth estate. It is the story they don't want you to know.

But I am here to give you good news. The economic growth that is occurring

will keep occurring because people now have confidence. The green shoots are back. The animal spirits are back. People are excited to be in America. They feel good about their country. They feel this is a place where they can fly as high as their wings can take them without being hindered by the strong arm of the state.

That is what the American Dream is about. That is what the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is about. And that is what believing in America is about.

I am proud to have played a part in it, however small, and I am proud of Congress for passing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). 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, it is great to hear my friend Congressman LEWIS. He does a great job explaining such matters.

We had an interesting combined hearing today in the Judiciary Committee and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We heard from the inspector general of the Department of Justice, Mr. Horowitz. It was interesting testimony.

But having reviewed the record, it is interesting, because he quoted prosecutor one, prosecutor two, agent one, agent two, agent three, these different people, different prosecutors, different agents that he was relying on; their comments, their opinions, their suggestions; the SSA, Supervisory Special Agent, recommendation and comments on things that should have been and should have not been; and things that were proper and improper. But we had no information who these people were.

The whole reason for the inspector general investigation was because of the massive amount of clear bias that had been unearthed within the Department of Justice, including the FBI that is, of course, under the Department of Justice.

So we are being asked to accept all this information from the inspector general when so much of it depends on the opinions and the comments and the assessments of people whose identity we didn't even know.

So not only did we not know their identity, we don't know if they have texts and emails that are just as condemning of Donald Trump and laudatory of Hillary Rodham Clinton. We don't know what their positions are. And we found out from the inspector general that he didn't make any inquiry. He didn't check on them.

But I know from my days trying cases as a prosecutor, or as a felony judge in Texas, the lawyers, when they are picking a jury, as to who will sit in judgment on their case, they have a