that everybody here that I have talked to has said that they want to work in a bipartisan manner to be able to pass a tax reform bill that is fair, that is done under regular order, that is done with transparency and done in the light, but the way that this is happening, it is just not right.

We know, again, that these trickledown economics just simply do not work, and we need to start all over. We need to head back to the drawing board and sit down as Democrats and Republicans like they did back in the eighties when Reagan was President and Tip O'Neill was Speaker and work out some of these issues that the American public has.

We know that people are very anxious about some of the things that they have been hearing about this tax reform bill, people from all congressional districts and, again, all backgrounds. We in the Congressional Black Caucus, we are concerned about the impact that this is going to have in the African-American communities around this country—and all of the communities, quite frankly, Mr. Speaker.

Again, let's just sit down at the drawing board, talk about some of these things, and come up with something that is fair that the American public can feel good about, knowing that Members of Congress, that they are not trying to gain advantage over one another, that we are trying to come up with a fair way how to reform our Tax Code, keep our businesses here, and keep a little bit more money in people's pockets at the end of the week or the end of the month, whenever they get paid, so they can take care of their families and buy a home, take care of their grandkids, do whatever it is they need to do in order to make ends meet.

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for this evening, and I yield back the balance of my time.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 2874, 21ST CENTURY FLOOD REFORM ACT, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF THE CONFERENCE REPORT ON H.R. 2810, NATIONAL DEFENSE AUTHORIZATION ACT FOR FISCAL YEAR 2018

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia (during the Special Order of Mr. VEASEY), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-408) on the resolution (H. Res. 616) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 2874) to achieve reforms to improve the financial stability of the National Flood Insurance Program, to enhance the development of more accurate estimates of flood risk through new technology and better maps, to increase the role of private markets in the management of flood insurance risks, and to provide for alternative methods to insure against flood peril, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of the conference report to accompany

the bill (H.R. 2810) to authorize appropriations for fiscal year 2018 for military activities of the Department of Defense, for military construction, and for defense activities of the Department of Energy, to prescribe military personnel strengths for such fiscal year, and for other purposes, and which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

REFORMING OUR TAX CODE

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

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the opportunity to be here once again and follow up on the gentleman from Texas and his remarks that I think hit the nail on the head with regard to what working class families out in the heartland, in the Deep South are facing every single day.

I think it is important that every policy that we push here in the United States Congress is a policy that addresses some of those deep concerns that they all have.

Sometimes I think that this town gets into a little bit of a bubble. Two separate political parties that talk to each other, talk at each other, talk within each other, but we are in the midst of deep change in the United States. We are in the midst of the kind of structural change we have not seen in our country in a long, long time.

We have an economic system, a Tax Code, a trade regime, that has not, quite frankly, been up to task to meet the needs of working class families.

We have a healthcare system that, even though many changes have been made, I think, to help people get coverage, to help them afford their healthcare, it is still not up to task with the deep needs of our country.

We have an education system that is not quite up to speed.

The deliberations in this body need to be a little bit deeper. I think we need to take a little bit of a step back.

We have tax reform that is on the docket this week.

We have a consistent dialogue with other nations with regard to how we are going to organize our trade relationships with other countries, whether it be in North America, whether it be with China or Europe or any other country.

□ 2030

Mr. Speaker, I will just say that after looking at the tax bill that has been presented in both the House and the Senate, the Congressional Budget Office has said that this tax bill will run a deficit and a long-term debt for our country to the tune of \$1.7 trillion. So this tax reform that our friends on the other side are pushing has a \$1.7 trillion hole in it.

What has to happen is that the United States Government, because the

Republicans are going to pass a tax cut, which the majority will go to the wealthiest people in the country, and because there will be this hole in the budget now, this country-our taxpayers are going to have to go to China, go to Saudi Arabia, and we are going to say: Hey, can you loan us some money? We have got this big deficit. We have got this debt we are running up in the United States. Can you loan us like \$1.7 trillion? Because we are going to give that money back to the wealthiest people in the country, in the hopes that it stimulates the economy and grows jobs and wages. And, oh, by the way, we tried that in 2001, and 2003, and it didn't work.

To me, I think it is very difficult for us as a country to say we are going to give China more power over us. We are going to give China more say in the negotiations that we have with them, whether it is North Korea, whether it is them moving bases out into the South China Sea where they are actually building islands so that they can put bases on them and project more force in that area of the world.

We are going to have less negotiating power with them as they continue to move into Africa and extract natural resources to feed their industrial machine. We are going to ask them for \$1.7 trillion to give a tax cut that goes primarily to the biggest corporations in the country and the wealthiest people in the country.

Now, that doesn't make a whole lot of sense to most people. It sounds like a little bit of a scam. And the \$1.7 trillion, which you have got to watch, we are borrowing it, and then we have to pay interest on the money that we are borrowing. So if interest rates go up, we are going to start paying more.

Meanwhile, back here in the United States, we have got a number of challenges that we have got to deal with. We have got to rebuild our country. The President, while he was campaigning, said: We are going to do \$1 trillion in infrastructure improvements in the United States. I am a builder. We are going to rebuild the country.

It is now November, and we have not heard anything about an infrastructure bill or building roads and bridges and all the rest. In fact, we have had a President who campaigned—might see a little theme developing here—the President also campaigned and said: We are going to expand healthcare. We are going to expand Medicare. We are going to expand Medicaid. We are going to make it cheaper, accessible. It is going to be beautiful, and it will be easy to do. I can do it.

And so goes life.

The two bills, in both the House and the Senate, from the Republicans, as analyzed by the Congressional Budget Office—not as analyzed by Democrats—it was analyzed by the Congressional Budget Office, which is a neutral third party. They are kind of the umpire down here. They are the referee in

Washington. They just look at the numbers. Whatever party is in charge, they always don't like the Congressional Budget Office because they always tell you things you don't necessarily want to hear.

So the Congressional Budget Office said, on both of those bills for healthcare, both the House and the Senate: 20-plus million people will lose their healthcare.

So we had a campaign saying we are going to rebuild the country, and that hasn't happened; a campaign saying we are going to get people more healthcare, and that is not happening. Then, we had a campaign where our President was saying: We are going to be tough on China. We have got to be tough on them.

There are all kinds of little quotes I can say from when he was in Ohio, or he was here, or he was there. He was going to be the tough-on-China guy.

As you can see from this chart, for good measure, this is a chart that outlines where Chinese trade, foreign trade, and automation have hurt our country, and who has been hurt the most. The red is the hardest hit; and then as it moves to more lighter colors, less so.

So you can see in the industrial Midwest, in the Great Lakes States, in the South, up in New England, Pennsylvania, and some out West, they were devastated by trade. The President is in China this past week, and he says: I don't blame the Chinese. It is not their fault, but it is the United States' fault.

Now, I will say that the United States has not done a great job of being as firm on China as I would have liked. I was one of the original cosponsors of the China Currency Manipulation Bill, with former Representative Duncan Hunter, the father of current Representative DUNCAN HUNTER.

So we have been on this for a long time. But this does not gloss over the fact that the Chinese intentionally steal our intellectual property. They intentionally skirt global trade rules.

If we put tariffs up on Chinese steel tubing coming into the United States, the Chinese will ship it to another country, and then, from that country, send it to the United States to avoid the tariffs that we put on because their product, their final product, was cheaper than the raw material costs of a company like Wheatland Tube, in my congressional district, that is trying to sell the same thing; or Vallourec Star, in my district, that is trying to sell the same thing.

So we would put tariffs on, and they would skirt the rules and come around through another country. So we play this constant game of trying to figure out where the Chinese steel is going to come in from. That is not our fault. That is not playing by the rules. That is not playing fair.

Our President needs to recognize—I am all for being a diplomat—but when you are in the country, you need to be firm with the leaders of that country

and tell them to stop hurting American businesses and putting American steelworkers out of work, especially when you campaigned on doing that just a year ago. We are seeing communities completely wiped out.

So back to the tax cut, we are going to go to this same country, and we are going to borrow money from them. That doesn't make any sense at all.

What Democrats are proposing, and what our side is proposing, is that the people in the country that really need a break are those people the gentleman from Texas was just talking about, the ones working swing shifts; the ones who take a shower after work; the ones who stand on their feet all day long, making minimum wage or maybe a little bit more. Those are the people we should be pushing a tax cut toward. Put a little money in their pocket; help them lift up the ladder.

Here is why I think this makes sense: If you go back to the last time we did tax reform, 31 years ago, in the last 31 years, 96 percent of all income growth went to the top 10 percent of the wealthiest people in the United States. So over 30 years, 96 percent of that growth went to the top 10 percent. That is where all of the money went.

We have seen it flatline wages across the middle class for 30 years. We know the story, unfortunately: communities gutted, manufacturing base eroded. So to say we are going to take this group that has made all of the income gains in the last 31 years, and we are going to give them a tax cut that we are going to finance by borrowing money from China, which is going to increase our national debt; so we are going to have to pay more on that; we are going to lose leverage in the world with China; and now they are our banker—even more so than they are right now.

So what I am asking is for us, in this body, to take a time out, to stop the process, to reach across the aisle to Democrats, to say that we have got to figure out this disparity that has happened over the last 20 or 30 years between capital and between labor. All of the gains have been on the capital side, yet capital gets taxed at a lower rate than wages

Warren Buffett said it a million times that he pays a lower tax rate than his secretary pays. Now, is that fair? Is that right? It is not. Of course, it isn't.

The argument is—because we have been adopting this system in one form or fashion or another for most of the last 30 years since Reaganomics—that has been the same time that all of this has happened. So we need a new way of doing this. This is not working for people. The Tax Code is an opportunity for us, I think, to ask those people who have been doing pretty well over the last 30 years, who make their money through capital gains, to pay the same level as the guy working the second shift at General Motors Lordstown. I think that is only fair. With that revenue, we can start rebuilding the counLet me just say, lastly, that there is no evidence—and I know in Washington that most things aren't based on evidence—but there is no evidence that cutting taxes for the wealthiest people in the country somehow makes it down to improve wages for middle class people. There just isn't any evidence of that.

George W. Bush, I was here for the second round of these tax cuts, but he cut, primarily, for the top 1 percent and threw some crumbs to the middle class folks. They got 300 bucks. That was supposed to create jobs, stimulate the economy, grow wages, and everything else. That was the slowest decade of growth in modern American history going back to the Great Depression.

We had a more stable line of growth with the Bill Clinton budget in 1993, in which we asked the wealthiest to pay a little bit more. We balanced the budget, reinvested back into the country, and created 20 million new jobs. Every income group, from top to bottom, saw wages go up.

\square 2045

When he walked out of this Capitol and George W. Bush came in, I think there was a \$5.6 trillion projected surplus. I hate to say it, but we were having the debate about what we were going to do with the surplus. You may remember Al Gore was campaigning saying: We ought to put that surplus in a lock box, and make sure we support Medicare and Social Security and extend the life of those programs.

George Bush was saying that we want to give it back in a tax cut. So George Bush won, and it went back in a tax cut. The only benefit—supposed benefit—is that at least we didn't necessarily borrow that money. We were projected to have that money come in, and then we gave it back in a tax cut as the country collectively—some of us weren't for that.

But now we don't have a surplus we are going to give away. We have got to go borrow the money. So then we give that \$5.6 trillion back—again, primarily to the top 1 percent—and have a slow decade of growth. We ended up in two wars, put that on a credit card, too, then a complete economic collapse, and we are just trying to climb our way back.

This is not the time to go borrow more money from China and give a tax cut to the wealthiest people in the country. It is just not the time to do that. We have got a lot of investments here at home that we need to make. We need to create an economic system that starts working for most people in the country which it is not now.

We have jobs, but we have stagnant wages. We do have jobs, but wages are low. We do have jobs, but people are still losing their pensions. We do have jobs, but people still don't have the kind of healthcare that they need.

We can do better than this. It starts, I think, now with our rejecting the Republican tax bill and saying to them: Reach across the aisle, work with Democrats, and let's do something that is bipartisan here and something that makes this a revenue enhancer or, at the very least, revenue neutral by asking and increasing the rates on capital and not borrowing \$1.7 trillion—if not more—with increased interest rates from China.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. Poe of Texas (at the request of Mr. McCarthy) for today on account of personal reasons.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. Pelosi) for today.

SENATE BILLS REFERRED

Bills of the Senate of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 1153. An act to prohibit or suspend certain health care providers from providing non-Department of Veterans Affairs health care services to veterans, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

S. 1266. An act to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to enter into contracts with nonprofit organizations to investigate medical centers of the Department of Veterans Affairs; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House. reported that on November 9, 2017, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 194. To amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other pur-

poses. H.R. 3243. To amend title 40, United States Code, to eliminate the sunset of certain provisions relating to information technology, to amend the National Defense Authorization Act for Fiscal Year 2015 to extend the sunset relating to the Federal Data Center Consolidation Initiative, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 47 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Tuesday, November 14, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS. RESI-DENT COMMISSIONER, AND DEL-

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same: that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God.'

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

JOHN R. CURTIS. Third District of Utah.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2016 and the third and fourth quarters of 2017, pursuant to Public Law 95-384 are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, DELEGATION TO ROMANIA, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 5 AND OCT. 10, 2017

Name of Member or employee	Date			Per diem 1		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure	Country	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²						
Hon. Mike Turner	10/6	10/10	Romania		1.000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Hon. Gerry Connolly	10/6	10/10	Romania		1,000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Hon. Tom Marino	10/6	10/10	Romania		1.000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Hon. Rob Bishop	10/6	10/10	Romania		1,000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Hon. Paul Cook	10/6	10/10	Romania		1,000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Hon. Ted Poe	10/6	10/9	Romania		750.00		(3)				750.00
Hon. Jim Sensenbrenner	10/6	10/10	Romania		1,000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Hon. Linda Sánchez	10/6	10/10	Romania		1,000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Adam Howard	10/5	10/10	Romania		1,250.00	(3)	5,133.00				6,383.00
Janice Robinson	10/5	10/10	Romania		1,250.00	(3)	5,133.00				6,383.00
Ed Rice	10/6	10/10	Romania		1,000.00		(3)				1,000.00
Committee total					11,250.00		10,266.00				21,516.00

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals

HON. MICHAEL R. TURNER, Nov. 2, 2017.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE, HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN JULY 1 AND SEPT. 30. 2017

	Date			Per diem 1		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
Name of Member or employee	Arrival	Departure	Country	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²						
Hon. Lisa Blunt Rochester	8/26 8/28	8/28 8/30	Ghana Nigeria		428.95 1,671.77		(3) (3)				428.95 1,671.77
Bart Fischer	8/30 9/1	9/2 9/5	Cote D'Ivoire		673.60 575.00		(³) 675.59				673.60 1,250.59
Committee total					3,349.32		675.59				4,024.91

3 Military air transportation.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended. ³ Military air transportation.

¹Per diem constitutes lodging and meals. ²If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.