

felt that his true mission was to make sure his squad made it home safely.

After leaving the Marine Corps, Ryan set a goal to attend college at Texas A&M University. He was accepted into Texas A&M, and he planned to attend the university after holding out one semester to work and to save money for school. Ryan embodied the core values of Texas A&M through his spirit of selfless service, leadership, loyalty, and integrity.

Unfortunately, the toll of his military service manifested itself in the form of PTSD, which, unfortunately, went undiagnosed. As the long-term effects of war began to grow within him, he ultimately became another victim of PTSD, and his life ended far too early.

Mr. Speaker, Sergeant Coffey worked tirelessly to serve our country as well as family and friends. He is loved by our Bryan-College Station community, and he left an enduring impression on the Brazos Valley. Ryan will be forever remembered as a courageous Marine, leader, loving son, community member, and friend.

My wife, Gina, and I lift up our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Coffey family. We also lift up Ryan's family and friends in our prayers.

I have requested the United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Ryan Coffey.

As I close today, I ask all Americans to continue to pray for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us from threats overseas, and for our first responders who protect us here at home.

HONORING LIEUTENANT COLONEL BOB AMMON

Mr. FLORES. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor retired Lieutenant Colonel Bob Ammon of Waco, Texas, who passed away on September 28, 2017.

Bob was born in West Reading, Pennsylvania, on February 28, 1924. He would spend his early years in West Reading, growing up in what he described as an "average American home." He grew up with an older brother, Jim, and a younger sister, Marjorie.

In 1941, Bob was a senior in high school when the Japanese struck Pearl Harbor on December 7, 1941. Not being old enough for the draft, Bob was still determined to serve his country and contribute to the war effort. In 1942, he decided to take the aviation exam to become a pilot in the United States Army. He passed the exam and, on August 25, 1942, he was sworn into the Army.

He was called into Active Duty in 1943, beginning flight training in Santa Ana, California, and completing his training at Fort Sumner, New Mexico.

After graduating from flight school, Bob was assigned to Mather Air Force Base to begin training as a B-25 bomber pilot. In 1944, he began bombing runs with the 11th Bomb Squadron, who were fighting to dismantle the Japanese occupation of China. He flew 21

bombing missions in China and participated in combat during the Battle of Hanoi Harbor.

After his service in World War II, Bob reenlisted during the Korean war. In Korea, he flew an astounding 43 bombing missions and earned a Purple Heart for wounds that he suffered after being shot down over North Korea.

Bob again reenlisted to serve when the Vietnam war broke out. He never missed combat in any of the wars he fought in, and he was proud of his military service until the day he passed.

While stationed at James Connolly Air Force Base, Bob met a beautiful woman named Ann at the Officers' Club, and they married in 1952. They enjoyed 64 years of marriage together and raised three sons—Steve, Bob, and Jeff—all of whom graduated from Baylor University in Waco.

Though he was often traveling, Bob made a point to be there for his sons and to make sure they were being raised well. He was known as a loving father who raised his sons with a steady hand, and he passed on his love of flying, golf, and family to his three sons. Today, his legacy includes 25 family members, including grandchildren and great-grandchildren.

Bob was a patriotic man and always flew the American flag outside his home in Waco. He always made a point to stand for the Pledge of Allegiance and the national anthem, even as his health began to fail him late in life.

Bob was known for giving back to the local community, and he had a strong faith in God. Bob served in a position of leadership at the Covenant Church for 27 years. He was well-known for greeting parishioners with a smile at the doors of the church. His friendly and welcoming manner will surely be missed at Covenant Church.

Mr. Speaker, Bob worked tirelessly to protect our country, to raise a strong family, and to serve our Waco community. He is loved by his friends and family, and he left an enduring impression on all of central Texas. He will be forever remembered as an American hero, a great community member, a husband, a father, a grandfather, a great-grandfather, and a friend.

My wife, Gina, and I offer our deepest and heartfelt condolences to the Ammon family. We also lift up the family and friends of Bob in our prayers.

I have requested that a United States flag be flown over the Capitol to honor the life and legacy of Lieutenant Colonel Bob Ammon.

As I close today, I urge all Americans to continue praying for our country during these difficult times, for our military men and women who protect us abroad, and for our first responders who protect us from threats here at home.

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

OUR ECONOMIC GROWTH FUTURE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of Jan-

uary 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, as we try to get the boards to line up, we are only going to do three of these today.

Mr. Speaker, one of the things I wanted to do tonight, and we did it during sort of the debate earlier today—I hear lots of the discussions from our brothers and sisters on the left about the tax bill, and we often tease that this place is often a math-free zone, but I wanted to actually go a little bit bigger on why this tax bill is actually so crucial to every American, whether you be on the left, on the right, or just out there working as hard as you can and not thinking about politics.

The chart I have right on the side, this is what our nonpartisan Congressional Budget Office has come up with as our economic growth future. If you take a look over here, you will see 1.8 percent GDP growth for the next 10 years. But we then skyrocket up to just, actually, if you saw the details, just slightly under 2. And then the next decade, so 30 years from now, we fall back down to 1.9 percent GDP growth.

Why this is crucial is, as baby boomers are retiring, we have lots of promises. You have heard discussions, just even someone that was behind the microphone 40 minutes ago, on the other side, talking about Medicare.

There are estimates out there that, over the 75-year actuarial window, Medicare is \$105 trillion underfunded. It is the largest unfunded liability we know in America and, possibly, the world. This is what happens when you are growing at 1.8 percent GDP.

If you love people, if you want this society to have an opportunity to keep its promises to our seniors, to our kids, to that working family, we must have economic growth.

I talked about this earlier today, a terrific editorial in The Wall Street Journal over this weekend, saying, hey, from the left's eyes, they think about equality, income inequality, and from the Republican side, we often sound like accountants. And I am sorry, but the math is important.

We think about economic growth because, if you look at the next chart, I just want you to sort of look at the very, very end. You see this sort of gold line, green line, the other green line. Do you see the separation? That is income inequality. It has grown dramatically in the last decade.

We have also grown at only 1.8 percent GDP the last decade. Slow economic expansion is where you get the income inequality.

If the left here actually cared about the very issue they talk about all the time, they would be embracing tax bills, regulatory bills, things that would actually expand the size of this economy so everyone has a fighting chance. But you find the politics of division very powerful around here.

Look, we all get the joke. We understand that so many of our brothers and sisters on the left, they are terrified, or their base is angry, however we want to define it. You can't let the Republicans have a victory, particularly on rewriting the Tax Code for the first time in 31 years, even though, if you actually look at many of their records in the past, they have all stood behind microphones and said the Tax Code is abysmal. It stifles economic expansion; it hurts hardworking people; and, in a low-growth environment, with this crappy Tax Code, this is what you get. But the politics are so uncomfortable that, for a lot of our friends, it is more uncomfortable to vote for something that actually might be seen as a Republican victory.

So I wish I had an elegant way of begging my friends on the Democratic side, saying: Just think about it as giving every American a fighting chance because, if we start to grow, you actually get paid more; you have more job opportunities; you can save money for your retirement, for your kids. Because where we are at today and where we have been the last decade, we are in real trouble.

You actually look at some of the nonpartisan groups, and even some of the partisan groups, on their analyses of what the U.S. debt structure looks like, there are many of these models that, in about 15, 18 years, they collapse, our debt to GDP.

What that means is, when we say, "Here is the size of our economy, gross domestic product—here is the size of our economy, and here is the size of our debt," in just a few years, we actually surpass the amount of publicly sold debt.

This is not where we are borrowing from our own trust funds. The publicly held debt passes the entire size of our economy, and it keeps going and going and going and going. That is status quo.

Please understand, the status quo has many of the models collapsing, much of this economy, in about 15, 18 years because our debt is so huge it consumes everything.

Social entitlements right now are about three-quarters of all of our spending. Medicare, Medicaid, Social Security, that includes benefits of other welfare programs, earned and unearned, that is three-quarters of our spending, and it is going to become dramatically more.

So if you are someone who actually cares about health research, if you actually care about education, if you care about the national parks, if you care about the military, if you care about our relations around the world, all those are getting squeezed because of, substantially, the demographic curve we are already in, the growth of those populations, and our attempt to keep our promises.

If you care about keeping our promises, you care about the economic growth; and the tax rewrite is one of

the key elements in that. And, yes, it is going to also require thinking through immigration. It is going to be thinking through regulations. It is going to be thinking through the adoption of technology.

□ 1900

But understand, you can't stand around here and give speeches about income inequality and then support the very policies that actually create it. The intellectual inconsistency around here is so frustrating.

This is a really interesting board, and why it is so important is that I ask for everyone to stop thinking about the actual debt number and think about it as its ratio, as its percentage, as its burden on the size of the economy.

If we have a \$20 trillion economy and \$20 trillion of debt, we are at 100 percent of debt to GDP. Our economy is actually a bit bigger than that, but if you actually look at this red line, that is entitlements.

Do you notice all those years where it is flat?

That is actually not because we were spending less money on entitlements. What that is about is we were growing as an economy. Yes, we were still spending more money, but we were growing faster than the growth in that spending.

If you care about fairness, if you care about opportunity, if you care about the ability to save, if you care about income inequality, you have got to step up and do those things that are difficult—and they are very difficult—that will maximize economic expansion in this country, because the difficulties that are coming in the next decade in our inability to have enough resources or enough borrowing capacity to continue to pay is devastating. We need this economy to continue to grow.

As we walk through this, I want to actually walk through also a couple of observations. And forgive me, but this is one of those opportunities where you have a few minutes to share.

I hold a seat on the Ways and Means Committee. It has been fascinating. On occasion you will hear folks say: Well, this was rushed through.

Well, except it was built on about a decade's worth of work. If you look at all the years that Dave Camp, the previous chairman of the Ways and Means Committee; and then the chairman after him, who happened to be PAUL RYAN; and now the chairman, KEVIN BRADY, there are volumes and volumes of documentation. There are volumes and volumes of hearings and data. And there has got to be hundreds of hours of video out there of different hearings, both the whole committee and the subcommittees have done, in just trying to understand what affects economic growth, what works and what doesn't work.

An observation. How many people in the last couple weeks have you heard walk up behind these microphones and use the early 2000s as an economic example of a tax cut?

Now, understand, that was just substantially a basic income tax. It wasn't rewriting parts of the Tax Code. What so many folks forget to tell you, if you go back to 2002 and you actually look at what we call the baseline—and I am sorry, this is going to geek out a little bit—baseline is our model of what we think revenues are going to look like and what spending is going to look like over the next decade. Then you look at those things that are referred to as the Bush tax cuts when they finally expired.

You do realize the revenues—the revenues—that came into this government were \$77 billion higher than the projection, yet you will hear people get up behind the microphone and say: Well, these didn't pay for themselves.

But that is not the math.

Now, this government spent a lot more money than was projected. We had wars, we had bailouts, we had storms. We have had all sorts of things. We spent a lot more money. But if you actually look at the revenue line when those 2002 tax cuts expired, there was \$77 billion more in revenue than was projected.

Is that because of the tax cuts?

Partially. Maybe. But there were lots of other effects in the economy, adoptions of technology, and all sorts of things. But the basic rule of thumb is: Here is where we thought we would be, and we were \$77 billion over that.

Back to this concept of: Are there tax cuts that pay for themselves?

Absolutely.

Are there tax cuts that don't?

Absolutely.

And that was one of the really gut-wrenching parts of this discussion. If you actually spend some time looking at a nonpartisan group like the Tax Foundation and look at a lot of their modeling, they would come back to us and say: Hey, you could spend this money on something that is great politics, but you get almost no economic expansion from it. Or you could spend that same money or something over here that turns out not to be great politics, but is really good for the economy and really good a few years from now and someone being able to find a job, someone being able to be paid more, someone being able to save for their retirement or their kids.

How do you get up in front of an audience and say, "I know we would love to have this because this gets me re-elected. But for that same money, our society, economically, will be healthier, bigger, wealthier a few years from now if you put that money in expensing, in certain types of business tax cuts, because that expands the size of the economy"?

That is something a lot of folks haven't thought about as they grind through the technical details of thousands of thousands of pages of the Tax Code. Parts of the Tax Code are absolutely an economic document.

How you make us competitive in the world again? How do you maximize

economic expansion? How do you maximize opportunity for everyone to have a good-paying job?

But a Tax Code is also a political document. These are things that are very popular. These are things that get us elected. These are things that certain special interests line up at our door, walk around the hallways. If you actually saw the hallways over the last few months, I didn't know there were that many lobbyists in this town, all advocating for something for their business, for their State, for their community. All are honorable. But you have got to understand, when we put together a few-hundred-page bill and grind through it month after month after month and make a change here and a change here, and then realize the interactivity when they actually model it turns out this idea blows up this idea, the number of hours that have gone into making this math work are stunning and it is a really good document.

Is it everything all of us would want? No. Being a Representative from Arizona, I believe it is really good for my State.

But the thing I care most about is it being good for our country. I believe the tax bill, the tax reform, is fair to individuals. It is simpler. It is going to also deal with the hemorrhaging we have of corporations—and these are big corporations—leaving our country, hiding their profits overseas, and moving their expenses to the United States.

Is that fair?

Of course it isn't, but that is what the current Tax Code allows.

If you hear someone saying, "Vote 'no' on this bill," if you hear them saying, "We prefer the status quo," understand what they are saying: We want to live in a world of absolute mediocrity, with almost no economic growth, no opportunity to save, have higher salaries and higher opportunities. We are happy having, in a decade and a half, a debt crisis in this country.

And what they are also saying is they are okay with the hemorrhaging of American industry leaving this country because of the tax arbitrage, where they can get a better deal in other parts of the world.

That is the absurdity of some of the arguments you have heard around this body.

So back to my fairly snarky comment: We get the joke. We understand there are many out there who are terrified of Republicans getting a win here. But I want to argue that this is not a win for Republicans. It is a win for our society because, if we start moving away from that 1.8 percent economic growth that our congressional budget has projected for the next decade, we have a fighting chance to financially keep our promises, to have a strong military, to have that money for our education, to have that money for healthcare research, and for you as an American citizen to see your salaries increase, see your ability to save, and know you have a brighter future.

Mr. Speaker, just as an idiosyncrasy, over the last couple months, I have been keeping a little bit of a notebook of many of the comments that have come from my brothers and sisters in this body, some supporting the tax bill and making claims, many opposing the tax bill and making claims.

I am going to make a mark in my calendar, 1 year from now coming back behind this microphone, and we are going to open up that journal and we are going to read what was said. Hopefully the American people at that time will understand this is political rhetoric and this is actually based in math. And that math, I am desperately hoping and desperately believing, is going to be great for our country.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today after 4:30 p.m. and balance of week on account of death in family.

Ms. CLARKE of New York (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for the first series of votes today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 11 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, December 20, 2017, at 9 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:

3430. A communication from the President of the United States, transmitting the National Security Strategy of the United States, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 3043(a)(1); Public Law 99-433, Sec. 603(a)(1); (100 Stat. 1075); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3431. A letter from the President, Institute for Defense Analyses, transmitting a report entitled, "Report on Elements Contributing to Expenses Incurred by Contractors for Bid and Proposal", pursuant to Sec. 824 of the National Defense Authorization Act for FY 2017, Public Law 114-328; to the Committee on Armed Services.

3432. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary for Congressional and Intergovernmental Relations, Department of Housing and Urban Development, transmitting the Fiscal Year 2017 Federal Housing Administration Annual Management Report, pursuant to OMB Circular A-136, Sec. 1.6.; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

3433. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Prineville, OR [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0616; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-26]

received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3434. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Seward, NE [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0354; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ACE-8] received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3435. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Multiple Restricted Areas; Vandenberg AFB, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0985; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-21] received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3436. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Saab AB, Saab Aeronautics (Formerly Known as Saab AB, Saab Aerosystems) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0563; Product Identifier 2017-NM-021-AD; Amendment 39-19076; AD 2017-21-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3437. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0693; Product Identifier 2017-NM-044-AD; Amendment 39-19074; AD 2017-21-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3438. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace LP (Type Certificate Previously Held by Israel Aircraft Industries, Ltd.) Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0692; Product Identifier 2017-NM-043-AD; Amendment 39-19075; AD 2017-21-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3439. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-9500; Product Identifier 2016-NM-140-AD; Amendment 39-19072; AD 2017-21-01] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

3440. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Embraer S.A. Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0697; Product Identifier 2017-NM-041-AD; Amendment 39-19080; AD 2017-21-09] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received December 14, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.