

cellphone. The first thing on it was a notice that JOHN McCAIN had brain cancer. I literally stopped in my steps and thought about JOHN McCAIN and was saddened.

Senator JOHN McCAIN is a true American hero who served our country in Vietnam and has served our country in this House of Representatives and the United States Senate.

When he ran for President, he had a bus called Straight Talk, and that wasn't just a name on a bus. He is a straight shooter.

He has been a voice of reason and honesty, standing up and speaking truth to power during these last 6 months of this current Presidency, and somebody whom we need as a voice.

It seems that Arizona produces those voices. They produced it with Barry Goldwater, and they produced it with JOHN McCAIN.

He is a nice guy, too. The few opportunities I had to interchange with JOHN McCAIN or go up to him and say something to him about an issue, he was always very easygoing, very pleasant, a good human being.

I urge you, if there are people in your life that you think well of, that you care about, let them know it now, and keep JOHN McCAIN in your prayers. Hopefully, he will come back and continue to serve the United States as he has throughout his entire life.

□ 1245

HIGHLIGHTING HALL GROWS

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

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to highlight the success of my friends and neighbors at the Hall County Chapter of the Georgia Farm Bureau. This past year, the Farm Bureau launched Hall GROWS, an educational initiative designed to help students expand their knowledge of agriculture.

In my home State of Georgia, agriculture is the largest industry, contributing \$74 billion to the State's GDP. Our young people represent the next generation of farmers, agricultural experts, and consumers. It is our duty to ensure that these young students possess an understanding of the strategic advantage that agriculture represents for the United States.

The Farm Bureau is donating time, funding, and other resources so that schools can cultivate gardens, hold workshops for educators, and have classroom activities to help students. Because of efforts like these, Hall GROWS can continue to make an impact both in the lives of students and on the future of the industry.

The Farm Bureau's willingness to support students attests to the generosity of the American farmer. I am excited to see this program make a positive difference in communities like

my own in Hall County in Gainesville, Georgia.

Again, congratulations to the Hall County Farm Bureau for their work and effort and Hall GROWS.

REMEMBERING AND HONORING CONGRESSMAN MARK TAKAI

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

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, we lost a brother, a friend, and a colleague, someone who made a great impact on my home State of Hawaii and this country.

My friend, Congressman Mark Takai, was someone who lived his entire life with a full heart committed to serving the people of Hawaii and his country. Always ready with a helping hand with creative new ideas and a hearty laugh, Mark was someone who was always on the move.

I had the honor of serving with Mark all the way back in the Hawaii State Legislature, through our time serving together in the Hawaii Army National Guard and then, again, here in Congress where we both served on the Armed Services Committee.

Mark, time and time again, made his decisions based on how best he could serve the people of Hawaii, and he took a lot of pictures along the way. Mark led by example with respect and with aloha understanding and passion building partnerships focused on seeing how he could get the job done.

So on this day commemorating Mark, my heart is with his family: his wife, Sami; his kids, Matthew and Kaila; his parents, Naomi and Erik; our entire National Guard "family," "ohana," and the people of Hawaii as we remember Mark and honor his entire life and legacy of service.

OBAMACARE

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

Mr. DESANTIS. Mr. Speaker, Republicans have promised for years to repeal and replace ObamaCare, and this effort has seemed to have stalled in the Senate.

The best way to restart the ObamaCare repeal process is simple. Make Congress live under it.

The President can make this happen. ObamaCare included a provision dropping the congressional health plans for Members of Congress and diverting Members to the ObamaCare exchanges where they would have to pay their own premiums. Yet an Obama administration regulation gutted this provision and provided lucrative taxpayer subsidies for Members thereby creating an illegal exemption for Congress under ObamaCare.

Mr. President, cancel this regulatory exception. Make Members live under ObamaCare as written. If you make them live under ObamaCare, my guess

is that they will vote to quickly repeal ObamaCare.

FREEDOM FROM BURDENOME REGULATIONS

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, last week, I started "Freedom Friday" to highlight freedom-killing regulations currently in effect.

Congress used the Congressional Review Act to overturn 14 regulations implemented in the waning days of the Obama administration. The repeal of these rules alone could save the economy millions of hours of paperwork—as much as \$3.7 billion in regulatory costs to Federal agencies and up to \$35 billion in compliance costs for industries. This is a nice start, but we are not done yet.

My main priority here in Congress is to restore the constitutional parameters of the Federal Government and end overregulation. The first regulation that I will be highlighting for "Freedom Friday" is an overly burdensome restriction on our trucking industry. California and the Ninth Circuit have imposed more stringent standards for truckers than those established by the Federal Motor Carrier Safety Administration.

There are some issues over which Congress has clear constitutional authority. This is one of them. We simply cannot allow our vital interstate commerce to fall victim to an incoherent patchwork of burdensome regulations. Our economic and national security depend on resisting this ominous trend.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to follow up on what my friend from Florida, Congressman RON DESANTIS, was saying: Under ObamaCare—that passed without a single Republican vote—Congress was expressly put under all of the conditions of ObamaCare, and it expressly took us out from the insurance that we liked, the insurance plans we had and liked, and 180 degrees contrary to what President Obama said and so many of our friends across the aisle.

Even though we liked our insurance and we wanted to keep it, it turns out that was not true what they had been saying for so many months. We didn't get to keep our insurance. I know emails keep circulating that Members of Congress have some special "pie in the sky" health insurance, but, actually, it is exactly the same insurance options that every single Federal employee from—well, I started to say

from the President down, but, actually, the President does have his own special healthcare. But I guess that is why ObamaCare seemed so appealing. It wouldn't affect the President and his family, or he might have looked at it a little bit differently. But since he has his 24/7 physician, it seemed okay to him to force the rest of the country under it.

Every Federal employee before ObamaCare had the same options we did. The major change in congressional healthcare came since the provision was put in there. Although every single Federal employee had employer—which means Federal Government, which means taxpayer—assistance in paying the premiums for their health insurance, we had to pay part and the Federal Government paid part—taxpayers, in other words, paid part. That was pretty common across the country.

But in ObamaCare, for some reason, Speaker PELOSI and Majority Leader Harry Reid thought it was a good idea to stick it to Members of Congress that were not in leadership so that there would be no Federal supplement. No Federal employer was going to pay part of the cost of the insurance, health insurance, for Members of Congress. That is in the bill.

Originally, we thought that meant every single Member of Congress would not get the employer part paid by the Federal Government. But it turns out the Speaker and certain of the leadership and leadership staff who must have helped draft the bill, that the way it was worded did not include the funds they were paid for them so they would continue to get the Federal portion paid by the government and taxpayers as that is.

But then Speaker Boehner, Majority Leader Reid, and President Obama got together, and they worked out a deal. Like my friend, Congressman DESANTIS from Florida, pointed out, they made a deal to completely ignore what was in black and white print in ObamaCare that Members of Congress, other than the leadership, would not have the Federal Government paying any part of theirs. All the rest of the Federal employees in the country, yes, they would still have the Federal Government pay part of their insurance, only Members of Congress wouldn't.

They made a deal to specifically ignore what our Democratic friends put in the law, in black and white expressly there, and so we had gotten so many calls and so much information.

Going all over east Texas, I've heard from so many people who have lost their insurance who now could not afford their insurance and now were forced into a network that did not have the doctor who was saving their lives or the medication that was saving their lives, didn't have Mayo Clinic and didn't have the certain cancer facility that they had been using to keep their lives going.

I had heard so many of those horror stories from constituents I just could

not—I mean, I went and talked to the personnel here that are supposed to help us sign up for healthcare, and I just could not bring myself to sign up for ObamaCare that was being illegally interpreted. It is not even an interpretation; it is very clear. We didn't get the Federal subsidy, yet they agreed to do it despite what they put in the law and agreed to in the law. So I went without insurance at all for a few years and then have to pay extra to have insurance through my wife's employer.

RON DESANTIS made a great point. If we went ahead and enforced ObamaCare exactly the way it is written, the Speaker and the leaders would be taken care of in the House and Senate, but the rank-and-file Members of the House and Senate, I think, would more quickly have come to the conclusion: we have got to have a change, and we have got to have it quick.

Perhaps that is what President Obama was thinking when he agreed to have the taxpayers fund the huge part of the congressional health insurance that, gee, if he did that, then they wouldn't be as quick to want to overturn it.

I think it is very important as we hear friends across the aisle talk about how devastating it will be if we repeal ObamaCare. Yeah, what happens? Think about it. What happens if we repeal ObamaCare? We would go back to the way it was before ObamaCare passed. I didn't remember it being quite this high, but one of our friends mentioned this week, I remember the polls were saying 75 percent of Americans were satisfied with their health insurance before ObamaCare was shoved down every Americans' throat. So if we repealed ObamaCare, what would happen is we would go back to a health insurance—or a healthcare situation—where 75 percent of Americans were satisfied.

What many of us were saying, as we were in the minority on this side, we were begging our friends across the aisle, look, don't just throw out the entire healthcare system the way it is even though you have got people in the health insurance business and the big pharmaceuticals helping you write ObamaCare so they are going to make billions and billions more than they have ever made—yes, it is true, a lot of health insurers have gone out of business, but the big ones that helped write ObamaCare and sign on to it—happy to endorse it and embrace it—made record profits. So much for opposing crony capitalism. We see it at its best in ObamaCare.

So Americans should be a bit skeptical when they see some of the people who helped write ObamaCare and made billions and billions saying: oh, no, let's not throw it out.

Well, just remember, if we did that, if we just voted to end ObamaCare and have our system exist as if ObamaCare had never passed, it would immediately put us into a situation where the vast majority of Americans were satisfied

with their health insurance and with the healthcare they got.

□ 1300

I have noted over the years that one of the things that has helped with the acceptance by the minority that has accepted ObamaCare as being a good thing has been that politicians here in Washington have skewed the difference between health insurance and healthcare.

I know people have said: Oh, gosh, people were dying on the sidewalks.

Actually, if you are on the sidewalk and you have got a health problem, you do as people that I have seen in the emergency rooms have done: they go to the emergency room. I am standing in line behind them, waiting to get care for one of my children.

So it wasn't a matter of not getting that healthcare. Those people did not have health insurance.

What good is ObamaCare insurance when your deductible is \$7,000, \$8,000, and you are paying \$10,000, \$12,000 a year for your insurance and you don't have enough to put aside in savings to even pay \$1,000 to \$2,000 of your deductible?

Yes, you have health insurance, but you sure don't have healthcare because now, because of ObamaCare, you can't afford it.

Yes, from time to time I hear people say: Yeah, but the subsidy is working out so well, I am able to have insurance.

Well, what is your deductible?

Well, it is pretty high, but I am satisfied with it.

You know what we keep finding?

They are satisfied with it because they have got cheap health insurance and it works out fine until they have something catastrophic happen and they find out they don't have the money to cover what they have got to cover.

We have got to do something. I submit it wouldn't be so bad to go back to a system that a majority of Americans said they were satisfied with and then work from there.

Don't throw out the whole system again and make the Federal Government, Big Brother, have its fingers in every aspect of your supposed care. When the Federal Government has that role, whether you want to call them death panels or not, there are bureaucrats who will make decisions to decide what they are going to allow you to have and be paid for. That should never, ever be the role of the government.

Some say to go to a single-payer system. I despise that term because it masks just how evil the system is. It is socialized medicine, which is also another way of saying you have rationed care. Everybody is not going to get what they need, and the government will decide who they think has a life valuable enough to get a new knee or to get a new hip or to have back surgery or to have lifesaving surgery. The government will decide that.

That is the same reason I have heard from numerous seniors now. Before ObamaCare passed, they had Medicare as supplemental coverage. But even so, after ObamaCare passed, which cut \$716 billion out of Medicare, they could not get timely surgeries that they needed before ObamaCare.

If we don't repeal ObamaCare, it will continue with those wait times that many seniors are now experiencing. Whereas, it used to be: When do you want to do this? Tomorrow? Next week? When do you want to do it?

Now it is: I know you need it now, but it is going to be 2 or 3 months before we can work you in.

It is rationed care. That is what ObamaCare causes. There is going to be more and more of that unless we get ObamaCare repealed. I just don't think that is an option. A majority of Americans did not want ObamaCare, and, after it passed, still didn't want ObamaCare. They gave us the majority in the House, now in the Senate, and now the Presidency on a promise that we would get rid of ObamaCare.

So we start from the premise that healthcare will be better and more affordable once ObamaCare is repealed. There needs to be reforms, but you have got to start from the premise that you have to get rid of the system that is skewing and basically destroying the greatest healthcare system ever produced in the history of the world.

Medical historians, as I noted before, have indicated there was probably some point in the early 1900s—it can be debated when that point may have occurred; some say around the protocols in the early 1900s, around World War I—or whenever it was, around 100 years ago, for the first time in human history, someone who needed healthcare had a better chance of getting better if they didn't go see a doctor. That point was in the early 1900s. After that point, you started having a better chance of getting well if you went to see a doctor.

So you look at that time, whether it is 100 years, 120 years, and to think that just in the thousands of years of recorded history in our lifetimes, you have not only had a chance of getting well after seeing a doctor, but you have a great chance of being cured.

Think of all the diseases and conditions that we found cures for. We have so many yet to go. There will always be something else that needs to be researched and cured, because that is the state of this world. But we had a system here in America that produced more lifesaving medications and treatments and surgeries, more lifesaving and enhancing procedures of all kinds because, for one thing, we had competition, we had a free market system.

Our Founders so wisely put in the Constitution provisions for rewarding people, because of original thoughts or inventions, copyrights and patents. Congress has done a lot of damage to that system in recent years, but it still provides an incentive to create some-

thing that is lifesaving or life-enhancing.

We simply cannot build a healthcare system that helps people based on the foundation of ObamaCare. More and more—until it is complete, socialized medicine will be, if we leave ObamaCare in place, there will be more and more rationed care, which means less and less care for individuals.

For 6 years, Republicans have been united in our support for fully repealing ObamaCare. Congress has voted—at least the House has—more than 60 times to repeal ObamaCare. So it is not the time to get timid. Now is the time to support the President's efforts to get rid of ObamaCare.

If what we have to do is bring forth the bill that we passed in the last Congress and put it on the desk of the President to get rid of the thing that has, at least informally, President Obama's name and that he says he is proud of—people are getting hurt, people can't afford what they have got. More and more are losing insurance. We are losing more and more insurance companies.

I still continue to be quite concerned to just say there is a great panacea in buying insurance across State lines because, unless we end the exemption from the monopoly laws, the antitrust laws, then we could very easily end up with only one or two insurance companies in the whole country instead of having only one in 30 or 40 States.

Far better it is to just end the exemption from antitrust laws, end the ability for a health insurance company to monopolize and have monopolistic tactics that keep entrepreneurs from developing new insurance companies, different ways of paying for healthcare. We have got to end that so that people that come up with new ways and better ways to provide healthcare end up doing well because of their great idea to provide more affordable healthcare.

One thing in my mind that is absolutely certain: if we can just get rid of ObamaCare, then one of the steps we have got to take is to get back to a system that we had 50 years ago or so, when I was growing up in Mount Pleasant in east Texas, and you knew what things cost.

All the different times I had to be taken in for stitches because I got involved in activity that was going to get somebody hurt—and I was often the one—all those times I went in for stitches, my parents always knew what it was going to cost when the doctor put stitches in my head or above and below my eye. All the different places I have got them, they knew.

Of course, on one occasion—he can't get in trouble now because he is gone—a dear friend of the family that was a family physician at the time let my mother, since she was such a good seamstress, put in maybe three of my five stitches. Mother said: That is just basic sewing; I can do that. He said: You sure could. I have seen you sew. That is all it is.

I don't encourage that kind of thing, but mother did a nice job, and he closed it up. She knew she was still going to pay the fee. Even though she put a couple of stitches in, she knew she was going to pay the fee. Anyway, he was shorthanded on nurses that day, and mother was the nurse because it was a weekend and he came in special.

Anyway, you don't see people anymore, like they did when I was young, who say: I am going to a different doctor because the other doctor raised his prices and that one is just as good. You don't see that.

Nobody knows actually what the doctors are getting paid. I have asked for answers from wonderful healthcare providers that are really trying to take care of people: How much is this? How much is that?

Well, LOUIE, I can't really tell you. It depends.

Is it Medicare, Medicaid, cash, Blue Cross, Anthem, an HMO? You have got to tell me. And what is the diagnosis?

Sometimes it is a different charge, depending on what the disease is.

Why is that?

Because the government has put different payment schemes on these things.

We have got to get rid of a system where nobody knows what anything costs. You can't have competition and spur healthcare and healthcare providers on to the very best they can possibly do to innovate new ways and better ways to treat people and to provide healthcare if we don't have actual competition and people knowing what they are paying for. That is one of the things we have got to get back to.

I know there are some physicians who have said: Well, my contract with the insurance company doesn't have that provision.

I have heard some do, but some have told me: Yes, my contract as a doctor with that insurance company said I specifically cannot let somebody who is paying cash pay as low an amount as I am taking as full payment from this insurance company.

Well, that shouldn't be the case. But as long as an insurance company can monopolize, violate antitrust laws, then they will be able to do that kind of thing to keep people from being able to pay cash as readily as they could if they were one of the major insurance companies.

□ 1315

We ought to get out of that.

How do you get out of that?

Well, the first thing is you never ever will as long as ObamaCare continues to be the law of the land.

So I am so proud we have a President that continues to push the idea of getting rid of ObamaCare so that we can have a better system providing healthcare. And I do use the word "healthcare" and not "health insurance."

And it bothers the heck out of me that the CBO makes this grandiose

claim of how many people will lose their insurance, because they are too ignorant, under the models they create, to distinguish the difference between somebody who chooses not to buy a policy that costs them a fortune, has a huge deductible, and is going to not help them when they need it, and someone who says: Gee, I want to keep this insurance, but I can't afford it.

The CBO has made themselves—put themselves in such a blind position, they can't tell the difference. The CBO says, "Well, if somebody says, I am not paying for this insurance policy. The deductible is too high. The premiums are too high. I am going to put my money in a savings account, and I will have, in 3 years, \$40,000 to cover healthcare problems, if I have some in the future, and that will keep growing," well, they will say that poor person that now has a huge growing health savings account is like a poor homeless individual, and the government yanked away their insurance.

No. They just chose to quit rewarding a health insurance company for not providing them insurance that they need. There is a difference between losing insurance and just refusing to buy insurance that is worthless.

I am hoping that we are moving closer to the day when we can get rid of this Democrat Congress contrived group called the Congressional Budget Office, CBO. I have been convinced for a number of years that we will never be able to get this country on sound footing with a driving economy, all boats being lifted, getting the country out of debt as long as the CBO is the official scorer for the bills in this building.

It seems clear to me. Yes, I understand. They have come to my office a couple of times. I understand. I get it. You create models, and then you feed this information in that you think is important to the models you created that hardly ever rely on actual historical performance. And then you just dutifully report what the model says the cost is and what is going to happen as a result.

Try living with history and using absolute historical evidence of what happens instead of creating some goofy model that, as best it appears now, when they—well, first, I think \$1.2 trillion, they estimated ObamaCare. And then after President Obama woodshedded Elmendorf, the director—and I know he doesn't like that term—but whatever you want to call it, he called him over to the Oval Office, met with him; Elmendorf comes out, redoes his numbers—Oh, it was under a trillion dollars. \$800 billion, just like President Obama said. How about that?

And then as soon as it passes, shortly thereafter, well, you know, it is actually probably more like 1.7, 1.9. And now more modern estimates say it is not \$800 billion; it is now 1.2. It is at least \$2 trillion, maybe \$4 trillion, maybe \$4½ trillion. It is just through the roof.

So I don't think it is unrealistic to say that the CBO's margin of error on

ObamaCare wasn't plus or minus 2 or 3 percent. It was plus or minus 200 to 400 or so percent. No entity that cannot have a better margin of error than 200 percent has any business scoring anything considered official in this building.

And I know Dr. Arthur Laffer got a private grant to figure out a way to have competitive scoring of bills in the House and Senate so that these scorers could have a score on their accuracy, their success rate for accurate scoring of bills.

So as you go along, this Republican idea of competition being a good thing—you have competitive scoring instead of one official group that will never allow this country to get on a proper footing because it was set up in 1974 as Nixon was going out. And the Democrats were having a heyday, and they got a little giddy and left 2 million people in southeast Asia to die instead of having an orderly transition, and, at home, were wreaking havoc with the way we pass laws in this building.

I will continue to urge the President of the United States, as we take up a tax reform bill, not to give in to the pressure from people in Congress toward the top to go more to a 20 or 21 percent corporate tax because the corporate tax really is about the most insidious—one of the most insidious taxes because it is based on a lie.

We tell the American people, "Oh, you don't have to worry. We are going to sock it to these evil corporations and make them pay all this big tax," when the fact is that corporations don't exist, don't continue to exist if they don't have the customers pay that corporate tax. That charge is ultimately paid by Americans across the country. It is another way of sticking it to the little guy when you have a high corporate tax.

And I am fully aware there are people in this country that think it is a great thing that they think we are evolving from a manufacturing country to more of a service economy where we just provide services and don't get engaged in this lowlife manufacturing.

Well, guess what, that lowlife manufacturing is how a country survives for centuries. Any nation that is considered to have power in the world loses that power after the next war if they cannot produce the things that they need to defend themselves from hateful, evil leaders in the world.

Some people didn't seem to mind when we were losing the tire manufacturing, steel manufacturing, steel product manufacturing, losing all that to China. They didn't seem to care. Oh, Louie, don't worry about it. We are a service economy.

Well, as a historian, I am telling you, if we don't get back to manufacturing the things that we have to have to defend ourselves successfully against evil tyrants—whether in Iran, North Korea, totalitarian in Russia, wherever, if we don't manufacture what we need to de-

fend ourselves and our freedoms, we won't have them past the next war. And be sure of this. Don't believe me. You know, Jesus said there will always be wars and rumors of wars. They are going to exist.

But Reagan was right. You know, the best way to avoid a war is to have so much strength that people will not attack you. They don't want to challenge you because they know you can take them out.

Unfortunately, we have had the ability to take out evil empires and evil tyrant leaders for a long time. But just as occurred when I was in the United States Army, Active Duty for 4 years, was at Fort Benning, and our embassy was attacked in Tehran, hostages were taken. We had a President—well, he had hailed the Ayatollah Khomeini as a man of peace when he took power, so it was kind of tough on him to turn around and attack him.

But the Iranians said the students did it. But it became very clear very soon, they stopped saying the students had the hostages, and started saying, "We have the hostages." It was a government-orchestrated attack. They could have and should have protected our embassy, and Carter should have made it clear: You either get our people out unharmed or we are bringing the full power of the United States military to Iran. And it wouldn't be a bluff. I think they would have let them go.

That is why they spent at least 3 days talking about the students having them. That was a way out. If Carter had said, "We are coming if you don't get those folks out," I think that they would have let them go. But you can't bluff in a situation like that. But we should have made it clear that we are not tolerating attacks on United States land—and that is what an embassy is.

And because we didn't defend ourselves there, the stories started: Well, they ran from Vietnam. You know, didn't do anything, the paper tiger.

One after another we got hit and didn't properly respond. And I understand President Reagan acknowledged that he let the Congress intimidate him into pulling our forces out of Beirut after 300 marines or so precious lives were lost to a terrorist attack.

So the story built and continued: The United States is a paper tiger. They won't defend themselves.

And it became attractive to be attacked.

So we need a 15 percent corporate tax. Meeting with different CEOs in years past over in China: Why did you leave America?

I thought they would say: Because of all the regulations. Yeah, those were problems. And sometimes unions are too—demand too much, and we can't stay in business, so we move.

But no. The number one answer over and over is: You know, we got a deal cut, and now we are at an effective rate between 15, 20 percent corporate tax.

And in America, you know, they say, cumulatively, corporations are probably paying around 40 percent for corporate tax.

It is time to undercut the tax that China pays. Bring back our steel industry. Let's get back to having Detroit—after so many of the great Midwestern States had cities that were model cities, and people were working, and there weren't the big slums because things were going great, that day can come back. But it will not come back to the extent it could with a 20 or 21 percent corporate tax.

But, oh, my goodness, if we cut our corporate tax to 15 percent, this United States economy will explode. This less than 2 percent that we had growth under President Obama, lowest for any 8 years in our history, that would end overnight.

Mr. Speaker, if I might ask how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 23 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I want to direct attention to this ongoing narrative about collusion with Russia. We still desperately need an independent counsel to investigate the Mueller-Comey-Lynch-Clinton relationships.

It appears Mueller is on a tear and he is going to do everything he can to divert attention from his collusion with James Comey. They were buddies. They colluded about so much.

Comey is trying to get an independent counsel appointed. He was able—by leaking illegally, pulling these shenanigans, he consulted with Mueller even on his testimony. And Mueller is the guy who is supposed to judge the testimony. And under current Federal regulations, Mueller should have recused himself.

We got to have somebody investigate Mueller. It is getting out of hand.

□ 1330

In the meantime, the new developments seem to make clear to some of us that Donald Trump, Jr., seems like a nice guy, but he appears to have been the target of a Democratic action to try to take down the Trump campaign.

They point to this meeting between Donald Trump and Natalia Veselnitskaya, a Moscow attorney. Some of this is in an article written by Scott McKay, July 14, *The American Spectator*. She was trying to meet with Donald Trump, Jr., and when they actually had the meeting, she didn't have anything to give him. She brought up about the bill that was passed that helped some extremely wealthy Russians who were buddies with Putin, but, as this article points out, the evidence of collusion between Trump, Jr., and the Russians seems to be based on a timeline which included the WikiLeaks disclosures of hacked Democratic National Committee emails and Trump's request that the Russians make public the 30,000 emails of Clinton supposedly that she deleted from her illegal private server. But it

is a smoking gun that Trump was the beneficiary of this Putin regime intelligence arm hacking the 2016 elections, so our friends across the aisle seem to say, but that doesn't make sense. He got nothing out of the meeting.

At some point, everybody in this room had to run for election, and if they had an opponent, if somebody said, "Hey, you need to know this about your opponent," you know, at some time or another, everybody in this room has listened to something, and many times it is just garbage, and you say, "I don't want anything to do with that."

And essentially that is what Donald Trump, Jr., did after he got lured into a meeting.

But when you think, wait a minute, what was this Moscow attorney even doing in this country? This article points out that her presence in the United States alone ought to be the source of suspicion, that not only is the Trump-Russian collusion narrative suspect, but the real inquiry ought to be whether the encounter was a small part of a larger attempt to trap the Trump campaign.

The Russian lawyer wasn't even supposed to be in the United States. She had been denied a visa for entry into the United States in late 2015, but given a rather extraordinary parole by the Obama administration to assist preparation for a client subject to an asset forfeiture by the Justice Department.

She could not be in the United States unless someone who answered directly to the President of the United States said: We are going to let her in. She is working on something special, so we are going to let her in. Even though we knew previously she is not somebody we should let in, she is doing something special right now. We want her in.

And the story is that Loretta Lynch had to approve her coming in.

So the client, Prevezon Holdings, that this Russian attorney was allowed to come in to help, was suspected of having paid some portion of \$230 million stolen by Russian mobsters. When Sergei Magnitsky, a Russian lawyer representing a company that had been the victim of the theft, reported it to authorities in Moscow, he was promptly jailed and beaten to death by the Russians.

The American response to this atrocity was the 2012 Magnitsky Act, which sanctioned several individuals connected to human rights abuses. The Russian Government retaliated by preventing American adoptions of Russian children. Who did that hurt? The Russian children, but Putin didn't care. Why would he care? He is making billions, he has got people like this Russian lawyer who Loretta Lynch let in.

So then we find out in June the Russian lawyer was permitted to fly back to the U.S. to have the meeting with Trump, Jr., at Trump Tower, no less, and then ends up in the front row for a

congressional hearing. She was sitting right there behind the Obama Ambassador.

In my experience, all the hearings I have seen, when you have somebody from the administration of the caliber of an ambassador, they are very careful to make sure people behind him are those who can hand a note to help him answer a question. That is what is normal. Yet there she is, right behind Obama's Ambassador to Russia.

Then she turns up at a D.C. showing of a documentary film on the negative effects of the Magnitsky Act and later appeared at a dinner involving another couple of representatives, and she is now a lobbyist for the Russians overtly. Maybe she was then. The repeal of that legislation is a priority item for the Russians and a personal objective for Veselnitskaya, the Russian attorney.

So rather than any Clinton dirt, as was reportedly the primary subject brought forth at the meeting with Donald Trump, it appears she was here with the approval of Loretta Lynch, with the approval of the Obama Department of Homeland Security.

They knew what she was about, just like they knew what the member of a terrorist organization was about when they approved him coming to the White House and Janet Napolitano lied at our hearing, said that that wasn't happening.

So she did all of this without a visa. She did not file a Foreign Agents Registration document, which is required, and the Obama administration gave her a pass on those things: Sure, let her in. She is doing important work. We are not giving her a visa; we are just letting her in. We are not going to pick her up, because she is doing important work.

Really? She is setting Donald Trump, Jr., up, and the Obama administration considered that important enough to let this person who they previously realized should not be allowed in the country to come in to do that kind of important work, set up Donald Trump?

Well, anyway, turns out Veselnitskaya was connected to Fusion GPS. That is the Democrat opposition research firm, which employed a former British spy who used Russian contacts to produce the infamous and now debunked "urinary dossier" smearing Trump. Veselnitskaya hired Fusion GPS head, Glenn Simpson, to work on behalf of Prevezon, the company she was allowed into the country to represent. Fusion then hired Christopher Steele, the British spy who drew on Russian sources to produce his dossier, and then they made him available for private briefings on the dossier with left-leaning media sources such as Mother Jones, *The New York Times*, *The Washington Post*, *Yahoo*, *The New Yorker*, *CNN*.

And, by the way, there is Veselnitskaya's social media account, which is decidedly more aligned with the Fusion GPS side of the equation

than with Trump. She was no friend of the Trumps. Every indication was she wanted the Trumps taken down.

Trump, Jr., met with her. It appears to be a setup.

I was guest hosting Patriot Tonight the other night. Some people say: Why do you do this media?

One of my jobs is to not only be aware of what is going on here, try to vote properly, argue the right way on different bills, but it is also to make sure that people in America know what is going on. And a guy called in, very interesting, but he seemed to have a pretty good grip on all of this. It is just amazing how many American citizens across the country—they are not confused by the smokescreen that we get from the mainstream media.

So if timelines are interesting to you, there is this: reportedly the Obama administration sought permission to electronically monitor Trump Tower in early June, and the FISA court refused to grant it, but in October, they allowed it. Isn't that something?

Once they set up Donald Trump, Jr., with this friend of the Obama administration, this Russian attorney who was using the Democrats' own opposition research firm, she was helping them, they then convinced a judge: Go ahead and let us monitor everything going on in Trump Tower. When the judge initially refused to do that.

The article said: "So if you'd like to don your tinfoil hat and play the collusion game, try this on for size—when the Obama administration couldn't get permission from the FISA court to surveil Trump, they allowed Veselnitskaya back in the country to take part in those Washington activities"—meeting up with Donald Trump.

"... and in the meantime"—she used—"the administration's pals at Fusion"—GPS—"with attempting to hook Trump, Jr."—into a basis for them getting a warrant.

There was nothing to that meeting, yet they used it, got a warrant to further monitor everything going on in the Trump Tower in October.

It just keeps pointing back to the fact we have got to get an independent counsel to investigate Mueller and his ties to Comey and Lynch and the Clintons, and get to the bottom of this mess. Yes, I want an investigation, because this is looking pretty lurid right now.

Just in the time left, I do need to mention, this continuing push by friends across the aisle and the Obama holdovers in our executive branch, they think net neutrality is something we have got to have. Maureen Collins in The Federalist has a great article on July 19, and she points out regarding net neutrality:

"The debate over net neutrality can easily turn into techie-jargon that no one understands. Here is the basic gist: the internet is made up of bits. Proponents of net neutrality want to make sure these bits are all treated equally,

meaning all web content appears on your computer at the same speed and with the same quality.

"That sounds like a good thing, right? Supporters say that net neutrality would make all content equal by ensuring that internet providers cannot buy faster or higher quality content. The free market, they say, is inherently unfair and only a third party—the government—can determine how content should be treated. But that sounds exactly like textbook New-Deal progressivism.

"You see, this is not a question of whether or not internet content should be equally available. Rather, it is the much older question of who should determine that content is equally available: consumers, or the government?"

"Even the background of net neutrality is straight out of the New Deal playbook. Like many administrative programs, the fight for net neutrality began when similar provisions failed in Congress. After legislative failures, what is a good progressive to do?"

"Progressive," that term bothers me, kind of like "single payer." Single payer means socialized medicine, government-run and rationed healthcare. What does progressive mean? Well, it actually is a throwback. It is socialism. Some socialists are even hardcore communists, not all are, but they want an Orwellian government where they watch and know everything going on, and they know better than Americans do. Let the government decide your future.

□ 1345

"The Bush FCC adopted principles for 'preserving internet freedom' in 2005, but did not go through a formal rulemaking process. In 2008, the FCC went after Comcast for going against these principles, only to get struck down by the D.C. Circuit, where bad administrative law goes to die.

"The entire process repeated itself under the Obama administration. In 2010, the FCC adopted an 'Open Internet Order.' Verizon Wireless sued the commission and, again, the commission lost at the D.C. Circuit.

"By now, it may seem that there must be something legally wrong with the FCC's net neutrality regulations."

And that is exactly right.

"Under the U.S. Constitution, only Congress can give a specific power to an executive agency, like the FCC—usually through statute. Here's the kicker: the FCC claimed Congress gave them the power to regulate the internet through the Communications Act of 1934. The observant reader will notice this law was passed a long time before the internet even existed, though the act did give the FCC power to regulate 'common carriers' like radio, wire communication, and telephone companies."

But not the internet.

"Not only does net neutrality follow the New Deal's progressive formula, it literally derives its power from a New

Deal-era law. Right before the 2016 Presidential election, the Obama FCC created a third set of net neutrality rules."

The bottom line is, if there is net neutrality, the government will decide what you get to see and hear on your internet. When I had family living in China, I knew what it was to be censored and have the government deciding. You can't learn anything negative about the government.

We cannot allow this pleasant sounding net neutrality to become a reality because, though it goes along perfectly with ObamaCare, with the government controlling our healthcare, why shouldn't they control what we get to see and hear on the internet?

And the bottom line is, this is the United States of America and it was created to control government, not to let the government control our free choices.

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 48 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Monday, July 24, 2017, at noon 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:

2021. A letter from the Acting Assistant Secretary, Acquisition, Technology, and Logistics, Department of the Army, transmitting a report on the use of the authority for Army industrial facilities to engage in cooperative activities with non-Army entities for fiscal year 2016, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 4544 note; Public Law 110-181, Sec. 328(b) (as amended by Public Law 112-81, Sec. 323(b)) (125 Stat. 1362); to the Committee on Armed Services.

2022. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Division of Regulatory Services, Office of Elementary and Secondary Education, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's Major final rule—Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965, As Amended By the Every Student Succeeds Act—Accountability and State Plans [Docket ID: ED-2016-OESE-0032] (RIN: 1810-AB27) received July 19, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

2023. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting Progress Report No. 25 on the continuing studies of the quality of water in the Colorado River Basin, pursuant to 43 U.S.C. 620n; Apr. 11, 1956, ch. 203, Sec. 15; (70 Stat. 111); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

2024. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule—Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2016-0461; Directorate Identifier 2014-NM-159-AD; Amendment 39-18937; AD 2017-13-07] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received July 19, 2017, pursuant to