

My heart goes out to Michelle Vo, her family and friends, and the other victims of the Las Vegas shooting.

I am heartbroken and angry about the events in Las Vegas. These incidents are far too common in our country, and it is my sincere hope that Congress takes action to lessen these types of tragic events.

OUR LAW ENFORCEMENT OFFICERS RUN TO DANGER, NOT AWAY FROM IT

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

Mr. HARRIS. Mr. Speaker, the Nation stands in mourning over the tragedy in Las Vegas. No one ever wants to be in that situation. But it, once again, reminds us that, when there is danger, our law enforcement officers run to it, not away from it.

We are going to hear many stories from that tragedy in Las Vegas, but many of them will concern those brave law enforcement officers who, at the risk of their own life, protected and saved the lives of many, many others.

So, as we mourn the tragedy in Las Vegas, let us always remember and be thankful for those law enforcement officers who protect us each and every day.

DREAMERS ARE AMERICANS TOO

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

Mr. SCHRADER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to share the story of Leonardo Reyes of Salem, Oregon, and urge Speaker RYAN to put forth a clean Dream Act bill.

Leo is an undocumented Oregonian. His mother brought Leo and his siblings to Oregon when he was 10 years old. His mother was a victim of domestic violence and felt she needed to get as far away from her husband as possible to keep Leo and his siblings safe. His mother left everything she knew in Mexico in order to pursue a better life for her children.

Leo has attended Davis Elementary School, Reynolds Middle School, McKay High School, graduated from Chemeketa Community College, and is currently pursuing a bachelor's degree in interdisciplinary studies at Western Oregon University.

He works full-time helping senior citizens and individuals with disabilities access healthcare and food benefits. Additionally, Leo was a cofounder of the Oregon DACA Coalition, which raises awareness in the community by empowering Oregon youth to engage in our democratic process.

Leo considers himself an American, and I do too. He believes that being an American is a set of values and ideals which we all hold dear.

We need to pass a clean Dream Act bill that will recognize Leo and over

800,000 DREAMers as equal members in our community.

COMBATING HUMAN TRAFFICKING

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, it is time we go after the perpetrators of online sex trafficking. A recent investigation revealed what I have been saying for years, that websites like backpage.com knowingly facilitate human trafficking due to existing law which has been wrongly interpreted and allows these sites to get away without criminal liability.

That is why I am cosponsoring legislation to specifically allow States to investigate and prosecute websites that facilitate sex trafficking. H.R. 1855 is bipartisan legislation that will empower law enforcement to combat online sex trafficking more effectively.

This is an important step forward in the fight to end the suffering of 12-, 13-, and 14-year-old girls and boys—children—who are the victims of sex trafficking.

So, Mr. Speaker, law enforcement needs more tools to put an end to the heinous practice of exploitation and modern-day slavery, and clamping down on backpage.com's ability to advertise young girls for sex is crucial and critical to holding them accountable.

IT IS TIME TO REAUTHORIZE THE CHILDREN'S HEALTH INSURANCE PROGRAM

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, in 1997, with a very, very bipartisan budget reconciliation deal, we passed a magnificent statement about this Nation's commitment to children, and that was the Children's Health Insurance Program that all of us were so very proud of. It started in 1997 as the first real health reform since Medicare and Medicaid, and millions of children were able to get healthcare. Maybe at that time their parents could not, but they could be covered: children with sickle cell, children with heart defects, children with various hereditary or genetic diseases who were impacted, children with cancer, leukemia, all of these children, or children injured on a playing field, children could be covered.

It is time to reauthorize the Children's Health Insurance Program. In fact, I call upon the leadership to be able to establish martial law so that we can pass the reauthorization of the Children's Health Insurance Program coming this week before we go home.

The Democrats have been pushing. The leadership of the Democrats have been pushing. They have been asking for the passage of the Children's Health Insurance Program.

I can tell you that those, Mr. Speaker, impacted by the hurricanes, they need that healthcare. I ask for its passage.

VIRGIN ISLANDERS ARE AMERICANS TOO

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, Hurricanes Irma and Maria have wreaked havoc on the U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and numerous Caribbean nations. Although the full extent of the two hurricanes' impact has yet to be assessed, it is clear that the damage from these storms is unparalleled.

The people of the Virgin Islands have lost their homes and possessions. Business has been lost, along with hospitals, schools, and utility systems.

In the coming months, I ask that all my colleagues on both sides of the aisle approve the full amount of funding and support needed for short- and long-term relief.

For example, tomorrow, the Energy and Commerce Committee will consider legislation to extend the Children's Health Insurance Program for 5 years. I ask my colleagues to remember the people and children of the Virgin Islands.

Just over one-third of the children of the Virgin Islands lived below the poverty level even prior to Hurricanes Irma and Maria. After the hurricanes, our antipoverty needs will grow exponentially.

We need Medicaid and CHIP provisions to provide the Virgin Islands with additional funding and higher rates of Federal matching funds so that poor Americans and children in the Virgin Islands can remain covered. This, in addition to further changes to Federal program requirements, will help the Virgin Islands with the resources it needs to build.

So I urge my colleagues to please remember that Virgin Islanders are Americans too, just the same as constituents elsewhere across the country.

GOING FORWARD AS AMERICANS

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, there are so many things on the minds of Americans: three hurricanes in a month, disasters in Houston, Florida, Puerto Rico, Virgin Islands. We just heard our colleague from the Virgin Islands speak of the problems that that island has. Millions of Americans harmed in so many ways, lives lost, just yesterday, the tragedy in Las Vegas.

It is hard not to focus only on those issues, but in many, many ways, Las

Vegas aside, the issue of the hurricanes and what we will do as Americans going forward is on my mind and, I suspect, on the minds of many.

As we review and as we figure out how to deal with those disasters and how we rebuild, I would like us all to keep in mind that our goal, in addition to bringing these economies back together again, putting people back in their homes, their businesses, and the infrastructure, that we keep in mind that we ought to be looking for better jobs and better wages for all Americans—and certainly for those in the low- and middle-income brackets—and a better future.

We think about Puerto Rico and their future. How do we make it a better future? Well, we certainly know that there is a problem in much of America, stagnation of wages, so higher pay becomes critically important.

We need to deal with the cost issues that go into this, and we need to make sure that all Americans, wherever they may be, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, or Washington, Virginia, wherever, that they have the tools to compete.

So today we are going to take 1 hour, and we are going to talk about ideas that need to be discussed here in the House of Representatives: legislation, existing programs such as the Jones Act, shipbuilding, and the like.

□ 1830

I would like to ask my colleague, BRENDAN BOYLE, to begin the discussion with a bill that he and his colleagues, or our colleagues, are introducing.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE).

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding.

Before I have the opportunity to speak about that, I just want to say briefly what a contrast we see between the Republican tax plan that was released last week and the bill that my colleagues, the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY), and I will be talking about.

The Republican tax plan that was released last week, I think everyone has acknowledged by now that it is a massive giveaway to the wealthiest 1 percent. The nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that 79.7 percent of the top 1 percent would get the benefit.

But what most people don't realize is that, under that same tax plan, many middle class families and working class families would see their taxes go up, not down. The same nonpartisan Tax Policy Center estimates that 30 percent of middle class families would see their taxes go up.

We did an estimate of my district in northeast Philadelphia, and suburban Philadelphia. A majority of middle class and working class families in my district would see their taxes go up, all

to pay for a massive tax cut for the wealthiest 1 percent. That is wrong.

Now, contrast that approach with what we are introducing this week, and I especially praise the leadership of my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, who was the first one to introduce this idea. We are introducing the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. It has always bothered me, as someone who has seen jobs leave my district and go overseas and go abroad, that our Tax Code gives an incentive for that sort of behavior; that a company like Mondelez International that closed the factory that existed for more than half a century in Philadelphia, and shipped over 300 jobs to Mexico, that they are able to claim a few tax deductions while doing that.

The Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act closes those deductions, and it takes the money and devotes 100 percent of it to benefit those responsible employers, those companies that are providing jobs here at home in America, that are well paid with good benefits.

Now, my colleague, Congresswoman SCHAKOWSKY, will go into greater detail about some of the aspects of the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act. But I really think that this should be a bipartisan bill. It is a chance for our colleagues on the other side, even this administration, that says it is concerned about losing American jobs overseas, to join with us on the Democratic side of the aisle. Support the Patriot Employer Tax Credit Act and reject the sort of Wall Street-driven tax cockamamie ideas that give a massive tax cut to the wealthiest 1 percent and require working class and middle class families to pay for it.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE) for his thoughts. I started off with a better deal, better wages, better jobs, or jobs at all. The Make It In America agenda, which we have been talking about here for 5 or 6 years, long before President Trump came along, involves tax policy. I am bringing to our attention tonight a tax issue that will create jobs in America and, frankly, no longer promote the offshoring of jobs.

Another piece of our puzzle on making it in America, and better wages, better jobs, and better future, is something that has been much discussed in recent days, particularly with regard to the Puerto Rican situation, and that is the Jones Act.

Joining me tonight to discuss the Jones Act, why it is important to America, why it is a major job opportunity and continuation for American mariners, American shipowners, as well as America's shipyards, is Ms. JAYAPAL.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL).

Ms. JAYAPAL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California for yielding. It was wonderful to see the gentleman out in Seattle exploring our maritime sector.

We are very proud of the maritime industry. And in the State of Washington, and in my district, the Seventh Congressional District of Washington State, sometimes people know about us for Boeing airplanes, but they really should know us for our national deep-water port and all of the maritime that we have there.

Obviously, Mr. Speaker, since Hurricane Maria hit Puerto Rico last month, residents have been without power. Many of them have not had access to relief supplies, including food and water. Many have lost their lives. It has been heartbreaking to watch. We all stand united in pushing this administration to do everything possible to ensure that the people of Puerto Rico have access to relief supplies and that the administration is doing everything it can to assist and rebuild.

These are American citizens, and we have an obligation to do everything we can to help after this devastating hurricane.

The reason I am here today is to join my colleague, the gentleman from California, because in the wake of Hurricane Maria, we did see a false narrative spreading through the media and social channels about the Jones Act. It caused us to reflect on the fact that perhaps not everybody knows the history of the Jones Act. Not everybody understands exactly what it does and how it supports so strongly American jobs that benefit so many of us.

There are people who thought that perhaps the Jones Act was to blame for the fact that supplies were not making it out of the docks and into Puerto Rico, and so I am very grateful to the gentleman from California, and Republican colleague across the aisle, Representative HUNTER, for holding an informal hearing on this very topic and inviting in shipbuilders, shipping companies, as well as the maritime labor industry to tell us a little bit about what was happening in Puerto Rico.

And so this is an opportunity, really, for us to talk about what the Jones Act means, because when you are talking about Make It In America, when you are talking about better wages, better jobs, and a better deal for the American public, then the Jones Act, in many ways, is the epitome of exactly that.

The Jones Act has been in effect for nearly 100 years and inspired by cabotage laws that were in place since the first session of Congress in 1789. The law requires that when goods are shipped via water between two points in the United States, they must be shipped on U.S.-made vessels that are owned and operated by Americans.

This is where the critical industry comes in. In terms of Puerto Rico, the Jones Act is not the reason that the distribution of relief supplies has been slow to move in Puerto Rico. In fact, reports are that thousands of containers containing fuel, emergency housing, food, water, and other essentials are trapped at the Port of San

Juan. To date, at least 11,300 containers with millions of pounds of relief supplies have been delivered.

To put this in perspective, just one such state-of-the-art container ship arrived in Puerto Rico just 3 days after Hurricane Maria made landfall, carrying more than 35 million pounds of cargo, the equivalent of about 1,900 cargo planes. You can see here on the chart that the Jones Act current capacity is 22,000 TEUs with a maximum carrying capacity of 1.079 billion pounds.

So just imagine that the additional surge capacity, as of now, is 5,430 TEUs with a max carrying capacity of 258 million pounds. So the issue has not been that ships are not delivering. Our American ships are delivering supplies. But unfortunately, because of the infrastructure, the lack of infrastructure, the destruction to the roads, and the issues around refrigeration across the island—unfortunately, warehouses have been destroyed—there is nowhere to store those products, and there is no refrigeration.

So what we are seeing is the capacity at the docks continuing to increase. So over the next 2 weeks alone, Jones Act vessels will deliver more than 9,000 containers to Puerto Rico, including at least 3,300 FEMA loads full of relief cargo.

So despite these volumes, the residents of Puerto Rico are suffering, not because ships aren't being able to deliver there, but because of the lack of infrastructure that I mentioned, lack of refrigeration, all of those things.

So currently, the point that is very important, I think, for everybody to understand is that American flagships have the capacity to meet Puerto Rico's relief cargo needs, and the emphasis needs to be on moving cargo from the Port of San Juan into the island, and focusing on rebuilding the infrastructure that has suffered because of this devastating hurricane.

Mr. Speaker, some have called for an outright repeal of the Jones Act despite these facts. Why should Members of Congress on both sides of the aisle support the Jones Act? Because it is incredibly important to our country's economy and to the maritime industry, which supports nearly 500,000 jobs and is responsible for over \$92 billion in gross economic output each year.

So in my home State of Washington, which ranks sixth in the country for Jones Act jobs, this law supports over 16,000 jobs and helps generate approximately \$1.1 billion in labor income. More than 19 million tons of cargo originate from my home State of Washington every year, and the State imports more than 28 million tons annually. Without these jobs, our economy would suffer tremendously.

In my district, Washington's Seventh Congressional District, the Jones Act directly supports nearly 2,000 jobs, indirectly supports more than 6,500-related jobs. And to be clear, everywhere in the country where we have Jones

Act jobs, they are better jobs, better wages, and a better future for our Americans across the country.

Shipyard jobs pay incredibly well. They earn workers about 45 percent more than the national average for private sector jobs. And this is an area, as we saw in the hearing that was had, this is an area where business and maritime labor, our merchant marines, are proud to work together to make sure that we provide for the national security of our country through the Jones Act, and also that we provide these deep investments in good-paying union jobs.

Mr. Speaker, there is no doubt that we have to invest in Puerto Rico by providing comprehensive relief, including water and food and housing and medical care, and we have to do everything we can to rebuild the infrastructure. But at the same time, we must make sure that we continue bipartisan support for this bedrock maritime law.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from the State of Washington for very clearly laying out why the Jones Act is good for all of us.

We held a hearing today, an extensive hearing on the maritime industry and on the Jones Act in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, and it was laid out with facts and figures, many of those behind you on the chart. There has been a lot of talk about the Jones Act somehow harming Puerto Rico. The fact is, the truth is exactly the opposite.

The Jones Act allows for three American shipping companies using American ships with American mariners to deliver twice a week—each of those companies—twice a week on what amounts to a milk run from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico, all the goods and services that they need.

With the hurricane having happened, these three companies are providing all of the FEMA, all of the emergency aid, and they have additional capacity that has not yet been used in delivering the goods and services that Puerto Rico needs in the wake of the hurricane.

In addition to that, the Jones Act is not just between the islands of Puerto Rico, Guam, or Hawaii. It is the inland waterways of America—the great Mississippi River system, all of the barges and tugs and the rest. If the Jones Act didn't exist, we would have companies, mariners, and sailors operating in the heart of our country from everywhere in the world. This is a major national security issue beyond what we will talk about.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. JAYAPAL) so very much for participating in this.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. VEASEY) to carry on with these issues.

Mr. VEASEY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from California (Mr.

GARAMENDI) for yielding. He has done a great job of really making Congress aware and the American public aware of just how important the Jones Act is to our country.

There have been a lot of misconceptions out there, a lot of reports on the news that were just quick to pick up on a sound bite. But the fact of the matter is, when you talk about trade, when you talk about taxes, labor, and other things that you have added, national security, it is the Jones Act that is keeping all of those things going strong in America. I just really appreciate the gentleman doing that.

When we talk about middle class jobs in this country, there has been a lot of talk in this country about how we have lost a lot of middle class jobs over the last 20 years.

□ 1845

These jobs, because of the Jones Act, have been protected, and we need to make sure that we keep those jobs here in America going strong.

I am so glad that the gentleman also cleared up the confusion about what was really going on in relation to Puerto Rico, that American ships were doing what they were supposed to be doing, and that there were other issues on why people weren't getting supplies. The American public needs to know that.

When the gentleman starts talking about minimum wage, middle class wages, obviously, the Merchant Marines, the mariners out there who work on these cargo and container ships, help keep that middle class strong in America.

One of the reasons why they are able to do that is because many of those jobs related to the Jones Act, as the gentleman knows, are union jobs. The people who run those unions work very hard to make sure people have good wages and that they have good benefits so they can take care of their families and be able to send them to college.

As the gentleman knows, I have talked with the gentleman before, and he heard Representative BOYLE earlier, who is also the co-chair of the Blue Collar Caucus, talk about how important these issues are to us, and I know as well as Mr. GARAMENDI and everyone else within our caucus.

I just want to point this out very briefly. According to the Center for Economic and Policy Research, unionized workers are compared to their nonunionized counterparts in showing that their wages are 14 percent higher on average. Again, if you have jobs that are paying 14 percent higher on average, we need to protect those jobs because we want people to have more spending power to be able to make our economy strong and great, not less spending power.

The union wage premium is even larger for some demographic groups that, on average, receive lower pay, including workers of color and those without a college education. According

to the Center for American Progress Action Fund, unions increase workers' benefits really substantially. Ninety-four percent of union workers have access to retirement benefits while only 65 percent of nonunion workers do.

As the gentleman knows, we discuss Social Security in this Chamber quite often, and how we are going into our retirement years and whether or not we are going to be able to take care of ourselves when we are no longer able to perform certain physical functions is obviously something that is very important.

Union workers are 28 percent more likely to have health insurance and pay a lower share of premiums for it. They are also 54 percent more likely to have a retirement plan than nonunion workers at workplaces. Union women in the United States are more likely to take parental leave, which is also more likely to be paid.

Again, whether it is the Jones Act or Davis-Bacon, we need to make sure that in this country we keep these jobs going strong and that we keep the conversation going in that direction.

Again, I just want to thank the gentleman for the work that he has done to raise awareness on this issue. We need to continue to talk about this just so the American public understands just how important this is to our economy and to our society as we continue to grow our workforce into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman very much for yielding.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VEASEY very much for bringing to our attention the role of the unions in maintaining wages throughout the United States. If we are looking for a better deal, better jobs, better wages, and a better future, certainly the union members in the maritime industry will—and have been able to—achieve that.

The great risk is legislation may be moving through the Senate and the House that would terminate the Jones Act and, along with it, some 400,000 jobs in the United States, 100,000 of those directly in the shipyards that are building these American-built ships for the intercoastal and for the brown water, the river transportation, as well as the open ocean transportation.

So we have got something here that is very important, and that is Make It In America, a better deal for Americans comes through the Jones Act.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. VEASEY very much for his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I notice that my colleague from Chicago, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, is here once again to pick up on something we talked about earlier in our Make It In America agenda. If she would look here, number two on the Make It In America agenda is taxes.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from Illinois (Ms. SCHAKOWSKY) to talk about taxes.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just pick up on something

that Congressman VEASEY said, but first let me just thank the gentleman from California for his relentless push to make sure that we have good jobs in America, that that is part of our better deal. We are not just talking about jobs. We are talking about good jobs.

I wanted to just say that when it comes to women, if women want equal pay for equal work now, join a union. There aren't any union contracts that say: Oh, we are going to pay men up here and women over here, not 79 cents on the dollar for a woman in a labor union.

So I encourage my friends—my sisters—to join a union.

MARC VEASEY and BRENDAN BOYLE are both the co-chairs of what we call the Blue Collar Caucus. I am part of it. Notice my blue collar today.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the gentlewoman is properly dressed for the Blue Collar Caucus.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am a proud member of that caucus because workers, as we know, are just not getting a fair deal right now in today's economy. The U.S. is the richest country in the world and in the history of the world. We are richer than we have ever been. Now, most people don't actually feel that because the ordinary worker has not seen any wage growth in the last 2, maybe 2½ or 3 decades. The income gap between top executives and the average worker is bigger than ever. At the same time, corporations are raking in record profits as they ship jobs overseas.

So, obviously, it is time for us to fix the economy that is rigged against America's working families. We can start with our Tax Code or end with our Tax Code or in the middle with our Tax Code. We need to do something about our Tax Code.

So today I am joining with Congressmen BOYLE and VEASEY to introduce—we introduced just a few minutes ago—the Patriot Employer Act, and that is H.R. 3925. It is a first step toward fixing a broken tax system.

Instead of giving tax breaks to companies that offshore jobs and that pay poverty wages, our bill encourages businesses to create good jobs here at home.

Here is how the bill works. We reward patriot employers with a tax credit for each employee's wages. To qualify for the patriot employers tax credit, a business must fulfill the following checklist:

One, invest in American jobs, no offshoring or tax inversion schemes;

Two, pay living wages;

Three, contribute to workers' retirement security through a defined benefit or defined contribution plan;

Four, provide quality health insurance;

Five, provide paid leave;

Six, and lastly, have practices in place to support employment of our troops, our veterans, and people with disabilities.

There is a companion bill that was introduced by Senator SHERROD

BROWN, and I am sure he will get more cosponsors.

Small businesses, under 50 employees, can qualify for the tax credits by meeting only some of these criteria.

Unlike the Trump-GOP tax giveaway proposal, our bill is responsible. It pays for the new tax credits by closing existing tax loopholes that incentivize corporations to invest overseas. I think most Americans get that there is actually an advantage now for companies who decide to take their jobs out of the United States.

Under the current Tax Code, multinational corporations get to defer taxes on overseas earnings until they bring those profits back to the United States. Through creative accounting, corporations essentially get to avoid taxes in perpetuity. That is forever.

At the same time, those corporations can deduct interest expenses on investments overseas, such as building a new manufacturing plant somewhere. That is totally backward. We are rewarding corporations that are avoiding U.S. taxes and offshoring American jobs.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, excuse me for a moment, forgive me for interrupting, but the gentlewoman said something that caught my attention.

American corporations that build a factory in China are able to deduct that cost of that factory against their American taxes?

Unbelievable. Unbelievable.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. That is exactly right, Mr. Speaker. If a corporation deducts interest expenses on investments overseas, and that would include building a new manufacturing plant offshore somewhere.

So we don't want to be rewarding corporations that are avoiding U.S. taxes and offshoring American jobs and giving them benefits. So the Patriot Employer Act fixes that. It raises taxes on corporations that offshore and reduces taxes on businesses that invest in good, American jobs.

The President talks about America first. This is exactly the kind of thing that we should be doing. Let's not create incentives to take those jobs away. But still, the Trump-GOP tax plan is a betrayal of American workers. I don't know if he knows that. It does nothing to raise wages. In fact, 80 percent of the plan's tax cuts would go to the top 1 percent of earners.

At the same time, 30 percent of middle class families—\$50,000 to \$150,000—would actually see a tax increase under the plan.

As for corporate taxes, it doubles down on the problem in the current Tax Code. While our current Tax Code lets multinationals put off paying taxes on offshore profits, the new Republican plan would give permanent tax breaks for offshoring.

The Republican tax plan means less revenue for investments that grow the middle class, like education and infrastructure, which we need so badly, which he said he wanted to do. We want to do it with him. It means more

jobs shipped abroad. For many middle class families, it would mean a smaller paycheck.

So we are offering a different path. The Patriot Employer Act, together with stronger unions and greater public investment, offers a real solution to the growing inequity in our country.

There are responsible businesses in our country. If a business pays fair wages and provides good benefits, we should support that. We shouldn't make them compete with corporations that don't.

In the end, it is a question of whose side are you on: the offshoring corporation or the American worker?

Mr. Speaker, I urge my House colleagues to reject tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, and multinational corporations, and to invest in American workers and not offshoring.

So I just want to thank the gentleman from California so much for letting me come today and talk about this new bill that was introduced. I think it is totally consistent with our better deal, better wages, better future, and better jobs for America. I thank Congressman GARAMENDI so much for his leadership on this issue.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman so very much for bringing the voice of Chicago to the floor on a very good piece of legislation. I believe that has already gone across the desk, and I didn't get a chance to sign on to it before the gentlewoman put it across the desk, but I will forgive the gentlewoman for that.

Ms. SCHAKOWSKY. Mr. Speaker, I am going to come to the gentleman right now and get his signature.

Mr. GARAMENDI. As a proud member of the Blue Collar Caucus, I thank the gentlewoman for both wearing blue and bringing a message from that caucus. It is extremely important.

The Make It In America agenda, which we have been talking about here for at least the last 8 or 9 years, has all of these pieces. The gentlewoman talked about trade, taxes, infrastructure, education, and labor—all the pieces of this puzzle.

As we discussed today, there are programs that are clearly going to be at risk. If the Jones Act somehow gets repealed or gets waived or otherwise is made less effective, then there are some 400,000 jobs in American shipyards across the Nation that will be lost. These are shipyards in Philadelphia, the Gulf Coast, and out in the West, as we heard Ms. JAYAPAL talk about Seattle.

San Diego has a major shipyard, the NASSCO shipyard. These are places where the Jones Act allows for American ships to be built not in China, but, rather, in America. Make It In America. The Jones Act does that.

Mr. Speaker, I will give you a couple of examples. One of the companies that ships goods from Jacksonville, Florida, to Puerto Rico is the TOTE shipping company. They recently spent nearly \$400 million on two of the most ad-

vanced clean energy ships anywhere in the world.

□ 1900

These ships were built in San Diego. They are LNG-powered, natural gas-powered ships, and they are now plying the Jacksonville-Puerto Rico trade twice a week, back and forth.

Crowley is another company operating in that same area, again, twice a week, back and forth. They, too, will soon have LNG-powered ships operating in that area—ships built in America with American workers and American steel, American engines, and the rest.

So this is critically important. There are 100,000 jobs in the shipyards. If we repeal the Jones Act, they are gone and, along with it, the ability of the American shipbuilding industry to supply commercial ships to move critical national security men and equipment wherever it needs to go in the world.

The U.S. military is dependent on the American merchant marine system to move 90 percent of the personnel, equipment, supplies, tanks, artillery, and all the rest around the world. We have huge airplanes. They are essential. We see those operating in Puerto Rico now. But they are not supplying the great mass of goods and services that are needed.

So the plea from all of us who understand what the Jones Act is really about is to say don't do away with this critical piece of America's infrastructure.

At the hearing today, I heard my Republican colleague, Mr. HUNTER, chairman of the committee, quote the great free market idol, Adam Smith.

All too often, the free marketers of the world read those paragraphs that serve their purposes, but if they were to read the next few paragraphs in Adam Smith's work, "The Wealth of Nations," they would read that Adam Smith said very clearly at the period of time he was writing that it was absolutely essential for the British Government to protect the British merchant marine and the British maritime industry.

That same admonition should come to the American Congress the same way: protect this vital industry, protect the merchant marines.

We do not want and we cannot have foreign ships, foreign tugboats, foreign barges operating up and down the Mississippi River.

What are they carrying? They are carrying gasoline, diesel oil, natural gas, volatile substances. They are carrying cement. They are carrying grain.

Do you want to have Yemeni sailors on the Mississippi? Do you want to have ships owned by China, tugboats, barges owned by China on the Mississippi River?

If that is what you want, then do away the Jones Act, because that is exactly what would happen. If you want good American wages with good American mariners operating on the inland

waterways through the Gulf Coast and up the East Coast, if that is what you want, then you better keep the Jones Act.

If you do away with the Jones Act, it is guaranteed we will have the elimination of the American maritime industry.

If you want American ships operating on the West Coast from Seattle to Anchorage, then you better keep the Jones Act, similarly with Hawaii and Guam.

Most of all, do you want to have the United States military phone China and say: We need to ship a few things to the South China Sea to deal with your encroachment on the islands in the South China Sea; gee, Mr. China, would you please send us some ships so that we can put the military equipment on those ships? Is that what we want?

For those men and women here in this Congress and the Senate that want to do away with the Jones Act, think about it. If you do away with the Jones Act, you do away with the American merchant marine. Then this country relies upon China, the largest ship-owning nation in the world, or maybe sailors from wherever. What background would they have?

So let's pay attention here. Adam Smith said to the British Government: Maintain the cabotage laws. Do not allow the maritime industry for Great Britain to go away.

So we should be paying attention to the master of the free market system, who wasn't totally for the free market but understood the necessity of protecting certain industries that are critical to the future of a country.

One more thing is on my mind. Two years ago, the Congress of the United States decided that we ought to, for the first time in some 50 years, export our crude oil. We have been exporting natural gas in the form of liquefied natural gas for some time. We added to that the export of oil.

Is that strategic national asset on American ships with American sailors? The answer is no. But if we passed a couple of paragraphs of law and required, as we once did with the North Slope oil when that opened up in the sixties, that that oil be transported on American-built ships with American sailors, if we were to reinstitute that law for just a small percentage of the strategic national asset, crude oil and natural gas, just a small percentage of that on American-built ships with American sailors, we could build ships in America. Not just a few ships, but over the course of the next 20 or 30 years, 50 or 60 ships, providing thousands upon thousands of jobs in our American shipyards.

Right now, where are those ships built? China, Japan, and Korea, but not in America. We ought to pay attention to the 1960 law that opened up the North Slope of Alaska that required that oil from Alaska be on American-built ships with American sailors. That

lasted for almost 40 years. Then slowly, slowly it was set aside. Now that oil is on ships that are built in China, Korea, and Japan.

If we want good-paying jobs in America, if we want a better future, if we want better jobs, if we want an opportunity for Americans to earn a good middle class wage in the shipyards on the ships, then maintain the Jones Act and think seriously about a law that would create even more jobs in American shipyards.

We will soon be introducing a bill called the Energizing American Maritime Act. Using a strategic national asset that we are now able to export, natural gas and oil, we require that a small percentage of that—not 50 percent, not 70 percent, not even 40 percent, but maybe 20 percent—be on American ships with American sailors.

There are many, many things we can do to create good-paying jobs in America. The Jones Act is one such law that has been in place for nearly a century. It served America well and will continue to serve America well if we maintain it and if we don't allow waivers that simply blow holes in that law, and if we take a strong Make It In America agenda. The President likes to talk about it, but talk is cheap. Legislation makes that talk real.

Trade policy, taxes: We just heard about the patriot tax encouraging American businesses with real tax incentives and discouraging American businesses that want to offshore the jobs.

Energy policy: I think I just talked about energy policy a moment ago. Put that oil and natural gas on American ships.

Labor: Good-paying jobs in the shipyards, good-paying jobs on the ships.

Education: The maritime academies provide the education that is necessary to do that.

Infrastructure: Freight movement, the ports, channels deepening, maintaining the locks on the Mississippi and the Ohio. Infrastructure, again, good-paying jobs.

We can do a lot. It takes laws and it takes men and women on the Democratic side and the Republican side that come together and say: We can do this. We can do this for America and for America's workers.

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

WESTERN CAUCUS: WILDFIRES

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arizona?

There was no objection.

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I rise to bring this Chamber's attention to the devastating wildfires that have ravaged the Nation this year.

The National Interagency Fire Center reports that there have been 49,563 fires that have burned 8,422,251 acres so far in 2017. Wow. Another 80 million throughout the country are at high-risk status, including one-quarter of the 193 million-acre National Forest System.

Though the Forest Service has spent a record \$2.3 billion to fight fires in 2017, these resources are being spent on the back end.

Mr. Speaker, the country has literally been on fire, particularly Western communities. It is far past time that this Chamber pass H.R. 2936 and get serious about combating catastrophic wildfires before they get started.

Mr. WESTERMAN's bipartisan bill adopts a forward-thinking, active management strategy and also provides allocation reforms that would cease the practice of fire borrowing.

I will likely have more comments later, but we have a few folks pressed for time, so I am going to end my comments there.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Colorado (Mr. TIPTON), my friend.

Mr. TIPTON. Mr. Speaker, I really appreciate the gentleman's efforts to be able to highlight the threat from wildfires that we are having in the West.

Mr. Speaker, in recent weeks, the aftermath of Hurricanes Harvey and Irma have dominated our news cycles. Our hearts certainly go out to the people who have been impacted as they rebuild their lives and continue to work to ensure that they have the resources they need.

When we hear the term "natural disaster," most of us probably think of hurricanes, tornadoes, or earthquakes. Unless you come from the Western United States, you probably don't think of wildfires as a natural disaster. But they are, and they have devastating effects.

Wildfire season is a part of life in the West, but this year's fire season is shaping up to be the worst in history. Years of mismanagement of our national forests have led to conditions where fires are burning longer and hotter than ever before.

We need to address this problem on two fronts: one, through better forest management; and, two, by updating wildfire response so it is more in line with the Federal response to other natural disasters.

On the forest management front, we need to give the Forest Service the tools to engage in actual forest management. This means removing the dead and downed timber that serves as a fuel source for either man-made or

naturally occurring fires, empowering local foresters and land managers to identify and designate areas of high risk, and supporting collaboration between all levels of government.

These principles are laid out in the Resilient Federal Forests Act by my colleague, Mr. WESTERMAN from Arkansas. I am proud to be a cosponsor of this legislation.

We must also reform the Federal budgeting process for wildfire prevention and the suppression efforts. For too long, the process the Federal Government has used to allocate money to fight catastrophic wildfires has undermined forest management efforts that could prevent these types of fires from igniting in the first place.

Under current law, if firefighting costs exceed an agency's budget, it must shift money from non-firefighting accounts to make up the difference. Last year, the Forest Service had to transfer \$700 million from other budgeted line items to cover firefighting costs, which brought the agency's total firefighting efforts to about 55 percent of the entire budget.

You would think that firefighting wouldn't be the biggest line item in the budget for an agency tasked with maintaining healthy forests. It is critical that we treat wildfires like other natural disasters after an agency's wildfire suppression funds are exhausted. The cost of any extraordinary firefighting that goes beyond the agency's annual budget should be funded through a budget cap adjustment similar to what is used by FEMA for other natural disasters.

It is my hope that we can continue to bring more attention to wildfires that are burning across the West and the impacts they are having on our communities, and also that we can work together to advance policies that better support forest management and fire prevention and suppression efforts and forest health.

□ 1915

Mr. GOSAR. Mr. Speaker, I thank the vice chairman for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Utah (Mr. STEWART).

Mr. STEWART. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank the gentleman from Arizona, who I consider a friend and one of the great leaders in the Congress, for leading this Special Order and for bringing this important matter before the Chamber.

2017 will go down as the worst wildfire season in history. My home State of Utah has definitely felt the effects. In June, the Brian Head fire burned more than 71,000 acres in my State. It burned for nearly a month, creating more than \$36 million in damage. And that doesn't count the millions—indeed tens of millions of dollars it took to fight the fire.

While the fire was burning through my district, I was able to meet with local, State, and Federal leaders to take a tour of the fire and to survey