minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, what happens if Congress goes nuts on tax cuts without paying for them?

Kansas, which did just that, has now had to raise State taxes back to where they were, providing a valuable object lesson for Congress right now: tax cuts about ideology, not economics, do not work.

Yet Republicans seem to be taking a page out of the Kansas tax cuts, authored by Governor Sam Brownback, that crushed that State's economy.

He promised tens of thousands of jobs to fund the State's schools. He guaranteed a progrowth economy that would pay for the tax cuts and then some.

Kansas did grow initially, but then lagged behind all the rest of the States. Now Brownback's tax cuts have produced new taxes for Kansas.

Let's learn from Kansas, not become Kansas 2.0.

GOP TAX SCAM

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

Mr. NADLER. Mr. Speaker, the Republicans are scamming America. They are offering a facade of lowered taxes that you probably will never see in exchange for massive and permanent tax cuts for the wealthiest Americans and corporations.

And for what?

We are told the corporate and upper income tax cuts will result in more investment and greater economic growth, which will yield more jobs and more revenue for the country and higher wages for the middle class.

But this is bunk. They have run this scam twice before. Reagan passed similar upper class tax cuts and told us the tax cuts would generate such economic growth that they would pay for themselves.

What happened?

The national debt—accumulated from George Washington through Jimmy Carter—went from $800 billion in 1980 to $4.3 trillion 12 years later, and growth was less than under President Clinton.

George Bush's tax cut turned an anticipated 10-year $5.65 trillion surplus into a $10.63 trillion debt in 8 years.

And 3 or 4 years from now, Republicans will use the $1.5 trillion to $2 trillion deficit this scam will create to say: Look at this massive deficit. We have to make savage cuts to Social Security, Medicare, education, and infrastructure.

That is what they are building in now. The Republicans are scamming America, and we must reject this bill.

□ 1845

WE NEED TO PASS A CLEAN DREAM ACT NOW

(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 Marco, a DREAMer in Portland, Oregon, and to continue to urge Speaker RYAN to put forth a clean Dream Act bill.

In 1995, Marco was brought to the United States when he was only 3 years old. As a teenager with dreams of going to college, Marco realized he didn't qualify for financial aid because of his immigration status, but he did not allow this to deter him. Instead, Marco worked hard in various minimum wage jobs, allowing him the ability to attend college part-time.

In 2012, after applying for DACA, Marco was granted a work permit, making it possible for him to earn a job with a law firm in Portland, where he worked his way up from the mailroom to be a legal assistant. His salary from the law firm enabled him to enroll in more classes and finally complete his bachelor's degree in accounting.

Marco now works as an accountant for an Oregon nonprofit that helps benefit youth.

This President claims to want only the best. I have news for him: we already have the best and brightest, and it is time we stopped treating them like second class citizens.

Mr. Speaker, we need to pass a clean Dream Act bill.

VETERANS

(Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, this week we honor America's veterans, a group of men and women with unparalleled courage and love of country.

We owe our veterans an eternal debt of gratitude. We made a promise to look out for them in exchange for their promise to defend our freedom, but gratitude is not enough. That is why I am fighting to maximize the care homeless veterans receive with my bill to improve reporting from our VA hospitals, to make sure no veteran, at any stage in life, falls through the cracks.

I also helped introduce the Patriot Employer Act, which would give tax incentives to American businessowners who employ veterans.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of Pennsylvania's 13th Congressional District, I would like to thank all of our Nation's veterans for their service on this Veterans Day and every day.

VETERANS DAY

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

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, I rise in honor of Veterans Day, which we will observe this Saturday, November 11.

Each Veterans Day, we celebrate America's veterans for their unwavering patriotism and willingness to serve and sacrifice above self. How noble for liberty's cause, yet too many veterans, upon their return from service, endure long wait-times at VA health facilities.

That is why I have developed a bill that would reduce the VA physician shortage, which is estimated to be about 5,000.

Our VET MD Act would address this by allowing pre-med students to participate in organized clinical observations at VA medical centers. Future physicians will have exposure to the VA healthcare system, and the VA will create potential medical professionals.

This is just one solution Congress should implement to address the VA physician shortage. It will help lead to decreased wait-times, better care, and healthier outcomes.

Our veterans dedicated their lives for our country. We owe these honorable men and women better basic healthcare.

Mr. Speaker, on this Veterans Day, I urge my colleagues to please join me. Let us affirm a commitment to action for the men and women who have defended our liberty and have lived the words duty, honor, and country.

WE NEED FAIR AND STRONG HURRICANE RELIEF PACKAGES

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to highlight the continuing urgency of providing relief and recovery aid for Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands, which were devastated by Hurricanes Irma and Maria. While U.S. efforts have ramped up after a failed initial response, we can and must do more.

In Puerto Rico, some 70 shelters remain open, access to safe drinking water is a problem, and there are dozens of waterborne disease deaths. Nearly a third of hospitals are still running off generators, bridges remain destroyed, and many roads remain impassable. Nearly 60 percent of the island is without power.

The news is not better for the Virgin Islands, where many still lack access to cell service, power, and clean water. Officials estimate $5.5 billion is needed for the most essential needs there.

Mr. Speaker, there are less than 20 legislative days left on the House calendar. How can we be prioritizing tax cuts for the wealthy? Let's put together fair and strong hurricane relief packages for communities ravaged by these hurricanes, including those in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST OF SPECIAL COUNSEL MUELLER AND OTHERS IN THE PREVIOUS ADMINISTRATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the

gentleman from Arizona (Mr. BIGGS) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I stand tonight with a number of my colleagues to shed light and ask questions and discuss the conflicts of interest of Mr. Mueller and several others in the previous administration.

As I recall the events of the past 2 years, it becomes clearer than ever that Mr. Mueller should resign. If he does not resign, then he should be fired.

I believe he has conflicts of interest that do not allow him to proceed with his investigation in an unbiased, independent manner. Further, he has broadened the scope of his investigation far beyond his charge to examine Russian interference in the 2016 Presidential election. In the process, he is helping to attack the integrity, perception, and credibility of the American justice and electoral system.

Mr. Speaker, my constituents want answers. Congress has sought answers from the previous administration for many years. Without exception, the Obama administration stonewalled these attempts.

Hillary Clinton and the Clinton Foundation are the subject of many of these questions and subsequent investigations.

Ms. Clinton did not become President. Some say that, because of this, we should not complete our investigations into multiple allegations of misconduct, but this is misguided.

No American is above the law. Losing an election does not grant immunity for misconduct. Whether Ms. Clinton is Secretary of State, President of the United States, or a citizen of Chappaqua, New York, she should be held to the same standard as everyone else.

I am pleased that the House Judiciary and Oversight Committees share this sentiment. Our committees will soon be launching a joint investigation into the unanswered questions surrounding the allegations that we have mentioned. We intend to get truthful answers to these questions.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. GAETZ).

Mr. GAETZ. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, we are at risk of a coup d'etat in this country if we allow an unaccountable person with no oversight to undermine the duly-elected President of the United States, and I would offer that is precisely what is happening right now with the indisputable conflicts of interest that are present with Mr. Mueller and others at the Department of Justice.

I join my colleague, the gentleman from Arizona, in calling for Mr. Mueller's resignation or his firing.

Moreover, we absolutely have to see the Department of Justice appoint a special counsel to look into the Clinton Foundation, the Uranium One deal, and the Fusion GPS dossier that I will now have the opportunity to discuss.

I really don't know who is investigating the Uranium One deal right now. I know that, in July, the chairman of the Judiciary Committee, along with 20 members of the Judiciary Committee, sent a letter to Attorney General Sessions asking who would be looking into these critical questions, demanding that a special counsel be appointed to conduct a thorough review. It is extremely disappointing that the chairman of the Judiciary Committee and my fellow members have received no response from the Department of Justice as to that letter.

I don't know whether the Attorney General's recusal on matters related to Russia impacts, influences, or, in any way, covers the Fusion GPS challenge and the incredible threat to national security raised by the Uranium One deal.

I do know that there is no world in which Mr. Mueller could potentially investigate these matters. It is Federal law that even the appearance of a conflict of interest means that someone cannot engage in prosecutorial duties regarding allegations and investigations. That conflict of interest is absolutely present.

As early as 2009, the FBI knew that we had informants alleging corruption into United States uranium assets. There were allegations of bribery, kickbacks, extortion. Even in 2010, Members of Congress were raising these questions and asking the Obama administration to provide answers that were never given.

I don't think it is a coincidence that at the same time we were hearing from sources that there was bribery to influence our uranium assets, you had former President Bill Clinton getting paid $500,000 by a bunch of Russians to go give a speech. It must have been one hell of a speech. It is deeply troubling to me that these circumstances seem to be ripe for corruption and seem to demonstrate an ecosystem of corruption that must be thoroughly investigated.

Now, why can't Mr. Mueller and Mr. Rosenstein conduct this investigation? First of all, Mr. Mueller was the head of the FBI in 2009. He potentially had a role to play in these questions. At the very least, the fact that the FBI never prosecuted any case, never raised objections, never allowed Congress to be able to look into these matters, that would be an act of omission.

So at best, there is an omission that creates a conflict for Mr. Mueller; at worst, there might have been actual malfeasance or active negligence. And in those circumstances, we need fresh eyes and clear eyes to give the American people confidence that our justice system is, in fact, working for them.

It is not only the Uranium One deal that gives us a great deal to question. We also have this Fusion GPS dossier, which we have now learned that the Democratic Party was paying for. The Democratic Party was out paying people to stir up this salacious and inaccurate dirt on President Trump both before and after he was elected.

In his own testimony before the Congress, Mr. Comey said that these allegations were salacious and could not be relied upon. So it begs the question, what was the Fusion GPS dossier relied upon for? Was it relied upon so that there would be FISA warrants issued to go and spy on the President and members of his team? We don't know, but until we have a special counsel, we will never get those answers, because Mueller and Rosenstein are conflicted.

Why did Congress never hear from these informants? Well, it is no surprise to me. You actually have Mr. Rosenstein's name on the signature block of the pleadings that sealed the information that could have shed light on this entire scandal, but we didn't have that opportunity.

Now, it may very well be that these were simply acts of negligence, acts of omission or oversight. If that is the case, let's get someone in who can give us the answers, because certainly the people who are there now cannot give us answers, and they have these tragic conflicts of interest.

The American people are well aware that the Clinton Foundation functioned largely as a money laundering organization to influence the State Department and to ensure that there were special people with special access and special relationships to the Clintons who got special treatment. That is not an America that abides to the rule of law.

As a member of the Judiciary Committee, we have to see the rule of law held up and cherished. We are a model for the world, but if we have circumstances where our President, who was elected, is undermined as a consequence of these things, if we do not replace Bob Mueller with someone who can come in absent of association with the individuals who may be implicated, then I fear this great, special place that we hold in the world may be diminished.

So I have introduced legislation. I am very pleased that my colleagues have joined me in sponsoring that legislation, calling for Mr. Mueller to resign. I have also called for a special counsel to be appointed.

To my colleagues on the other side who say, well, hey, you know, there were a variety of agencies that were involved in approving the Uranium One deal, there were eight or nine groups that could have said no.

□ 1900

Are Members of Congress really taking the position that the Clintons don't have their tentacles in just about every agency of government?

How ludicrous. You are talking about the former President of the United States and, at the time, the lady who was serving as our Secretary of State.

The fact that this was a multiagency process only underscores the conflicts of interest that lie with Rosenstein and Mueller.

I am calling on the Attorney General to appoint a special counsel to preserve the rule of law and to help us save this great country from those who are trying to undermine us and undermine our President.

Mr. BIGGS. I thank the gentleman from Florida and I appreciate his remarks.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JORDAN).

Mr. JORDAN. Mr. Speaker, why, in 2016, would James Comey call the Clinton investigation a matter, not an investigation?

Last time I checked, he wasn't director of the Federal bureau of matters.

Why, in 2016, would then-Attorney General Loretta Lynch, one day before the Benghazi report is due to come out, 5 days before Secretary Clinton is scheduled to be interviewed by the FBI, meet with former President Bill Clinton on a tarmac in Phoenix? Why would that happen in 2016?

Why, in the days just following that meeting with the former President, would Attorney General Loretta Lynch, when corresponding with the public relations people at the Justice Department via email, not use her real name and, instead, use the name Elizabeth Carlisle?

Again, it seems to me if you are just talking about grandkids and golf, you could probably use your real name.

Why, as we have learned recently, reported in The Federalist, why would the FBI be reimbursing Christopher Steele, the author of the dossier? Why would that be happening all in 2016?

You know, as the previous speakers have talked about, we have had this focus the last several months on potential Russia, Trump campaign collusion and influence, Russian influence on the election.

It seems to me we know something pretty clearly. The Obama administration Justice Department certainly tried to influence the election. I mean, I think we can see that without a doubt.

What did we learn today? The gentleman from Florida was talking about the dossier. What did we learn today?

It was reported today that the cofounder of Fusion GPS, Glenn Simpson, was meeting with the now famous Russian lawyer, Natalia Veselnitskaya, both before the meeting that she had with Donald Trump, Jr., and after the meeting she had with Donald Trump, Jr. I find that interesting. The story keeps getting better.

When James Comey is fired, he then leaks a government document, through a friend, to The New York Times. And what was his objective? What did he tell us?

Under oath, he told us this: Trying to create momentum for a special counsel.

Of course, it can't just be any special counsel. Who is that special counsel going to be?

Bob Mueller, his friend, his predecessor, his mentor and, maybe most importantly, as my good friend from Florida just pointed out, the guy who was running the FBI when the whole Uranium One deal was going down.

I mean, this is amazing. All we are asking for is for the Attorney General to name a special counsel to look into all these questions.

Why was it so critical that James Comey call the matter not an investigation?

Why was it so important that Loretta Lynch not use her real name when she is talking about the meeting she had with Bill Clinton on the tarmac?

Why was it so important that we get a special counsel, and that special counsel be Bob Mueller; so important that James Comey can leak a document, through a friend, to The New York Times, a government document? Why was all this so important?

All we are asking for is to name a special counsel to look into this; and we first asked for this 3½ months ago. Twenty members of the Judiciary Committee sent the Attorney General a letter on July 27, laying out all these questions and saying: Name a special counsel to look into it.

After all, the taxpayers, the American people, would like the answers. I know the ones in the Fourth District of Ohio would. I talk to them all the time.

For 2 months we heard nothing. So five of us went and met with the Attorney General asking about the July 27 letter, and would they appoint a special counsel. To date, we have got no answer, no response.

So I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona for organizing this Special Order. I appreciate my good friend from Florida, the gentleman from North Carolina, the gentleman from Pennsylvania, and the gentleman from Arizona who are going to join us as well this evening.

It is time for a special counsel to be named to get the answers for the American people on these fundamental questions. We haven't said them all. There are lots of other questions, but these are the fundamental ones. It is time we had a special counsel get to the bottom of this. That is what we have called for. That is what we want to see happen. We hope it does, and the sooner the better.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Ohio for his eloquent comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. MEADOWS).

Mr. MEADOWS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his leadership; and, obviously, for the eloquent words of my colleagues from Florida and from Ohio.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to join my colleagues in, really, addressing a serious matter of transparency that has left the American people with questions that deserve honest answers.

You know, for the past year, as our government has been mired in a fruitless, aimless, and sometimes laborious investigation on accusations of collusion between the Russian Government and the 2016 Presidential campaign, my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have insisted that Congress follow where the evidence leads in this investigation.

Mr. Speaker, I am here to tell you today that I agree wholeheartedly. Congress should follow the facts where they lead. However, they are leading in a very different direction than many of the mainstream media narratives might suggest.

You see, in the process of this investigation, we have learned a fact pattern surrounding the Clinton campaign and potentially the Obama administration's involvement in a targeted campaign using information from foreign intelligence officials against then-candidate Donald Trump.

Now, as we know from the recent New York Times report, the Presidential campaign of Hillary Clinton and the Democratic National Committee paid for research that was included in the now infamous Russian dossier that was made public in January of this year by Buzzfeed and reported on by CNN.

Now we know that the Clinton campaign and the DNC paid an ex-British intelligence officer, Christopher Steele, to compile this dossier with the research provided from Russian intelligence officials.

Now, much of this dossier contains claims that have either not been verified or have been directly refuted. So, Mr. Speaker, it is suspicious enough that the Clinton campaign and the DNC paid intelligence officials in Russia for this type of material and false information on President Trump.

But we were also beginning to see evidence that raises questions about the very way that the Obama Justice Department may have inappropriately involved themselves into this project, both before and after the 2016 Presidential campaign.

Mr. Speaker, now, if you would, consider the timeline that we are working with here. In April of 2016, the Clinton campaign used the law firm of Perkins Coie to retain Fusion GPS, the firm behind the Russian dossier.

Now, that very same month, in April of 2016, President Obama's campaign began paying more than $900,000 to what law firm?

Perkins Coie, the very same firm used by the Clinton campaign in the creation of the dossier.

Now, we also know that in the weeks prior to the 2016 election, President Obama's FBI tried to reach an agreement with Christopher Steele to pay for the Russian dossier, and the FBI actually ended up reimbursing some of the dossier expenses.

Now, to be clear, the FBI attempted to pay, and then reimbursed, the costs of the Russian dossier that was being orchestrated by Hillary Clinton's Presidential campaign. Now, the FBI has refused to answer questions and resisted any transparency on this issue.

So going a step further, we now know that on January 6, President Obama's intelligence officials, led by then-Director of the FBI, James Comey, briefed President-elect Trump on the contents of the dossier.

Now, following that January 6 briefing, there are reports that the Obama administration's intelligence officials leaked to CNN the fact that the President-elect was briefed on the dossier. Four days later, on January 10, the dossier ended up being published by Buzzfeed.

Now, keep in mind, several media outlets had the dossier in hand prior to January 10, but none of them had printed it since the claims could not be verified.

Now, this timeline leaves us with a myriad of extremely concerning questions, Mr. Speaker, but they can be boiled down into a few specifics: Why did President Obama's campaign begin paying almost $1 million to the very same firm that the Clinton campaign used to fund the dossier in the very same month that the Clinton campaign began paying for the dossier?

The second question: Why did President Obama's FBI attempt to pay Christopher Steele for the Russian dossier? Why was President Obama's FBI involved in paying for a project that the Clinton campaign started and was orchestrating?

Again, the FBI has refused to answer these questions and has resisted transparency on this issue.

And why brief the President at all on the dossier if much of the dossier could not be verified?

Or, I would suggest, if President Obama's intelligence officials had reason to treat the dossier seriously, then why did they wait 2 months after the election to disclose the information on January 6? Why wait?

And why was the President's meeting with President-elect Trump leaked to CNN 4 days after the briefing, if, again, the dossier could not be verified?

Mr. Speaker, the intention of all of this is not to spread theories or to speculate as to what might have happened. The point is to recognize that there are legitimate, unanswered questions about whether the Obama Justice Department involved themselves in a political project targeting then-candidate Donald Trump, a suggestion that has far more evidence behind it than the directionless investigation into the Trump-Russian collusion.

The American people deserve an answer to those questions. They demand answers to those questions, and it is our government's responsibility to find them.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from North Carolina for his remarks, and I am grateful to have him here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. FRANKS).

Mr. FRANKS of Arizona. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona. He and I hold a deep, common conviction that Arizona is the most important and best State in the Union, and I don't think anyone here would debate that.

Mr. Speaker, last Monday, October 30, we were delivered the over-hyped ''bombshell'' story that Special Counsel Robert Mueller would introduce some damning evidence about President Trump's collusion with Russia via indictments.

On Friday, October 27, someone involved in the grand jury investigation—now, don't forget, Mr. Speaker, that the purpose of a grand jury is secrecy, but someone in that organization leaked information to the press, specifically CNN, with no reasonable person being able to count as a friend to the President of the United States; and it caused every political pundit in the country to begin surmising who would be the first to fall.

Reporters were assigned the story, revisiting campaign notes and combing through stacks of research and fact sheets about so-called evidence of Russia collusion.

Then the big reveal: Paul Manafort and Rick Gates were indicted for crimes related to their business dealings with a Ukrainian politician clinging to power in a country undergoing a revolution, back in 2014. The FBI had been trying to indict them ever since. There was no mention of the Trump campaign, not any whatsoever in the 12-count indictment.

In other words, Mr. Speaker the announcement amounted to what many have called a ''nothing burger.''

Mainstream media members, who had spent all weekend promising the viewers and their readers some new damning evidence about Trump, were aghast.

□ 1915

Mueller had let them down. How could they face their audience now with nothing to show? But wait, another indictment snuck in in the last few hours, only a few hours later, right in the nick of time. George Papadopoulos—now, here is our guy. This is the guy. He actually went to Russia, and he proposed Trump meet with Putin. We have got him now.

Well, no. It turns out Papadopoulos was an unpaid intern who possessed a background in researching Russia. When he suggested Trump meet with the Russians, he was shot down quickly and firmly. The indictment against Papadopoulos didn't even have to do with his work on the campaign. He was indicted because he had lied to the FBI—again, no collusion with the Trump campaign found whatsoever.

But that didn't stop the media from sensationalizing the news. After all, they have a job to do. But the American people didn't fall for it, Mr. Speaker. The New Yorker's legal writer, Jeffrey Toobin, and the liberal vox.com have suggested Mueller seems to be conducting his investigation like he is going after a mafia mob boss.

The problem with treating the Trump campaign as an organized crime organization, clearly, is it presumes Trump's guilt. No matter how well-intentioned and full of integrity Mr. Mueller might be, if he is treating Trump like Al Capone, his tactics are wrong.

When trying to pursue charges on a mafia boss, the FBI pulls in the street guys, threatens them with life in jail or some other steep charge, unless they spill the beans on their superior. Once they crack, they bring in the next level, all the way to the top. This is a well-known tactic, and it incentivizes those arrested to invent some spurious testimony against their superiors.

Could Mr. Mueller be acting with vengeance or to vindicate his good friend and colleague, James Comey, who had a very public feud with the President? Well, we don't know, Mr. Speaker, but it is hard to take any charges with this investigation seriously when they are going about it in this fashion.

The main point is this, Mr. Speaker: at least James Comey, the media, and the Democrats desperately want collusion to exist between Trump and Russia. And when you want something that bad, you might even begin to believe it is true, even if it is not.

But there is good news. Anyone sincerely looking for the drama of American officials actually colluding with the Kremlin, need look no further now than the emerging scandal concerning the sale of American uranium reserves to Russia during Hillary Clinton's time at the State Department.

The FBI, in 2009, under the Obama administration, began investigating Russia's use of bribery, kickbacks, and extortion to gain a bigger foothold in the American atomic energy industry. They knew this was happening. The record is clear. Of course, Mr. Speaker, American nuclear resources are a critical component of America's national security. So any detail between Russian companies and U.S. atomic energy resources would require a signoff from the State Department.

After all, Russia is a hostile foreign government. Correct? Democrats certainly seem to believe so now, even though, in past years, most of them couldn't find Russia on a map.

So when Rosatom, a Russian energy group, took control of the Canadian Uranium One, which had control of mining and uranium stakes stretching

from Central Asia to the American West, that deal needed U.S. State Department approval. After all, this meant that Russia, a hostile foreign power, would control 20 percent of America's uranium industry. And, of course, as Obama's FBI was investigating Russia for bribes and extortion related to atomic energy, this deal should have raised a red flag for the State Department.

Vladimir Putin really wanted the deal to go through because, per The New York Times, it would allow him to realize his goal of becoming one of the world's major atomic energy players. The only thing standing in his way was Hillary Clinton's State Department. The month the deal was approved by Hillary Clinton's State Department, Bill Clinton received $500,000 from a Russian investment bank with ties to the Kremlin for a ''speaking engagement'' in Moscow. Then, Mr. Speaker, Uranium One's chairman used his family foundation to make a series of donations to the Clinton Foundation, totaling $2.35 million.

Now, being under agreement to disclose all of their foundation contributions publicly, the Clintons neglected still to reveal the Uranium One donations. That is pretty convenient, Mr. Speaker. Are we paying attention here?

Now, since the media seems to have an insatiable appetite for Russian collusion, let's take a look at the Uranium One deal. That is a story worth looking into, Mr. Speaker. And I would bet the biggest stake in Washington, with anyone in this place, that if a special counsel was appointed to look into it, that investigation would bring some truly legitimate results.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona for his remarks. It is my pleasure now to yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. PERRY).

Mr. PERRY. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arizona.

Mr. Speaker, we have been entreated to claims of collusion with our government, people high in our government with Russia for over a year now; since the last election happening this very day a year ago, we have been entreated to this.

So I thought I would bring some sense to this confusion about what we know as the Uranium One deal. Even I didn't know a whole lot about it, so I did a little research to understand the timeline and what exactly happened here. I want to talk to you about that this evening.

On June 8 of 2010, the Russian State Atomic Energy Corporation, also known as Rosatom—the Russian state, not some private organization. It belongs to Vladimir Putin. Make no mistake about it—announced plans to purchase a 51.4 percent stake in the Canadian company Uranium One.

Now, why do we care? Well, we care because this announcement had significant strategic implications for the United States since Uranium One's international assets included 20 percent of the United States' uranium reserves.

Now, due to uranium status as a strategic commodity, the $1.3 billion deal was subject to the approval of the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States, known as CFIUS; CFIUS, the Committee on Foreign Investment in the United States. And they care because uranium is important. Do you know why? We make nuclear bombs out of it—that is why it is important—and so do other countries. And maybe so do terrorists if they get their hands on it. So we care.

Now, the CFIUS panel is made up of nine department heads and agencies, including, at that time, Secretary of State Hillary Clinton. Okay, fair enough. Now, CFIUS went through the approval process at what we would consider an unusually rapid pace, approving the sale of one-fifth of our uranium reserves, the United States' reserves, to a Russian, Vladimir Putin, state-owned enterprise in less than 5 months. Five months. I mean, they did that in 5 months. We have been investigating allegations of President Trump and Russia for about 12 months now. In earnest, less than 12 months, but, certainly, the claims have been made since the night of the election, yet they got this done in 5 months. Okay, that is good.

CFIUS proceeded at this pace despite national security concerns raised by Congress—people right here said: Hey, 20 percent of our uranium shouldn't go to Vladimir Putin. That doesn't make sense to us.

The FBI had extensive concerns, tying Rosatom's main executive to a U.S. racketeering scheme. My colleague has already talked about bribery, extortion, racketeering. Right. Both Secretary of State Clinton and Attorney General Eric Holder—whose FBI, by the way, produced the evidence—voted in favor of the deal. Interestingly enough, who was in charge of the FBI at the time? Our friend, Robert Mueller. It just is a little too coincidental for me. I am sorry, it is just a little too coincidental.

After the sale, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, the United States Nuclear Regulatory Commission, assured both Congress and the public that the uranium sold could not be exported because neither Uranium One nor Rosatom, Vladimir Putin's organization, had an NRC export license. So even though we had control of 20 percent, he could never do anything with the 20 percent except leave it in the United States.

And, by the way, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission still hasn't granted a license to export any of that material to Rosatom or to Uranium One to this day.

But despite the public statements, somehow it got exported because an NRC memo showed the agency approved the shipment of yellowcake uranium from the Uranium One mines in the United States to Canada through a third party. Additional shipments of the uranium were made to Europe, and they were authorized as well by the NRC. And where they went from Europe, who knows. The NRC doesn't know. At least if they know, they aren't telling us. We have asked. We certainly don't know. Maybe Rosatom knows.

The question you should have is: Why? Why would the United States do this? What was in our interest to sell 20 percent of our uranium? Was it that we needed $1.3 billion? I suspect not.

In an attempt to avoid congressional scrutiny, the NRC did not provide a direct export license to Uranium One, but, instead, it amended an existing license for a logistics company to allow it to export Uranium One's uranium, which was, in effect, the United States' uranium, our uranium.

The NRC was able to amend this export license because of two policy changes resulting from the Russian reset orchestrated by Secretary Clinton. Again, look, it might be innocent. It might be completely innocent, but it deserves more scrutiny, certainly.

The two things—the two policy changes were: the Obama administration reinstated the U.S.-Russian civilian nuclear energy cooperation agreement in May of 2010. Shortly thereafter, in 2011, the Commerce Department removed Rosatom from a list of restricted companies that could not export nuclear or other sensitive materials or technologies. They still didn't have a license, but they were removed from the list.

Nine months after the Commerce Department did that, the removal of Rosatom from the list, the NRC issued the license amendment to the third party allowing for uranium of the United States to be exported from Uranium One mines through Canada, and eventually on to Europe, and who knows where from there. The license amendment stipulated that the exported uranium must be returned to the U.S. Now, this did not occur. Instead, the Department of Energy approved the movement of uranium from Canada to Europe, and that was it. It is gone, folks. It is just gone.

It is now clear that the previous administration took every conceivable action to clear the path for Rosatom to purchase Uranium One and to enable the export of that uranium. The Russians got it. Vladimir Putin got the uranium.

In taking these extraordinary measures in support of Russian state-owned enterprise, the Obama administration, with the aid of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton and former Attorney General Eric Holder, put our national security at risk.

Mr. Speaker, it is far past time to thoroughly—marginally, how about to marginally investigate this deal—the Obama administration's actions and the Clinton family's role and their foundation's role. You only need to ask

one question about all this: Why? Why would we do this? Why would the United States agree to this? Why did this deal happen the way it did happen? No other deals happened that way. Why did this one happen this way? Why is there no independent investigation into these matters at this point? Why? And why is there no special counsel?

We are here tonight to call for a special counsel so that we know the truth, so if there is Russian involvement in the United States' national security, whether it is our election, or whether it is our uranium that they could use to make an atomic bomb, the American people need to know. They should know. They should have all of the evidence.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Pennsylvania for his remarks, and I yield to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT).

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend, Mr. BIGGS. I appreciate your hosting this hour because this is critical stuff here. This is the kind of thing that makes or breaks an experiment in self-government because there is an attempted coup taking place.

We have heard over and over about, oh, gee, Mr. Mueller will come to a fair and just conclusion. Well, the only fair and just conclusion that Bob Mueller could come to would be that he should never have accepted the position of special counsel, that he had conflicts so deep that accepting the role of special counsel could not be ethical and appropriate. You wonder, why would he take it?

Well, when you find out that, as FBI Director, he and U.S. Attorney Rod Rosenstein were involved in the deep cover investigation into Russia's effort to corner the market using American uranium, and that Hillary Clinton and Eric Holder and others in the administration approved the sale to a group, the stockholders of which donated, as I understand, $145 million or so to the Clinton Foundation, in effect, the Clintons hit the Russian megalottery—the megamillions lottery from Russia.

□ 1930

As I understand, $145 million or so to the Clinton Foundation, in effect, the Clintons hit the Russian mega lottery; the megamillions lottery from Russia, and just a little tease was the half-a-million-dollar fee for just giving one little, short speech by Bill Clinton.

But if we look back at what has gone on, just look at some of the facts, it was shocking that FBI Director Comey did not have Cheryl Mills interviewed. She was Clinton's former Chief of Staff at the State Department. Now we are finding out, well, I guess, gee, if Comey was going to draft a statement saying that there was not sufficient evidence to prosecute Hillary Clinton before he ever talked to Cheryl Mills or talked to Hillary Clinton or followed up on the most critical evidence, then clearly it makes sense why Director Comey would not want to make Cheryl Mills' interview recorded, and would make an agreement with Cheryl Mills and the other potential defendants in the case that, gee, if they just got a look at their laptops, they promised they wouldn't use anything in the laptop to prosecute them, and the FBI would then, under Comey's direction, would actually participate in the obstruction and destruction of evidence so that nobody could ever use it against any of them.

Now, originally, we thought that might only be Hillary Clinton. But as we find out, gee, Mr. Mueller, Mr. Comey, and Mr. Rosenstein were in this up to their eyeballs when it came to the Russian investigation regarding uranium. If they were doing their jobs, they should never, ever have allowed that sale of American uranium to go to a company that they knew would end up in Russian hands.

So if you look at Cheryl Mills, Heather Samuelson, John Bentel, Bryan Pagliano, and Paul Combetta, these are people who were potential targets. And what does Director Comey do?

He makes sure that they walk. Because if they were properly interviewed, like good prosecutors or good investigators normally do, you start there and you say: You help us with what happened and what you were told by the person above you, and then we won't prosecute you to the full extent of the law.

That is how deals are made. That is how you get to a Mr. Big in a racketeer organized confederation.

Mr. Comey and the FBI apparently relied on the Fusion GPS investigation knowing where it came from and knowing who paid for it. This is incredible.

If you go back to the Washingtonian article of 2013, it makes pretty clear that Comey and Mueller were basically joined at the hip.

In fact, a quote back in 2013 says: ''The stressed Comey had few people he could turn to for advice; almost no one was allowed to know the program existed, and disclosing the program's existence to someone outside that circle could send him to prison. In fact, there was only one person in government whom he could confide in and trust: Bob Mueller.''

''Comey thought, 'A freight train is heading down the tracks, about to derail me, my family, and my career.' He glanced to his left at his fellow passenger, thinking, 'At least Bob Mueller will be standing on the tracks with me.' ''

''The crisis over, Comey and Mueller shared a dark laugh.''

Well, it is not quite so amusing when you look at the stakes and whether or not this little experiment in self-government will continue. For example, we know that Comey admitted in testimony before Congress before the Senate that he had leaked information in order to get a special counsel appointed. That was his dear friend who would stand beside him through thick and thin, Bob Mueller. This brought memories of when Mr. Comey urged his boss, John Ashcroft, to recuse himself and let them appoint a special counsel. So Ashcroft trusted Comey. He probably shouldn't have, but he did.

Then Comey saw to it that his child's godfather, Patrick Fitzgerald, would be the prosecutor. Much like Mueller, he got massive amounts of money and a great powerful staff so they could go after Karl Rove and Vice President Cheney. They were embarrassed there was no case there, so they made up one on Scooter Libby, and he became the fall guy.

But we know from the leak that Comey admitted that he used an ex-U.S. Attorney, identified as Columbia University professor Daniel Richman, to leak to The New York Times the contents of the memo Comey wrote.

If you look at the FBI contract with agents and with people employed by the FBI, it makes it very clear that memo that Comey prepared about his conversation with the President was not supposed to ever be provided to the press. That is FBI property, and he violated the law in leaking it.

But if you look, then-professor Daniel Richman got that to The New York Times author Michael Schmidt, who later wrote the Comey memo story in which Comey told Congress he directed Richman to leak.

Well, if you go back through and you start looking for this common thread, Michael Schmidt writing stories for The New York Times about leaks, then you find a number of cases where it appears likely. Whether it is March 1, March 4, March 5, March 6, it appears likely that this was James Comey leaking again.

The only question is: Did he commit a crime in one or all of those events?

The answer is: We will never know as long as Bob Mueller is special counsel. He needs to have the decency to say that it was a mistake for me to take this on, it was a mistake when Comey testified there was no evidence of any collusion between Donald Trump and the Russians, it was a mistake for him to leak out that night that now he is investigating the President for obstruction of justice.

Why would he do that?

So he wouldn't get fired, because there was no purpose in his investigation.

Why would he indict people when he did?

Because even The Wall Street Journal and others around this town began to say: Do you know what? Mueller really should resign.

He had to get those indictments out quick so people would not keep calling for his resignation. Well, some of us are. We have got to clean this town up, and it will start with the resignation of Mr. Mueller and a proper investigation of all of this underlying case involving Comey, Lynch, the Clintons, Russia, and Rod Rosenstein who oversaw the Russia case before he decided to seal it.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas, my friend, for his leadership on this issue. I appreciate his giving his remarks tonight.

Mr. Speaker, may I inquire how much time is remaining.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. SMUCKER). The gentleman from Arizona has 13 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

Mr. YOHO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. BIGGS for putting this very important hearing together. I am going to cut mine a little bit shorter.

After the previous election, a lot of people were angry. They came to our office demanding special investigations into the Trump campaign and the Russia probe. I forewarned them then, and I will make this prediction now: that if it goes there and it leads to the previous administration or Hillary Clinton, are you willing to go down that rabbit hole?

Here we are today. I think we need to follow this because it has led to that.

Without going too much into all the stuff that has already been said, we can talk about how the Obama administration approved the sale of the Canadian mining company with significant U.S. uranium reserves to a firm owned by a Russian Government. The NRC, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, assured Congress and the public the new owners could not export any raw nuclear material from the American shores. No uranium produced at either facility may be exported, the NRC declared November 2010 in a press release. We found out that is not true.

As has been brought up, over 20 percent of our uranium is going into the hands of Russia. Beyond the mines in Kazakhstan, which are among the most lucrative in the world, the sale gave Russia control of one-fifth of all uranium production capacity in the U.S.

Since uranium is considered a strategic asset with implications for national security, the deal had to be approved by a committee composed of representatives from a number of United States Government agencies. Among those agencies that eventually signed off was the State Department, then headed by Mrs. Clinton. Frank Giustra, a mining financier, has donated $31.3 million to the foundation run by former President Bill Clinton.

As the Russians gradually assumed control of the Uranium One in three separate transactions from 2009 to 2013, Canadian records show how a flow of cash made its way into the Clinton Foundation. We could go on and on about this.

Shortly after the Russians announced their intention to acquire the majority stake in Uranium One, Mr. Clinton received $500,000 from a Moscow speech from a Russian investment bank with links to the Kremlin that was promoting Uranium One stock. Very interesting. I remember when President Clinton was asked about his high speaking fees. He kind of brushed it off with a laugh and said: Well, there are people who like to hear me speak.

Fordham University professor Zephyr Teachout, a highly regarded law professor who has written extensively about political corruption—and she is a Democrat—said:

> As a Democrat, I am concerned about Hillary Clinton as a general election candidate. These questions aren't going away. There is a pattern of foreign donations and speaking fees that the Clinton Foundation and her husband have found their ways to the Clinton Foundation.
>
> Bill Clinton made 13 speeches between 2001 and 2012 in which he was paid $500,000 or more. The interesting part is 11 of those speeches were made after Hillary Clinton became Secretary of State—pay to play.
>
> Why did the Clinton Foundation change its name to the Bill, Hillary, and Chelsea Clinton Foundation?
>
> It is surmised that it was because the public and large corporation donors backed away from the questionable, if not unethical, and possibly illegal activities.

I just want to speak as an American. We come up here from different backgrounds. I see people who are here tonight who spoke tonight all from different backgrounds. The thing we hear about over and over again is that we want transparency and accountability. We demand that, but we never see it. So as these investigations go forward, my hope is that there is a conclusion to an investigation and that the people who broke the law are held accountable so that we don't have to talk about another investigation that spends the American taxpayers' money without somebody paying the price for misrepresenting the American people and turning over strategic products of this country—uranium in this case—to a foreign entity that doesn't want the best for America.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman from Arizona for putting this on and leading this.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the gentleman being here and speaking tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JODY B. HICE), my good friend who has been waiting like patience on a monument.

Mr. JODY B. HICE of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my good friend from Arizona for holding this Special Order. What an incredibly important issue.

Over the past year, we have heard nearly on a daily basis accusations of what Russia tries to do to undermine the United States. I think most of my colleagues would agree that Russia's actions over the past 2 years, which include everything from cyber attacks to supporting Assad's bloody regime in Syria, all of it demonstrates that their intention is to disrupt the stability both of the United States and the entire world.

□ 1945

But here is the deal: none of this happened overnight. No one in Russia flipped a switch on their foreign policy and it suddenly changed from being friendly to the United States to trying to cause us harm.

The fact is the United States did not remain vigilant. Our foreign policy suffered. We ignored the fact that Russian interests and goals are not our interests and goals. Nothing demonstrates this more than the Uranium One case.

In 2010, the Committee on Foreign Investments of the United States approved a partial sale, as you have heard this evening, of a Canadian company to the Russian-owned nuclear giant Rosatom. We have heard about all of this. One-fifth of our uranium capacity gone.

In the United States, we have been long aware of the fact that the Russian Government's request is, among other things, to control the production of energy, both at home and in other nations, and then use that energy as a source of leverage during conflicts.

Furthermore, striking information has been uncovered that Federal agents used a confidential U.S. witness working inside the Russian nuclear industry to gather extensive evidence that showed Moscow had compromised an American uranium trucking firm with bribes and kickbacks, all, of course, in violation of the law.

Rather than bringing these charges up, however, the FBI kept this secret. They didn't tell anyone about it for 4 years. That is unacceptable. We need to know why the FBI didn't share this information. Why was this crucial information about Russia's actions in our nuclear energy sector not shared? This is absolutely unacceptable.

Then, as we have been hearing tonight, we have the cases where Russian officials spent millions of dollars to benefit former President Bill Clinton's charitable family foundation while Hillary was Secretary of State.

These are all extremely serious allegations, and it is absolutely our responsibility to investigate them. There was a fundamental conflict of interest here, and I think you would have to be blind not to recognize that. Our Secretary of State was making decisions that impacted the entire world while, at the same time, receiving massive amounts of money from foreign donations.

As the Russians assumed control of Uranium One, the company's chairman was giving tons of money to the Clinton Foundation. Of course, none of this was disclosed as it was supposed to be.

So from what we know, the decision to allow the Clinton Foundation to continue soliciting foreign donations was, at best, naive, if not criminal. This seems to be a pattern of the previous administration. It is absolute cluelessness and self-interest, at best, perhaps even worse than that. It is hardly surprising that Russia believed it could pull the wool over our eyes with impunity and increased its malicious behavior.

I look forward to this investigation going forward, and I thank my friend

from Arizona for having this Special Order.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Georgia.

Mr. Speaker, how much time is remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 4 minutes remaining.

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I will do my best to sum up.

What you have heard tonight, those who have been listening, are the outlines of the scandal of our lifetime—the scandal of our lifetime that began in 2009 and proceeded forth even to revelations in the last 36 hours of Mr. Comey changing the wording in his draft from the statutory culpable mental state requirement of gross negligence to merely carelessness.

That is a huge change as he prepared his draft report on Mrs. Clinton and the misuse of her email server giving access—which we don't even know. We don't have access to that. But you take this back from the Uranium One situation, the transaction that should never have happened, the money that changed hands, and you look at the common thread throughout.

Well, oddly enough, it is Robert Mueller. Robert Mueller sits today as the investigator of the supposed collusion between the Trump administration and the Russians to influence the election.

Oddly enough, it has turned on its head. We have found out now that it is the DNC and the Hillary Clinton campaign that was funding Fusion GPS, trying to influence the American electorate. It is upside down.

Yet the person who is tied throughout all of this is Robert Mueller. He is the guy conducting the investigation. Is there any clearer conflict of interest than what we see in this special investigator?

Again, with my colleagues—I thank all of them who have spoken tonight—I renew my call for his resignation, short of that, his termination of employment.

This is the scandal of our time. It affects our national security, the views of the American people for justice, and our elections.

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

TAX POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, I came here to talk about tax policy, and I will; however, having listened for the last 60 minutes to the most remarkable admission that Russia is meddling in America in many, many ways, even an admission that Russia somehow wants to influence America's elections—in this case, America's elections for the last year—I am pleased that my Republican colleagues are so adamant in pursuing Russian influence and, perhaps, controversial influence in the United States. I am pleased that they are doing that.

I am also pleased that Mr. Mueller is continuing his investigations. I will note that there have been two indictments and one guilty plea that have already come forth from his investigation having to do with people that are very, very close to President Trump's administration.

More will come of that, and I certainly hope our Republican friends will continue to focus on the fact that Russia is playing very serious and, quite possibly, illegal games or activities here in the United States.

We will carry on. I firmly believe that Mr. Mueller is not about to resign or be fired. If he were to be fired, I would suspect that there would be far more serious consequences than the kind of yapping we just heard for the last hour here on the floor.

Let me go back to my original point, which has to do with tax policy. As interesting as Russia might be, tax policy is going to be far, far more consequential in the long term. Whatever comes of the Russian situation in the election and conspiracies or other kinds of conflicts will bear themselves out over the next several years or months. Tax policy, however, is something that America is going to live with for a long, long time, were it to pass.

There are many things we could say about it. One is that, yes, the top 1 percent of America's wealthiest people—you take 360 million of us Americans and take the top 1 percent—are going to get 50 percent of all of the tax cuts that are in this multitrillion-dollar tax cut legislation.

So a trillion and a half dollars over the next 10 years to the top 1 percent ought to really drive up that problem that we call income disparity in the United States, you know, what we used to talk about: the rich get richer and the poor get poorer, or that America has a real problem with the superwealthy controlling most of the wealth and the rest of Americans really left behind.

So this tax bill is going to make it even worse. Now, that is really good. How does it do that?

Well, let's see. By eliminating the estate tax. Yes, five members of President Trump's Cabinet, including the President, would benefit in the billions. You see, the estate tax would be eliminated in just 4 years, about the same time they would be leaving the administration.

What does that mean?

Well, if you have a billion-dollar estate and there is a tax on that, you can eliminate the first $10 million, $11 million of that, but you have a 40 percent tax on the remainder. Well, that is about $400 million in estate tax.

Who would have a billion-dollar estate?

The President, Mr. ROSS, the Treasury Secretary, maybe the Education Secretary, maybe others.

So who is going to benefit from this?

The superwealthy, to the tune of millions upon millions or hundreds of millions of dollars of the estate tax itself.

There is much more to that. American corporations would see their top rating from 39 down to 20. Who is going to benefit from that?

Well, we heard the Treasury Secretary say the American workers will.

Where is the evidence for that?

There is no evidence for that, none at all; in fact, quite the contrary. The Treasury Department's own tax analysis section says that 70 percent of the after-profit taxes now go to, guess who. Stockholders and executives, not to the workers.

It used to be that way back in the sixties and seventies. Maybe 70 percent went to the workers, went to increasing plants and equipment, investments in the United States. It is not that way anymore. Quite the contrary. The American workers will be left behind once again by those tax reductions.

That is not to say we shouldn't reduce the nominal tax rate for corporations. Yes, we should, but we should do it in a way that actually helps American workers. It keeps investments in the United States. But, no, not this tax proposal. This one actually creates what is called territorial accounting for international corporations.

Let's suppose that you have an international corporation located in Silicon Valley. We have some really big ones there. Territorial taxes would be that all of the earnings that that corporation has outside of the United States would be beyond being taxed by the United States, even though it is an American corporation that can manipulate the price of its goods and services to actually push, overseas, its profits. Brilliant.

You want to bring jobs back to America? Don't do territorial tax reform. It doesn't work for the American worker. It works for the stockholders. Their stocks and stock prices will go up. They will be able to receive even more benefits.

That is only $3 trillion over 10 years of reduction for corporation taxes.

Who benefits?

Wall Street corporate executives.

Who loses?

The American worker loses.

One more thing that is on my mind is that I used to hear last year, the year before last, the year before that—in fact, for the last two decades—a lot of talk from about more than half of the Members of this House of Representatives who would talk about the horrible impact of the American deficit and that it would lead to ruin for the American economy, our grandchildren would be left to pay it off, and all the horrible things that the deficit would bring to the United States, ultimately leading to the collapse of the American economy.