not only my two daughters, but all of our sons and daughters.

That is why I oppose the Senate bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

NO FEDERAL DOLLARS FOR SANCTUARY CITIES

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

Mr. CULBERSON. Mr. Speaker, over a year ago, Kate Steinle, a young woman in San Francisco, was murdered by a criminal illegal alien and died in the arms of her father.

At that time, as chairman of the Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies Subcommittee on Appropriations, I swore that I would do whatever it would take to cut off every dollar of Federal money to every sanctuary city in America.

I persuaded the previous Attorney General to put that policy in place. Thankfully, with President Trump's election and the appointment of our new Attorney General, Jeff Sessions, they moved aggressively to enforce existing laws, secure our border, and restore respect for the rule of law in this great Nation.

It is appalling and outrageous that a jury in San Francisco acquitted the killer who murdered Kate Steinle. This should renew our zeal as the Representatives of the people of this country to restore respect for the rule of law by cutting off every dollar of Federal money to every sanctuary city in American and to do whatever it takes to protect our citizens from criminal aliens who enter this country illegally and then commit crimes against the people of this great Nation.

What happened in San Francisco is an outrage, and I will not rest until we cut off every dollar to every sanctuary city in the United States of America.

TAX SCAM

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

Mr. HUFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax scam picks clear winners and losers, yet our colleagues are rushing it through Congress faster than President Trump can retweet British racists.

Let's be clear: the winners in this tax scam are the country's wealthiest, including Donald Trump, his family, and his billionaire cronies in his Cabinet. Meanwhile, students, middle class families, homeowners, and seniors across this country are the losers. They are left holding the bag.

Californians get an especially raw deal because my Republican colleagues want to impose an unfair double tax on the State and local taxes that we pay.

There is more bad news for Californians. Homeowners will be hit by a new cap on mortgage interest deductions, students will have to start paying taxes on student loan interest, graduate students will lose tax-free tuition waivers, and biotech companies who focus on ultra rare diseases will see their tax credit disappear.

The Republican tax bill is unbelievably bad and historically unpopular, for good reason, but it is not too late for my Republican colleagues to stop it.

REMEMBERING ROSA PARKS

(Mrs. LAWRENCE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Rosa Parks, who, 62 years ago today, changed the face of the United States.

On December 1, 1955, Rosa Parks refused a bus driver's orders to give up her seat on a segregated bus in Montgomery, Alabama. This simple act led to a bus boycott that helped to energize the civil rights movement.

Reflecting on that day, Rosa Parks once said: ''The only tired I was, was tired of giving in.''

She didn't give up. She didn't give in. Rosa Parks reminds us that we all must never, never give in when faced with injustice. Her brave actions have inspired all of us. Each and every one of us have an opportunity to stand up, sit down, or kneel for what is right.

It is because of civil rights champions like Rosa Parks that future generations can grow up in a nation that is free and fair for all.

REPUBLICAN TAX PLAN BAD TAX POLICY

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

Mr. DEUTCH. Mr. Speaker, the Republican tax plan that provides massive, permanent tax cuts to the largest corporations and tax increases for millions of middle class Americans is bad tax policy.

Let's be honest about what it does. This $1.5 trillion tax cut will trigger cuts to domestic programs in the amount of $150 billion every year, including $25 billion in cuts to Medicare, with 55 million Americans who rely on it being put at risk if this bill becomes law.

Mr. Speaker, it is bad enough that this tax policy favors the largest corporations over middle class Americans, but to effect these kinds of massive cuts by tricking the American people in order to try to do it is shameful.

We have to defeat this bill, prevent these massive cuts, and protect the 55 million Americans on Medicare from a $25 billion cut.

SALT DEDUCTION

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

Mr. LOWENTHAL. Mr. Speaker, I want to quote from one of my colleagues from California: ''Eliminating the State and local tax deduction would assure that almost all of the bill's tax cuts would be distributed to other States, leaving California with the bill.''

That was from my Republican colleague, DARRELL ISSA.

Mr. Speaker, he was right on this. The Republican tax plan is cruel in so many ways. But perhaps the worst provision specifically targets States like California, New York, and New Jersey.

Our States have stepped into the breach left by the Federal Government. We have raised taxes to pay for infrastructure. We have raised taxes to pay for hospitals. We have raised taxes to pay for schools.

Now the Republicans want to punish us?

Mr. Speaker, this is a political game, plain and simple. Californians are smart enough to see through it.

FACING A CRISIS IN OUR COUNTRY

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

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, today, in Federal district court in Washington, Michael Flynn pled guilty to lying to the FBI, a felony. It is a strong indication that he is cooperating with the Mueller investigation concerning Russia and its involvement with President Trump and his team and the election of the President of the United States.

We are facing a crisis in our country with our Constitution, our form of government, and the rule of law. I have filed a bill to amend the Constitution to not allow pardons of people from any President's campaign team or family. I am also the sponsor of a bill that says you can't fire a special counsel without cause. The special counsel would have the right to seek redress in court.

We must be ready to protect Bob Mueller and the integrity of the rule of law in this country, for I foresee this President firing him, as Nixon did in the Saturday Night Massacre.

We are repeating the horrors of Watergate and the shredding of our Constitution, common sense, and decency.

ISSUES OF THE WEEK

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, as folks head back to their districts—and I will be doing so shortly—it is important to take a look at some things that have been rather important here in our country.

The Department of Justice does need an investigation into the matters that have been raised and clearly were not handled properly regarding the Russian Uranium One program and the sale of a significant percentage of United States uranium, ultimately, to Russia.

There appears to be collusion, for sure. It is still staggering to think that the person who accepted the role as special prosecutor, Robert Mueller, would accept that, knowing that he and the person that selected him as special prosecutor, Mr. Rosenstein, were involved in the Russian investigation that went on for a number of years and involved a person working undercover and clearly established for Director Mueller, as head of the FBI, and for Mr. Rosenstein, the U.S. Attorney, that Russia was trying to corner the market by acquiring American uranium.

Yet, while you had a man like Jeff Sessions trying to go out of his way to ensure that nobody could say he acted inappropriately—I think it was done prematurely, but he recused himself—not wanting to be a burden to the President.

As much as Attorney General Jeff Sessions was trying to be fair and avoid even the appearance of questions about him handling the Russian investigation, you had Robert Mueller and the Deputy Attorney General acting—or appeared to be—even more inappropriately than Jeff Sessions was acting, beyond the pale of honor, as they are two people involved in the investigation of Russia acquiring American uranium, even though it wasn't just Hillary Clinton that signed off on it. It was also Eric Holder and some others.

□ 1145

All that needed to be investigated, but not by the people who covered up the prior Russia investigation and saw to the sealing of many of the documents involving that investigation. In fact, Mr. Rosenstein's name was actually on the motion to seal matters involved in that investigation.

It seemed pretty clear that if you are going to go to the trouble of sealing an investigation like that, and the extraordinary measure of getting the person who is acting undercover, force him, threaten him, get him to sign a nondisclosure agreement under threat, seems to me that wasn't an arm's-length transaction. That was done under coercion by the most powerful law enforcement people in the country at the time, threatening to bring down the full weight of the United States Government on the man who was working for them, helping them find the evidence that showed how Russia was acting so inappropriately and illegally trying to get hold of our uranium.

Just when you think, ''Well, just can't be much more in the way of surprises,'' The Daily Caller's Richard Pollock has a story on November 30: ''DOD Inspector General Opens Probe Into Alleged Retaliation by Obama Holdover.''

It says: ''The Pentagon's Inspector General has launched a preliminary investigation into charges that James H. Baker, the Director of the Defense Department's Office of Net Assessment, ONA, is retaliating against a whistleblower who warned of 'rigged' contracts to outside consultants, The Daily Caller News Foundation has confirmed.

''The DCNF verified through two independent sources that the Acting IG, Glenn A. Fine, initiated a formal 'Whistleblower Reprisal Investigation' September 28 to look into allegations that Baker unleashed various reprisals against Adam Lovinger, a senior ONA official. Lovinger warned about potential sweetheart deals to politically connected outside contractors, including one with a woman Chelsea Clinton has referred to as her 'best friend.'

''The IG is investigating Baker's actions under Presidential Policy Directive-19, an October 2012 directive designed to protect members of the intelligence community who report waste, fraud, and abuse. The directive pointedly states that it 'prohibits retaliation against employees for reporting waste, fraud, and abuse.'

''Baker is an Obama holdover appointed by Secretary Ashton Carter in May 2015, who remains the ONA Director 11 months into the Trump administration.''

I might insert here: This has got to be so frustrating to the President of the United States as the Senate Democrats continue to hold up efforts to get nominations confirmed so that he can start implementing the policies that he was elected to carry out. They are thwarting him by continuing to have Obama holdovers, even though that term apparently, we are told, offends our National Security Advisor McMaster—a guy who apparently can't stand the President and is thwarting his efforts at every turn he can.

But the guy is an Obama holdover. He should not be making calls, yet he is staying around, according to this information, to carry out vendettas against someone who was a whistleblower complaining of sweetheart deals to people, including Ms. Clinton's best friend.

Richard Pollock from The Daily Caller goes on to say: ''Lovinger specifically protested $11.2 million in ONA contracts awarded over a decade to the Long Term Strategic Group, a company owned by Jacqueline Newmyer, a childhood friend of Chelsea Clinton. Clinton and Newmyer first met each other while attending Sidwell Friends School, an exclusive private Quaker school in the Nation's Capital. They were in each others' weddings, and, in 2011, Chelsea referred to Newmyer as her best friend.

''Lovinger's attorney, Sean M. Bigley, accuses Baker of continuing the . . . contract''—with Chelsea Clinton's friend—''in the hopes it could help him in a Clinton Presidency.

'''We submit that Baker's interest was his awareness of the LTSG-Clinton connection; his presumptive desire to exploit that to his advantage in the event of a Clinton election win; and the fact that contractors like LTSG served as a lucrative landing pad for ONA retirees,' Bigley charged in a September 13 letter to Rear Admiral Kevin Sweeney, chief of staff for Defense Secretary James Mattis.

''The IG's decision to launch a preliminary investigation occurred as former high-profile national security officials are beginning to publicly weigh in about Baker's allegedly retaliatory actions.

''Richard Perle, Ronald Reagan's former Assistant Secretary of Defense, told the DCNF of Lovinger, 'He has been treated so badly. It's a disgrace.' ''

He is talking about the whistleblower who pointed out this unseemly relationship and unfair awarding of contracts to the Clinton friend.

Richard Pollock from The Daily Caller goes on to say: ''Perle called Baker 'a shallow and manipulative character that should have gone with the change in administration.' ''

Baker being the Obama holdover.

In any event, it is just incredible when you think there surely can't be any more shoes to drop about improprieties from the last administration. They just keep coming.

But as a former prosecutor, former judge, former chief justice, what occurred in a decision by the jury in the Kate Steinle homicide is really extraordinary. You know, when I was handling cases as a felony judge, I know sometimes juries surprised me. But in this case, for a jury to find that he wasn't—this person, this illegal alien who had been deported five times and who should have been deported the sixth, except San Francisco was protecting him, to the detriment of its residents, the jury comes back and says he wasn't even negligent in firing the gun that killed Kate Steinle. I mean, that is just staggering beyond words.

But when a verdict is seen that just goes against what the evidence shows clearly, I mean, it could have easily found that, yes, they don't find him to be credible; but, of course, you had the judge—number one, you had the judge protecting him, going way beyond what would seem normal to many judges in order to protect this guy.

His story was apparently that—well, actually he had several stories. So anytime a jury is presented with several different stories about how something happened coming from the same individual who is on trial, normally, is my experience in noticing, that if a jury finds that you lied to them about one thing, they seem to find it easier to find you guilty of what you are charged with. That often happens.

Even sometimes when I might have been surprised that they could find someone guilty of the more serious charge, when there is a lesser included, like there was in this case—but it went back to where the jury felt like he had

lied to us on this, so he is probably guilty of the crime. I mean, I am just talking from a practicality standpoint the way sometimes jurors look at things.

But in this case, it didn't bother the judge. And from what the jury was allowed to hear, that the judge didn't obstruct, it should have been clear this was not an honest individual and that there is likely a very good chance he would lie to avoid a murder conviction, and that is why the different stories about how he came to shoot Kate Steinle as she walked along arm-in-arm with her father. Just incredible.

This story from John Diaz of the San Francisco Chronicle says: ''As they awaited the verdict in the trial of Kate Steinle's accused killer, her parents and brother had one overriding wish. It had nothing to do with the severity of the defendant's conviction.

''Above all, they wanted it to mark the end of a public profile they neither sought nor enjoyed. Each media interview, each exploitation of Kate's name for political gain, each still shot of her smile on television only amplified the anguish of their loss. Yet they also wanted to convey their appreciation for the many strangers who, having heard their story, offered solace and assistance.

'' 'We just want to get this over with and move on with our lives and think about Kate on our terms. Nothing's been on our terms. It's been on everyone else's terms,' said Jim Steinle, who was strolling with his 32-year-old daughter on a crowded San Francisco pier when she was shot and killed July 1, 2015. He, his wife, Liz Sullivan, and their son, Brad Steinle, sat down with the Chronicle recently at their longtime East Bay home for an exclusive interview they planned to be their last.

'' 'We have never had a second of anger—not a moment,' Jim said. 'Frustration, maybe, and sadness for sure, but no anger and no retaliation or vindictiveness or anything like that. We're not that kind of people. Even if this guy gets 100 years in prison, it doesn't solve anything; it doesn't help anything. We would just like people to know . . . that's the Steinles' feelings.'

''They had decided not to attend court to hear the jury's decision.

''On Thursday, the verdict arrived: Jose Ines Garcia Zarate was acquitted of all murder and manslaughter charges. He was convicted merely of being a felon in possession of a firearm.

'' 'We're just shocked—saddened and shocked . . . that's about it,' Jim said. 'There's no other way you can coin it. Justice was rendered, but it was not served.'

''Brad said he was 'not surprised,' considering the 'epic failure' that led Garcia Zarate to be released on the streets and end up with a loaded handgun on the pier that day.''

□ 1200

''I'm stunned that they couldn't even get him on using the weapon,'' Brad said.

It really is staggering. The jury could not find him guilty of even a negligent-type homicide.

Okay, you could have reasonable doubt, apparently. I don't think most people would. But, in San Francisco, all they hear about from the media and elected officials is how the illegal aliens are the victims and not so much someone like Kate Steinle as a true victim. That sets a jury up to make an inappropriate finding.

The Washington Examiner reports today, Anna Giaritelli:

''Thousands of Twitter users on Friday were urging people to #boycottsanfrancisco after a jury there decided Jose Ines Garcia Zarate, a five-time deported Mexican man charged with shooting and killing Kate Steinle, was not guilty.

''The Boycott San Francisco hashtag began trending on Twitter Friday morning as people vowed not to travel there or buy goods or services produced in the city.''

Mr. Speaker, I don't normally advocate any type of boycott, and I really don't here. My thought is that people need to consider their own safety. When they are in dangerous places in the world, our State Department will issue a travel warning to Americans: Be careful. Try to avoid this area. It is not safe. It is dangerous.

And I think that the Nation should have gotten a picture that in San Francisco they are far more concerned about making sure that illegal alien felons have a place for a hangout—a hideout. The Hole-in-the-Wall Gang would have been, apparently, very welcome there if they had only been illegal aliens, instead of simple outlaws.

It is as if they want a monument in the Bay with a sign reading: Give us your outlaws, so long as they come in illegally.

I have an article, also in the Washington Examiner by Anna Giaritelli. The headline is: ''Trump: Kate Steinle verdict more reason to 'Build the Wall!' '' The President is exactly right; he is exactly right.

I go back to the case of the gentleman who was, obviously, in the country illegally. I recall he had had nine DWIs. On a third DWI in Texas, it can be raised up to a felony. That is how he ended up in my court, but not on the third DWI. He had had many DWIs. It was not brought to the DA's attention, because we had a terrific DA, but it just wasn't brought to his attention that this guy already had so many DWIs.

The immigration authorities hadn't done anything, until, finally, he was driving drunk, hit another car, and did serious injury to people in the car. They were very loving, caring people. But he was clearly an alcoholic.

So I sent him to prison, considering the safety of people in Texas. This guy was out there driving drunk that many times. It was a wonder he hadn't killed somebody. He certainly would kill somebody if he was not stopped. And, since he had not been deported, I felt, considering the need for deterrence, for punishment, for public safety, all that dictated that I needed to send him to prison; so I did.

I was shocked that, within about 6 months, he was in my court again. I recognized him, and I asked him what he was doing back in my court. He said that he was charged with another DWI as a felony. I said: But I ordered him to prison. How does he end up, just in a matter of a few months, being back in my court for another felony?

And he explained that, about 3 months after I sent him to prison, he was picked up by the immigration authorities at the prison, taken to the border, ordered to walk across the border, and he did. And he said that he waited until they drove away, and then he walked back across the border and ended up back in Smith County, Texas.

So, on that occasion, I thought: Man, they are going to only deport the man if I send him to prison. And we don't have a wall. President Clinton certainly was not enforcing the border sufficiently during those years, so I thought: I still have to protect people here; so I will send him to a lockdown felony substance abuse facility where he is in a lockdown, he can't go anywhere, a confined place, with others who are either drug addicts or alcoholics.

I got a report 3 or 4 months after he went into the felony punishment for substance abuse defendants that the immigration authorities at the time picked him up and took him to the border. And if it happened the way that he was deported the time before, as he told me, they told him to walk across the border, he did, he waited until the border officials, the immigration officials, left, and then he came right back across the border immediately.

The only thing I don't know is where he ended up, if he continued to follow the trend and continued coming back into the country. A law enforcement officer said: Well, one thing for sure, he knows he doesn't want to come back to your court because he is going to get locked up one way or another. So, in all likelihood, after the immigration officials drove away, he probably came back and went to somebody else's county where he heard they didn't have a judge like me who would enforce the law.

But it put people at risk, and Americans have known that. And Candidate Trump promised to do something about it, and he sure is trying, but he needs Congress' help.

I still don't have any doubt that, at some point, we are going to get concessions from Mexico that will pay for the wall, but it needs to be done for our own safety, our own benefit. And even though there are those who say that is an outrageous thing to do to Mexico, it actually is the kindest, best thing we could ever do for Mexico.

Those who have been there—my wife and I honeymooned in Mexico—it is a

beautiful, beautiful place, a wonderful place. We have vacationed there, certainly not in recent years. But it is incredible, the beauty that lies in different places in Mexico.

And we know—from people there and from people who have come from Mexico into the United States: many of them I have gotten to know and love, people I went to church with, people who came legally—these are hardworking, God-fearing folks. And although it might be an over generalization, still the fact is that most of the people who emigrate to the United States from Mexico whom I have ever gotten to know—and it is a lot—they love God, they love their family, and they are hardworking.

I also have to think an abundance of those three feelings are what made America the greatest, freest, most opportune country in the history of the world.

I was reading again last night about Solomon's reign in Israel. Israel didn't even have the individual assets during that incredible wise man's reign—well, wise until he started having so many wives. That will take anybody's wisdom away from them. But an incredible place to have lived, with all of the advantages that were found in Israel, back during Solomon's reign.

But they didn't have individual opportunity, individual assets, individual freedoms, like we have in America. And some people get to thinking—because they don't know the history of the world—they get to thinking that: Gee, even if things don't work out and we lose our freedom here in America, another America will pop up somewhere: a country that loves freedom to the extent that its own citizens will travel to other places in the world and fight and die for other people's freedom. I mean, there has just never been a place like the United States of America.

And I have mentioned him before, and I will mention him again. The gentleman from west Africa named Ebenezer, an older gentleman, who, with other west Africans, met with me before I left. My wife had been there with Mercy Ships. And, ultimately, at the end of our reception together, he pointed out and said: America has been getting weak, and we were excited when you elected your first Black President, but we have seen America get weaker and weaker. And you need to know and tell people in Washington that when America gets weak, we suffer. He said: You know, we are Christians. We all know where we are going when we die. But our only chance of having peace in this life is if America is strong.

There has not been another country, that I can find, in the history of the world that fought for, not imperialism, as some ignorant of history have said about the United States. Obviously—it should be obvious—not imperialism, because people in Germany and France speak German and they speak French, and people in Japan speak Japanese.

I mean, we were not out for imperialism, we were out for freedom. We liberated Kuwait under George H. W. Bush. We didn't demand that they become colonies of the United States. They are an independent nation.

In Bosnia, in so many places, we have spilled American blood for the freedom and benefit of others. There has never been a nation like this that had so many individual assets and opportunities. But whether or not they will continue has a lot to do with what this body does.

A wall between us and Mexico—where it is appropriate, where it is needed—would be the best thing that we could do for Mexico because they have the natural resources, they have a better location for trade than the United States. They have hardworking, God-fearing people. So why are they not one of the top ten economies in the world?

□ 1215

It is clear the answer is corruption.

Why is there so much corruption in Mexico? Because of the drug cartels and the drug money, the tens or hundreds of billions of dollars—billions, with a B, of dollars—that has gone to the drug cartels through the purchases of drugs, and, of course, they have gotten into bringing people across the border illegally.

Border patrolmen have told me on many occasions I have been down there during the night that there is not an inch of the border between Mexico and the United States that is not under the auspices of some drug cartel.

Some drug cartels, I was told, allow some Mexican gangs to carry out their jurisdiction and enforce their jurisdiction on that part of the border they control, but what the border patrolmen would tell me is that there is no one who comes across the border illegally in that drug cartel's sector who does not pay or does not do something to get the permission of the drug cartel to come in; because they are all told, when they are brought in illegally, that for those who still owe money and have agreed to work in the city where you are ordered to go by the drug cartel, if you fail to keep paying the drug cartels the money you owe them, you keep selling drugs to repay the money or engage in prostitution to repay the money, if you fail to do that: We have people all over the U.S. They will come and they will kill you.

This stuff is going on in the United States.

When Woodrow Wilson was President, certainly not my favorite President, but even Woodrow Wilson, after a Mexican gang led by Pancho Villa came across the U.S. border one time too many and killed a bunch of American families, Woodrow Wilson said enough is enough. They didn't have the wherewithal to build a wall where they needed it back then, so he sent American troops. Something new called the National Guard was also utilized.

I have asked for the official number of U.S. troops that Woodrow Wilson, as President, sent to the border to enforce the border, and I have gotten anywhere from 15,000 to 150,000. I continue to get different figures. It may have been 75,000. Regardless, Woodrow Wilson sent American troops to stop people from illegally entering the country. He also sent a general after Pancho Villa.

In the last administration, I have heard it said that no one has done more than the Obama administration to protect our border.

I know no one said that intentionally misleading. They just were not aware that Woodrow Wilson sent potentially tens of thousands of American troops to the border so that nobody came across into the United States illegally to kill Americans the way Pancho Villa had done that invoked President Wilson into sending the troops.

President Trump doesn't want to have to send so many precious American lives to stand around the border protecting us. Why should they, when, in so many places, all we need is to build a wall and have it enforced the way Israel enforces its wall.

The irony about the Israeli wall, as I have visited and been shown around their so-called wall, 75 percent of the Israeli wall that has saved an abundance of children's lives who were being killed by Palestinian radical Islamists—they could walk across, right into a basketball court or a schoolyard, blow themselves up, killing as many children as they could; walk into a restaurant where innocent people were sitting, having pleasant times together, many families, and blow themselves up to kill as many Israelis as possible. They did a remarkable job of cutting the violence by building a wall, 75 percent of which is a fence. The difference is, though, that their fence is monitored 24/7, and nobody comes across without them noticing and having people on the spot before the person can actually get across.

We could do that. If Israel can do that, we could do that.

Although there are Mexican leaders who have appeared to have been outraged, they have to know deep in their heart that, if we build a wall and stop the flow of American money, billions of American dollars into Mexico's drug cartels, they can't fund the corruption; they can't keep killing any police official that gets in their way, putting their heads on pikes to set an example for others that you don't mess with the drug cartels in Mexico.

If we bring that flow of billions of dollars to a tiny trickle, then Mexico can begin to experience the kind of success that they should be experiencing. We could be the best neighbor Mexico could ever have if we just help them by building a wall, stopping anything from crossing the border illegally, including drugs, and you would have people wanting to go to Mexico and live permanently from America if they could trust the law enforcement situation there, which they really can't right now.

I know there are plenty of Americans who have bought property there, but the restrictions on Americans buying property in Mexico is so significant, if we applied the same terms on Mexicans seeking to buy property in America, the whole of Mexico would be absolutely outraged that we were treating them the way they treat us.

As this article in the Washington Examiner points out that President Trump said it, and he is accurate in saying it, the Kate Steinle verdict is one more reason to build the wall. I hope and I pray we won't have to wait until more people are killed, as is occurring regularly, by illegal aliens.

It doesn't even have to be deaths. I mean, constituents of mine have been harmed by people who come into this country illegally, driving without a driver's license or driving without insurance, hitting cars, whether they do injury to the occupant or not.

I mentioned before, a girl weeping. She is in high school. She has to work. An illegal alien rammed her car, had no insurance, and she and her mom, single mom, could only afford the insurance for others, liability insurance; they couldn't afford the insurance to cover themselves, so she couldn't replace her car. If she can't replace her car, she cries that: I can't work, and my mother and I can't live.

How can you let people come in illegally and do such harm to Americans and wreck our lives? He even drove away in his car without a license, without insurance. He drove away in his car after he totaled hers.

It is time that we did the job we took an oath to do. If we enforce the Constitution, the laws of the land, then Americans will be protected and we become stronger.

Because of the idealistic nature of this Nation, it has assured the freedom of more and more people: first the people in our own Nation—the Constitution eventually came to represent what it said, all people were to be treated equally—and now to the point that, for 100 years, we have been in wars off and on that ensured freedom for others as well.

It is time to build the wall.

In the meantime, hopefully, we are about to have a major tax reform bill. I would like to have seen a flat tax across the board. You make more, you pay more. The more you make, the more you pay. That is not what we have done, but it is a reform.

It will mean that even more poorer Americans pay no income tax, and the poorer working poor, fewer of them will pay any income tax, and people will pay less tax.

The only rate that is not lowered in the tax proposal the House and Senate had was the wealthiest Americans. That was left at 39.6 percent.

Some of us think we should have had a smooth, even percentage cut across the board for everybody. How could you argue that that was not fairness? Republican leaders thought: No. We will leave the highest rate on the wealthiest Americans. We will leave that percentage right where it is so we can't be accused of taxing the poor to help the rich.

Now, some will take the actual numbers of the amount of money that will be saved and say: See, people who are making more are saving more.

Well, yeah. People who pay a lot more in income tax will save a little bit, but not nearly the percentage that people who are the working poor will save percentagewise.

The best thing for the American economy will be the cut in corporate taxes. The corporate tax has been a gimmick by both parties for so many years, telling people: Oh, no. These rich, greedy corporations, we will make them pay.

Well, that is hiding the ball, because the fact is no corporation can stay in business unless they pass on the cost of the corporate tax to their customers, their clients, for their goods and services. They have to pass on that cost or they can't stay in business. They just can't.

We have the highest corporate tax of any industrialized nation in the world. China is a little less than half of our 35 percent. That is why President Trump was pushing so hard, as were many of us: Let's at least take it to 15 percent.

Whatever the percentage is, unless it is zero, it is a tariff on Americans' goods and services. How insane for a country to put a tariff on its own goods and services so that it makes us less competitive in the world market.

If you took away the 35 percent tariff called the corporate tax on American-made goods, we could compete globally; but because we put such a huge tariff on our own goods, 35 percent, then our goods are far too often not competitive in the world market.

□ 1230

If we make our own products competitive anywhere, people around the world, if American prices were more competitive, they would love to buy American products.

When some of us went to China, talked to CEOs about why they moved there, I heard the number one answer being the corporate tax.

I loved hearing them say: Now, our best quality control was in America.

We have got better quality control. We have got better quality of workers. I love hearing that around the world. Yeah, the best workers are in America, best quality control for our products is in America, lowest margin of error among our plants is in America. We make good stuff. Those who take pride in what they do, that is an American way.

People would love to buy them, but not when our 35 percent tariff we put on our own corporate-made goods are not able to compete as they would if we removed it.

But at least at the 15 percent the President and some of us were pushing for—we would have undercut China's income tax for corporations, and just even a point or two undercutting China's income tax or corporate income tax would have brought so many manufacturing jobs back to America.

I know there are elitists in America who say: Well, yeah, but those manufacturing jobs, those are not for classy countries like America. No, we have evolved upward into a service economy. We provide elegant services. We are not into manufacturing goods. We leave that to more developing nations.

But the historical fact is clear: any powerful nation that cannot manufacture what it needs in a time of war will not be a powerful nation past the next war.

Just as Jesus assured there will always be wars and rumors of war, we have to be aware. As long as we are in this world, we have to protect our country, protect ourselves, and it doesn't matter if you are a Christian or not a Christian. Those who are Christian sometimes say: Oh, yeah, but Jesus said we have got to love our neighbors as ourselves. Blessed are the meek, his Sermon on the Mount and all.

That is absolutely the way Christians are supposed to live, but when they are acting as the government, we are to be mindful of Romans, Romans 13. The government is to be an encourager of good conduct. We are not supposed to design programs to lure people away from their productivity, lure them away from their potential and that wonderful, awesome feeling of multiple employers wanting you to come work for them.

Too many young people have never experienced that. I really believe, with a major tax cut like we have passed in the House, there will be more and more young people that will know that feeling. It is such a gratifying feeling when multiple firms want you to work for them. You can decide whether you want to be on your own, start your own business, or go to work for someone. It is just an awesome feeling.

The economy has struggled so, never hit 3 percent growth in any year in the last 8 years, and now we have had 2 months back-to-back where we hit over 3 percent growth. If we can do that, we are going to bring in more Federal revenue, even with the lower taxes. It is going to be great for America. People are going to see what it is like to have more companies wanting you.

We do need to come to grips with the number of people we are allowing in this country, both illegally and legally. No country in the world allows a million people to come into its country legally like the United States does. We allow that many legally.

I happen to be helping a fellow Texan who emigrated from Mexico, has been here on visas legally for 15 years. She is trying to get her citizenship. She has done everything she can legally, but it gets really frustrating for someone from Mexico who is following the rules,

following the law, doing everything according to American law.

That is the kind of person we want to come here, someone who has respect for the law.

We are helping her try to get her citizenship, but, unfortunately, that part of our government is only now looking at applications from September of last year. Hoping not to have to get yet another visa, surely this greatest Nation in the world could move faster on applications for citizenship and visas. Surely we could at least work as fast as Third World nations that don't have computers. Apparently, in some cases, we don't.

We owe it to all of those who have sought to come into America legally and to all of those who were born here, at least born here and are American citizens. The children of diplomats who are born in the United States are not U.S. citizens.

Originally, when the 14th Amendment passed—and you can go back and look at the debate, back at the time—the advocates for the 14th Amendment were saying obviously there will be people who have children born in America whose children will not be citizens. They contemplated that would be diplomats from foreign countries who are in this country legally as diplomats of foreign countries. Their children would not be citizens, and they are not.

They also contemplated that, if you snuck into this country illegally, certainly your children would not be citizens. That would be insane. Yet what they thought would be insane is the way things have been interpreted for far too long.

We ought to be able to say who can come into the country legally and approve anybody who comes in, whether legally or illegally, for citizenship on our own terms. That is the way it needs to be if we are going to perpetuate this amazing blessing of a country.

I didn't deserve to be born here, but I was. And if we are going to continue to be a light on the hill that so many hundreds of millions of people around the world want to come to, then we can't let hundreds of millions of people come here or it would overwhelm the country and it would no longer be a place anybody wanted to come. At that point, the greatest hope for peace in the world, the United States, would cease to be the United States we have come to know and love.

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

RECOGNIZING WORLD AIDS DAY

(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, I thank you, and I want to extend my courtesies to the gentleman from Texas for his courtesy as well, Mr. AL GREEN.

I stand here today because this is World AIDS Day. Since 1988, we have commemorated World AIDS Day. I have on my lapel, if you will, on my shawl, a red ribbon which symbolizes remembrance.

Earlier today I called in to the Thomas Street Clinic, as I have celebrated with them for many years, and while I was in Washington, I wanted to give them the recognition as fighters against HIV/AIDS.

It does not seem that long ago, but HIV/AIDS affected many around the world before the disease even made its way to America's shores. Countless researchers, healthcare providers, politicians, and educators have contributed to the global initiative to contain and eventually eliminate its presence in all corners of the world.

I remember going to Zambia on the first Presidential trip dealing with HIV/AIDS around the world. 38.6 million people worldwide were living with HIV at the end of 2005, and more than 25 million have died of AIDS since 1981.

In December, we remember that, and that is what this day is: a day of remembrance, when an estimated 1 million to 1.2 million HIV-positive individuals live in the United States and approximately 56,000 new infections occur every year.

Mr. Speaker, my district is impacted, upwards of 22,000 people. Texas is impacted.

Today is a day of remembrance to honor those we lost and to commit to those we fight for.

Mr. Speaker, established by the World Health Organization in 1988, December 1st is universally known as World AIDS Day.

World AIDS Day serves to focus global attention on the devastating impact of the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

All governments, national AIDS programs, churches, community organizations and individuals are given the opportunity to display their commitment to fight this deadly disease.

It has been more than 30 years since the first AIDS case was reported in the United States.

It does not seem like it was too long ago, but HIV/AIDS had affected many around the world before the disease even made its way to America's shores.

Since then, countless researchers, healthcare providers, politicians, and educators have contributed to the global initiative to contain and eventually eliminate its presence in all corners of the world.

Although HIV/AIDS is no longer a mysterious and mischaracterized entity, it is the most relentless and indiscriminate killer of our time.

And though a diagnosis is no longer the sealing of an immediate fate, it is the beginning of an indefinite battle for life, adequate health care, and for social belonging.

With an estimated 38.6 million people worldwide living with HIV at the end of 2005, and more than 25 million people having died of AIDS since 1981, December 1st is a date which serves to remind everyone that action makes a difference in the fight against HIV/AIDS.

Let there be no mistake, we are here to acknowledge that AIDS is a deadly enemy against which we must join all our forces to fight and eliminate.

Americans should be reminded that HIV/AIDS does not discriminate.

With an estimated 1,039,000 to 1,185,000 HIV-positive individuals living in the U.S., and approximately 56,000 new infections occurring every year, the U.S., like other nations around the world, is deeply affected by HIV/AIDS.

The detrimental effects of HIV/AIDS have also hit home. More than 65,000 people in Texas are living with HIV.

Thirty-six percent more Texans are living with HIV today than just seven years ago. In 2010, studies showed that 1 in every 3 diagnosed persons in Texas were not getting proper medical treatment.

We must make certain that every affected individual receive efficient medical treatment that will afford them long life.

Not only is the state of Texas suffering from HIV and AIDS, but my district, the 18th Congressional District of Texas, has seen an increasing number of people living with the disease.

In 2010, there were over 22,000 reported persons living with HIV (non-AIDS) in the greater Houston area, and more than 9,000 reported persons living with AIDS.

This problem continues to escalate as there have been 1,700 new infections each year among individuals in Harris County, particularly among racial and ethnic minorities.

We must continue to fight a tough fight to reverse all of these costly and tragic trends.

I will continue to sponsor and co-sponsor legislation that addresses the HIV/AIDS epidemic.

The fight is not over.

We must continue to stand strong in our struggle to conquer some old and new challenges that we as Americans and members of the global community encounter.

Today, Friday, December 1st, is World AIDS Day.

And, we will focus on HIV/AIDS, prevention and awareness, and continue to fight for life.

Together, we will help all of our friends, relatives, and children live healthy and full lives.

REASONS WHY PRESIDENT DONALD J. TRUMP SHOULD BE IMPEACHED

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

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the leadership for this opportunity. I greatly appreciate any opportunity to stand here in the well of the Congress of the United States of America.

I rise today, Mr. Speaker, because I do love my country. I rise because I want persons to know that there are certain things that are not being presented properly, and one of the things that is not being presented properly as it relates to impeachment is the notion that a President has to commit a crime to be impeached. I would like to talk about this for a moment and then address some of the issues associated with impeachment.