

I went from being . . . hardly able to move to where I feel like I can do almost anything. Dr. Roy saw me at my lowest, and she has seen me improve so much that she celebrates with me. Dr. Roy kicked me in the seat of the pants, and I will always thank her for it.

Darin got his kick in the seat of the pants, and, Mr. President, with all due respect, I believe Members of this body could use one too.

There are 25 million people who count on community health centers for their care—their children's care, the care of their moms and dads. There are 9 million children who are covered under the Children's Health Insurance Program. They have been waiting and worrying for long enough; 67 days is long enough. I am hopeful that there will be a sense of urgency from colleagues to get this done.

Thank you.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. MORAN). The Senator from Utah.

### TAX CUTS AND JOBS BILL

Mr. HATCH. Mr. President, last week, the Senate came another step closer to providing real tax relief to the middle class and providing a much needed boost to our economy. Yes, I am talking about the passage of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

That bill spent years in the making. As my chief legislative focus for many years, tax reform is not some off-the-cuff effort. No, we have been researching, holding dozens of hearings, commissioning bipartisan working groups, and working with our friends on the other side of the Capitol and down the street at the White House for some time now.

This bill is going to put another \$2,200 in the pockets of the average American family. This bill is going to boost the economy. It is going to grow jobs and finally help end the wage stagnation we have been faced with for years.

This bill is going to unleash the American spirit, bringing businesses back home where they started and encouraging other businesses to both come from abroad, as well as to grow from within. Once again, America will be open for business.

I have not been alone in this process though, not by a long shot. In fact, tax reform has been a priority for many of my colleagues, including some who are no longer serving. I am talking, of course, about people like Congressman Dave Camp and Senator Max Baucus, who did a lot to move this effort forward. I feel gratified to have been here and to have worked with my colleagues to get this far.

As efforts this year began in earnest, we set out to build on the work of our former colleagues and to give low- and middle-income Americans some much needed relief and to give our country an opportunity to compete in the global economy. Our bill will do that, but as we all know, these great reforms are

not quite yet promised to the American people. There is still work to do as we work to iron out our differences with the House and make sure every section of this bill is ready to be eased into law or passed into law.

That said, I think we deserve to celebrate a little bit and, more importantly, to thank everyone for their work to get us to this point. So many people—both in and out of Congress—have worked hard to get us this far, and I want to express my appreciation for their efforts. Of course, I can't thank everyone in a single floor speech, but I do want to thank some who may be within earshot of this Chamber.

First and foremost, I need to thank Secretary Mnuchin and Director Cohn for their commitment to this effort and their help in getting it done. It is good to finally have an administration that is willing to lead out on tax reform. I also want to thank the distinguished majority leader who also did so much to secure the details of the bill and shepherd it through the Senate. Furthermore, I want to thank Chairman BRADY and Speaker RYAN over in the House of Representatives, as well. They, too, have been great partners and leaders in this endeavor.

I also need to thank the staff from the leader's office, including Sharon Soderstrom, Brandon Dunn, Antonio Ferrier, Hazen Marshall, Erica Soares, Terry Van Doren, Don Stewart, and Jane Lee.

Of course, I want to thank the Members of the Senate Finance Committee who put in countless days, weeks, and months in preparing this legislation and helping to get it passed. All of our majority Members contributed greatly to this process, and I am most grateful.

I also want to thank the tax legislative assistants from each of the committee members who helped to craft this bill; namely, Chris Allen, Sam Beaver, Joseph Boddicker, Chris Conlin, Shay Hawkins, Randy Herndon, Bart Massey, Monica McGuire, Mike Quickel, Zachary Rudisill, Andrew Siracuse, Robert Sneed, Derek Theurer, and Mark Warren, all of whom did an outstanding job in helping us to produce this bill.

I also thank the committee's legislative directors: Charles Cogar, Ken Flanz, Chris Gillott, Brad Grantz, Amber Kirchhoefer, Kurt Kovarik, Jessica McBride, Sarah Paul, Landon Stropko, Jay Sulzmann, Stephen Tausend, Pam Thiessen, and Christopher Toppings.

In addition to all of the Senators and staff on the Finance Committee, I need to thank some others. As we all know, this process has been a joint effort with our friends on the Budget Committee. I need to thank Senator ENZI, once again, for his leadership on that committee to give us the reconciliation instruction that made this all possible. Additionally, I would like to thank members of his staff, including Joe Brenckle, Jim Neill, Betsy McDonnell,

Matt Giroux, Paul Vinovich, Becky Cole, Eric Ueland, Thomas Fueller, and the rest of the Budget Committee team.

Closer to home, I thank the staff of the Finance Committee, who have done so much of the heavy lifting here. I need to single out Mark Prater, my chief tax counsel, who has served the committee for decades, and whose knowledge and expertise on these matters is recognized by everyone here and by pretty much everyone everywhere else. I also express my thanks to the rest of my committee tax staff: Jennifer Acuna, Tony Coughlan, Christopher Hanna, Alex Monie, Eric Oman, Marty Pippins, Preston Rutledge, and Nick Wyatt.

Additionally, I need to thank my staff director, Jay Khosla, who quarterbacked the staff through this whole ordeal and who has spent many years with me as we have laid the groundwork and started construction on this undertaking. I want to thank the other members of my senior team as well, including Matt Hoffmann, Jeff Wrase, Julia Lawless, Jennifer Kuskowski, Chris Armstrong, and Bryan Hickman. I need to thank the communications staff on the committee: Katie Niederee, Nicole Hager, and Joshua Blume.

I also need to thank a couple of former staff members: Chris Campbell, my former staff director, who worked for years on this effort. While he is now at Treasury, I am sure he is celebrating right now along with us. I would also like to give a thank-you to Jim Lyons, my tax counsel, who, unfortunately, passed away a little over a year ago. He contributed greatly to this effort for a number of years, and his steady presence has definitely been missed.

Other bodies deserve our thanks as well. Tom Barthold and his team at the Joint Committee on Taxation made themselves available at all hours to help us get this bill written and ready to pass, as did the staff at the legislative counsel's office, led by Mark McGunagle and Jim Fransen, as well as those who work with Elizabeth MacDonough in the Parliamentarian's office.

I am so grateful to all of you for your sacrifices and talents that have allowed us to craft this impressive package.

Unfortunately, though, there are too many people to thank in a single floor speech. So, please, let me express my gratitude to the countless individuals who have helped in this endeavor over the years. This would not have been possible without you.

Before I close, I would like to reiterate that we are not yet there though. I know I will not rest and that I can count on the rest of you to keep going until we have this over the finish line. We are so close to finally giving the American people the Tax Code, and, in turn, the economic growth not only they but their children and grandchildren deserve. It is my solemn commitment to keep working and get this done for all of us.

I yield the floor.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Iowa.

#### BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL OVERSIGHT

Mr. GRASSLEY. Mr. President, I have been doing oversight of the executive branch for a very long time. I have done it as ranking member, I have done it as chairman, I have done it when my party held the White House, and I have done it when the other party held the White House.

Earlier this year, I stood up for the rights of my Democratic colleagues to do oversight of the Trump administration, even while they are in the minority. I did it because it was the right thing to do. Lots of people give lip service to the notion of bipartisan oversight, but very few actually practice it. It is tough. You have to be willing to work with colleagues in the other party to ask tough questions of your own political allies.

You can't just ask. If you actually want answers, you have to follow through. True bipartisan oversight is impossible unless it is a two-way street. If Democrats are unwilling to ask hard questions and force answers from their own political allies, then there is simply no way to move forward together in good faith. Both sides need to be committed to getting the whole story—not just the half they think helps their side. Regardless of whether my Democratic colleagues join me, I am interested in that whole story.

There are two major controversies plaguing the credibility of the Justice Department and the FBI right now. On the one hand, the Trump-Russia investigation, and then on the other hand, the handling of the Clinton investigation. Any congressional oversight related to either one of these topics is not credible without also examining the other.

Both cases were active during last year's campaign. Both cases have been linked to the firing of the FBI Director. I have been trying to explain this to my Democratic colleagues for months. The political reality is, half of the country thinks our law enforcement establishment gave Hillary Clinton and her aides a pass. These questions go to the heart of the integrity of our Federal law enforcement and justice system.

They are not going to go away just because Clinton lost the election. The independent inspector general at the Justice Department certainly isn't ignoring that issue. Democrats and Republicans in Congress have asked the inspector general to look into a host of issues involving the handling of the Clinton investigation during the campaign. His hard work has already uncovered some pretty disturbing information.

Over the past week, the press has reported that an FBI agent was removed from the special counsel's team and de-

moted at the FBI due to—what do you think—political bias. The agent was at the very center of both of these high-profile investigations. High-ranking FBI agent Peter Strzok reportedly used his work phone to send anti-Trump and pro-Clinton text messages to another FBI agent with whom he was having an illicit and immoral relationship.

This man was the Deputy Assistant Director for the FBI's Counterintelligence Division. He worked on the investigation of former Secretary of State Hillary Clinton's use of a private server to conduct—what do you think—official business.

According to news reports and according to documents, it looks like he also helped draft Comey's controversial public statement ending that case of Hillary Clinton and emails. Specifically, he apparently edited out language that suggested legal jeopardy for Clinton. Press reports state he opened the FBI's investigation of allegations of collusion between the Trump campaign and Russia. It has been reported that he was one of the two FBI agents who interviewed former National Security Advisor Michael Flynn.

Can you imagine if the shoe were on the other foot? What if a high-ranking FBI official got caught expressing pro-Trump political bias on his work phone while leading what is supposed to be a professional, objective, and non-partisan search for the truth? Why, of course, if that were happening, Democrats would go ballistic, and they would have every right to go ballistic.

This man held a crucial position of public trust, charged with protecting this country from counterintelligence threats. He was a key part of Director Comey's Clinton investigation and his Russia investigation. I have been saying for months that these two cases are forever linked. You cannot separate them.

The same people in the same agency handled both cases at the same time, and now a huge segment of the American people have no faith that these cases were treated, as they should be, impartially. I don't blame the American people.

It is interesting that before he was fired, FBI Director Comey lectured our Judiciary Committee and lectured the public about how the men and women of the FBI "don't give a rip about politics."

I believe that for most of the hard-working, rank-and-file FBI agents, that is absolutely true. Their jobs normally don't involve controversial political questions, and their own political views aren't relevant because they are professionals.

But no human is perfect, and no organization is immune from error. It does no good for the leaders of the FBI to pretend that its senior management is above all reproach, that they would never show any improper political bias, and that they would never make mistakes.

The only way to protect against bias or misconduct is to recognize that it

exists and to confront it, not to hide it from Congress and the American people.

The law and the facts, whatever they are, should guide the work of the FBI and the Justice Department. If politics infected the Department's decisions during a hotly contested national political campaign, we would have to look at it. That is true whether it occurred in the Clinton case, or in the Trump-Russia case, or if it included both.

Anyone claiming to do bipartisan oversight of the executive branch has to examine both. Ignoring either half of this story simply will not be credible with the other half of the country.

Everyone thought Hillary Clinton was going to be President—everyone. The perception of a huge segment of the public is that the whole Washington establishment worked overtime to get her name cleared before the Democratic Convention last summer. The FBI even called its case "Mid Year Exam."

Director Comey testified that the former Attorney General refused even to name the FBI's work and investigation. That is how political it became. It was really the Attorney General who was at that time insisting on calling it not an investigation but "a matter"—m-a-t-t-e-r—whatever that means.

We have learned that Director Comey started drafting his exoneration statement long before the investigation was done. It looks like there was a rush to clear her. It looks like the fix was in. I know Democrats don't want to hear that. They only want to talk about Trump.

There is a double standard here in the way they desperately want to go after the President but ignore all other potential wrongdoing in the previous administration. It stinks to high heaven.

But Democrats have visions of impeachment dancing in their heads. Rather than reserve judgment and carefully examine the facts—all of the facts—they are jumping to all sorts of conclusions.

The Judiciary Committee has an obligation to do a deep dive into the firing of James Comey and both of the two controversial political investigations that preceded it. Unfortunately, the Democrats are preventing any truly bipartisan path forward. They appear to be assuming the conclusion at the outset.

They complain publicly, and they complain privately that I am not doing enough to investigate "obstruction of justice," but "obstruction of justice" is a legal term of art. It is a conclusion, not evidence. That is not how I conduct my investigations.

I do not make my conclusions first and try to shoehorn the facts to fit my conclusions. I try to get the facts and then go where those facts lead.

Let's consider examples of where investigations have uncovered facts that point to "obstruction."