



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, WEDNESDAY, MARCH 7, 2018

No. 40

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. MARSHALL).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,

March 7, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable ROGER W. MARSHALL to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,

Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

TURNING ABUNDANCE INTO SCARCITY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, Frederic Bastiat, the great 19th century economist, posed a simple question that we need to think about carefully as we consider tariffs and trade wars.

What is better: abundance or scarcity?

The answer might seem self-evident, but protectionists down through history just don't seem to grasp it.

Suppose widgets cost \$1 in Canada, but \$2 in America. That means you can buy twice as many Canadian widgets by importing them. That is called abundance.

But some say that is not fair. We need to slap a \$1 tariff on Canadian widgets to level the playing field. That means we can only afford to buy half as many. There is no more perfect way to turn abundance into scarcity than by levying a tariff on imports.

Yet that is what was precisely proposed for steel and aluminum. By slapping a tariff on foreign steel imports, the amount of steel Americans can afford will diminish as the price rises, so, too, the price of everything we make from steel, from cans to cars.

We are told this is necessary to save American steel jobs. Well, Bastiat would tell us that what we cannot see is just as important as what we can. We see the American steel jobs the tariff has saved by blocking foreign competitors. What we don't see as clearly are the jobs that disappear in every American industry that uses steel as their prices rise and demand for their products falls.

Remember, every producer in a society is also a consumer. No consumer benefits from higher prices, and no producer benefits from scarcer materials.

Every country that has cried protectionism has suffered terribly, including ours. Thomas Jefferson thought high tariffs could fund the government and promote domestic manufacturing. That caused a devastating recession that nearly destroyed our fledgling economy. Herbert Hoover responded to the recession of 1929 with the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. It didn't end well.

Trade is simply the exchange of goods, and both parties have to benefit from the trade or it just doesn't happen. If I pay you \$1 for a cup of coffee, I am telling you that your coffee is worth more to me than my dollar, and you are telling me that my dollar is

worth more to you than your cup of coffee. When we make that exchange, we both take away something of greater value than we had.

But what happens if we slap a \$1 tariff on that cup of coffee. Only two possible things: I am either going to buy less coffee, or I am going to buy less of other things to afford the tariff. Neither is good for the economy.

True, some governments subsidize their exports, and that puts our producers at a great disadvantage. In effect, these governments are picking up part of the tab for the stuff that we buy. As Milton Friedman observed, that is simply foreign aid to American factories and consumers, paid for by the unfortunate taxpayers in the exporting countries. The appropriate response for us is to say, "thank you."

Yes, that hurts the 140,000 American jobs that produce steel. But the other 6.5 million Americans who manufacture products using steel can make more of their products, causing their producers to hire more workers and to pay them more. Jobs will disappear in the steel mills, but they will reappear as better jobs in industries that can now obtain more steel at lower prices.

What would happen if we had a war?

Bastiat answered that question 150 years ago. He said trade, by its very nature "is a reciprocal dependence. We cannot depend on the foreigner unless the foreigner depends on us." If war clouds should gather between Canada—our biggest foreign supplier of steel—and the United States, we might face the prospect of losing their steel, but Canada would lose all of the American resources and products that their steel exports buy. Trade reduces the risk of war because it increases the value of peace.

Bastiat marveled at how much we spend to build ports and harbors, railroads and highways, all for the sole purpose of surmounting the obstacles to trade that nature has created. What

□ This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., □ 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H1445

sense does it make to erect artificial barriers to replace the natural ones that we have overcome?

By that same token, President Trump has set the stage for rapid economic expansion by reducing the tax and regulatory burdens that were crushing our economy, and the economy is responding. What sense does it make to ruin that progress by replacing the taxes and regulations we have shed, with new ones?

BLOCKING IMMIGRATION LEGISLATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIERREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIERREZ. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I talked about immigrants Donald Trump doesn't really care for, like the Dreamers who were raised in the United States and are now vulnerable to deportation. Then there are the refugees from war and religious persecution. He doesn't really care for them either.

Let's see, there are the people from El Salvador, Haiti, or Africa—the people from shithole countries. Trump would rather deport than protect them. And he doesn't want them coming here legally either.

No, as we all know by now, Trump prefers immigrants from snowhole countries like Norway. Yep, you take a look at the Winter Olympics leaderboard of the countries that won medals and that is a pretty good list of who Trump wants to have here. Norway, check. Canada, great. Netherlands, okay. And we better add Russia to that, too.

President Trump has been blocking any kind of immigrant legislation because he will only agree to protect Dreamers from deportation if he can eliminate whole categories of legal immigration. And not just any immigration, but specifically the programs that are filled with people who want to come to the United States legally from Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

He is especially opposed to diversity in our immigration system, and among the programs he insists we eliminate is the one most often used by immigrants from Africa.

So Trump's immigration approach is pretty simple: If you are White, you are all right. If you are Brown, you are a little lower down. And if you are Black, just go back.

The other group of people Trump is particularly angry about are family members of U.S. citizens—yes—and those who are on the path to becoming U.S. citizens. He insists that we need to take away the rights of U.S. citizens to petition for their family members. Nope, Trump thinks U.S. citizens cannot be trusted to petition for their own family members, which is kind of strange because he doesn't have to look very far to find an immigrant American citizen who petitioned—legally—for Melania's parents to come to the United States.

According to The Washington Post:

"The parents of First Lady Melania Trump have become legal permanent residents of the United States and are close to obtaining their citizenship, according to people familiar with their status. . . .

"Immigration experts said"—they—"very likely relied on a family reunification process that President Trump has derided as 'chain migration' and proposed ending in such cases."

Remember, the in-laws are from Slovenia, and that country won two medals at the Winter Olympics, so I guess they are okay. It is okay, apparently.

Now, let us remember that the First Lady of the United States is here in this country because she applied for, and received, an "extraordinary ability visa," which is often called the Einstein visa because we give it to Nobel Prize winners. But I guess we also give the Einstein visa to musicians and artists and runway models.

The First Lady's extraordinary abilities are many, I am sure. Now, I want you to recall that one of the issues in Jared Kushner's security clearance was that he owes so much money to foreigners, that some people might be able to leverage that debt into an application for another visa program just for millionaires and fat cats. Yes, in America, if you have \$1 million, or you look like \$1 million, you can get a visa. But if you look like a parking attendant or a busboy or a field hand or the king of Wakanda, in the eyes of our President, you are just not welcome in the United States of America.

Look, let me break it down from my perspective. This is not the country we aspire to be. My mother came from Puerto Rico with a fifth grade education, and Puerto Rico has never won a gold medal at the Winter Olympics. But guess what? Her daughter—my sister—is a great public school teacher and her son is a Member of Congress, and I think that is what the American story should always be about. Not special treatment, not special programs just for the rich and the beautiful, and not, apparently, fast-tracking for the President's family, especially when he is going after so many other people's families who look just like mine.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in profanity in debate.

Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

VENEZUELA HUMANITARIAN SITUATION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Florida (Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN) for 5 minutes.

Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise this morning to bring attention to the sad and tragic truth of what is going on in Venezuela today under a cynical socialist thug, the Maduro regime.

Even though this administration has stepped up and has taken a strong stance against Maduro—we have sanctioned a lot of individuals—there is still much more that needs to be done.

And the first step is getting more action by making sure that my fellow colleagues are aware of the ongoing crisis in Venezuela and helping those who refuse to believe that Maduro can be that bad. Yes, he really can be that bad. And we need to understand the suffering and the frustration of the Venezuelan people.

The second step is urging the administration to increase the pressure, to use the tools that are available to us, to hold Maduro and his evil cronies accountable. We have already seen how some of these tools are working, Mr. Speaker.

Our sanctions are working, so much so that Maduro is actively looking at ways to circumvent our sanctions, like this crazy idea of launching his own cryptocurrency. We are hitting him where it hurts, and we need to build on that momentum.

But we must also not forget to advocate on behalf of the people of Venezuela who are suffering, who are malnourished, and who are sick and poor. They lack the most basic medical and food supplies that they need—again, all as a result of Maduro's policies. Who would have ever thought 30 years ago that Venezuela, that was a breadbasket for South America, is now having food shortages throughout the country.

So I call on the international community to try to see what we can do to ease this humanitarian crisis that Venezuelans are going through, because this situation is terrible, but I fear that it will get worse.

Maduro and his thugs are taking advantage of the worsening humanitarian situation, defrauding organizations that are looking to bring much-needed food and medicine into the country, and making it much harder to deliver aid to those who desperately need it.

This is why my dear friend, Ranking Member ELIOT ENGEL of our Foreign Affairs Committee, and I have introduced the Venezuela Humanitarian Assistance Act. This bill calls attention to the food shortages, to the water shortages, to the severe lack of medicine, to the severe lack of medical supplies, and to the lack of other vital goods and services. But, more importantly, it directs our great agencies—the USAID, especially, and the Department of State—to develop a plan to determine how the U.S. can help send in some humanitarian assistance through credible and independent nongovernmental organizations that are operating in Venezuela or in neighboring countries. It is very difficult to get that aid to the people who need it because Maduro does not want to help the suffering Venezuelan people.

This bill passed the House last year, and it sends a strong message that we see the millions of people of Venezuela who are suffering and that we want to