

system and try to understand the old Tax Code.

The standard deduction was something that most people in my district did before, but by doubling it, 94 percent of the people in my district will now utilize the standard deduction. This affects everybody.

Other commonsense provisions, like the earned income tax credit, adoption tax credit, charitable deductions, and retirement savings options are all preserved under the bill. That ensures that families can keep more of their own money.

Now, since this bill passed, being home in the district, I have been to the bank and talked to people. In the grocery store, people have come up to me and told me what a difference this has made in their paycheck—\$50 a week, \$100 a paycheck, \$200 a month. It is real money adding up to the people in my district.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have supported this bill for the expansion it is going to enable in our businesses, for the new jobs it is going to create, and for the people who are going to see it in their paychecks every paycheck.

I recently did a roundtable. We called in businesses and tax accountants and experts on the Tax Code, all together, not only to look at what this new bill has done, but specifically how we would see job growth in our community. Time and time again, I heard from businesses independently owned that talked about the expansion that they are going to see.

We will see a great expansion in growth across this country: seeing money that was invested overseas coming back and reinvested here, markets that we have lost that will now be coming back. Manufacturing, building things again, that is what this bill is all about, supporting American families and the pursuit of the American Dream.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to have supported the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. MCCLINTOCK), a fellow Californian and a member of the House Budget Committee, who represents the Fourth District of California.

Mr. MCCLINTOCK. Mr. Speaker, I think it is important to ask ourselves how legislation is actually doing once it has passed; and 4 months after tax reform, I think it is time to reflect on that.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my colleague from California for organizing this time tonight.

In my California district, the average family is paying \$1,900 less Federal income tax this coming year. That means 1,900 more dollars that they can spend to meet their own needs.

I want to urge everyone to visit a website called taxplancalculator.com. There, you can put your own tax numbers in and calculate how your family will fare under the new tax law this

year. Everyone I have directed to taxplancalculator.com has come back happily surprised.

But the real importance of tax reform is expanding our overall economy. That is the rising tide that lifts all boats.

One provision of the measure allowed companies to write off the full cost of equipment purchases when they make the purchase. But what does that mean in real life?

Well, Ken Steers is president of Freight Solution Providers, a local shipping company in my district that provides worldwide transportation logistics for businesses large and small. He tells me that since the tax reform took effect, his shipping orders for manufacturing equipment have gone through the roof and haven't let up.

Before the tax reform, our corporate tax rate was 35 percent, the highest in the industrialized world. We reduced it to 21 percent.

Aslam Malik is CEO of AMPAC Fine Chemicals in Sacramento and El Dorado Counties. They produce the active ingredient in several cancer and epilepsy drugs. He said they could outcompete their European competitors in terms of quality and technology and service, but many customers told him that even if their product was free, the American tax made AMPAC non-competitive. Well, I checked back with Aslam this week. They have already added \$2 million to their budget for expansion because, literally, a whole new world of business opportunities has opened up for them.

Now, the left says this is just tax relief for the rich. Obviously, they don't understand that this is precisely what produces higher pay, better jobs, greater opportunities, and stronger financial security for every American.

I attended the Oakhurst Rotary Club last week. They have a tradition of donating dollars to the club as they report good news in their own lives.

One Rotarian had been out of work for nearly 2 years. He was on the verge of despair. With tears in his eyes, he announced to the group that he had just landed his dream job with Pfizer pharmaceuticals and that he would now be able to keep his home and stay in the town that he loved. Relief was written all over his face.

To be sure, our economy still faces many threats—trade wars, bad monetary policy, runaway Federal spending—but, clearly, the tax reform is working. From what people are telling me, if it isn't yet morning again in America, it is at least a new dawn.

Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California. Mr. Speaker, 90 percent of Americans will see an increase in take-home pay because of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Under this new law, a typical middle-income family of four will see an average tax cut of over \$2,000. Those cuts will vary from State to State. In California, a family of four will see a cut of \$2,840, and in New York, \$3,129.

Individuals and families will take this money and put it toward their re-

tirements, mortgage payments, or college savings.

There are over 400 Chipotle locations in California. In fact, California has the most Chipotle restaurants in the country. Since the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act passed, Chipotle is providing hourly and salaried workers with bonuses up to \$1,000 or a stock grant. The company is also improving employee benefits and has announced plans to provide additional paid parental leave. These bonuses and increased benefits make a big difference in people's lives.

Chipotle also plans to spend \$50 million to renovate its stores. This means opportunities for construction companies and numerous small subcontractors, which will invigorate local economies, including my home of Orange County.

Tax reform is spurring the free market economy to provide opportunity and an increased standard of living for all Americans.

Mr. Speaker, according to a recent survey, the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act has significantly improved the economic outlook for small businesses. The survey recorded historic highs in the small business confidence index, showing that support for tax reform is growing within the small business community.

In fact, small businesses have rallied around the new tax policy, with over half of the country's small-business owners viewing the law as having a positive effect on their business. Nearly half of small businesses expect to see immediate tax benefits this year. Small businesses are the leading job creators in our country and are the engines of economic growth.

Mr. Speaker, McDonald's is one of the largest employers in California, with over 1,000 locations. Following the enactment of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, McDonald's announced plans to contribute \$150 million to cover tuition costs, expanding its current Archways to Opportunity education program.

Nearly 400,000 employees are eligible for benefits that can be used toward college or trade school. McDonald's now offers \$2,500 per year in tuition benefits for crew members, and \$3,000 per year in tuition benefits for store managers.

Thousands of McDonald's employees will benefit from this enhanced program, and it is thanks to tax reform that companies like McDonald's are able to do more to empower their employees.

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

A RAID ON CONSTITUTIONAL RIGHTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. COMER). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GOHMERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, a very tragic thing occurred for those of us

who care about constitutional rights yesterday. It is a continuation of the travesty that is coming out of the so-called special counsel Robert Mueller.

I am not aware of anybody else in the House or Senate who was as absolutely concerned and livid as I was when I heard about the appointment of Robert Mueller as a special counsel because, from my questioning of the man and from my research from questioning the man during judiciary hearings, I believe he has done more damage to the FBI than all of the FBI Directors put together since J. Edgar Hoover.

□ 2015

He ran off thousands and thousands of years of experience from the FBI in his goofy 5-year up-or-out policy. It works in some areas, but not in law enforcement. That is the one area where law enforcement needs time to build credibility with local law enforcement.

But anyway, these guys were—most of them that he ran off with thousands and thousands of years of experience during his first 10 years, which is the requisite term set up for an FBI Director—those guys were trained to recognize radical Islamist characteristics as to what they were studying, what they believed, things they did, and that was a very helpful thing for the FBI to know.

They began, I guess really got on track after the attempted—well, actually, the bombing of the World Trade Center in 1993. It was incredible, the amount of information the FBI had discerned about radical Islam during the prosecution of The Blind Sheikh, led by Andrew McCarthy, a brilliant lawyer. He was a fantastic prosecutor. I believe Mr. McCarthy said yesterday, in an interview, that he had three prosecutors helping him with what, at that time, was the most important and high-level prosecution of radical Islamist terrorism in our country.

Since then, back in 2008, there was prosecution and conviction of principles involved in the Holy Land Foundation who were convicted for supporting terrorism. The FBI gathered that evidence as well.

Yet, under Robert Mueller, who came in immediately before 9/11—you would have thought that this man would have enough wisdom after seeing the tragedy befall thousands of Americans—what does he do? He crawls in bed with CAIR, one of the named coconspirators in the Holy Land Foundation trial, along with others, and wants to placate them at all costs.

They wanted his training materials that helped FBI agents understand what to look for in trying to find radical Islamist terrorists. They wanted those materials purged, cleaned out of anything that might help educate our FBI agents as to what to look for in radical Islamists, and FBI Director Robert Mueller obliged.

And there was nothing that, I think, draws the distinction about how wrongheaded he was as FBI Director

than his responses when I was asking him about the heads-up that they had gotten over the Tsarnaev older brother who was the main Boston bomber, killed and maimed so many people, totally preventable if Robert Mueller had allowed his agents to know what to look for.

But in frustration, I said: You didn't even go out to the mosque to find out if they had been radicalized. You didn't go out there to find out about the Tsarnaevs at the mosque where they worshipped.

He said they did go out to those mosques in their outreach program. It is where they go play patty-cake, sit around, maybe have a meal together on the floor, something like that. And that is great. That is fine to do. It is a good thing to do. But not when you are ignoring your law enforcement function that will prevent so many people in Boston from having their lives tragically ended or tragically altered and a living hell imposed upon them.

But that was our Robert Mueller. If you go back to his days as the acting U.S. attorney in Boston when, even after it was clear to most everybody else that the FBI had helped frame Whitey Bulger, the mob boss' competitors, and put four in prison, it was clear to most everybody at that point the FBI framed these guys. They didn't do it. And yet Mueller was still riding the parole board demanding that they not let them out on parole, which ended up costing the people of Boston and Massachusetts over \$100 million for Mueller's horrible aide.

The taxpayers of the United States paid less of a price for the years of harassment that Robert Mueller, with his sidekick, James Comey, did zeroing in on Dr. Hatfill as the person who was spreading bioterror. I think they only paid about \$6 million as a result of Mueller's intensity on pursuing the wrong guy, against whom there was not one shred of any evidence that could ever be used.

The only thing they had to justify the many years of torture that the FBI put Dr. Hatfill through was when two dogs—which were later found to have been totally bogus in spotting anything—when they went by Dr. Hatfill, he rubbed their ears, and they seemed to have reacted favorably to having their ears rubbed. That was the only so-called evidence Robert Mueller ever had, and he was relentless.

One thing you have got to give Robert Mueller credit for, he is consistent.

He has destroyed so many lives. He has cost people their lives, but he never apologizes. He always hides behind the words that he is doing his job when he goes about destroying innocent people's lives.

Alan Dershowitz, I disagreed with him so many times on policy matters, but he understands the Constitution. So does Jonathan Turley. As Dershowitz said, he didn't vote for Donald Trump, but he sees what is happening. And he points out in an article

published today in The Hill, he says: "There is much speculation as to the significance of the search of the offices and hotel room of President Trump's lawyer, Michael Cohen. To obtain a search warrant, prosecutors must demonstrate to a judge that they have probable cause to believe that the premises to be searched contain evidence of crime. They must also specify the area to be searched, the items to be seized and, in searches of computers, the word searches to be used."

The problem is there has to be probable cause established by sworn evidence to justify a warrant. And when anyone gets a warrant to go after a lawyer of someone that law enforcement wants to target the way Mueller and Rosenstein want to target Donald Trump, there has got to be probable cause put in the affidavits.

These guys have gotten so used to sending out bogus national security letters like subpoenas. We found out that while Mueller was at the FBI, the IG says there may have been thousands of letters sent out with no basis in fact. This was under Mueller's direction at the FBI.

He may not have known individual letters, but he let things get out of control because, in his mind, when he or any of the people working for him are going after people they think are bad guys, it doesn't matter what they do. They are in the right. And that is exactly how you can lose a constitutional republic that we have.

Dershowitz says: "I believe we would have been hearing more from civil libertarians—the American Civil Liberties Union, attorney groups and privacy advocates—if the raid had been on Hillary Clinton's lawyer. Many civil libertarians have remained silent about potential violations of President Trump's rights because they strongly disapprove of him and his policies. That is a serious mistake, because these violations establish precedents that lie around like loaded guns capable of being aimed at other targets."

"What else does the raid tell us?"

He says: "It seems likely that special counsel Robert Mueller is bifurcating the investigation: He will keep control over matters relating to Russia, the campaign and any possible obstruction. But he has handed over to the U.S. attorney for the Southern District of New York any matters relating to Trump's personal and business affairs."

Well, I would submit to you, having been a prosecutor, defense attorney, felony judge, chief justice, that normally when somebody in law enforcement raids a lawyer's office—and in this case, office, home, and, since they were out of the home while it was being apparently remodeled, they raided the hotel room. When a raid on a lawyer's office—and especially personal lawyers—occurs, the guys raiding that are lawyers know, if they find something, even if it is a potential defendant telling his lawyer, "I am guilty as sin"—we know that didn't happen in

this case because President Trump knows he is not guilty. But even if the target had said that to his lawyer, judges ultimately—even if it has to go to the Supreme Court, that is not going to be admissible. That is going to be protected by the attorney-client privilege.

That is why every defendant who people suspect told his lawyer exactly what he did doesn't have that lawyer's office raided because, if this system of justice is going to work, there has to be two adversarial sides that do the very best they can as long as it is ethical and it is constitutional, following the law.

So the attorney-client relationship means something. It is protected. Courts have made that clear. It doesn't matter what you have got that went between the attorney and client. Now, there were those who say: Well, but, you know, the law, if they are both engaged in fraud, then together—well, you still have got an attorney-client problem with admissibility.

And that is why, normally, when someone in law enforcement raids a lawyer's office trying to target their client, they are looking for something that they can use against that lawyer, hopefully, maybe a bunch of violations, no matter what it is, they can use against that lawyer that doesn't have an arguably protected status of attorney-client, just something to do with the lawyer, so that they can tell that lawyer: Here is what we have got now. We had what we believe was a lawful search, and while we were searching, we found all of this stuff that shows you have committed other crimes. So you are looking at going for life or 1,000 years, whatever it is they happen to use in that particular case. However, if you will simply testify that your client violated the law, you don't go to prison at all. You stay rich. Everything looks good for you. It is only your client who suffers.

Well, in this case, it would be a constitutional republic going down the toilet. Mueller doesn't care. He has shown that over and over. He let Eric Holder get away with all kinds of things—some would say even murder in the Fast and Furious operation where one of our own agents died and potentially hundreds of others across the border died as a result of Eric Holder's Department's actions. But they covered up.

□ 2030

But they covered up. They obfuscated how they had violated the law that resulted in death.

Eric Holder said recently in the press about how he knows Mueller and that Mueller is going to get Trump on something.

There is a reason President Obama extended the horrendous 10 years that Mueller was FBI Director for 2 extra years. Any of my colleagues who really want to go back and see who Mueller is and what he did, I can show you. There is plenty to show the damage that this man has done to our country.

He served valiantly in Vietnam. Great. Congratulations. He deserves awards. But that doesn't give him the right to ruin my country after he gets back, and that is what he has been doing. He is bringing us to the brink of a terrible constitutional crisis.

I think he is also trying to provoke the President to firing Mueller because Mueller knows he doesn't have anything right now. This is a last-ditch effort to try to find something, try to get something, get somebody to testify against the President, even if it is a lie just as it was that put Sergeant Derrick Miller in prison for life whose parole hearing I came back and testified before last week. It is not that hard to get people to testify to a lie against somebody else when you are threatening to take everything they care about away.

Rosenstein needs to be stopped. He was involved in the original Russia uranium investigation as a U.S. attorney. He should never have been allowed to appoint a special counsel. If Rosenstein had any decency and ethics about himself, he should have told Jeff Sessions: I am not the guy who can do this because I was involved in that Russia uranium investigation that enriched Hillary Clinton's foundation \$145 million; I can't do this.

But since he is not ethical, he is not moral, and he doesn't mind keeping the limitations running while they are looking elsewhere rather than at him and Mueller who is also the FBI Director involved in that Russia investigation where Russia was trying to get our uranium, neither one of them should have been able to accept.

Rosenstein has got to go, and his assistant who so often keeps the good people who supported President Trump in the dark, Tash Gauhar, she needs to go. She needs to go, and Rosenstein should follow right out the door. Those people are doing more damage over there. They have got to go, and then we can try to salvage this country and our constitutional Republic.

By the way, tomorrow we are voting on a balanced budget amendment. I came up here wanting a balanced budget amendment, and Congress wanted it passed here, in the Senate, and across the Nation, but I saw very quickly how easy it was to raise revenue—taxes, fees, whatever you want to call it—and if we don't have a spending cap on a balanced budget amendment, it is a prescription for ratcheting up the level of spending taxing, spending taxing, because we just can't get people to vote for real cuts.

We vote to slow the rate of spending sometimes, but real cuts, we couldn't even vote to do that. We had the horrendous thing called the sequestration that gutted our military which we have been trying to make up for. But every time, we add hundreds of billions of dollars just to do what is right by the military.

Now, to cover for the horrendous omnibus that gave CHUCK SCHUMER and

NANCY PELOSI big smiles because of all that they were awarded during that horrendous vote is a huge mistake. I guess it is a cover-our-rear type of action, but it doesn't cover anything. It is like a hospital gown. You only think you are covered. This doesn't cover anything.

BOB GOODLATTE has a good balanced budget amendment that includes a spending cap, but that is not the one we are going to be allowed to vote on. We are not going to be allowed to bring an amendment to put a spending cap on this bill. That is why I voted against it last time.

People say: Oh, but you don't have to worry. There is protection in this against things like that terrible omnibus.

Oh? What is the protection?

Oh, if you look—and I did—it says that it will require three-fifths of a vote from the House and Senate to set aside the requirements of the balanced budget amendment and to raise revenue. So to raise revenue, we have got to have a 60 percent vote; and in that horrendous omnibus, it passed with 60.5 percent of the vote.

This terrible balanced budget amendment we are voting on is such a farce. It would not have even stopped us from hurting future generations in this last omnibus bill. It still would have passed even if the balanced budget amendment we are voting on tomorrow were a part of the Constitution already.

Then you say it won't take effect for 5 years. Please. The Senate is not going to take it up. This is to try to make us look conservative after the omnibus bill. I am sorry, Mr. Speaker, I want a balanced budget amendment that means something, not a hospital gown bill.

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

HOUSE BILLS APPROVED BY THE PRESIDENT

The President notified the Clerk of the House that on the following dates he had approved and signed bills of the following titles:

January 22, 2018:

H.R. 195. An Act making further continuing appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2018, and for other purposes.

H.R. 3759. An Act to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a Family Caregiving Strategy, and for other purposes.

January 29, 2018:

H.R. 984. An Act to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe-Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

H.R. 4641. An Act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

February 9, 2018:

H.R. 1301. An Act making appropriations for the Department of Defense for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2017, and for other purposes.