

chronic deficit of inertia, as the unwanted result of inadequate revenues and a restricted economy, or a temporary deficit of transition, resulting from a tax cut designed to boost the economy, increase tax revenues, and achieve, I believe—and I believe this can be done—a budget surplus. The first type of deficit,” Kennedy warned, “is the sign of waste and weakness. The second reflects an investment in the future.”

Well, Mr. Speaker, if there ever was an investment in the future, it is the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. So JFK got his tax cut enacted after his tragic death, and what happened in the 1960s? We had lower rates, but we had more revenue. Now, how is that possible?

Our critics of our tax reform say: Oh, you can't cut rates and have more revenue.

It is amazing how many people know so little about modern business. If you are sitting in your local hardware store, if you have unwanted inventory, what is the first thing you do to move product? You lower the price. Why? Because you lower the price to sell more goods and services, albeit at a lower price, but a volume increase for more revenue.

It happened during the 1978 capital gains tax cut, the Steiger amendment, when we cut capital gains rates and, actually, revenue went up. Every single time we have cut tax rates in the modern era, the “revenue loss” has been nowhere near the predictions.

So in the 1960s, what happened? We had lower rates, and we had a balanced budget by 1969. Higher revenues grew.

Fast forward to the 1980s. We had the doldrums of the Carter-malaise era when we were told that the era of prosperity was over. We had to put on our cardigan sweaters, button them up, and turn down the thermostat because the good times were not coming back. Get used to it.

Ronald Reagan comes on board. He is pushed by the supply side movement of 1970s and 1980s, and the Kemp-Roth tax cut. And he enacts in 1981—in those days, a Democratic Congress when Democrats realized that economic growth was actually a good thing and you want to celebrate it, they enact Kemp-Roth, bringing the top rate down from 70 to 50 percent.

Now, there was a delay in 1982, you might recall, but then the tax cuts finally kicked in, in 1983. By 1984, it was morning in America again.

Revenues when Ronald Reagan took office were about \$580 billion. By the time the 1980s were over, Federal revenues were almost \$1 trillion. How could it be? How could it be that you cut tax rates and you almost double revenue?

This is an amazing phenomenon that our critics of tax reform just won't heed. They won't understand. They don't want to see it. They don't want to hear it. But it is ironic. What is the first thing that folks who say they want to reduce teenage smoking advocate? Mr. Speaker, they advocate rais-

ing the taxes on cigarettes. Why? Because when you raise taxes on something, you get less of it. You get less activity.

Why is it that if you buy a bond, a 30-year bond or a bond in the open market that is taxable, you demand a higher interest rate, but if you buy a tax-exempt bond you will take a lower rate? Because people do not work for pretax income. They work for after-tax income. And when you lower the marginal tax rates and you increase after-tax income, more people work. More people invest.

It happened in the 1920s. It happened in the 1960s. It happened in the 1980s. And guess what? It is happening right now.

We have a 4.8 percent growth, 4.5 percent growth. Who knows, it may just be 4 percent growth, but considering that we have been at 1.9 percent growth for so long, this is the miracle that keeps on giving and yet won't be acknowledged.

Mr. Speaker, I will tell you why it won't be acknowledged by the other side, because not one of them voted for it. Imagine, a tax bill that doubles the childcare tax credit; a tax bill that lowers the tax rates for mom-and-pop pass-through businesses by letting them deduct the first 20 percent of income; a tax bill that says you don't have to itemize any more to get a bigger deduction, and we are going to double your standard deduction; a tax bill that puts America's corporations in line with the rest of the world, not penalizing America's corporations compared to the rest of the world.

Now we have foreign profits coming back. We have more mom-and-pop businesses expanding. And we have a rising tide of economic growth, a rising tide that lifts all boats.

I thought that is what this body was here to do. We are not here to pick out groups, pick out winners and losers, to have some sort of industrial policy where a command-and-control central government decides who wins and who doesn't. You only gain if you are a political entrepreneur.

The folks out in the real world, businesses and capitalists, they invest for an economic return. But government all too often invests for a political return. We have seen that form of crony capitalism, and it gave us 1.9 percent economic growth. Now, instead of carve-outs and loopholes, instead of favoring some States that like to tax their citizens over States that don't, we have lower rates, broader but lower rates for everyone, and loopholes for fewer, which means economic growth is going to be determined by an economic return.

I don't know how else to describe this. It is an amazing success story in the 115th Congress. Yet you would never know it listening to the other side, listening to our friends in the fourth estate. It is the story they don't want you to know.

But I am here to give you good news. The economic growth that is occurring

will keep occurring because people now have confidence. The green shoots are back. The animal spirits are back. People are excited to be in America. They feel good about their country. They feel this is a place where they can fly as high as their wings can take them without being hindered by the strong arm of the state.

That is what the American Dream is about. That is what the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act is about. And that is what believing in America is about.

I am proud to have played a part in it, however small, and I am proud of Congress for passing the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FERGUSON). 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, it is great to hear my friend Congressman LEWIS. He does a great job explaining such matters.

We had an interesting combined hearing today in the Judiciary Committee and the Oversight and Government Reform Committee. We heard from the inspector general of the Department of Justice, Mr. Horowitz. It was interesting testimony.

But having reviewed the record, it is interesting, because he quoted prosecutor one, prosecutor two, agent one, agent two, agent three, these different people, different prosecutors, different agents that he was relying on; their comments, their opinions, their suggestions; the SSA, Supervisory Special Agent, recommendation and comments on things that should have been and should have not been; and things that were proper and improper. But we had no information who these people were.

The whole reason for the inspector general investigation was because of the massive amount of clear bias that had been unearthed within the Department of Justice, including the FBI that is, of course, under the Department of Justice.

So we are being asked to accept all this information from the inspector general when so much of it depends on the opinions and the comments and the assessments of people whose identity we didn't even know.

So not only did we not know their identity, we don't know if they have texts and emails that are just as condemning of Donald Trump and laudatory of Hillary Rodham Clinton. We don't know what their positions are. And we found out from the inspector general that he didn't make any inquiry. He didn't check on them.

But I know from my days trying cases as a prosecutor, or as a felony judge in Texas, the lawyers, when they are picking a jury, as to who will sit in judgment on their case, they have a

right to know the biases and prejudices, or potential biases and prejudices, of anyone who may be sitting in judgment on their case. So that is why voir dire, as we say in Texas, is allowed, questions of the potential jurors.

Normally, how one votes is completely inappropriate to ask about. That is a secret ballot for a good reason. However, if one of the people on the ballot is the defendant in the case, is a civilian party in a civil case, then the attorneys are going to want to find out: Were you for or against this person? Did you have a bumper sticker for this person or against this person? Did you have a sign in your yard? Did you go around doing block walks trying to push for this candidate?

And as a judge, I know defendants' attorneys. If it were a defendant who had been a candidate, they would be pushing to ask those questions, to find out those questions, and it could lead to challenges for cause in Texas courts—I think in Federal courts as well.

□ 2030

Even if it didn't, I have heard defense attorneys argue many times: We cannot adequately exercise our preemptory strikes if we don't know about potential biases. So we need to know: Did they support this candidate? Were they against this candidate?

I know initially the response of one of my Democratic friends was: Gee, we never ask about how somebody voted.

No, we don't. It is not appropriate—unless someone who is on the ballot is being judged in that court. The same should be true for a grand jury. The same should be true for anybody who is going to pass judgment, and that should also include the people who are charged with bringing forth justice, not the concept of “just us” we have experienced during the recent two terms, but the concept of true justice.

Proverbs talks about the blessed nature of a government that doesn't judge because somebody is rich, doesn't judge because somebody is poor, doesn't give more favor to somebody who is rich, and isn't biased for somebody because they are poor, but does make just decisions based on the case, not on someone's social standing, be it rich or poor. Some are tempted to be biased for the poor, some biased for the rich. But real justice is just following the law regardless of someone's background.

So it is a bit of an anathema, it seems, that you have got an inspector general report based on people who may have worse biases than the people whom they are judging. We don't even know. So I was a little surprised by that.

We had a record of over 500 pages that was just full of some of the worst illustrations of biases ever imaginable. It was interesting. I didn't realize, but apparently back, I believe it was in 2012, there was a case that was lost

that the Justice Department was prosecuting during the Eric Holder days. I had never seen this information until today and didn't see it until after the hearing, but apparently it was even one case where the jurors found somebody not guilty because information came in about the same kind of texting and emails that we were seeing regarding the hatred by some in the Justice Department and the FBI against Donald Trump and for Hillary Clinton.

There was a time when the Federal Department of Justice and the FBI were considered the best law enforcement, the best at providing justice anywhere in the world. That time is not now. In fact, we know that under Eric Holder and Attorney General Lynch, the U.S. Department of Justice went after police departments, local law enforcement, and using the power and almost unlimited money of the Department of Justice, they could overwhelm and force a local law enforcement office into agreeing to a consent decree where the U.S. Department of Justice got to basically supervise whatever they did.

Based on the kind of prejudice, bias, and outrageous actions within the United States Department of Justice and the FBI, it looks like some of those police departments that ended up agreeing to consent judgments might be better off suing the U.S. Department of Justice, exposing how biased and prejudiced they were during the period during which the Department of Justice came after them and was trying to supervise them, show how biased and prejudiced they were. So maybe the local police department should end up getting to tell the Department of Justice when they are acting appropriately and when they are not.

For heaven's sake, it is just incredible how such a great justice organization has been not just compromised, but devastated like a cancerous prejudice and bias, incapable of rendering fair, blind decisions without regard for any bias in favor of or against a litigant.

What a change. What a difference. President Obama is right. He did fundamentally transform America. I really would never have thought we would see the Justice Department after those 8 years end up like it is.

It didn't come out in the hearing, but I was given to understand that after the shock subsided somewhat of Donald Trump winning November 2016 that there was a massive effort just at a rapid pace to try to move people who had been politically appointed by the Obama administration in the Department of Justice and the Department of State, but especially DOJ, Homeland Security, political appointees, trying to get them into civil service jobs so that the Trump administration would not be easily able to get rid of them as every other administration does.

When a new administration comes in, the political appointees tender their resignations. Most are accepted, some

are not. But instead of doing something like that, what we were hearing was that the Obama administration was trying to put them into cubbyhole civil service jobs, so that basically they could still utilize the prejudices and biases that were built up during the Obama administration.

It is just such a dangerous time. As I was sitting there for the hearing, it dawned on me that the kind of bias, just rabid prejudice and hatred not only for a candidate, but the disgust that was on parade in the texts, the email messages, just extraordinary, but that that kind of bias and prejudice may very well be the second biggest threat to Federal justice in America.

It is a cancerous bias. It is probably a cancerous bias in stage IV where it just is eating its way through, creating big holes where there was once a solid Justice Department.

What occurred to me was that that may be the second biggest threat to Federal justice in America, that cancerous bias. But perhaps the biggest threat to Federal justice in America is that I think for the first time in American history, you have one of two major political parties has about half of the country's support without anybody being horribly offended that this kind of bias and prejudice was driving a Justice Department.

I keep going back to when President George W. Bush was in the White House, and when we found out about the abuses of the National Security Letters, FBI agents just sending them out willy-nilly, just sending them out on fishing expeditions. That was not authorized. That was not lawful. Somebody needed to pay a price.

In retrospect, it is directly, as Robert Mueller said, that was his responsibility, his fault. Yes, it was. He should have been fired. He should never have been allowed to get close to anything attempting to pervert justice in America.

Unfortunately, he wormed his way in through his joined-at-the-hip buddy, Comey, leaking information in order to get a second counsel, that second counsel being his joined-at-the-hip buddy, Mr. Mueller. He should never have allowed that to happen. If it was a fair and just Justice Department, Rosenstein would have recused himself, Mueller would have recused himself and said: I am not the proper person to do this special counsel job because of my strong friendship, maybe even mentorship—whatever you want to call it—with James Comey; and also the fact that I was FBI Director working with the U.S. Attorney named Rosenstein, and my go-to guy, Weissmann, and we were the ones who were investigating Russia's illegal efforts to obtain United States uranium.

Of course, they helped quash information about that so that the Commission on Foreign Investment in the United States could approve the sale, that would open the way for beneficiaries of that sale to donate \$145 million to the Clinton Foundation as well

as paying off Bill Clinton to make speeches for a short amount of time. There is just so much that stinks to high heaven here in Washington.

We don't even know anything about the biases and prejudices of those people on whom Mr. Horowitz was relying to reach his conclusions. But it is worth looking at some of the things that were recommended.

For example, you had a man named Pagliano—and this is according to the Horowitz report—Pagliano was a critical witness because he set up the server that Clinton used during her tenure.

In other words, he set up the unsecured server which we now know was hacked. And I think my friend Andrew McCarthy makes a great point in an article today when he points out the mere setting up of that unsecured server out from under the government watch for the purpose, according to James Carville—he may have been trying to make a joke, but it actually was an indication of the mindset of the Clintons, when he said: Hillary didn't want LOUIE GOHMERT rifling through her emails.

She didn't want proper oversight, so she intentionally and knowingly had a server set up that was not secure, was out from under government protection and control, also knowing she might be able to get away with not turning in emails because they were not under government control.

How there could be 500-plus pages of bias shown in this report, and then a conclusion that there is no evidence of any bias in the investigation? My gosh, that is a lay-down, slam-dunk prosecution right there. You could have indicted Mr. Pagliano, who was certainly far more responsible for potential crime than Mr. Manafort is, clearly.

In the Horowitz report he says: The supervising special agent told us that the FBI did not consider Pagliano a subject or someone they would prosecute in connection with the midyear—talking about the Hillary Clinton investigation. The FBI believed his testimony was very important and providing immunity was an effective way to secure his testimony.

So this guy sets up the unsecured server, and it carried we now know for certain classified information.

□ 2045

We knew there was going to be a good chance he would have had to have known that. But if that supervising special agent and the Horowitz team had not been so favorably inclined not to find any wrongdoing, then certainly they would have recognized that this is a guy who could and should have been indicted.

Of course, I don't advocate that people be unfairly treated as Paul Manafort was, where you go busting down his door in the early morning hours when you know he is not a threat; there is no reason to bust down a door in those early morning hours, no reason to ransack a house, other than trying to intimidate.

But nobody tried to do anything, not even indicting or bringing him before a grand jury to potentially pursue him, because the prosecutors, many of them have told me: Man, this is a real easy one, much easier than organized crime. All you have to do is go after Pagliano, go after a couple of these other people, and once they see they are looking at years in prison, yes, they will tell you exactly what Hillary Clinton told them and others told them. And then you go to the next one and make the case that that testimony gives you.

None of that was done. It was all done in a way to protect Hillary Clinton, no question.

That report talks about Combetta. It says Paul Combetta is the one that later wiped emails from that private server in March of 2015. The report says that the investigation's team members told the inspector general Combetta was an important witness for several reasons, including his involvement with the culling process and the deletion of emails and his interactions with several people who worked for Clinton.

Several of the midyear—they call them midyear; it is the Clinton team members—stated that, after conducting two voluntary interviews of Combetta, they believe Combetta had not been forthcoming about, among other things, his role in deleting emails from the PRN server following the issues of a congressional preservation order.

The witness further stated that Combetta's truthful testimony was essential for assessing criminal intent for Clinton and other individuals because he would be able to tell them whether Clinton's attorneys, Mills, Samuelson, or Kendall, had instructed him to delete the emails.

So this is the way you work up through a prosecution. They didn't indict Combetta. This says the supervising special agent told us he believed Combetta should have been charged with false statements for lying multiple times. Well, if that had happened, then you go to him and you say: This is how many years you are looking at.

I have seen incredibly professional FBI agents in the field do just that: Here is what you are looking at. You are going to talk to your lawyer. You are going to decide what to do. We want you to see the evidence we have.

Then they would lay out the evidence: Here is evidence that might help. You might think it is exculpatory, but we here is the evidence that we have that we believe will overwhelm that. It is incriminating. We are not wanting you to make a statement now. You talk to your lawyer. See if you would like to assist us.

Then when you realize that, wow, their evidence is overwhelming, I am dead meat, I am going to prison, then let's see what kind of deal we can make.

Then you make a proffer: Here is what my client will say if you will give us this plea agreement or this agree-

ment, maybe an immunity agreement, you work that out. That is how you go about proving a case.

None of that was done. The FBI and the Department of Justice attorneys, people who absolutely loved and worshiped Hillary Clinton and absolutely despised and hated Donald Trump didn't do any of that. They protected the people who would have been critical witnesses.

We get around to Mr. John Bentel. He worked at the State Department for 39 years. Here is what the IG report said:

Both agents who interviewed Bentel told us that he was uncooperative and the interview was unproductive. However, they attributed these problems to nervousness and fear of being found culpable.

Agent three—whoever that was, with whatever biases he had—told us that he did not believe that immunity was necessary and it did not help the investigation because Bentel was not forthcoming during his interview.

That makes no sense. That is the kind of guy where you go ahead and you have got enough evidence, you indict him, and then he gets a little more cooperative through his lawyer. The guy helped commit crimes, apparently. Then you see about getting more cooperation when he is looking at being convicted and doing a long time in prison.

But he did not have any of that done. There was not even a threat of prosecution. He wasn't prosecuted because bias affected the outcome of the Hillary Clinton email investigation. If he had been prosecuted, he would likely have been quite cooperative as a witness in establishing what really happened. But he knew he was guilty. He had a guilty conscience, which is obvious from what these people said in their statements.

So what about Cheryl Mills? She was treated as if she were an attorney for Hillary Clinton. She was allowed to sit in on the interview of Hillary Clinton that was not recorded, and, basically, she was assured in advance that she would be given a pass.

But Cheryl Mills is one who actually went through the Clinton emails. Because of her position, she was in a position to make sure they did not turn over any emails that would have incriminated Cheryl and Hillary Clinton. And instead of doing anything that would have brought that to light, they give her an immunity deal. They let her consult.

There is a massive question here of conspiring to obstruct justice, yet they gave them a pass.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. Horowitz really did appear as if he were trying to do something so that he could kind of say he was placating two different sides. On the one hand, over 500 pages absolutely documenting the horrendous bias and prejudice that permeated an actually cancerous kind of bias that was eating through the Department of Justice and FBI, then turns around and gave Democrats what they would hope to have:

Oh, no, there was no evidence that bias affected the investigation.

Well, how about the fact that there is no attorney-client privilege if an attorney and a client are conspiring to obstruct justice or are absolutely obstructing justice?

In such a case, you don't give immunity to the attorney, the counselor, potential codefendant, and say: Here, you go through the evidence and you tell us what you are going to let us have, and then you destroy anything at all that you think might not be helpful to you and Mrs. Clinton and give us what you think will be safe to give us.

It is absolutely incredible. The very fact that that was done, that she was allowed to sit in on the interview, she was allowed to go through and screen the emails for her and her client that could have shown any possible crimes there is an outrage.

We need a second special counsel, and we need it now.

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

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6, SUBSTANCE USE-ORDER PREVENTION THAT PROMOTES OPIOID RECOVERY AND TREATMENT FOR PATIENTS AND COMMUNITIES ACT; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5797, INDIVIDUALS IN MEDICAID DESERVE CARE THAT IS APPROPRIATE AND RESPONSIBLE IN ITS EXECUTION ACT; AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6082, OVERDOSE PREVENTION AND PATIENT SAFETY ACT

Mr. BURGESS (during the Special Order of Mr. GOHMERT), from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-766) on the resolution (H. Res. 949) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6) to provide for opioid use disorder prevention, recovery, and treatment, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 5797) to amend title XIX of the Social Security Act to allow States to provide under Medicaid services for certain individuals with opioid use disorders in institutions for mental diseases; and providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6082) to amend the Public Health Service Act to protect the confidentiality of substance use disorder patient records, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. STIVERS (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of his flight being canceled.

Mr. CLYBURN (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delay due to weather.

Mrs. NAPOLITANO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 2652. An act to award a Congressional Gold Medal to Stephen Michael Gleason; to the Committee on Financial Services.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 56 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, June 20, 2018, at 9 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the first and second quarters of 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JONAS W. MILLER, EXPENDED BETWEEN APR. 30 AND MAY 5, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²
Jonas Miller	4/30	5/5	Kuwait		1,746.66		12,539.01				14,285.67
	5/2	5/3	Iraq		66.00		4,650.00				4,716.00
Committee total											19,001.67

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.
² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

JONAS W. MILLER, May 24, 2018.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

5213. A letter from the Director, Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, transmitting the status of FY 2018 Rescission Proposals, pursuant to 2 U.S.C. 685(e); Public Law 93-344, Sec. 1014(e); (88 Stat. 335) (H. Doc. No. 115-134); to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

5214. A letter from the Under Secretary, Personnel and Readiness, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter authorizing three officers to wear the insignia of the grade of brigadier general, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 777(b)(3)(B); Public Law 104-106, Sec. 503(a)(1) (as added by Public Law 108-136, Sec.

509(a)(3)); (117 Stat. 1458); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5215. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General William D. Beydler, United States Marine Corps, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5216. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Robert L. Caslen, Jr., United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5217. A letter from the Assistant Secretary (Civil Works), Department of the Army, Department of Defense, transmitting the 2018 Corrosion Prevention Report, pursuant to 33 U.S.C. 2350(d); Public Law 113-121, Sec. 1033(d) (as amended by Public Law 114-322, Sec. 1142); (130 Stat. 1658); to the Committee on Armed Services.

5218. A letter from the Administrator, Rural Housing Service, Department of Agriculture, transmitting the Department's proposed rule — Single Family Housing Guaranteed Loan Program (RIN: 0575-AD10) received June 18, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.