emergency is to continue in effect beyond the anniversary date. In accordance with this provision, I have sent to the *Federal Register* for publication the enclosed notice stating that the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13818 of December 20, 2017, is to continue in effect beyond December 20, 2019.

The prevalence and severity of human rights abuse and corruption that have their source, in whole or in substantial part, outside the United States, continue to threaten the stability of international political and economic systems. Human rights abuse and corruption undermine the values that form an essential foundation of stable, secure, and functioning societies; have devastating impacts on individuals; weaken democratic institutions; degrade the rule of law; perpetuate violent conflicts; facilitate the activities of dangerous persons; undermine economic markets; and continue to pose an unusual and extraordinary threat to the national security, foreign policy, and economy of the United States. Therefore, I have determined that it is necessary to continue the national emergency declared in Executive Order 13818 with respect to serious human rights abuse and corruption.

DONALD J. TRUMP.

THE WHITE HOUSE, *December 18, 2019*.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 5377, RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 772 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 772

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 5377) to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to modify the limitation on deduction of State and local taxes, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Ways and Means now printed in the bill shall be considered as adopted. The bill, as amended, shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill, as amended, are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill, as amended, and on any further amendment thereto, to final passage without intervening motion except: (1) one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from California is recognized for 1 hour.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma (Mr. COLE), pending which I yield myself such time as I may consume. During consideration of this resolution, all time yielded is for the purpose of debate only.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members be given 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from California?

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, on Wednesday, the Rules Committee met and reported a rule, House Resolution 772, providing for consideration of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act, under a closed rule.

The rule provides 1 hour of debate, equally divided and controlled by the chair and the ranking minority member of the Committee on Ways and Means.

Mr. Speaker, SALT has been in law since the 16th Amendment was passed in 1913 with few minor adjustments, that is, until 2017, when Republicans passed the tax scam law.

In 2017, the Republicans gave away almost $2 trillion in tax cuts to corporations and the wealthy. They paid for this tax scam on the backs of hardworking American families. Thirty-six million middle-class families saw their taxes increase.

The average American deducted $12,500 in State and local taxes, or SALT, from their Federal taxes before 2017. However, the Republican tax bill capped SALT deductions at $10,000, therefore, not fully covering what the average American deducts in State and local taxes. This cap means that Americans are paying taxes twice on the same dollar earned.

Our tax system is based on the principle of federalism and acknowledges that the Federal Government should not do everything.

State and local taxes provide funds for critical infrastructure and services, such as ensuring quality schools for our kids, fixing our roads, and supporting our local law enforcement.

Local governments know how to meet the unique needs of their communities, and the implementation of a SALT deduction cap threatens the ability of our local governments to provide these critical services.

The SALT deduction is not a Democratic or Republican issue. Taxpayers across the country in both red and blue States benefit from the deduction.

Midwestern States like Iowa, Minnesota, and Wisconsin are known for their State and local tax contributions. In fact, Wisconsin ranks among the top five States in the country, higher than California, for the average proportion of a resident's income tax that goes toward State and local taxes.

Whether from California, Wisconsin, or New Jersey, getting rid of the SALT cap will benefit Americans across the country.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I am supporting H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. This legislation will raise the SALT cap for 2019 to $20,000 for married couples.

Under the Republican tax bill, the SALT cap is set at $10,000 for a household regardless if that household consists of an individual or two people filing jointly.

Mr. Speaker, I don't think taxpayers should be punished for being married.

This legislation will completely repeal the SALT cap for 2020 and 2021, ensuring that Americans are not taxed double on their hard-earned money.

Included in H.R. 5377 are investments in our teachers and law enforcement officers. I have heard from southern Californian teachers who are working two or three jobs to make ends meet, but they still buy supplies for their students: notebooks, chalk, pencils, markers, whatever they need.

Across the country, nearly all teachers report buying school supplies for their students with their own money, spending almost $500 on average.

Currently, the tax credit for out-of-pocket expenses for educators is $250. This legislation will double the tax credit to $500, matching what is actually spent, what teachers spend for their students.

It also creates a new tax deduction for law enforcement officers, firefighters, paramedics, and EMTs related to expenses for uniforms and for tuition fees for professional development training. As a former 911 dispatcher, I can testify to the importance of having well-trained first responders.

Mr. Speaker, H.R. 5377 is about restoring fair tax policies for the middle class that have been suffering under the Republican tax bill, and I am proud to stand here in support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my good friend, the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES) for yielding me the customary 30 minutes, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is our third rule debate in what has turned out to be a pretty eventful and memorable week. Unfortunately, today's debate is on a deeply partisan and misguided tax bill.

□ 0915

H.R. 5377 would temporarily remove the cap on the deduction for State and local income taxes, property taxes, and sales taxes. The bill also pays for this temporary tax break for a few by permanently increasing the top marginal tax rate.

What is worse, Mr. Speaker, the permanent tax increase isn't limited to individuals but applies to small businesses, as well.

Two years ago, Congress passed and President Trump signed into law the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act. This monumental legislation not only reformed the corporate tax code to make American business more competitive and simplified the personal tax code, but it also ensured that the vast majority of Americans are getting to keep more of their hard-earned money than they did 2 years ago. Between lower tax rates, the expanded standard deduction, the child tax credit, and changes to the alternative minimum tax, the benefit of the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act are numerous and reach far and wide across the Nation.

Today, the majority is seeking to undo some of that progress and is seeking to push a temporary tax break that will only benefit a few wealthy individuals in a few States. The State and local tax deduction, or SALT deduction, as it is called, primarily benefits only a select group of individuals, generally wealthy people in the top 20 percent of income, in a few high-tax States, who own expensive homes. H.R. 5377 would allow these individuals to temporarily claim an unlimited SALT deduction for only the years 2020 and 2021.

Mr. Speaker, the benefits of this bill will overwhelmingly go to those who are already wealthy. According to the Center on Budget and Policy Priorities, the top 1 percent of households would receive 56 percent of the benefit of repealing the SALT deduction cap. Let me repeat that: The top 1 percent get 56 percent of the benefits of repealing the SALT deduction cap. The top 5 percent of households will receive over 80 percent of the benefit. Again, let me repeat that: The top 5 percent of income earners in the country are going to get 80 percent of the benefit of this bill. Amazing. The bottom 80 percent of all households would receive precisely 4 percent of the benefit. Amazing.

What is worse, in the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we have already acted to offset the reduced SALT deduction by doubling the standard deduction. In the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, we doubled the standard deduction from $12,000 to $24,000 for married couples, which offset an increase resulting from lowering the SALT deduction cap for a vast majority of taxpayers.

Before TCJA, 30 percent of all taxpayers itemized deductions and could potentially benefit from a SALT deduction. Today, just under 90 percent of all taxpayers take the standard deduction. This has made tax filing significantly easier. More importantly, for our purposes, it has meant that the vast majority of taxpayers who potentially could have benefited from a SALT deduction are already benefiting from the increased standard deduction.

In the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the drafters of the bill made sure that the benefits were spread across all taxpayers. Between doubling the standard deduction, doubling the child tax credit and making it partially refundable, and simplifying the tax code, there is hardly a taxpayer in America who did not see some benefit from the bill.

Here, unlike the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act, the benefits of H.R. 5377 will go only to a select group of people in a few key States, and it will overwhelmingly go to people who are already wealthy—already wealthy. Though the majority likes to claim that Republicans only want to cut taxes for the rich, it is ironic that the majority is now pushing a special tax break that literally benefits only the rich.

But the bill is worse than that, Mr. Speaker. To pay for this short-term tax break for a few, the bill also increases the top marginal tax rate for all taxpayers on a permanent basis. That is correct. The bill imposes a permanent tax hike on all Americans to give a short-term tax break for a wealthy few.

That type of tax change simply doesn't make any sense, Mr. Speaker. The tax code does need further reforms, no doubt about it. But those reforms should be those that increase the competitiveness of American business, simplify the tax code further to make it more comprehensible to taxpayers, and ensure further fairness for everyone. Giving a few select people in a few States a short-term and complicated tax break simply doesn't meet these goals.

Mr. Speaker, I urge opposition to the rule, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, school districts across America are struggling to recruit and hire teachers. In the Fourth District of Oklahoma, for example, there are 8,680 teachers who currently receive the education expense deduction. This legislation doubles the above-the-line deduction for educators' out-of-pocket expenses to $500.

Mr. Speaker, I can imagine that these teachers would greatly appreciate being able to claim up to $500 out-of-pocket for the school supplies that they buy for their students.

I want to tell a story from Debra Deskin. Debra is a teacher in Oklahoma, and she has been a faithful public servant for 15 years. She teaches gifted students. She says: ''I literally had to choose whether to purchase items for my classroom and students or pay bills. Honestly, the bills get put on the back burner.''

These are the type of public servants who this bill is tasked to support to ensure that they are not having to choose between paying their bills or buying supplies for their students.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PASCRELL).

Mr. PASCRELL. Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of the rule reported by the Committee on Rules providing for the consideration of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. I was an original cosponsor of this legislation.

Last Congress, the middle class was targeted by the former House majority. The tax scam law of 2017 remains one of the most destructive bills we have ever seen here because it specifically went after the middle class. The principal way it did this was by capping the State and local tax, or SALT, deduction, one of the oldest deductions on the books. It existed before the tax code, and there was a reason for it.

This unfair cap hit New Jersey like an anvil dropped from five stories up. The average value of all New Jersey families' deductions was $19,162 in 2017, a figure double the $10,000 cap.

But this is not just about New Jersey. The SALT deduction directly benefited more than 46.5 million households, which represents over 100 million Americans. Almost 40 percent of taxpayers earning between $50,000 and $75,000 claimed the SALT deduction, and over 70 percent of taxpayers making $100,000 to $200,000 used it. Imagine that, that spread over millions of households from coast to coast.

These are families in New Jersey, Illinois, New York, Minnesota, Kentucky, and Texas. They are not all blue States. That is where you made your mistake. You tried to nail us, and you got everybody else paying through the nose to fund a tax cut, which you know went to Big Business and executives, which didn't invest in the government. It didn't invest in this government bill. It didn't invest in industry. It invested in the pockets of shareholders. We know. Look at the data.

When I hold this up at my meetings, your home is worth less than it should be. That has happened all over the country. That is what it has done.

Get rid of all the deductions; see what will happen to charity donations.

Nor is this just a blue-State issue, like some bad faith critics claim. In 2017, the average SALT deduction exceeded $10,000 in 25 States and the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield an additional 30 seconds to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PASCRELL. At least 10 are so-called red States where the average deduction exceeded $9,000, including South Carolina, Idaho, Arkansas, and West Virginia.

SALT benefits flow to all communities, like my hometown of Paterson. SALT relief empowers communities to make investments in broadly shared services.

I want to emphasize, this package is fully paid for, so don't give me this malarkey that you are concerned about the poor people, all of a sudden. It is like the Sun coming out in the morning, all of a sudden, and we are concerned about the rich. It doesn't work out that way. It doesn't work out that way.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD a Statement of Administration Policy on this particular bill, noting that the President's advisers would advise him to veto this bill, were it to pass.

STATEMENT OF ADMINISTRATION POLICY

H.R. 5377—RESTORING TAX FAIRNESS FOR STATES AND LOCALITIES ACT—REP. SUOZZI, D–NY, AND 52 COSPONSORS

The Administration strongly opposes House passage of H.R. 5377, the Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act. This legislation would unfairly force all Federal taxpayers to subsidize a tax break for the wealthy, as well as excessive government spending by fiscally irresponsible States. H.R. 5377 would likely cause State and local governments to raise taxes, all while hindering the growth of small businesses and opportunities for workers.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 (TCJA), which passed Congress without a single Democrat vote, is a signature achievement of the Trump Administration. This bill, which President Donald J. Trump signed into law on December 22, 2017, has spurred economic growth across the Nation by lowering individual tax rates, nearly doubling the standard deduction, simplifying the tax code, and closing special interest loopholes. Workers and middle-class Americans are reaping the benefits of the TCJA in the form of record low unemployment and substantially higher wages. H.R. 5377 would turn back the clock by adding a special interest provision back into the Federal tax code that unfairly requires middle-class Americans to subsidize fiscally irresponsible States and wealthy taxpayers. In doing so, H.R. 5377 would violate the principle that States should raise their own revenue rather than rely on tax subsidies from the Federal Government. The bill would also reduce incentives for States to be fiscally responsible.

Additionally, the provision in H.R. 5377 that would raise the top income tax rate from 37 percent to 39.6 percent would stifle economic growth by placing an undue burden on thousands of small businesses. Because it is unfair to middle-class taxpayers, encourages excessive spending by States, and would stunt economic growth, H.R. 5377 is poor tax policy that should not be enacted into law.

If H.R. 5377 were resented to the President his senior advisors would recommend that he veto the bill.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, there is nobody I like better than my friend from New Jersey, quite frankly. We are very good friends. We have worked together on a lot of good things. But I have to tell you, on this one, we just disagree.

The middle class is going to benefit from this bill? Let me just go through the figures again. The top 1 percent of income earners in America get 56 percent of the benefits in this bill. The top 5 percent get 80 percent. The bottom 80 percent get 4 percent.

This is not a middle-class bill. This is not even an upper-middle-class bill. This is a bill for pretty wealthy people. Ninety-six percent of the benefits go to households that make more than $200,000 a year.

Mr. PASCRELL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. COLE. No, I won't yield. I want to yield to another speaker in a moment. You are the one who raised the issue, so I am just going back to the numbers.

The numbers here are pretty clear. This is a targeted tax cut for wealthy people in a very few States. That is just the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 6 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO), my good friend and fellow Rules Committee member.

Mrs. LESKO. Mr. Speaker, most people would think that the most surprising bill to me that we voted on this year was the Articles of Impeachment. Really, that wasn't a surprise to me because I serve on the Judiciary Committee, and since January, we have been doing investigations of President Trump. Many Republicans and I predicted all along that the majority, the Democrats in this House, were going to vote to impeach the President, so it really wasn't a surprise to me.

But this bill really surprises me, and let me tell you why. My goodness, I have served in the Arizona House of Representatives for 6 years and another 3 years in the Arizona Senate. For years, every time the Republican majority would cut taxes so that it would boom the economy and help everyone, my Democratic colleagues then said: ''Oh, my gosh, those Republicans, they are just helping the rich. They are just helping the rich. They don't care about the little guy. They don't care about the middle class.'' The same thing is said for years now, years and years, by my Democratic colleagues and others that: ''Oh, those Republicans, they just care about the rich.'' Oh, baloney.

The tax cut Republicans did in 2017, you can see the effect of those tax cuts. The economy is booming.

□ 0930

There are more job openings than there are jobs to fill them.

This bill is an interesting bill because, in the 2017 tax cut bill that the Republicans put through, it said—you know what—States that are fiscally responsible, that don't have exorbitant property taxes, those constituents in my State of Arizona—

What did you say, sir?

Did you say I was wacko?

Oh, thank you, sir.

Mr. Speaker, people in Arizona, we are responsible taxpayers. We don't have exorbitant property taxes. I know people who live in New Jersey, and I know how they complain how their property taxes are so incredibly high.

The people in Arizona are fiscally responsible, and that is why people are flocking to our State and other States with low taxes. People in Arizona and other States that are fiscally responsible, they don't want to subsidize the irresponsible States that have high taxes by giving them huge deductions on their Federal taxes.

So, in the Republican tax bill, we capped the deduction at $10,000. It seems reasonable to me. In fact, the gentleman from New Jersey, I think, just said, recently, the average deduction is $9,000. Well, that is below $10,000. That is below the $10,000 cap, so they can deduct it.

But here in this bill today, Democrats want to raise the cap to $20,000 and then totally eliminate it in the next 2 years.

When the Republicans put forward amendments, one of the amendments said let's not give this tax break to the top 10 percent of income earners. Democrats rejected it.

Then Republicans had another amendment that said, well, let's not give this big tax break to the top 1 percent income earners. The Democrats rejected it.

So, please, the next time my Democratic colleagues, and Democrats throughout the Nation, when they say it is the Republicans who are always for the rich people, let's look at this bill, because the proof is here. No, it is the Democrats.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, the fact is that Republicans are funding their tax scam bill on the backs of hardworking Americans. The fact is that there is a race to the bottom under their cheating, gerrymandering ways.

So, now, the Democrats are in charge in the House. We will continue to work to uphold and bring up our hardworking families.

In Arizona's Eighth Congressional District, there are 9,330 teachers claiming this tax expense deduction. They should know the Democrats stand with them to ensure that they are able to pay their bills, because no one should have to live in poverty because they are standing up for a future generation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. BROWN).

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank Representative TORRES for yielding me the time and also my good friend from New York, Congressman SUOZZI, for his work on this important legislation.

Mr. Speaker, this bill fixes several alarming defects in President Trump's tax giveaway to the wealthy. It also takes steps to make our tax code fairer for working people.

In 2017, my Republican colleagues tried and failed to eliminate a $250 tax deduction for teachers buying school supplies for their children in their classrooms.

Smaller education budgets have forced too many teachers to buy supplies to fill the gap. More than 90 percent of public schoolteachers are not reimbursed for these expenses. Nearly 80,000 educators in Maryland claim this deduction on their taxes.

The average teacher spends $479 of their own money buying supplies for our kids, so I am pleased that this legislation incorporates language from my standalone bill that I filed in the 115th Congress and again in this Congress, the Educators Expense Deduction Modernization Act, which increases the deduction from $250 to $500. It is a small benefit for educators who make a financial sacrifice.

It is critical for local school districts and States to better fund education and pay educators. In Congress, we can do more to ensure classrooms are stocked with the supplies that our students, our children need.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, before I get into my prepared remarks, I want to advise my friend that I certainly have no objection to raising the tax credit for teachers or first responders. Those things are, I think, perfectly laudable parts of the bill.

Our main objection is simply that the main benefits of this are going to the top 1 percent and 5 percent of incomes, and that is just indisputable.

Mr. Speaker, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to immediately bring up H.R. 750, a resolution that expresses the sense of the House that it is the duty of the Federal Government to protect and promote individual choice in health insurance for all American people and prevent any Medicare for All proposal that would outlaw private health plans such as the job-based coverage in Medicare Advantage plans.

Earlier this Congress, the House Rules Committee held the first-ever legislative hearing on the Democratic Medicare for All proposal. During that hearing, we heard promises about the Democrat-proposed, one-size-fits-all, government-run healthcare system. But we also heard about the realities of that plan: how it would require doubling income and corporate tax rates to implement, how it would lead to long waits for care, and how it would lead to 158 million Americans losing their current coverage.

That is all because Medicare for All, if implemented, would outlaw private healthcare coverage. This includes coverage offered through the popular Medicare Advantage program, which gives 22 million Americans healthcare.

Given that reality, it is wholly appropriate for the House to take this stand now. Protecting individual choice and protecting the private healthcare plans should be a priority for this House.

If we defeat the previous question, we will give every Member of the House an opportunity to say so together, with one voice.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to insert the text of my amendment in the RECORD, along with the extraneous material, immediately prior to the vote on the previous question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Oklahoma?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''no'' vote on the previous question, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from California (Mr. LEVIN).

Mr. LEVIN of California. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the bipartisan Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act, which I was proud to cosponsor.

Since 2017, many families in the north county of San Diego and south Orange County communities I represent have taken an unexpected, unfair tax hit. The financial plans they had made, like whether to buy a new home, were upturned when Washington Republicans passed a tax bill that capped the State and local tax deduction.

In my district, more than 58,000 people who make less than $100,000 per year claimed SALT deductions in 2017, saving $6,328, on average.

Many of the families in California's 49th District have made serious, long-term financial decisions in recent years based on the expectation that they could take advantage of this significant deduction. Now, because of the Republican tax bill and the SALT cap that placed new limits on those deductions, their financial plans are being turned upside down. That is why I am glad that we are voting on legislation to restore the SALT deduction.

The House is doing its part. Now Senate Majority Leader MITCH MCCONNELL needs to do what is right and bring this bipartisan bill up for hearings and a vote.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, just to quickly respond to my friend, I would remind the gentleman that Republicans offered, in committee, an amendment which would have, frankly, given the SALT deduction to the bottom 90 percent of all Americans in exchange for continuing to charge it on the top 10 percent. I suspect that would cover the vast majority of the gentleman's constituents who might benefit.

I also remind everybody that the standard deduction was double, so, for most people, the average person actually came out ahead. It is only the very wealthy people who lost ground under this particular measure.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. GREEN), a distinguished former general.

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I want to just say today that I live in the State of Tennessee, and in Tennessee, we are a fiscally responsible State. We have the lowest per capita debt in the Nation. We have no income tax at all. We have no investment income tax.

When a State has superhigh taxes and you allow individuals to write that tax off, it is unfair to those well-managed States like Tennessee that don't tax our people as much.

So, when you raise caps or you raise deductions, those States that are poorly managed, those States that are high-tax States to their individuals are subsidized by the people in Tennessee. We wind up paying more tax so that those States that are poorly managed can pay less.

To say, oh, we have got to do this for the low-income individuals out there, well, how about those States just manage themselves better, tax their people less, and then there wouldn't be an issue? Why should the people of Tennessee have to subsidize States that can't manage themselves?

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I want to correct, for the record, about the 2017 Republican tax scam.

We have heard today, during this debate, that these tax cuts boosted our economy, and that simply isn't the case.

I include in the RECORD an article from Forbes titled: ''The 2017 Tax Cuts Didn't Work, the Data Prove It.''

[From Forbes, May 30, 2019]

THE 2017 TAX CUTS DIDN'T WORK, THE DATA PROVE IT

(By Christian Weller)

The independent, non-partisan Congressional Research Service just released a report showing that the 2017 tax cuts for the richest Americans and corporations did not work. This confirms what anybody who has been looking at the data already knew. Investment did not boom and workers will not see the promised bump in pay. Instead, the federal government incurred massive deficits while wealth inequality increased to its highest level in three decades.

Republicans in Congress and President Trump touted the benefits of Tax Cuts and Jobs Act of 2017 as game changing. Showering the richest Americans and corporations even more money was supposed to lead to more business investments. These investments, the argument went, would translate into more productivity growth. Workers would then supposedly see an additional $4,000 per year in wages. And faster economic growth and higher wages would result in more tax revenue, thus paying mainly for itself.

These were empty promises. Businesses did not use the windfall of new cash to invest in new machines, technology, office parks and manufacturing plants. Without an acceleration in business investment, though, American workers will not see the bumps in pay promised over the longer term. The richest Americans instead got even richer while corporations used a lot of the new money to keep shareholders happy. Federal budget deficits quickly ballooned because there was no faster growth and more revenue to offset the hundreds of billions lost each year to the predictably wasteful tax cuts.

The core of the argument in favor of the tax cuts was that they would result in more investment. The main measure is business investment that goes beyond replacing obsolete equipment and buildings—so-called net non-residential fixed investment. As share of gross domestic product (GDP), net investment reached a low of 2.8% in the first quarter of 2016 (see figure below). It grew afterwards until the tax cuts were passed in late 2017 and eventually levelled off rather than accelerating in mid–2018. Consequently, net investment as share of GDP stayed below its levels in 2014. The tax cuts did not accelerate investment as promised by supply-side advocates.

But maybe the tax cuts boosted growth in other ways? In theory, the tax cuts could have created some additional demand that resulted in people spending more money, which would then have led businesses to also increase its spending. To capture this, an economic measure needs to strip out parts of the economy from GDP that are not affected by tax cuts. These parts include inventory investment—material that is produced but sits on shelves—government consumption on salaries and supplies, and net exports—the difference between exports and imports. The resulting key measure are so-called private domestic final purchases (PDFP).

The tax cuts did not lead to faster private activity. PDFP increased by 3.3% from December 2016 to December 2017, before Congress passed the tax cuts. Afterwards, year-over-year growth remained at or below that level, actually declining since September 2018. This deceleration is yet another clear indictment of the tax cuts' ineffectiveness.

But didn't GDP growth accelerate? Not only does GDP growth capture parts of the economy that clearly were not affected by the tax cuts, the data also show no acceleration there, either. GDP growth started to get faster from low of 1.3% in June 2016 and continued to gain strength through 2018 (see Figure above). But year-over-year growth in 2018 stayed below the levels shown in early 2015.

The money from the tax cuts obviously went somewhere, just not to investments or workers' wages. Corporations just decided to use their additional cash to keep their shareholders happy. Non-financial corporations used most of their after-tax profits since the tax cuts went into effect to buy back their own shares and pay out dividends. When a firm buys back its own shares, the remaining shares become more valuable and the company's stock price goes up, increasing the wealth of shareholders, mainly people who are already very wealthy. CEOs in particular gained from buybacks since their compensation typically depends on the price of a company's stock. In 2018, corporations spent about two-thirds of their after-tax profits on buying back their own shares and paying out dividends, according to Fed data. By the fourth quarter of 2018, corporations spent 107. 7% of after-tax profits on dividends and share repurchases.

This was good news for the wealthiest few. The top one percent of wealthiest households owned a record high share of all wealth by the middle of 2018 (see figure below).

At the same time, federal budget deficits rapidly jumped. After falling precipitously in the immediate aftermath of the Great Recession, the deficits quickly grew again in 2018 (see figure below). The increase in deficits was driven heavily by a sharp drop in corporate tax revenue—not surprisingly, given the massive corporate tax cuts in the legislation.

did not accelerate, but wealth inequality grew. The American tax payers are now getting stuck with the bill, while they did not see many benefits from this trillion dollar boondoggle.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD another article, and this one is from CNBC, titled: ''Trump Tax Cuts Did Little to Boost Economic Growth in 2018, Study Says.''

[From CNBC, May 29, 2019]

TRUMP TAX CUTS DID LITTLE TO BOOST ECONOMIC GROWTH IN 2018, STUDY SAYS

(By Jeff Cox)

An in-depth look by the nonpartisan Congressional Research Service indicated that not only did the rollbacks in business and personal rates have little macro impact, but they also delivered the most benefits to corporations and the rich, with little boost to wages.

In all, GDP rose 2.9% for the full calendar year, the best performance since the financial crisis. But that came in an economy already poised to move higher, economists Jane Gravelle and Donald Marples wrote.

''On the whole, the growth effects [from the cuts] tend to show a relatively small (if any) first-year effect on the economy,'' the report said. ''Although examining the growth rates cannot indicate the effects of the tax cut on GDP, it does tend to rule out very large effects in the near term.''

Trump had touted the cuts as a key step toward generating GDP growth of at least 3%. The legislation, passed in late 2017, slashed corporate tax rates from 35% to 21%, reduced the number of brackets, lowered rates for many individual payers, and doubled the standard deduction in an effort to make most income tax-exempt for the lowest earners.

Employment continued to boom in 2018 and average hourly earnings have in recent months passed 3% on a year-over-year basis for the first time since the recovery began in 2009. However, the economists said wage gains could not be tracked to the tax cuts.

''This growth is smaller than overall growth in labor compensation and indicates that ordinary workers had very little growth in wage rates,'' the economists wrote.

The study indicated that the tax changes contributed only marginally to the overall economic economic gains—maybe 0.3% of a ''feedback effect.'' The economists say that for the tax cuts to pay for themselves, as Trump has promised, GDP would have to rise by 6.7%.

''The initial effect of a demand side is likely to be reflected in increased consumption and the data indicate little growth in consumption in 2018,'' the report said. ''Much of the tax cut was directed at businesses and higher-income individuals who are less likely to spend. Fiscal stimulus is limited in an economy that is at or near full employment.''

At the same time, tax receipts from 2018 indicate that corporations got an even bigger break than expected.

While the Congressional Budget Office had forecast a $94 billion break that still would have generated $243 billion in corporate revenues, the actual total was $205 billion, or 16% lower than projected.

The effective tax for corporations, or the level they pay after taxes, was 17.2% in the year before the tax breaks took hold and plunged to 8.8% for 2018. Individuals, meanwhile, saw a drop from 9.6% as a percentage of personal income in 2017 to 9.2% last year.

Bonuses from those companies also didn't amount to much when averaged across all workers, with the $4.4 billion paid coming to just $28 per employee in the U.S.

Companies also received incentives to repatriate profits held overseas, and they did so to the tune of $664 billion. While companies bought back about $1 trillion of their own shares, ''the evidence does not suggest a surge in investment from abroad in 2018,'' the report said.

The White House did not immediately respond to a request for comment.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I wasn't going to speak today on the rule, but I am just so outraged when I hear people attacking States like mine and other States.

My State, the State of New York, is the largest single net donor to the Federal Government of any State in the United States of America. We send $48 billion a year more to the Federal Government than we get back. And to hear this talk about irresponsible States that are really subsidizing these other States of the speakers who have spoken from the other side today is just so irresponsible and so divisive in our Nation.

We talk about this bill, about restoring tax fairness, that is exactly what it is: tax fairness.

It is not fair that people are taxed on the taxes they have already paid.

It is not fair that State and local governments who pick up the garbage and plow the roads and protect our people and educate our children are being forced to have to worry about more money being used to subsidize the rest of the country.

It is not fair that this has been in place since 1913, and they want to try and change this covenant that has existed since the beginning of the Federal tax code. They want to change it at this time, and it is completely unfair.

Let me point out, with one last point, that 100 percent of this bill is paid for by the highest earners in the United States of America. One hundred percent is paid for by the highest earners.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman from New York an additional 30 seconds.

Mr. SUOZZI. If my colleagues are concerned about the wealthy getting too much, then have them increase the progressive tax even higher if that is what they really mean.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, nobody admires my friend from New York more than I do. We worked on a number of issues. But let's be real. Democrats are going to make the rich, I guess, in every State pay for the rich in your own State. That is just the fact.

□ 0945

Most of the benefit of this thing—56 percent of the benefits—goes to the top 1 percent of income earners. That is the fact. Eighty percent of it goes to the top 5 percent, and 94 percent goes to households that make over $200,000 a year. Those are just the numbers.

Now, some of this is used for worthy causes. I would agree with that. But a permanent tax increase for a temporary tax cut, frankly, just doesn't make a lot of sense, and that is what we are dealing with here.

So I would also suggest that my friends remember that the tax cut that they revile so much doubles the personal exemption for most people so that more than offsets for most people the SALT tax reduction that was reduced. It is not eliminated; it is still there.

Mr. Speaker, $10,000 a year is still a pretty good deduction to be able to take. If you make that much income that you can take a deduction that large, then you are probably doing pretty well.

So, again, I don't have any problem with people defending the interest of their States, that is a perfectly appropriate thing to do. I don't have any problem with people wanting to use money for good purposes. That is a perfectly appropriate thing to do. But let's be real about who is getting the benefit of this tax package, and it is very-high-income people.

In fact, I am going to oppose it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1 additional minute to the gentleman from New York (Mr. SUOZZI).

Mr. SUOZZI. Mr. Speaker, I won't take a full minute.

Mr. Speaker, I want to first start by saying how much I respect and admire Mr. COLE, and I have worked closely with him on many issues.

I just want to make one point, though. So many of my colleagues on the other side of the aisle have been boasting about the fact that people are leaving States like mine to move to their States. That has been one of the effects of this tax bill by eliminating the State and local tax cap.

What happens when people leave my State and move to the Southwest or the Southeast?

They leave behind lower- and middle-income-tax people to pick up the bill.

They are trying to boast about the fact that our States, which are mature, industrial States that have old roads, old bridges, old sewers, old schools, and old hospitals, when we get money from the Federal Government, we have got to fix up those legacy issues. We have got to deal with pockets of poverty because we have been around for a longer time.

Their States are growing when they get money from us. We are subsidizing the rest of the country.

When they get money from the Federal Government, what are they using it for?

New sewers, new roads, new bridges, new hospitals, and new schools. They are growing, and they are bringing in new sales and new property taxes. They are trying to take credit for it when really it is because of the progressive income tax and the money that has come from our States that has helped their States to succeed. It is hypocrisy to suggest that our States are somehow irresponsible. It is hypocrisy to suggest that they are concerned about the wealthiest Americans.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I advise my friend I am prepared to close whenever she is. In the interim, I will reserve if she has more speakers.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close also.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time to close.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I oppose both the rule and the underlying measure. H.R. 5377 is a deeply misguided and partisan tax bill that sets up a temporary tax break for a privileged few and seeks to trade it for a permanent tax hike for the entire country.

The bill temporarily removes the cap on the State and local tax deduction, a benefit that will primarily go to wealthy taxpayers living in expensive homes in a few key States and localities. But to pay for this temporary boondoggle, the majority is adding a permanent hike at the top marginal tax rate. The benefits will go only to a few key privileged areas, but the costs are spread across the entire country.

It makes very little sense to me to trade a temporary tax break for a permanent tax increase, and it makes even less sense to me to ask the entire country to pay for it in perpetuity for a short-term tax break for a few areas with high State and local taxes.

Now, my friends have talked about the relative tax burden and who gives what and what States give what. As a former member of the Budget Committee, those numbers are, by the way, usually based on the discretionary portion of the budget. The reality is—I hate to say this, because we have a big problem in front of us that I don't think either party has confronted very well, certainly not mine, but I don't think my friends have either, and I don't think this administration has, and I don't think the last one did—every State in America is a debtor State if you start adding in Medicare, Medicaid, and those type of nondiscretionary expenditures.

So we have a big problem. It is really related to an aging population more than it is anything else, but the idea that some States are so-called donor States, I have to tell you, Mr. Speaker, nobody is a donor State in America. We are running nearly a $1 trillion deficit. That deficit comes almost primarily because we have simply not readjusted Medicare, Medicaid, and Social Security to pay for the benefits that are drawn out. I hope someday we will work on that.

I actually have a bipartisan bill, I used to carry it with Mr. Delaney—a very good friend and Presidential candidate from my good friends on the other side—that would go back and set up what we did in 1983. When Ronald Reagan and Tip O'Neill worked together, we had a Social Security Commission. We actually increased the revenue going into Social Security. I think that would have to be one of the long-term fixes, not simply cuts, reductions, and reforms. That is a debate for another day.

In closing, Mr. Speaker, American taxpayers, in my view, deserve better than what is in front of us here today. Rather than making the tax code more regressive and complicated, which this bill would do, we should further reform and simplify the tax code to make it easier for all taxpayers to understand. We should be making American businesses more competitive, and we should be taking steps so that American workers can keep more of their hard-earned earned income, something I know we all want to do.

In closing, again, just remember this: 56 percent of the benefits of this bill go to the top 1 percent of income earners. The top 5 percent get 80 percent, and the bottom 80 percent in terms of income get 4 percent. That should explain it all and why we should reject this bill.

So, Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to vote ''no'' on the previous question, ''no'' on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, I want to start by clarifying a misconception that all of these taxes are forced upon taxpayers. This last election cycle local voters voted to tax themselves to pay for affordable housing for our growing homeless population, to pay for improved roads, and to pay for better water quality. So they should not be punished for filling the gap where the Federal Government has failed to do so. This bill is paid for by raising taxes for households making over $400,000, back to the levels before Republicans passed their tax scam bill.

California pays $13 billion more in Federal taxes than it received from the Federal Government according to a 2016 IRS report. Tennessee is the third most dependent State on Federal resources. So to argue here that we should punish the people for wanting to help provide for your constituents because you failed to do that is outrageous. Oklahoma received $7.5 billion in Federal funding in 2016. This bill is not about subsidizing those who already have too much. This bill is about stopping the double taxation on the same dollar.

Mr. Speaker, we are here to try to give the middle-class families a break and undo the damage caused by the Republican tax scam. As we look forward to the new year, I want to take a minute to reflect on the work Democrats in Congress have done during this 116th Congress.

Whereas, the Republican tax law provided seven drug companies $34 billion in tax cuts in 1 year alone, last week, Democrats passed H.R. 3 to help seniors and American families afford their prescription drugs.

Whereas, last January the President caused the longest government shutdown in history by pushing to irresponsibly use taxpayer dollars for an unnecessary border wall, Democrats have fought for comprehensive funding bills that invest in our infrastructure, healthcare, national security, and to increase the Federal minimum wage.

Whereas, the Republican tax scam led to America's 400 wealthiest people paying a much lower tax rate than the working class, Democrats are here today because we believe in the middle class.

Repealing the cap on the State and local tax deductions will benefit taxpayers across our Nation. I have heard my colleagues claim that this bill is for the wealthy.

Mr. Speaker, do my colleagues remember voting on the largest tax giveaway to the rich and corporations in American history?

Obviously, they don't. But I am here to remind them that the biggest beneficiaries of the tax law that they passed were billionaires. The Joint Committee on Taxation estimated that wealthy taxpayers making $1 million or higher received a tax cut of $37 billion in 2019.

Mr. Speaker, while the Republican tax scam was a bill for the megarich, H.R. 5377 is legislation for constituents like mine, working-class Americans. The cap on SALT deductions is bad for my constituents.

The average Californian pays over $18,000 in State and local taxes, which is almost double over the SALT cap, again, to help improve the quality of life of the fifth largest economy in the world, which no other State can claim. As a result, 1 million Californians will pay $12 billion more in taxes into the SALT cap.

In 2016 my constituents deducted almost $700 million in State and local taxes from their Federal taxes.

It is time to give them a break and give them back the deductions that they once had. No one should have to pay taxes twice on the same dollar.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all my colleagues to vote for the rule and passage of H.R. 5377, Restoring Tax Fairness for States and Localities Act.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a ''yes'' vote on the rule and a ''yes'' vote on the previous question.

The material previously referred to by Mr. COLE is as follows:

AMENDMENT TO HOUSE RESOLUTION 772

At the end of the resolution, add the following:

SEC. 2. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution, the House shall proceed to the consideration in the House of the resolution (H. Res. 750) expressing the sense of the House of Representatives that individual choice in health insurance should be protected. The resolution shall be considered as read. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the resolution and preamble to adoption without intervening motion or demand for division of the question except one hour of debate equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Energy and Commerce. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of House Resolution 750.

Mrs. TORRES of California. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on ordering the previous question.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, the Chair will reduce to 5 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote on the question of adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 195, not voting 8, as follows:

[Roll No. 697]

YEAS—227

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Bera
Beyer
Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Golden
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McAdams
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stanton
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—195

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—8

Beatty
Hunter
Kaptur
Marchant
McEachin
Pressley
Serrano
Shimkus

☐ 1024

Mr. MCCARTHY changed his vote from ''yea'' to ''nay.''

Messrs. THOMPSON of Mississippi and CARSON of Indiana changed their vote from ''nay'' to ''yea.''

So the previous question was ordered.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated for:

Ms. PRESSLEY. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted ''yea'' on rollcall No. 697.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the resolution.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 227, nays 196, not voting 7, as follows:

[Roll No. 698]

YEAS—227

Adams
Aguilar
Allred
Axne
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera
Beyer

Bishop (GA)
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.
Brindisi
Brown (MD)
Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Butterfield
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Cartwright
Case
Casten (IL)
Castor (FL)
Castro (TX)
Chu, Judy
Cicilline
Cisneros
Clark (MA)
Clarke (NY)
Clay
Cleaver
Clyburn
Cohen
Connolly
Cooper
Correa
Costa
Courtney
Cox (CA)
Craig
Crist
Crow
Cuellar
Cunningham
Davids (KS)
Davis (CA)
Davis, Danny K.
Dean
DeFazio
DeGette
DeLauro
DelBene
Delgado
Demings
DeSaulnier
Deutch
Dingell
Doggett
Doyle, Michael F.
Engel
Escobar
Eshoo
Espaillat
Evans
Finkenauer
Fletcher
Foster
Frankel
Fudge
Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
García (IL)
Garcia (TX)
Gomez
Gonzalez (TX)
Gottheimer
Green, Al (TX)
Grijalva
Haaland
Harder (CA)
Hastings
Hayes
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Horn, Kendra S.
Horsford
Houlahan
Hoyer
Huffman
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson (TX)
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kildee
Kilmer
Kim
Kind
Kirkpatrick
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Lamb
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee (CA)
Lee (NV)
Levin (CA)
Levin (MI)
Lewis
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loebsack
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowey
Luján
Luria
Lynch
Malinowski
Maloney, Carolyn B.
Maloney, Sean
Matsui
McBath
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Morelle
Moulton
Mucarsel-Powell
Murphy (FL)
Nadler
Napolitano
Neal
Neguse
Norcross
O'Halleran
Ocasio-Cortez
Omar
Pallone
Panetta
Pappas
Pascrell
Payne
Perlmutter
Peters
Peterson
Phillips
Pingree
Pocan
Porter
Pressley
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rose (NY)
Rouda
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Ryan
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Scanlon
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Schrier
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Sewell (AL)
Shalala
Sherman
Sherrill
Sires
Slotkin
Smith (WA)
Soto
Spanberger
Speier
Stevens
Suozzi
Swalwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Titus
Tlaib
Tonko
Torres (CA)
Torres Small (NM)
Trahan
Trone
Underwood
Van Drew
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Visclosky
Wasserman Schultz
Waters
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wexton
Wild
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NAYS—196

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Armstrong
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Baird
Balderson
Banks
Barr
Bergman
Biggs
Bilirakis
Bishop (NC)
Bishop (UT)
Bost
Brady
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burchett
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cline
Cloud
Cole
Collins (GA)
Comer
Conaway
Cook
Crawford
Crenshaw
Curtis
Davidson (OH)
Davis, Rodney
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Duncan
Dunn
Emmer
Estes
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxx (NC)
Fulcher
Gaetz
Gallagher
Gianforte
Gibbs
Gohmert
Golden
Gonzalez (OH)
Gooden
Gosar
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green (TN)
Griffith
Grothman
Guest
Guthrie
Hagedorn
Harris
Hartzler
Hern, Kevin
Herrera Beutler
Hice (GA)
Higgins (LA)
Hill (AR)
Holding
Hollingsworth
Huizenga
Hurd (TX)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson (SD)
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Joyce (PA)
Katko
Keller
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Kustoff (TN)
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamborn
Latta
Lesko
Long
Loudermilk
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McAdams
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
Meadows
Meuser
Miller
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (NC)
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palazzo
Palmer
Pence
Perry
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reschenthaler
Rice (SC)
Riggleman
Roby
Rodgers (WA)
Roe, David P.
Rogers (AL)
Rogers (KY)
Rooney (FL)
Rose, John W.
Rouzer
Roy
Rutherford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smucker
Spano
Stauber
Stefanik
Steil
Steube
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Timmons
Tipton
Turner
Upton
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Waltz
Watkins
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Wright
Yoho
Young
Zeldin

NOT VOTING—7

Hudson
Hunter
Marchant
McEachin
Serrano
Shimkus
Stanton

□ 1035

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. STANTON. Mr. Speaker, had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 698.

UNITED STATES-MEXICO-CANADA AGREEMENT IMPLEMENTATION ACT

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, pursuant to the order of the House of December 16, 2019, I call up the bill (H.R. 5430) to implement the Agreement between the United States of America, the United Mexican States, and Canada attached as an Annex to the Protocol Replacing the North American Free Trade Agreement, and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. TORRES SMALL of New Mexico). Pursuant to the order of the House of December 16, 2019, the bill is considered read.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 5430

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE; TABLE OF CONTENTS.

(a) SHORT TITLE.—This Act may be cited as the ''United States-Mexico-Canada Agreement Implementation Act''.

(b) TABLE OF CONTENTS.—The table of contents for this Act is as follows: