

PLEASE HELP!

THE 2020 CAMPAIGN HAS ALREADY BEGUN!



@tommcclintock



jointom

www.TomMcClintock.com

Tom is the sole survivor of the eight California Congressional seats Democrats targeted last year, which will likely make him their #1 target next year. Yes, it's true that Tom won handily last November, but the Democrats outspent us by three-to-one and they'll try to double down in 2020 and we need all the help we can get. To give you an example of what campaigns cost, the mailer you are reading now cost Tom's campaign tens of thousands of dollars to produce and mail to you.

Tom needs your help this year if we're going to beat the Democrats next year.

Please use the contribution form inside to make a donation and help ensure that Tom wins next year.

NRCC SPRING DINNER WITH PRESIDENT DONALD TRUMP

Have you already had enough of Nancy Pelosi, Adam Schiff, Maxine Waters, Jerry Nadler, and foul-mouthed radicals like Alexandria Ocasio-Cortez? **THE BIGGEST FUNDRAISER OF THE YEAR TO TAKE BACK** the House is coming up on **April 2nd** at the historic **National Building Museum** in Washington, D.C., headlined by President Trump. Tickets are \$2,500, and the proceeds will go to the National Republican Congressional Campaign Committee. Seats can be reserved on the contribution form inside or by calling our campaign office at 916-787-0112.

SAVE
THE
DATE

PAID FOR BY TOM MCCLINTOCK FOR CONGRESS



CONGRESSMAN TOM MCCLINTOCK'S CAPITOL **COMMENTS**

FEBRUARY 2019

WHY **OUR BORDER
MATTERS**

How Cloture
Killed the
**115th
Congress**

Why ^{the}
Border Wall
IS NECESSARY

CATASTROPHIC
Wildfire
IS THE OLD
NORMAL





Dear Friends:

Thank you for standing by me during 2018 midterm election! Your loyal and generous support last year made the difference by assuring I had the resources to defend this seat against the radical left.

Nancy Pelosi's Democratic Congressional Campaign Committee targeted eight California Republican seats last year, and I was the only one to survive. The massive influx of leftist money combined with one-sided election laws literally cut our Republican delegation in half – from 14 seats down to just seven – out of a total of 53 California House seats.

In this district, I was outspent more than three-to-one. But you gave me enough to respond to the attacks and get my message out to voters. In the end, the Democrats spent more than \$4.6 million dollars here in vain.

Here's the simple math behind the challenge now ahead of us: I'm now one of just seven remaining Republican representatives from California. That means that the Democrats will try to double down next year. They certainly have the resources to do it.

That is why I need your help now more than ever.

Candidate filing for 2020 begins in September, and the next fundraising reports close less than two months from now on March 31st. I must raise significantly more than I did in the last campaign to have enough in the bank to hold this seat. These next few months will decide where the Democrats put their money – and they have a lot of it.

The skewed California election laws that include automatic voter registration, on-demand voting and ballot harvesting now tilt the playing field against Republicans. Our only hope is to explain to voters how socialism impoverishes and diminishes every person in a society and how freedom enriches and empowers every citizen. The Democrats have been able to sell socialism despite its dismal failure and we must do much better in promoting freedom and its success in creating opportunity and upward mobility for all.

Countering the advantage that the left has in the media, in the schools, in the new California election laws doesn't require that we out-spend them. It DOES require that we reach the voters and make our case. With your help, I was able to do that in 2018, and I'll need your help again in 2020.

If successful, I believe we can make this district a stronghold from which to begin to take back California from the leftists whose policies are destroying it. I think people are already waking up to the misery that the left is imposing on our state – and will impose on our nation if they can take unchallenged control in Washington.

Will you help me carry this message first to the people of the Fourth Congressional District and ultimately throughout this state? If so, NOW is the time.

Thank you.

A handwritten signature in blue ink that reads "Tom McClintock".

Tom McClintock

Your generous help today will ensure that I will be able to have the resources to successful defend my congressional seat and build a grassroots operation to counter the Democrats ballot harvesting.

www.TomMcClintock.com



McClintock

FOR CONGRESS

CAMPAIGN UPDATE

Next year may seem like a long way off, but the McClintock for Congress campaign is already beginning to prepare for the 2020 campaign. As Tom's campaign manager, the most common question I get is "How can I help Tom's campaign?" I wanted to take a moment and answer that question. If you are interested in helping Tom's campaign, making a donation, or getting updates from the campaign, then please visit the McClintock for Congress campaign website at www.TomMcClintock.com where you can sign up to volunteer, make an online donation, and provide the campaign with your email address so that we can send

you campaign updates. If you are on Facebook or Twitter, the addresses for the campaign's accounts are down below so that you can follow the campaign. You can also reach out to me directly at campaign headquarters at (916) 787-0112 with any questions you might have.

A handwritten signature in white ink that reads "Jon Huey".

-JON HUEY, CAMPAIGN MANAGER



CATASTROPHIC WILDFIRE IS THE OLD NORMAL

Pundits and politicians have taken to calling the rising incidence of catastrophic wildfire **“the new normal.”** Not to be outdone, California Governor Jerry Brown has christened it the **“new abnormal,”** and blames the all-purpose scapegoat of global warming.

The rise in wildfire is indeed alarming. This year, wildfires burned 1.9 million acres in California, more than seven times the average annual loss of 250,000 acres during the last half of the 20th Century.

But California’s experience in the 21st Century is neither a new normal nor a new abnormal. It is, in fact, the old normal. The devastation unfolding today is how nature manages our forests. Just like an untended garden, an abandoned forest will grow until it chokes itself to death. Nature deals with morbid overcrowding through drought, disease, pestilence and ultimately catastrophic wildfire.

So it was before modern land and forest management. Scientists studying charcoal deposits in California estimate that pre-historic wildfires destroyed between 4.5 million and 11.9 million acres per year. When Juan Cabrillo dropped anchor in the Santa Monica Bay in October of 1542 (the height of the Santa Ana fire season), he promptly named it the “Bay of Smoke.”

Our modern sensitivities reel at the devastation of the Camp fire that recently incinerated 153,000 acres, wiped out the entire town of Paradise, California and claimed at least 86 lives. Yet in 1910, the “Big Burn” in Idaho and Montana consumed 3 million acres, wiped out seven towns and killed 87 among a far smaller and sparser population.

The fledgling U.S. Forest Service had formed just five years before, driven by scientific breakthroughs in our understanding of forest ecology. The conservationists who created our national forests believed that we didn’t need to watch helplessly as the cycle of catastrophic overpopulation followed by catastrophic wildfire wiped out entire forests for centuries at a time. Instead, we could manage our forests to keep them healthy and resilient for every generation to enjoy.

Excess timber comes out of a forest in two ways. Mankind can carry it out or nature will burn it out. For nearly a century, harvesting excess timber produced thriving forests by matching tree density to the ability of the land to support it. Foresters designated surplus trees and auctioned them to loggers who paid the U.S. Treasury for the right to remove them, generating revenues that could then be put back into forest management and shared with local communities.

What went wrong? In the 1970’s, Con-

gress imposed a series of environmental laws that subjected federal land management to endlessly time consuming and ultimately cost-prohibitive environmental regulations. Instead of generating revenues, forest management now consumes millions of dollars to meet these requirements. As a direct result, timber harvested from federal lands has declined 80 percent, while acreage destroyed by fire has increased proportionally.

After 45 years of experience with these laws, **perhaps it’s time to ask how is the environment doing?** A typical acre in the Sierra can support roughly 80 mature trees. The current density is over 300. A single fully-grown tree can draw 100 gallons of water from the soil on a hot day. Drought can quickly kill overcrowded forests – and it has.

The environmental left blames climate change. Yet this doesn’t explain the dramatic difference between private forests that practice scientific forest management and the federal lands subject to these laws. The boundary lines can often be easily seen from the air because of the condition of the forests themselves. How clever of the climate to decimate only the lands hamstrung by these environmental laws.

Decaying or burning forests make a mockery of all the laws aimed at reducing carbon emissions. Wildfires in the United States pump an estimated 290 million tons of carbon dioxide into the air every year. Healthy, growing forests absorb it. Milling surplus trees sequesters their carbon indefinitely and renews the forest’s ability to store still more.

Today’s environmental laws have restored the old normal that makes drought, disease, pestilence and fire a constant scourge of our forests. A healthy forest that is maintained and preserved for the enjoyment of future generations is an abnormal condition produced by modern forest management. **Ironically, in the name of improving the environment, we have surrendered our forests to a policy of benign neglect, which, as we can now see, isn’t very benign.**

WHY OUR BORDER MATTERS

Every nation has a natural right and responsibility to determine who is admitted to its borders. This is what defines a country and ultimately determines whether its culture, values and institutions will endure. The unique qualities that develop within each country’s borders naturally make some more desirable places to live than others. These differences drive immigration patterns. The more successful a nation, the greater is the demand to immigrate to it.

Most of the world’s 7 ½ billion people live in violent and impoverished countries and it is no wonder that they find the United States an attractive alternative. Yet uncontrolled and indiscriminate immigration from them risks importing the same undesirable conditions to our own country and destroying the qualities that encouraged immigration in the first place.

History offers many examples of great civilizations that have succumbed to this paradox, and the current crisis on our southern border poses a fundamental test of whether ours may soon join them.

America has traditionally welcomed the truly persecuted who have escaped to our shores, but what is unfolding today makes a mockery of our asylum laws. This is not a peaceful caravan of asylum seekers, as many have attempted to portray. A “cara-



van” is a group of people travelling legally and peacefully through a foreign land. An “invasion” is a group of people attempting to violate a nation’s border by force, whether by military or mob action.

The vast majority camped on our southern border are military-aged males. Authorities have already identified roughly 600 as known criminals and Mexican law enforcement has reportedly arrested roughly a hundred for crimes committed there. The fact that this force has attacked both Mexican and U.S. law enforcement, with several injuries reported, contradicts any claims that as a group they come with “peaceful” intent.

Nor are they “asylum seekers” in any conventional sense. No doubt many are non-violent and simply caught up in the group dynamic of a mob. But poverty and violence in a country does not entitle every person in it to enter ours. Asylum is reserved for those who have been specifically targeted for harm by their own government based on their race, religion, nationality, political opinion, or particular social group, and who have entered directly into this country from their own.

In those instances, asylum is reached by crossing a border and accomplishing separation from that government. A Central American arriving in Mexico has already achieved this and therefore has no call on asylum in any other country. The appropriate request is to the government in Mexico, a

request some have already made.

Nothing succeeds like success. If this throng is allowed to muscle its way into the United States, we can expect many and larger groups to follow.

If anything, the crisis should emphasize the importance of completing the border wall that Congress first authorized in 1996 and President Trump is desperately trying to complete. A forceful incursion of our border can only be repelled by the application of equal or greater force – a recipe for violence and bloodshed. The physical separation provided by a wall can prevent that, protecting the officers who place their lives on the line in defense of our law. It also protects the law breakers themselves from the violent conflict their behavior otherwise would make inevitable.

Orderly immigration regulated by law and protected by secure borders is a prerequisite to a prosperous nation. If our immigration laws are not enforced then our borders become meaningless, and America becomes a vast open territory between Canada and Mexico, susceptible to every social, political and economic disorder brought to it. This seems to be the ultimate aim of the American Left and its powerful chorus in the media. We are fortunate in this crisis to have a President obedient to his constitutional command to **“take care that the laws be faithfully executed.”**

WHY THE BORDER WALL IS NECESSARY

The term “crisis” is chronically overused by politicians, but the numbers behind the debate over the “border crisis” speak for themselves. Between 16 and 29 million people are now living in the United States illegally, costing American taxpayers more than \$100 billion a year. Sixty thousand more are now illegally crossing the southern border each month, an 86 percent increase over last year. In 2017, illegal aliens were convicted of murdering 1,800 Americans and violently assaulting 48,000 more. Not one of these crimes should have occurred because not one of these criminals should have been in the country to begin with. Heroin kills 300 Americans every week and 90 percent of it comes in through the southern border.

The “caravan” that Trump stopped in Tijuana attacked border patrol officers on New Year’s Day, and a much larger force is now on its way with the clear intention to cross the border illegally.

President Trump might be a blunt force in American politics, but his insistence on confronting this issue has brought us to a turning point in American history. It has become a pivotal test of will, but ultimately not a test between the President and Congress or between Republican and Democrats. It is a test of whether the American people can still summon the resolve to enforce their laws, secure their borders, protect their communities and defend their sovereignty.

The congressional Democrats who oppose the President’s proposal insist that they support border security but that a wall is a costly and ineffective way to stop illegal immigration.

It is hard to take either claim seriously.

The Democrats have long advocated for providing a wide range of services for illegal immigrants, ranging from health care and legal counsel to education and housing, all at taxpayer expense. It is hard to convincingly argue they want to discourage illegal immigration while simultaneously rewarding those who illegally immigrate.

Many Democratic officials have gone so far as to advocate abolishing the agencies that defend our borders. The Democrats long ago ceased to call illegal immigration for what it is – illegal. They have enacted sanctuary laws that protect dangerous criminal illegal aliens from deportation, opposed mandatory

employment verification to hold employers accountable for hiring illegals; supported enfranchising illegals; and opposed entry/exit tracking of foreign nationals entering our country.

Walls have been used for thousands of years to impede unauthorized entry for one reason: they work. And they still work: when Israel built a 143-mile wall to protect its southern border, illegal immigration fell 99 percent. The \$5.7 billion that President **Trump has requested to build a wall first authorized in 1996 is a fraction of the cost incurred by American citizens every year to support the illegal population in this country.**

It doesn’t address the whole problem. It doesn’t address bogus asylum claims, hi-tech evaders, and the nearly half of illegal immigrants who arrive on visas that they violate. But a wall would be a tremendous force multiplier for border enforcement agencies, allowing them to implement vigorous tracking of visa overstays, enforce existing employment laws, stop drugs entering through legal ports of entry and apprehend and deport criminal aliens.

The impasse cannot go on much longer, and the President cannot unilaterally appropriate funds for the wall. But in 1976, Congress authorized the President to reprogram already appropriated but unobligated military construction funds for the defense of the nation. And what is more central to national defense than the integrity of our borders?

Ironically, this approach has encountered Republican opposition. Some have argued that the money to secure our southern border would necessarily come from other defense department projects. It’s an odd logic that argues the defense of the Iraqi border is more important than the defense of our own.

Others have worried that a presidential order would provoke a protracted legal challenge. But isn’t that true of any course the President could take? Others question the law’s constitutionality. The courts must settle that question, but while the law is on the books, the President clearly has the authority and obligation to use it.

History warns us that countries that either cannot or will not defend their borders simply aren’t around very long.

HOW CLOTURE KILLED THE 115TH CONGRESS

Whittier’s lament is an appropriate epitaph for the 115th Congress: “Of all sad words of tongue and pen, the saddest are these: it might have been.”

In 2016, the American people voted at a pivotal moment in the life of our country with a simple mandate: to “make America great again.” As a practical matter, this meant reviving the economy, balancing the budget, securing our borders and rescuing our healthcare system. To accomplish these goals, voters provided Republicans all the necessary tools: majorities in both houses of Congress and the Presidency.

If Republicans had proven worthy of this trust, history would have looked back on the past two years as the turning point when America reclaimed its greatness and entered a new era of prosperity, solvency and security. The 116th Congress would be taking office with a clear mandate to build on that success.

What happened? Cloture.

Cloture is the Senate rule that requires 60 votes before a bill can be considered. Originally designed to protect the minority’s right to debate, it has degenerated into a very effective way for the minority to prevent any debate. Today, it gives minority Democrats the power to summarily reject almost every measure brought to the Senate.

House Republicans sent the Republican Senate over 1,300 bills during the last two years, fulfilling every promise made to the American people. The Senate acted on fewer than 300. Did the Senate, which absurdly boasts to

be the greatest deliberative body in the world, carefully and meticulously deliberate over these measures and ultimately reject them? No, the greatest deliberative body in the world never took them up for even a moment of deliberation – all for lack of cloture.

That’s not the fault of Senate Democrats, who radically abused this rule as part of “**the Resistance.**” It is the fault of the Senate Republicans who let them by stubbornly refusing to reform the rules.

The only major accomplishments of this Congress were due to rare instances when cloture could be bypassed. The appointments of Neil Gorsuch and Brett Kavanaugh to the Supreme Court occurred only after Senate Republicans changed the rule – but only for Supreme Court confirmations.

The landmark tax reform bill could only be taken up and passed in the Senate by misusing a budget process called reconciliation, which avoids the cloture rule. Reconciliation is a once-a-year bill designed to control spending. It isn’t subject to the 60-vote cloture, but it can only change laws to conform to spending levels set by the budget. Even then, it proved a mixed political blessing for Republicans: the limitations on deducting state and local taxes were all placed in the bill solely to conform to reconciliation requirements. Republicans got clobbered in the high-tax states where these provisions proved so unpopular.

The tax cuts triggered such dramatic economic growth that federal revenues increased, yet the deficit continued to widen. Why? Spending exploded, in part because House leaders hijacked reconciliation – the most potent tool

to control spending – to get around the cloture rule.

Cloture turned healthcare from a winning to a losing issue for Republicans. House Republicans had proposed comprehensive health care reforms that rescued Americans from the bureaucratic labyrinth of Obamacare, restored their freedom of choice, protected those with pre-existing conditions and provided a supportive tax system to guarantee an affordable health plan for every family. Yet cloture made a comprehensive bill D.O.A. in the Senate, forcing House leaders to concoct a hodge-podge measure that could fit within the narrow rules for budget reconciliation. The mangled product that resulted couldn’t even muster a Senate majority. Since the replacement bill never took effect, Democrats could portray it any way they wanted.

The same story can be told of border security and funding for the long-promised border wall. Though majorities in both houses favored funding, cloture gave Senate Democrats the power to run out the clock toward a government shutdown, producing the impasse that now paralyzes one fourth of the government.

Ironically, the political demographics of Senate elections allowed Senate Republicans to increase their majority while voter frustration decimated their House colleagues. **The 115th Congress now passes into history, as Democrats take control of the House and end any chance to fulfill the hopes of 2016.**

All that’s left are history’s saddest words.