

the problem of Ebola. So I couldn't agree with you more.

It should also be said that if you take away this aid and you have people becoming more desperate in nations around the world, they do become more susceptible to being employed by, for example, drug cartels, or being lured by terrorist organizations because these folks are desperate and need to survive. So these rogue alternatives become more attractive to them.

So it is important to point out that a lot of this development and a lot of this aid also prevents some of these things from happening.

I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. ENGEL. Absolutely. Again, I want to reiterate that we are not the leaders of the world because we anointed ourselves. We are the leaders of the world because we provided leadership for all of these years, particularly after World War II, and it is important to engage with the world.

One of the gentlemen mentioned some of the things that the President said. You know, one of the things he did was he called NATO obsolete. That kind of talk worries me because it is our alliances that are the pillar of our foreign policy and the strength of the United States and our alliances which have worked so well since World War II.

So if we denigrate our alliances, and then we cut funding for all these programs that help various countries so we can be a leader by about a third, that doesn't say much for a robust foreign policy. You get to be a leader by acting like a leader, not by pulling away from the world.

Mr. CASTRO of Texas. Absolutely. I will give Mr. SIREs the last word. I yield to the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. SIREs. Well, before we finish, I just want to compliment Chairman ROYCE and Ranking Member ENGEL on the recent resolution that we worked on together in encouraging Argentina to continue on the path under new President Macri. Former President de Kirchner decided that she was going to be an isolationist.

Argentina is too big. It is a country that could be a player in assisting us in any crisis that we have in South America. So this resolution did not cost any money, but it shows our friendship, it shows our support, and it shows that they are moving in the right direction.

So my compliments to the gentleman, my compliments to the people that signed this resolution.

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

INFRASTRUCTURE IN THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to talk about several things to do with infrastructure in the United States and in California. I am a happy new member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee here in the U.S. House, and I am very interested and dedicated to things we can do to improve all of our types of infrastructure that are so important for the economy, for the people, for movement of goods, and for the people's own convenience in doing what they need to do in their personal lives, their business lives, et cetera.

So this is, indeed, a committee and issues that will affect all of our States and have a positive effect if we put good policy in place for all of our people. We have jurisdiction over quite a few areas. One of the important things we will be working on in the short term have to do with airports as well as reauthorization of the FAA, Federal Aviation Administration.

Airports, obviously, are coming more and more into play with the amount of passenger traffic that we are seeing. The FAA projects that by the year 2029 we could see 1 billion passengers using our airports per year, and that is just not that many years away. So airports will need to continue to have more upgrading, runway extensions, maybe additional runways, the infrastructure in them, the process for getting people through TSA. These are all things that we will be looking at within our committee as well as some of our other committees we partner with here in the House, because passengers are using more and more air service, whether it is urban or the rural airports that are very important to areas like my district, the First District of Northern California. They have equal weight to those that are using them in where they live and where they need to get to.

Obviously, a lot of discussion about infrastructure led by our President, Donald Trump, on highways being a key component of movement of goods and people and everything we need for our economy to be strong and the convenience for our people. Highways are breaking down. Bridges are breaking down.

We just saw the other day, in Georgia here, a fire caused by storage of things underneath that bridge. They are on the fast track trying to get that redone on I-85.

Now, was it a bridge that needed to be maintained?

Not sure. But certainly that is a situation that shows how acute the problem is when you lose one structure like that, what it can do to traffic, an inconvenience for people and commerce in an area like that.

So we have these problems all across the country with our bridges that are in dire need of repair. We need not have more accidents or more things that would endanger the public when they are not properly maintained or upgraded.

Just try driving in the right lane of a lot of our freeways here and with the truck traffic on them who pay weight fees and many other excise taxes, other forms of fees and taxes to be part of the solution. We see much damage to them because of the backlog of work that needs to be done on highways, on freeways, that have this traffic, that have this high flow that is really part of what we would expect for our highways and these systems.

But when we are not doing the work to maintain, when we are not putting the investment in there, when people pay their gas tax, when they pay the tax on diesel, when they pay their weight fees, when all those forms of compensation that are in place to help keep our highways and roads and bridges and all of our transportation structures up, when the money isn't getting there, then we have a real problem.

Again, being from California, we see that some of our highways and road systems are in some of the worst shape in the whole country. Right now, as they contemplate raising taxes on people at the State level, a gas tax increase, a per-car tax increase to get your license plate sticker, people are going to be wondering where are we going to make ends meet on that, because probably at least the average cost to a family would be somewhere around \$500 in new gas and new fees to register a vehicle and get their kids to school and go to work and things that they need to do.

We need to be part of the solution on that. I don't think more taxes, more fees upon working people who are trying to make ends meet—you know, \$500 out of a family's income is a pretty tough deal when we see that the jobs are not coming back as rapidly, especially in the State of California, that they need to for average working families, especially inland, that aren't part of the coast where most of the wealth seems to be centered in California.

We see that the drive in California is still pushing forward on the high-speed rail project, one that was passed all the way back in 2008 just under a \$10 billion bond by the voters of California, and supplemented a few years later by ARA funding, stimulus funding from the Federal Government, about \$3.5 billion.

Well, at this point, here in 2017, they have hardly even done anything on the construction of the high-speed rail, which is probably a blessing, because this a boondoggle of epic proportions. The original cost, as sold to the voters of the State of California, would be \$33 billion to put a high-speed rail system from San Francisco to Los Angeles going through the Central Valley.

Just a couple of years later, the true numbers started coming in on that, and they finally admitted that it was going to cost \$98.5 billion was the estimate, this in the fall of 2011.

So they scurried back, went to the drawing board once again and found a

way to downsize the cost by using local transit, local projects in northern California and the San Francisco Bay Area and in southern California, trying to bring the cost down to then an estimated \$68 billion, which is still double of the original budget—the original cost that was sold to the voters in proposition 1A in 2008.

Much of the funding was supposed to come from private concerns, private investors, because when you add it up, \$10 billion from the State bond, \$3 billion-plus of Federal money, you are only a little over \$13 billion.

And if they are projecting it is a \$68 billion cost, where is the other \$55 billion going to come from?

Where are the private investors that have had nearly 9 years now to line up to be part of this profitable enterprise? They are staying away in droves.

□ 1900

There are no guarantees of income which the State cannot do under proposition 1A which is illegal. There is no subsidizing of the high-speed rail allowed under the proposition 1A bond. Yet it keeps going on and on. We have these infrastructure needs we have all over the country. I don't see any more money coming from Congress, not coming from the Federal level, to help boost this boondoggle in California. We will work hard to make sure that doesn't happen.

Unfortunately, when they seek new funds for other things such as electrification of the rail in the bay area, they were seeking \$647 million of brand new money from a different pot federally to electrify the existing train route they have in the bay area that is run by diesel trains presently. So it is not like they don't have train service for commuting in the bay area, indeed, one of the richest areas of the country. They come to Congress here and ask for \$647 million of new money maybe to electrify but mostly to help facilitate the high-speed rail boondoggle as part of that.

We need not be part of that. They can go to the funding they have already set aside within the bond or the \$3.5 billion that we don't seem to be able to capture back from the stimulus package. Go to those sources of money if you want to electrify the rail.

That said, part of the problem with building the high-speed rail is people don't really want to cooperate. When the first segment was being contemplated, it was going to go from San Francisco halfway down into the valley or L.A. halfway up to the valley. One of the reasons they chose to start building in the valley was that was the cheapest area to build one, the most wide open. One of the quotes at the time from one of the spokesmen for the authority was they would find the least amount of resistance to build the rail in the valley because there are not that many people there compared to the cities.

Well, there is plenty of resistance there, too, because, at this point, I

don't know exact statistics, but they have less than half of the parcels even in their control that they would need to lay the route out through the valley because people are resisting. They don't want this thing coming through their neighborhoods, knocking out their farms, and cutting up their property in sections into little triangles and little bits that they can no longer farm or even transport their livestock or equipment to because it is going to be cut off by this rail that will be fenced on both sides because you have got a 220-mile-per-hour train supposedly running through it. So there will be a lot of damage to the economy and the fabric of the Central Valley.

The people in the urban areas aren't that excited about it either. In the high-value properties in the south bay area, they are not really excited about having this causeway 20 feet above their neighborhoods there. So they are talking, put this thing underground. So they are doing that part last. In the meantime, they are going to try and electrify the commuter train they have, which is a low-speed rail and doesn't fulfill the goals of a high-speed rail which is just required from San Francisco to Los Angeles. As well in southern California, they want to take over part of the system there to use that commuter rail as fulfilling part of the obligation to have a high-speed rail system that is electrified from one end to the other.

Now, they haven't even really contemplated what it is going to cost as they talk about drilling a hole, drilling a bore, through the Tehachapis down there in southern California, to the tunes of billions and billions of dollars that isn't really comprehended in the cost of doing the system.

So this is an issue, this is a dream, and this is a project that really needs to be scrapped. Where is the money going to come from? It is not coming from the Federal Government, and it is not coming from investors. The cap-and-trade dollars that they were counting on in the State of California from auctioning off CO₂ allotments to large businesses, that has withered as well. They are not getting the billions they were hoping to get from auctioning off this new commodity created by government in California of CO₂ allotments to large businesses that produce CO₂.

So the funding isn't available anywhere. Still they hold on to this dream of building this high-speed rail project that is at least \$55 billion, probably a lot more than \$55 billion short of being completed.

Do you know what? This isn't even a priority for most people. Are they going to be able to afford to ride that rail? Are they going to be able to afford to ride that train and afford the ticket? Because if it is not going to be a subsidized ticket, it is probably going to be close to \$200 or \$300, not the \$80 that they projected 9 years ago.

Then should that really be the priority? Now, California, until this year,

we were blessed with so much rain and snow pack—there is an incredible amount of snow pack up on the mountains that I just flew over yesterday in my commute to Washington. We had suffered about 5 years of drought previously to that. We didn't have the infrastructure in place to store water that we should have with a State of 40 million people that, in the good old days, we used to plan for with the Central Valley Project built in the thirties and forties, the State water project built in the fifties and sixties.

Why have we been sitting all these decades since not really doing the things to stay forward and stay ahead of the curve on a population, on the needs of an economy of agriculture and municipalities of people? Instead, we are chasing these utter boondoggles like high-speed rail.

Our water infrastructure still has a lot of needs. Our rivers, when we have the high flows, many of our levees are in danger of not holding up in really high flows. We see that issue on the Feather River on the south end of my district and the adjacent district to the south of there with the levee systems in Yuba County and Sutter County, which a lot of folks have worked really hard in recent years on, and they are trying to locally upgrade these levees and keep it going.

This year, they had to spend a lot of dollars on upgrading the levees just to get through the season by laying gravel and mat down so that the boils that would be potentially coming through the levees wouldn't give out and have a blowout in those areas. What is going on with that? The money has been put aside, and the work is ready to go, but delays have cost the ability to get more miles of those levees done during the good weather last year so that we would ensure the safety of these areas, whether it is south Butte County, Yuba and Sutter Counties, and many other areas in the north State leading all the way down to Sacramento and the delta.

We need to be getting that work done immediately. Why should we endanger our communities by not getting the work we know we need to get done, the funding has been more or less put aside for, yet needless delay and bureaucratic red tape have caused delays in endangered places like that? Or like Hamilton City up in my area that I share in western Butte County and Glenn County.

This is the type of infrastructure that produces jobs—but even more importantly, after the jobs are done, the safety to a community, the ability to invest there, to build homes there, and to have that 200-year flood protection on the levees that is necessary to be insurable and, again, ensure the public safety. So this is part of the water infrastructure we desperately need in California and many of our other States, too, as well.

So serving on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, we could advance these. We can have this debate.

We can have this discussion and hold accountable the agencies that are supposed to be getting it done and not looking for more ways to delay it with paperwork sitting on the desk for projects that could be going out this year that might be delayed yet another year.

Coming back to dams, that is one of our most important components in flood control because we can control the water as it comes down from the higher elevations and have that ability to store water at the level we decide to let it out of the dam instead of whatever might be coming in uncontrolled with the high flows you can sometimes get from a massive amount of rain like we saw in the Sierras this year and the snow pack that is still sitting up there.

Lake Oroville, which many people have heard about across the country in recent weeks, is right in my district, right in my backyard. It has been a great project. It is a jewel of the State water project in California, built primarily in the sixties. Well, there was a big problem with the spillway. It gave way in early February, and so they had to assess what was going on with that and temporarily shut it down, in case of so much—an amazing amount of rain coming in during some of those same days actually caused the lake to top out and some of the water to start coming over the emergency spillway, which became another issue requiring an evacuation because erosion happening underneath that emergency spillway structure was unpredictable. Nobody knew what would happen as the dirt field below that eroded.

Why is it still a dirt field? That will be an interesting thing for us to hear about in hearings that are going to be going on at the State level as well as at the Federal level here. Why was it allowed to stay that way? A dirt field. The erosion nearly came up. Who knows what the effect might have been on that emergency spillway structure. Thankfully nothing happened. The dam structure is sound, the emergency spillway structure is sound. The main spillway needs much work, and a Herculean effort since then has cleared the river channel so the river can properly flow from the power plant, which is an important regulator of State level, the water that can run through that power plant. So a really good effort was done to do that after this emergency has occurred.

The evacuation really worried deeply many people in the north State. 180,000 people were evacuated. It was the right call by our Butte County sheriff to do so because of the unpredictability of that situation. So Sheriff Honea deserves much kudos for making the correct call on that and making people safe, keeping people safe.

But, nonetheless, we have this infrastructure issue we need to come back to and is being contemplated right now with a plan to replace the spillway. Can it be done in 1 year? It doesn't look like it. But measures will be

taken to upgrade that and make it work. It can be a long-term structure that will be durable for many decades. That is what we need. We need that predictability so the lake can be regulated and water stored properly in a fashion that provides for flood control during the high rain season and high snow pack season, as well as storing water for those drought years that we hopefully didn't let too much water get away from. We still have an obligation to meet water contracts and grow agricultural products and meet the needs for municipalities as well as all the environmental needs that are being demanded these days as well.

So we need to rebuild our spillway at Lake Oroville soon. That project will soon be underway. In the meantime, we still have a massive snow pack up there that has to be modeled and watched and carefully contemplated as to what the releases from the lake will be in the interim until the point where they can know what the predictability is of the amount of snow, the amount of rain, and the amount of water that can come down from the Sierras and affect the river system all the way down basically to where it meets up near Sacramento.

We need to have that predictability for people to be secure in their homes, at the same time finding that balance of storing the water that is needed to make a State run because we never know what the next drought year will be. Will it be next year? Or will we get a massive amount of rain this coming year? So we need to find that balance to make sure that we are keeping those communities safe, modeling very carefully what is up on the slopes still in snow pack and storing water for California's long-term needs this coming year and following years.

So with the repairs to Oroville that will soon be underway, I think people can be confident that that system will be sound. The dam is sound, the emergency spillway is sound, and the repairs that will be going underneath the base of that should make—if it is ever needed—which the goal is to never use the emergency spillway, but, should it be needed, it would be a sound piece of that infrastructure. And with a new spillway that will be built at Oroville within 1 to 2 years, that will be sound as well. People need to have that confidence.

I was speaking with people around the Oroville area, several of the businesses there that are concerned that having to move in an evacuation obviously is a horrendous expense, but also it is a concern for those others that they do business with, maybe outside of the area, that they can continue to supply the things that they produce for the contracts they would have. Indeed, that was expressed to me at a meeting a few weeks ago that maybe they are vendors for others in other parts of the State or the country that if they have the perception they can't rely upon them to keep producing those compo-

nents that go into other assemblies, then they may not do business with them anymore.

We need to ensure those folks that Oroville is going to stay, is in business to stay, and that those manufacturers can count on those components to be produced and made available to them because we will keep working to make sure that that infrastructure is sound with the water storage and the levee flood control system that we have. In just a few short weeks, we will see that, with the snow pack properly accounted for and that flood season past us, in the rebuilding of that infrastructure, then we can assure everyone that Oroville is strongly here to stay and here for business.

□ 1915

We have the operations of the lake. Indeed, there are a lot of things to balance with this infrastructure: recreation, electricity generation, agricultural and municipal as well as environmental waters. These are all things that have to be balanced. But, indeed, balance needs to be brought to it so that no one side is pushing too far the other so that we don't meet all these goals that are needed.

Energy is an important component of that as well. Generating that with hydroelectric power helps meet a reliable baseline load for electricity generated in California. It is much more reliable than solar or wind power. Why hydro-power isn't seen as an even more important component of the renewal energy portfolio is kind of silly and arbitrary to me, but it is, indeed, very, very valuable.

As we wind through all the different needs we have for infrastructure in this country—some of these examples in my own backyard—they are also needed elsewhere. Folks in all parts of the country have needs for a strong infrastructure, whether you are riding the train from New York to Washington, D.C., which I have a couple of times—that is a very important part of that infrastructure for those folks. We need to support them as well and make sure it is as modern and as safe as it can be. It affects everybody, the highway system that goes from the East Coast to the West Coast or North to South. It is a positive for all of us.

We need to stay ahead of the curve. President Trump has a very ambitious plan for rebuilding and adding to our infrastructure. It isn't all just about ribbon cuttings on new infrastructure. It is, indeed, the less glamorous that is a very important part of rebuilding what we have: upgrading our bridges, repaving those lanes, adding additional lanes to our freeways. That helps make it more convenient for all of us, better for commerce, better for safety.

With so much consternation in Washington, D.C., about what we are doing, these are some of the positives that we can point to in moving forward on infrastructure that everybody can use. It will be positive for the jobs in construction while it is being built and,

longer term, for the type of commerce that will make the United States a place to locate factories once again and have that manufacturing and that predictability of energy sources, water sources, safety of the infrastructure, and the ability to move these goods down our freeways to our ports, wherever they need to go.

With that, I will be looking forward to what we can do in California to have better infrastructure that is something people can actually use, actually access, and certainly afford without being hit with more taxes, more gas tax, more vehicle fees, and more ideas for taxes that may come from the Federal Government.

I don't see that happening here, but the people pay enough. As it is, it is already difficult enough for middle-income families to make ends meet if they have dreams of buying a home, paying off college debt, or sending their own kids to college a little later and maybe even, once in a while, going on a vacation that they would like to save up for. People need to have these choices. We are here at the Federal level to help be part of facilitating their ability to have those choices.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage all the folks in northern California to hang in there. We are going to get through this season here. To the people of Oroville, we will make sure our systems are very sound. I think already, with steps that are taken, we will weather this difficult winter with a sound dam and infrastructure that will be able to have predictability and the assurance that, when you go to sleep at night, these systems are going to be serving us well and providing for our safety. I think we are well onto that track already.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today after 4 p.m. on account of personal reasons.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTIONS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled joint resolutions of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker on Thursday, March 30, 2017:

H.J. Res. 43. Joint Resolution providing for congressional disapproval under chapter 8 of title 5, United States Code, of the final rule submitted by Secretary of Health and Human Services relating to compliance with title X requirements by project recipients in selecting subrecipients.

H.J. Res. 67. Joint Resolution disapproving the rule submitted by the Department of Labor relating to savings arrangements established by qualified State political subdivisions for non-governmental employees.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 19 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 5, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

973. Under clause 2 of rule XIV, a letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 653. A bill to amend title 5, United States Code, to protect unpaid interns in the Federal Government from workplace harassment and discrimination, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-78). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CHAFFETZ: Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. H.R. 702. A bill to amend the Notification and Federal Employee Antidiscrimination and Retaliation Act of 2002 to strengthen Federal antidiscrimination laws enforced by the Equal Employment Opportunity Commission and expand accountability within the Federal Government, and for other purposes (Rept. 115-79). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Ms. ROSEN (for herself, Mr. PALONE, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania):

H.R. 1868. A bill to provide that providers of broadband Internet access service shall be subject to the privacy rules adopted by the Federal Communications Commission on October 27, 2016; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. DELAURO (for herself, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Ms. SLAUGHTER, Mr. O'HALLERAN, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. NORTON, Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. PAYNE, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. HASTINGS, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. LANGEVIN, Ms. FRANKEL of Florida, Mr. CICILLINE, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New

York, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. ADAMS, Ms. SHEA-PORTER, Ms. MOORE, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. TSONGAS, Mr. DEFAZIO, Ms. ROSEN, Mrs. TORRES, Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. POCAN, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. BLUMENAUER, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. RASKIN, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. CÁRDENAS, Mr. CARBAJAL, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mrs. DEMINGS, Mr. LYNCH, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. KIHUEN, Mr. MEEKS, Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BEYER, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts, Mr. CAPUANO, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mrs. LAWRENCE, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Mr. FOSTER, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KIND, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. FUDGE, Mr. ELLISON, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. GRIMALVA, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. HECK, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. YARMUTH, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. GARAMENDI, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. EVANS, Mr. CONYERS, Mr. GALLEGO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. RYAN of Ohio, Mr. COOPER, Mr. CLEAVER, Mr. PETERS, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. KILDEE, Ms. DEGETTE, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CONNOLLY, Mr. NADLER, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Mr. VARGAS, Mr. WALZ, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. SÁNCHEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. HIMES, Mr. BUTTERFIELD, Mrs. BEATY, Mr. BRADY of Pennsylvania, Mr. BERA, Mr. MCGOVERN, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. SCHNEIDER, Mr. KILMER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mr. ESPALLAT, Mr. LEVIN, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Ms. LEE, Mr. CRIST, Mr. DELANEY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. PALLONE, Mr. HUFFMAN, Ms. MATSUI, Mr. PASCRELL, Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. VELA, Mr. GUTIÉRREZ, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. BARRAGÁN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. WELCH, Mr. BEN RAY LUJÁN of New Mexico, Ms. PINGRÉE, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Mr. SARBANES, Mr. HOYER, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Ms. TITUS, Ms. SINEMA, Mr. CROWLEY, Mr. DOGGETT, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. CUMMINGS, Mr. PRICE of North Carolina, Mr. NOLAN, Ms. MENG, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. BASS, Ms. GABBARD, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. CLAY, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Mr. KEATING, Mr. LARSEN of Washington, Mrs. LOWEY, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. O'ROURKE, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. VISCLOSKEY, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. SHERMAN, Mr. RUSH, Mr. LOEBACK, Mr. CORREA, Mr. QUIGLEY, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mr. RICHMOND, Ms. HANABUSA, Mr. NEAL, Ms. LOFGREN, Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. SIREN, Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LEWIS of Georgia, Mr. SCHIFF, Ms. ESTY, Mr. SOTO, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. POLIS, Mr. CASTRO of Texas, Ms. BORDALLO, Ms. PELOSI, Mr. CLYBURN, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. PANNETTA, Ms. PLASKETT, Mr. RUIZ, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. THOMPSON of