

For our taxpayers, what does it mean?

Well, these are commercial ships, so no direct. However, if the American shipyards are able to reconstitute their ability to build large commercial vessels, they will also be able to compete for the naval vessels and begin to give America naval construction competition in the shipyards. It is not a bad thing to have competition. That is one.

Number two. For more than 3 decades we have had the School Lunch Program, which is also the School Breakfast Program, which is a critical program that provides nutritious meals to students in our schools who would not otherwise be fed.

Now, there is one genius here that said: Well, hungry kids can learn.

Really?

I know a lot of my colleagues that can't think if they are hungry. At least that is a good reason to assume what they are actually talking about in policy. But a hungry kid will not be able to learn. They are thinking about their stomach. They are thinking about that ache. We have had the school nutrition program for some time—lunches and breakfasts.

The law says that the food should be produced in America, but the practice is different. The practice is: We will buy wherever we can.

Now, I will give you an example. A school district in Sacramento, California, whose name actually happens to be similar to the city, decided that they should purchase Chinese peaches in big cans. Yet, within 10 miles of that school there were three packing plants that produced California-grown peaches.

It turns out that the Chinese peaches have some label on it that says organic. Right. Now, there is a label you can believe. It turns out that they are really not too organic at all.

So in terms of quality, in terms of food that is produced domestically and locally, the Buy American provisions that have been in the law for the School Lunch Program and School Breakfast Program need to be observed by school districts across this Nation.

So we have introduced another bill called American Food for American Schools. It doesn't change the basic requirement that the food be American-produced food by our farmers and by our packing houses and by the facilities that take that food and bring that nutritious meal to the schools. No. It simply says that school districts can no longer ignore the law. That they are going to be required to follow the law, to report and to seek a waiver if the cost of domestically-grown peaches, peaches grown within 10 miles of the Sacramento school district, are too expensive compared to peaches that are imported from California or some other part of the world. They could seek a waiver. They could prove that those peaches are nutritious and that they are not somehow contaminated.

We have done the studies, and there is some question about whether there

is or is not contamination. But I know that in California, we have the strictest laws concerning the quality of the food, both on the tree and in the can.

I want our students to have the best. If the cost is way out of line, a waiver can be sought and granted. But no more willy-nilly not paying attention to the law, which says: American food for American schools. And now there will be somebody watching to make sure that that law is followed.

I would also add that a similar bill is now being pushed through the California legislature.

So, once again, it comes back to this issue: Do you want to grow the American economy? Do you want to use our taxpayer money to support American jobs and American manufacturing? Or are you willing to just not worry about it and let the jobs go wherever they may?

I am still trying to find who it was; maybe one of my colleagues here in the House of Representatives or a Senator, but quite probably some staff person that when they wrote the American Recovery Act, they said: Great, we need new electric locomotives on the Eastern corridor. And they said: 100 percent American made. Hundreds of jobs in Sacramento building these. And the electric engines, the brakes, the steel, all the rest of it, all gathered from America, 100 percent American made.

So don't let anybody tell you it can't be done. If we write the law, it will be done. Those LNG ships, those oil tankers that will take our crude oil and ship it around the world, those can be built in America, in the American shipyards with American welders and plumbers and boilermakers and naval architects and American businesses providing the jobs here in the United States. It is possible.

But, colleagues, it takes a law. That is our business: to pass laws that support the American jobs, that support American businesses, just like the American Recovery Act. Sixteen lines of law. The export of crude oil, the export of LNG, starting with 5 percent in the first year, and then building up to 25 percent over the next 7 years. American ships will be built, American sailors will be on it, and American jobs will be here in the United States. We can do it if we want to.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. MARINO (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family medical issue.

Mr. NEWHOUSE (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today and the balance of the week on account of a family illness.

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 59 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, April 26, 2017, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

The oath of office required by the sixth article of the Constitution of the United States, and as provided by section 2 of the act of May 13, 1884 (23 Stat. 22), to be administered to Members, Resident Commissioner, and Delegates of the House of Representatives, the text of which is carried in 5 U.S.C. 3331:

"I, AB, do solemnly swear (or affirm) that I will support and defend the Constitution of the United States against all enemies, foreign and domestic; that I will bear true faith and allegiance to the same; that I take this obligation freely, without any mental reservation or purpose of evasion; and that I will well and faithfully discharge the duties of the office on which I am about to enter. So help me God."

has been subscribed to in person and filed in duplicate with the Clerk of the House of Representatives by the following Member of the 115th Congress, pursuant to the provisions of 2 U.S.C. 25:

RON ESTES, Fourth District of Kansas.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

1126. A letter from the Acting Deputy Secretary, Department of Agriculture, transmitting a report of violations of the Anti-Deficiency Act by the Department of Agriculture's (USDA) Working Capital Fund, National Finance Center managed by the Office of the Chief Financial Officer, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 1351; Public Law 97-258; (96 Stat. 926); to the Committee on Appropriations.

1127. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Philip H. Cullom, United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

1128. A letter from the Acting Chairman, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's 2016 Annual Report, pursuant to 12 U.S.C. 1752a(d); June 26, 1934, ch. 750, title I, Sec. 102(d) (as amended by Public Law 95-630, Sec. 501); (92 Stat. 3680); to the Committee on Financial Services.

1129. A letter from the Regulations Coordinator, Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services, Department of Health and Human