

President, we can work on a more comprehensive deal addressing all of his concerns.

That is why we have to work on this more comprehensive deal based, as was discussed with President Trump yesterday, on four pillars: the substance of the existing agreement, especially if you decide to leave it; the post-2025 period, in order to be sure that we will never have any nuclear activity for Iran; the containment of the military influence of the Iranian regime in the region; and the monitoring of ballistic activity.

I think these four pillars, the ones I addressed in front of the General Assembly of the United Nations last September, are the ones which cover the legitimate fears of the United States and our allies in the region.

I think we have to start working now on these four pillars to build this new, comprehensive deal and to be sure that, whatever the decision of the United States will be, we will not leave the floor to the absence of rules. We will not leave the floor to these conflicts of power in the Middle East. We will not fuel ourselves in increasing tensions and potential war.

That is my position, and I think we can work together to build this comprehensive deal for the whole region for our people, because I think it fairly addresses our concerns. That is my position.

And this containment I mentioned in one of the pillars is necessary in Yemen, in Lebanon, in Iraq, and also in Syria. Building a sustainable peace in a united and inclusive Syria requires, indeed, that all powers in the region respect the sovereignty of its people and the diversity of its communities.

In Syria, we work very closely together. After prohibited weapons were used against the population by the regime of Bashar al-Assad 2 weeks ago, the United States and France, together with the United Kingdom, acted to destroy chemical facilities and to restore the credibility of the international community. This action was one of the best evidences of this strong multilateralism.

And I want to pay a special tribute to our soldiers, because they did a very great job in this region and on this occasion.

Beyond this action, we will, together, work for humanitarian solutions in the short-term on the ground, and contribute actively to a lasting political solution to put an end to this tragic conflict.

I think one of the very important decisions we took together with President Trump was precisely to include Syria in this large framework for the overall region and to decide to work together on a political deal for Syria and for the Syrian people, even after our war against ISIS.

In the Sahel, where terrorist networks span a footprint as large as Europe, French and American soldiers are confronting the same enemy and risking their lives together.

Here, I would like to pay special tribute to the American soldiers who fell this past fall in the region and to their French comrades who lost their lives earlier this year in Mali. Better than anyone, I think our troops know what the alliance and friendship between our countries mean.

I believe facing all these challenges, all these fears, all this anger, our duty, our destiny is to work together and to build this new strong multilateralism.

Distinguished Members of Congress, ladies and gentlemen, on April 25, 1960, General de Gaulle affirmed in this Chamber that nothing was as important to France as “the reason, the resolution, the friendship of the great people of the United States.” Fifty-eight years later, to this very day, I come here to convey the warmest feelings of the French nation and to tell you that our people cherish the friendship of the American people with as much intensity as ever.

The United States and the American people are an essential part of our confidence in the future, in democracy, in what women and men can accomplish in this world when we are driven by high ideals and an unbreakable trust in humanity and progress.

Today, the call we hear is the call of history. This is a time of determination and courage. What we cherish is at stake. What we love is in danger. We have no choice but to prevail; and together, we shall prevail.

“Long live the friendship between France and the United States of America,” “vive les Etats-Unis d’Amerique.”

“Long live the Republic,” “vive la République,” “Long live France,” “vive la France,” “Long live our friendship,” “vive notre amitié.”

“Thank you,” “merci.”

(Applause, the Members rising.)

At 11 o’clock and 52 minutes a.m., His Excellency Emmanuel Macron, President of the French Republic, accompanied by the committee of escort, retired from the Hall of the House of Representatives.

The Assistant to the Sergeant at Arms escorted the invited guests from the Chamber in the following order:

The members of the President’s Cabinet;

The Acting Dean of the Diplomatic Corps.

JOINT MEETING DISSOLVED

The SPEAKER. The purpose of the joint meeting having been completed, the Chair declares the joint meeting of the two Houses now dissolved.

Accordingly (at 11 o’clock and 53 minutes a.m.), the joint meeting of the two Houses was dissolved.

The Members of the Senate retired to their Chamber.

The SPEAKER. The House will continue in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

□ 1230

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO) at 12 o’clock and 30 minutes p.m.

PRINTING OF PROCEEDINGS HAD DURING RECESS

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the proceedings had during the recess be printed in the RECORD.

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

There was no objection.

ELECTING A MEMBER TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Republican Conference, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 844

Resolved, That the following named Member be, and is hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES: Mr. Mitchell.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 4, FAA REAUTHORIZATION ACT OF 2018; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 3144, PROVIDING FOR THE OPERATIONS OF THE FEDERAL COLUMBIA RIVER POWER SYSTEM; AND PROVIDING FOR PROCEEDINGS DURING THE PERIOD FROM APRIL 30, 2018, THROUGH MAY 4, 2018

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 839 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 839

Resolved, That (a) at any time after adoption of this resolution the Speaker may, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 4) to reauthorize programs of the Federal Aviation Administration, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. The bill shall be considered as

read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived.

(b) No amendment to the bill shall be in order except those printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution and amendments en bloc described in subsection (e).

(c) Each amendment printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules shall be considered only in the order printed in the report, may be offered only by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for the time specified in the report equally divided and controlled by the proponent and an opponent, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(d) All points of order against amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules or amendments en bloc described in subsection (e) are waived.

(e) It shall be in order at any time for the chair of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or his designee to offer amendments en bloc consisting of amendments printed in part A of the report of the Committee on Rules not earlier disposed of. Amendments en bloc offered pursuant to this subsection shall be considered as read, shall be debatable for 20 minutes equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure or their designees, shall not be subject to amendment, and shall not be subject to a demand for division of the question in the House or in the Committee of the Whole.

(f) At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 2. Upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 3144) to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System pursuant to a certain operation plan for a specified period of time, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The amendment printed in part B of the report of the Committee on Rules accompanying this resolution 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 Natural Resources; and (2) one motion to recommit with or without instructions.

SEC. 3. On any legislative day during the period from April 30, 2018, through May 4, 2018 —

(a) the Journal of the proceedings of the previous day shall be considered as approved; and

(b) the Chair may at any time declare the House adjourned to meet at a date and time, within the limits of clause 4, section 5, article I of the Constitution, to be announced by the Chair in declaring the adjournment.

SEC. 4. The Speaker may appoint Members to perform the duties of the Chair for the duration of the period addressed by section 3 of this resolution as though under clause 8(a) of rule I.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Georgia is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentlewoman from California (Mrs. TORRES), the newest member of the Rules Committee, 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

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, today's rule provides for the consideration of two bills: H.R. 4, which is the FAA Reauthorization Act, and a closed rule for H.R. 3144, which would adjust operations at the Federal Columbia River Power System.

We are lucky today, Mr. Speaker, in that we will have Mr. NEWHOUSE, who is an expert from Washington State on H.R. 3144, come down to the floor and talk extensively about that measure and why it is important for Washington State. But before we talk about Washington State, I want to talk about the FAA reauthorization bill as well.

I would point out, Mr. Speaker, it is not every rule in every case we are able to make every Rules Committee member's amendment in order, but we are fortunate today that, during Mrs. TORRES' very first rule on the House floor, we are making her amendment in order, which, again, Mr. Speaker, is one of those prerogatives of Rules Committee members.

I know that in the first few moments of the FAA bill, Mr. Speaker, we are going to want to talk about the good work that went on in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. It has really been my pleasure as not just a Rules Committee member, but as a Transportation and Infrastructure Committee member to be able to work on this bill now in two committees.

You may recall, Mr. Speaker, that we went not only through our initial hearings in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee; we went through a summer markup last year. We have gone through five short-term extensions on FAA, and we are now here prepared to consider a full 5-year reauthorization on the floor.

It has not been the easiest process. There have been a lot of folks who haven't gotten everything they have wanted in this process, but it has been a collaborative process, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad that we have it here today.

I would be remiss if I didn't thank our committee chairman on the authorizing committee, Mr. Speaker, Chairman SHUSTER, for all the work

that he has done. As you know, he has been a long champion of reforming the FAA, believing that we could get even more value for the American taxpayer dollars out of the FAA. While he did not achieve everything that he wanted to achieve in this bill either, Mr. Speaker, we have a dramatic step forward in H.R. 4 today.

These things never happen by accident, Mr. Speaker, as you well know, and I want to thank all the folks who have been toiling behind the scenes in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee day in and day out. I am thinking of folks, Mr. Speaker, like Chris Vieson. I am thinking about folks like Naveen Rao. I am thinking about Hunter Presti and Brittany Smith.

Mr. Speaker, even though he has left us to go, now, serve in the article II Federal Railroad Administration, I want to thank Matt Sturges, who was the former staff director there at the committee, for all he has done over 2 years to get us to this place.

Mr. Speaker, as you know, getting this work done requires a collaborative working relationship, Members and staff across the aisle, from committee office staff to personal office staff, and it has really been a rewarding process. I am very proud of the product that we have on the floor today, but it wouldn't have been possible without all of the staff working and the collaboration that went on. I am grateful to folks for that. That is the authorizing committee side, Mr. Speaker.

On the Rules Committee side, we had an equal amount of work going on. These past few days, moving this bill through the Rules Committee, the staff has had to work tirelessly, in large part, because of all the amendments that were offered to the bill. We now, in this rule, today, Mr. Speaker, made in order 116 different revisions to this bill.

Let me say that again. We went through a complete, full, and open markup in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, as you know, Mr. Speaker; but then, in the Rules Committee, we made in order an additional 116 amendments through this rule today: 56 of those are amendments sponsored by my Democratic colleagues; 36 of those are amendments sponsored by my Republican colleagues; and 24 of those are amendments that have bipartisan support here in this Chamber. That is just over 50 percent of all the ideas that were brought to the Rules Committee last night, Mr. Speaker.

I hope that my colleagues are as proud of that as I am. It reflects the commitment that Speaker RYAN made to having a more open and transparent process. Here, again: 56 Democratic amendments, 36 Republican amendments, and 24 bipartisan amendments.

Mr. Speaker, this FAA bill is a good step towards bringing more value to the American taxpayer from the FAA, and this rule is a good step to making

that possible. With the passage of this rule today, we will be able to move directly to that debate.

Mr. Speaker, don't believe the headlines that say Congress has packed up its bags and gone home. I hear that day in and day out that folks think this 2018 is not going to be a particularly productive legislative session. I reject that. I reject that with no reservations whatsoever.

I see the passion my friends on the Democratic side have for continuing to make improvements for the American people. I see that same passion on our side. Now, I am not saying we are not going to have some challenges keeping people focused on the process at hand, but this FAA bill is a good example of the fact that we are still hard at work, and there is still much work that we can do together.

This bill, Mr. Speaker, finally delivers on the regulatory reform to the FAA certification process.

Now, if you have any companies in your district that are involved in FAA regulations in any way, shape, or form, you know exactly what I am talking about. This certification process is going to allow companies all over the country, including many in my district, Mr. Speaker, like Meggitt in Suwanee, like Universal Avionics in Duluth, like Siemens in Cumming, Gulfstream in Savannah, and many others, to get safer, more innovative aviation products to market faster.

Let me say that again, Mr. Speaker: safer products, more innovative products, more value to the American taxpayer to market faster.

This bill also provides a pathway to regulatory certainty for unmanned aircraft systems. That allows companies like L3 Technologies and Colonial Pipeline in Alpharetta, like UPS in Sandy Springs, like our electric utilities in Gwinnett and Forsyth Counties, Mr. Speaker, and many other companies in my home State of Georgia to get their technologies out faster, to make environments safer for their employees and for my constituents.

□ 1245

We all know that the transformative power of unmanned aviation is upon us. We have got to regulate that in a safe and responsible way to make sure that the rules are in place for certainty, for safety, and for opportunity for innovation. I believe we have that in this bill.

We have a choice, Mr. Speaker. We are either going to lead the world in unmanned aviation or we are going to cede leadership to countries like China. I say we seize leadership, and we are seizing it here in this bill.

The bill also commits that our airports—from the busiest airport in the world, Mr. Speaker, my hometown airport of Hartsfield-Jackson, the fourth busiest airport in the State; and also in my district, Mr. Speaker, is Briscoe Field in Lawrenceville—that these airports have access to long-term funding sustainability. We all know that

yanking the pendulum back and forth on Federal funding does not serve any of our constituents' cause. Funding stability—knowing that they can count on the Federal Government to be their partner in providing innovation and improving the overall experience of those men and women who travel through these airports—is of vital importance.

And finally, Mr. Speaker, this bill ensures that our American airlines—like my hometown airline of Delta—can compete and win against anyone on the planet in terms of the service, reliability, safety, and customer service that we have come to expect. Again, aviation is a partnership in this country, Mr. Speaker, between private sector actors and public actors. We need to do all that we can, from our end of Pennsylvania Avenue, to be the very best partners that we can.

Of course, we can always do more, and I hope that we will continue to do more. I am expecting a very robust Transportation Committee cycle here over the next 9 months. But this bill today is a significant downpayment on our commitment to the American people to make our aviation infrastructure continue to be the very finest on the planet.

Mr. Speaker, this rule that, again, will govern debate of both H.R. 4 and H.R. 3144 is a fair rule. These are both commonsense measures that will benefit the American people. I hope my colleagues will see that, I hope my colleagues will come to the floor and support this rule, and I hope my colleagues will also support the two underlying measures.

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

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume. I thank the gentleman for yielding me the customary 30 minutes.

I am proud to be the newest member of the House Rules Committee. When I expressed my desire to join the committee to the minority leader, I shared my hope that I could do my part to ensure the committee would allow the House to work its will in an open way. Unfortunately, the rule that we are bringing to the floor does not meet that standard. For that reason, I rise in opposition.

The rule we consider this afternoon is a combined rule for H.R. 3144, legislation to delay and derail management practices at the Federal Columbia River Power System in the Pacific Northwest, and H.R. 4, the Federal Aviation Administration Reauthorization Act. There is no reason for the House to take up these items in a combined rule. We have plenty of time to give each bill a full, robust debate, and plenty of time to allow the House an opportunity to vote on some of the 138 amendments filed to these bills that were not made in order under this rule.

Mr. Speaker, the House appears to be in a rush to leave here every single week. Last week, we only had three

voting days, and with this combined rule, who knows how long we will be here this week. Perhaps we could use some of this extra time to take up a number of issues which Americans have been asking for.

Instead of making this yet another short week, how about we give Americans a vote on addressing gun violence by giving us a vote on background checks, bump stocks, assault weapons, gun trafficking reform; or ensuring that we don't find ourselves in a constitutional crisis by protecting the special counsel, and making sure that we address Russian interference in our elections; or allowing the House to actually take a vote on so many outstanding immigration issues by protecting DACA and TPS recipients?

There are 244 cosponsors of Representative DENHAM's "Queen of the Hill" resolution, including over 40 members of the majority party.

Nearly 8 months since President Trump terminated the DACA program, Congress has continually failed to protect the thousands of American Dreamers who lose their protections every single day. Dreamers are the educators, doctors, and small-business owners who make our communities better and help make our country stronger and safer.

There are very real consequences for the lack of a permanent solution to this crisis. The American people want us to act. We can respect their will by taking up the "Queen of the Hill" resolution on one of the many days where we find ourselves with nothing to do. We could work together to at least provide the House with a path forward where the best idea wins.

Mr. Speaker, instead of doing what we did last week by canceling voting days, let's take this time to act on behalf of our constituents. Why don't we put a stop to the administration's attack on the Affordable Care Act and work on bipartisan improvements to control the cost of healthcare, prescription drugs, and increase access to services?

Finally, why don't we take some time to do what I have been calling for since my first day in Congress and pass a large-scale infrastructure package? There are roads and bridges crumbling around our country, transit systems in need of significant repair, and a power grid waiting to enter the 21st century. We need robust investments in our transportation and energy infrastructure.

In its 2017 report card, the American Society of Civil Engineers gave us our infrastructure a nearly failing grade of a D-plus. But based on my experiences driving around my hometown, that might be a bit too generous.

These are all the things that have bipartisan agreement. It is up to us to address the real problems before us with leadership, security, and stability that the Nation demands.

That said, as I mentioned before, we have two bills included in this rule. The first is the FAA Authorization

Act, the first long-term FAA reauthorization since 2012. This legislation was developed over 3 years of bipartisan and stakeholder negotiations. It will provide long-term stability for our Nation's aviation community, continue investments in research and innovation, and make necessary reforms to improve American competitiveness and safety in aviation.

I appreciate Chairman SHUSTER working with Ranking Member DEFALZO to ensure that this bill is as bipartisan as possible. I would have preferred that we did more to assist our Nation's airports, but this bill reflects the committee's will.

Airline safety is on all of our minds, especially after the tragedy of Southwest Flight 1380. Moving this bill forward, without the poison bill language we had seen in previous versions, will go a long way in improving passenger safety, passenger comfort, and the entire experience on our Nation's airlines.

Following my work to return the Ontario International Airport to local control, we have seen my hometown airport go through a renaissance with new flights being added constantly. It is my hope that this bill continues that growth and allows for more improvements at the airport.

While I am pleased this rule does make in order an amendment I offered to assist Ontario International Airport and airports like it, there are many amendments which were not made in order.

One such amendment I want to mention is Representative CARTWRIGHT's amendment No. 152 on single-pilot operations. I am extremely concerned with section 744 of the underlying legislation, which establishes an FAA research and development program in support of single-pilot all-cargo operations utilizing remote piloting or computer piloting technology.

Unfortunately, I believe moving in this direction—single-piloted aircraft—will result in excessive workload for pilots and safety risks for everyone.

I think it would have been fair for the House to give the Cartwright amendment a floor debate and a simple up-or-down vote.

In addition, I am disappointed that Representative GRACE MENG's amendment No. 28 was not made in order. This amendment would have standardized the treatment of animals aboard airlines.

I know we were all horrified when we read the reports last month of a pet who died after being forced into a luggage compartment, or being flushed down a toilet, or being forced to leave the plane.

According to a U.S. Department of Transportation report issued in February, 24 animals died in the care of U.S. carriers last year. I don't think it is too much to ask for a vote on the House floor to establish standards for the safety of our constituents' pets.

In addition to the FAA authorization bill, this rule will also bring H.R. 3144

to the floor. This bill is intended to provide for operations of the Federal Columbia River Power System and delay multiple court decisions which are intended to protect the local environment.

This legislation would derail the ongoing comprehensive efforts to improve dam management practices on the Columbia River basin, creating problematic conservation and management policies. The impact on salmon and steelhead trout, in particular, would harm not just the environment, but also tribes and businesses of the Pacific Northwest.

I joined the Rules Committee from my previous role as ranking member on the Indian, Insular, and Alaska Native Affairs Subcommittee. I was proud of the work I did to protect Tribal communities, and while serving in that role, I opposed this legislation due to the negative impact on local tribes.

The 2014 operation plan, which this bill attempts to re-implement, was developed by the Department of Commerce National Marine Fisheries Services. That plan was found to violate the Endangered Species Act and the National Environmental Policy Act, and failed to live up to the agreement we made with local tribes.

Native peoples of the Pacific Northwest ceded most of their ancestral homeland to the U.S. in exchange for the right to catch salmon and steelhead at their accustomed places. This tradition carries great cultural and religious significance, but the current operation plan would further harm Tribal fisheries.

Mr. Speaker, I oppose this rule and the underlying legislation because it fails to include the appropriate input from local tribes. I urge my colleagues to reconsider bringing this bill forward, and go back to the drawing board where an agreement can be reached that brings all affected parties on board.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the rule we have before us, and I reserve the balance of my time.

□ 1300

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

Mr. Speaker, I say with no levity that we are absolutely thrilled to have Mrs. TORRES on the Rules Committee, as she has already made a contribution. She is going to continue to make a wonderful contribution.

I would say, Mr. Speaker, to my friend from California, that sometimes setting expectations is the right way to find success in the things that we pursue in our lives.

This FAA bill, I recognize her concerns that not every amendment was made in order. She is absolutely right. However, this bill did go through the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, where all of our transportation subject matter experts are supposed to be, and absolutely every amendment was considered in that transportation committee.

Now it leaves the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, where the subject matter experts are, and we have now made in order over 100 additional amendments brought from all across this House, more Democratic amendments made in order than Republican amendments made in order, but over 100 additional amendments made in order to try to perfect this bill.

It may not be everything that folks would like to see, but I would share with the gentlewoman, Mr. Speaker, that from my brief Rules Committee experience, we are getting close to a high-water mark here, and I am going to try to take credit and share enthusiasm when we have an opportunity to do it.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Montana (Mr. GIANFORTE), for his insights on this legislation.

Mr. GIANFORTE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 3144, which will bring certainty to the management of the Federal Columbia River Power System.

For generations, the system has provided thousands of Montanans with clean, low-cost energy. Compliance with environmental mandates and litigation, however, threaten our way of life.

The Bonneville Power Administration spent over \$700 million to comply with environmental red tape in 1 year alone. Thirty percent of those costs were passed on to taxpayers. A recent court-ordered spill released nearly \$40 million of potential hydropower. Approximately 130,000 Montana taxpayers will pay a portion of the costs for this court-mandated spill. This increase is on top of rate hikes of up to 50 percent that western Montana electric co-ops have faced since 2011.

It is time to bring certainty to the operations of the Columbia River System.

Mr. Speaker, as a cosponsor of this bipartisan bill, I urge my colleagues to bring some relief to Montana taxpayers and pass H.R. 3144.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. DOGGETT), the distinguished ranking member of the Ways and Means Subcommittee on Tax Policy.

Mr. DOGGETT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Recently, our attention was rightly focused on one passenger who was killed after jet engine failure.

Two years ago, July 30, 2016, 16 people were killed near Lockhart, Texas, in the deadliest commercial balloon crash in our Nation's history and the worst aviation disaster of any type in the last decade.

After that crash, this photo shows all that was left. Rightly, the head of the National Transportation Safety Board expressed his disappointment that the Federal Aviation Administration appears to be shirking its responsibility for the many people who go out to enjoy a commercial balloon flight.

Since 2016, I have repeatedly urged the FAA to adopt a safety measure, long recommended by the NTSB, to help avert tragedies like this.

The NTSB found that the FAA's refusal to require commercial balloon operators to obtain a medical certificate that they are suitable for flying contributed to this crash where so many were harmed.

My bipartisan amendment, that has been approved by the Rules Committee, would end this exemption for commercial balloon operations to ensure that there is not another family in America that is at risk of injury or death from an impaired pilot.

Continued inaction is inexcusable and risks condemning more to death.

Uniting in Caldwell County around the courthouse in morning prayer to remember the victims, a bell rang 16 times for each person who was lost; families, coming together in their hurt, lovingly embraced by that community.

You cannot un-ring a bell, and we cannot bring the precious lives back that were lost in this crash. But from their loss, we can pass an amendment that will help ensure that no other family needlessly suffers.

Mr. Speaker, I urge adoption of the amendment in the course of the debate.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Washington State (Mr. NEWHOUSE), a member of the Rules Committee and a subject matter expert on the Columbia River bill before us.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman, Mr. WOODALL, my good friend from the Rules Committee, for yielding me such time.

Mr. Speaker, I also welcome Mrs. TORRES to her first management of a rule on the floor. It is a pleasure to have her as part of the Rules Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the rule, including the underlying legislation, H.R. 3144, of which I am a proud original cosponsor.

H.R. 3144, Mr. Speaker, is a vital piece of legislation for my constituents as well as for the greater Pacific Northwest region.

The legislation keeps in place a groundbreaking, comprehensive plan which governs the operations and salmon protection management plan for the Federal Columbia River Power System.

This plan was the product of painstaking negotiations conducted by the Bush and the Obama administrations, scientists, engineering experts at Federal agencies, affected States, sovereign Northwest Tribes, and local stakeholders. In fact, every Tribe in the region was consulted in the development of the 2014 biological opinion, and all but one supported it.

H.R. 3144 ensures that Tribal consultations provided for under the BiOp continue unaffected.

These experts collaborated to develop this comprehensive plan to both protect Endangered Species Act-listed salmon and to provide certainty for our

region's ability to continue providing clean, renewable, and affordable power derived from hydroelectric dams.

Now, unfortunately, a Federal judge in Portland, Oregon, has decided to throw out this comprehensive plan and negate years of serious concerted efforts by a diverse set of Federal, State, and local stakeholders. He has anointed himself the sole expert of this river system and has begun dictating scientific and engineering decisions.

As my friend Jack Heffling says: "One judge in Portland does not know how to manage this river system better than the experts and professional workforce who keep the lights on for the entire Pacific Northwest."

Jack is president of the United Power Trades Organization, a labor union representing more than 600 men and women who maintain and operate the equipment at hydroelectric projects throughout the Pacific Northwest.

Mr. Speaker, I stand with Jack today and all of the men and women of the power trades. I believe the experts, scientists and biologists, engineers, and professional workers at Federal agencies and on the ground working at our dams should be deciding how to best manage this system, not a judge sitting behind a bench.

Unfortunately, this judge thinks otherwise and now has mandated an ongoing forced spill order over eight of our dams in the region. This order could have devastating impacts on transportation and barging systems, on our flood control capabilities, and irrigation systems; it could impair our agricultural economy, both by limiting modes of transportation for our commodities and by hobbling our irrigation resources.

While there are no cost estimates of the effects this decision will have on transportation and barging, flood control, or irrigation, Federal agencies have estimated that the forced spill will cost ratepayers, utility ratepayers, \$40 million per year in increased electrical rates starting in the very near future.

The judge's order could also harm the very fish he is claiming to protect. The Bonneville Power Administration, or the BPA, notes that the risks of exposing fish to the maximum total dissolved gas levels have not been evaluated, nor has it been recommended by the National Marine Fisheries Service or the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.

They warn that the potential for adverse effects from exposure to these gases in the river is a concern recognized by experts in the region and also creates risk of adverse consequences for other aquatic species.

The judge's decision to recklessly dictate a water management plan could, in fact, harm or even kill these ESA-listed salmon.

This order also threatens the reliability of the Federal power and transmission system. BPA has also warned of blackouts, stating:

When the Lower Columbia and Lower Snake generators are operating at minimum

generation levels, however . . . there is far less generation available for use. . . . Under the right conditions, local blackouts may occur if there is inadequate transfer capability in the transmission system to move the necessary electric power to loads.

I am already hearing from our local cooperatives and public utility districts that this threat is not far off. Our communities could be facing the risk of rolling blackouts in the coming months due to this order.

Mr. Speaker, it is because of this reckless antisense order that constituents and stakeholders from a great variety of backgrounds and viewpoints have joined with me and my colleagues from the Pacific Northwest over these past several months to stand against this decision and support a rational, science-based resolution.

I have been overwhelmed and invigorated by these supporters, whether it is the barge captains on our rivers, who move commodities like wheat for export; or small-business owners, who depend on our affordable electricity throughout the Pacific Northwest; it is the union workers at our hydropower dams and the irrigators, who provide the incredibly vital resource of water for our region; it is the local cooperative managers and public utility district leaders across Washington State and throughout the Northwest who have rallied to bring this legislation to the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives today, and I could not be more proud to stand with all of them in support of H.R. 3144.

Mr. Speaker, unfortunately, not every aspect of this matter has been as inspiring. I have been disappointed to see radical and ideological groups use hyperbolic language to insinuate that my colleagues and I are actively advocating for the extinction of our native salmon species.

Let me tell you, Mr. Speaker, nothing could be further from the truth, and, frankly, I have been appalled that some of my colleagues in this very body have decided to use these same scare tactics to fearmonger other Members of this House.

They claim we advocate for an illegal or an unlawful plan that does not do enough to help fish, yet they fail to mention that it was President Obama's administration who formally approved of this plan after years of work with scientists, with experts, with affected States, and, like I said, with sovereign Northwest Indian Tribes.

Mr. Speaker, I take offense to these fringe voices and proudly stand with the reasoned, serious contributors who have been a part of these collaborative and unprecedented negotiations.

I challenge these detractors, let this plan actually come to fruition, let us actually have a plan that has the intent of continuing our salmon restoration efforts, rather than constantly bogging down our Federal action agencies and experts running the system in decades of litigation after litigation.

Honor the work of these diverse stakeholders who, in a good faith effort, worked to build a plan to both save our salmon and save our dams.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues, support the rule and support H.R. 3144. Join me to save our salmon and save our dams.

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

Mr. Speaker, President Trump campaigned on the promise of draining the swamp, but has instead allowed corruption to run rampant in the executive office. Several Cabinet officials are being investigated for ethics violations and the misuse of Federal funds.

Housing and Urban Development Secretary Carson spent over \$31,000 on a new dining room set for his office. Interior Secretary Zinke spent \$139,000 of taxpayer money to remodel three sets of office doors.

One of the most outrageous practices by President Trump's Cabinet is the hundreds of thousands of dollars spent on luxury air travel. Just a couple of examples: Environmental Protection Agency Administrator Pruitt spent over \$14,000 on a private jet traveling just 300 miles within Oklahoma.

□ 1315

Interior Secretary Zinke cost the taxpayers \$12,000 chartering a plane belonging to an oil and gas exploration firm.

President Trump recently said: "Sometimes it may not look like it, but believe me, we are draining the swamp."

Well, with a Cabinet like this, I have to agree with President Trump in part. It does not look like he is draining the swamp, but that is because he is not.

For this reason, if we defeat the previous question, I will offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Representative LIEU's H.R. 3876, the SWAMP FLYERS Act. This legislation will ensure that senior political appointees are not using Federal funds for official travel on private aircraft.

Unlike the restrictive rules we are considering today, this bill would be brought to the floor under an open rule so that all Members have the opportunity to amend the bill on the floor.

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

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

There was no objection.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4½ minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU) to discuss this proposal.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, whether you are a Republican or a Democrat or an Independent, you don't want corruption in your government. Unfortunately, multiple members of Donald Trump's Cabinet have

engaged in massive fraud, waste, and abuse, largely by using taxpayer funds on luxury private air travel.

Democrats have been calling repeatedly for investigations into Trump's "Cabinet of Corruption." Unfortunately, the Republican-controlled House has largely protected these officials at every turn. So I am going to highlight to you some of the more egregious examples, and we have added up the numbers.

Representative TORRES gave very specific examples, but we are going to give you the big numbers so you understand how much corruption there is.

It all started with former Health and Human Services Secretary Tom Price, who spent half a million dollars of taxpayer funds on private and military jet travel for no good reason. He could have taken commercial. He chose not to.

Treasury Secretary Steve Mnuchin looked at that and must have said "what a great idea," because he doubled that spending. He spent nearly \$1 million of taxpayer funds on at least seven military jets, for no good reason, because he could have flown commercial, just like his predecessors.

And then we have Interior Secretary Ryan Zinke, who took multiple trips that added up to thousands of dollars on expensive private jets, as well as about \$139,000 to renovate his office doors.

Then we have former Veterans Affairs Secretary David Shulkin, who spent \$122,000 of taxpayer funds on a trip to Europe with his wife, largely to do sightseeing.

But EPA Administrator Scott Pruitt, he takes this to a whole new level. He is so creative in his corruption. You will be very impressed to hear how ingenious he is.

First of all, he spent over \$40,000 on a private phone booth of your hard-earned taxpayer funds. For most Americans, we know there is a very simple way to make private phone calls from your office; it is called closing the office door. But no, he didn't do that. He spent your hard-earned money to have this private phone booth for him to make his phone calls.

Then he managed to find a way to live here in Washington, D.C., cheaply, by getting a below-market rate condo deal, \$50 a night; and then he structured the lease so that the landlord had to keep the condo open for the entire time for 6 months, but he only had to pay for the days that he stayed there. No ordinary citizens could have gotten that lease.

Then he spent over \$200,000 of your hard-earned taxpayers' money, on, again, first class travel and chartered flights.

The Trump administration's "Cabinet of Corruption" is sticking Americans with a raw deal. Democrats believe that hardworking Americans deserve a better deal, and my bill, the SWAMP FLYERS Act is very simple. It will prevent administration officials

from using taxpayer funds for private air travel, ensuring that government officials are not using your hard-earned taxpayer dollars to fund their lavish lifestyles.

If my colleagues care about protecting our tax dollars and preventing these obvious abuses, they will vote "no" on the previous question and call up H.R. 3876, the SWAMP FLYERS Act, for a vote.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, with great optimism that we will return to the bill at hand, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I yield 1½ minutes to the gentlewoman from Nevada (Ms. TITUS), the distinguished ranking member of the Transportation and Infrastructure Subcommittee on Economic Development, Public Buildings and Emergency Management.

Ms. TITUS. Mr. Speaker, after testifying before the Rules Committee last night on my amendment to this bill, H.R. 4, a worthy amendment that, by the way, was not made in order and will not be debated or voted on by this body, I felt compelled to speak about the broken process that dominates this Congress.

The Speaker promised us an open and inclusive process but, in reality, it has never been more closed. Members play very little role in legislating today. Instead, the agenda is dictated and the process is controlled by a failed leadership cabal.

Let me remind my colleagues on the other side of the aisle that majorities can switch and, when they do, previous mistreatment, unfairness, and disregard for the democratic process will be hard to forget.

In the meantime, we can reverse this destructive trend and better serve the American people by rejecting the rule before us, so I urge a "no" vote on the rule.

Mr. WOODALL. Mr. Speaker, I would advise my friend from California I do not have any speakers remaining, and so I am prepared to close when she is. I reserve the balance of my time.

Mrs. TORRES. Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to oppose the previous question and the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

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

Mr. Speaker, I had a wonderful closing statement but, against that backdrop of collegiality, I will say only this. I did mention earlier that subject matter experts were assigned to the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee. My friend, Ms. TITUS, is on that committee; I am on that committee.

As a subject matter expert, my mom and dad come to me regularly to help them with their airline reservations, Delta Airlines, of course, being an Atlantan. But just recently, they were heading out to California; demanded that I make those reservations going into Ontario instead of LAX because, why in the world would anyone want to

battle LAX when they could be in the Torres district there in Ontario?

They were treated wonderfully and had a wonderful visit, so I recognize the gentlewoman's passion for her airport.

Mr. Speaker, if you have an airport in your district, if you have aviation travelers in your district, you want the FAA to be reauthorized. This bill, this rule makes that possible. This bill gets that job done in an open, collaborative, and bipartisan way. I urge my colleagues to support this rule, support the underlying bills.

The material previously referred to by Mrs. TORRES is as follows:

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 839 OFFERED BY
MS. TORRES

At the end of the resolution, add the following new sections:

SEC. 5. Immediately upon adoption of this resolution the Speaker shall, pursuant to clause 2(b) of rule XVIII, declare the House resolved into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for consideration of the bill (H.R. 3876) to prohibit the use of Federal funds for the official travel of any senior political appointee on private aircraft, and for other purposes. The first reading of the bill shall be dispensed with. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. General debate shall be confined to the bill and shall not exceed one hour equally divided and controlled by the chair and ranking minority member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform. After general debate the bill shall be considered for amendment under the five-minute rule. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. At the conclusion of consideration of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the bill to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit with or without instructions. If the Committee of the Whole rises and reports that it has come to no resolution on the bill, then on the next legislative day the House shall, immediately after the third daily order of business under clause 1 of rule XIV, resolve into the Committee of the Whole for further consideration of the bill.

SEC. 6. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3876.

THE VOTE ON THE PREVIOUS QUESTION: WHAT IT REALLY MEANS

This vote, the vote on whether to order the previous question on a special rule, is not merely a procedural vote. A vote against ordering the previous question is a vote against the Republican majority agenda and a vote to allow the Democratic minority to offer an alternative plan. It is a vote about what the House should be debating.

Mr. Clarence Cannon's Precedents of the House of Representatives (VI, 308-311), describes the vote on the previous question on the rule as "a motion to direct or control the consideration of the subject before the House being made by the Member in charge." To defeat the previous question is to give the opposition a chance to decide the subject before the House. Cannon cites the Speaker's ruling of January 13, 1920, to the effect that "the refusal of the House to sustain the demand for the previous question passes the control of the resolution to the opposition" in order to offer an amendment. On March 15, 1909, a member of the majority party of-

fered a rule resolution. The House defeated the previous question and a member of the opposition rose to a parliamentary inquiry, asking who was entitled to recognition. Speaker Joseph G. Cannon (R-Illinois) said: "The previous question having been refused, the gentleman from New York, Mr. Fitzgerald, who had asked the gentleman to yield to him for an amendment, is entitled to the first recognition."

The Republican majority may say "the vote on the previous question is simply a vote on whether to proceed to an immediate vote on adopting the resolution . . . [and] has no substantive legislative or policy implications whatsoever." But that is not what they have always said. Listen to the Republican Leadership Manual on the Legislative Process in the United States House of Representatives, (6th edition, page 135). Here's how the Republicans describe the previous question vote in their own manual: "Although it is generally not possible to amend the rule because the majority Member controlling the time will not yield for the purpose of offering an amendment, the same result may be achieved by voting down the previous question on the rule. . . . When the motion for the previous question is defeated, control of the time passes to the Member who led the opposition to ordering the previous question. That Member, because he then controls the time, may offer an amendment to the rule, or yield for the purpose of amendment."

In Deschler's Procedure in the U.S. House of Representatives, the subchapter titled "Amending Special Rules" states: "a refusal to order the previous question on such a rule [a special rule reported from the Committee on Rules] opens the resolution to amendment and further debate." (Chapter 21, section 21.2) Section 21.3 continues: "Upon rejection of the motion for the previous question on a resolution reported from the Committee on Rules, control shifts to the Member leading the opposition to the previous question, who may offer a proper amendment or motion and who controls the time for debate thereon."

Clearly, the vote on the previous question on a rule does have substantive policy implications. It is one of the only available tools for those who oppose the Republican majority's agenda and allows those with alternative views the opportunity to offer an alternative plan.

Mr. WOODALL. 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 yeas appeared to have it.

Mrs. TORRES. 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 the adoption of the resolution.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 225, nays 190, not voting 13, as follows:

[Roll No. 150]

YEAS—225

Abraham	Allen	Amodei
Aderholt	Amash	Arrington

Babin	Graves (LA)	Paulsen
Bacon	Graves (MO)	Pearce
Banks (IN)	Griffith	Perry
Barletta	Guthrie	Pittenger
Barr	Handel	Poe (TX)
Barton	Harper	Poliquin
Bergman	Harris	Posey
Biggs	Hartzler	Ratcliffe
Billirakis	Hensarling	Reed
Bishop (MI)	Herrera Beutler	Reichert
Bishop (UT)	Hice, Jody B.	Renacci
Blackburn	Higgins (LA)	Rice (SC)
Blum	Hill	Roby
Bost	Holding	Roe (TN)
Brady (TX)	Hollingsworth	Rogers (AL)
Brat	Hudson	Rogers (KY)
Brooks (AL)	Huizenga	Rohrabacher
Brooks (IN)	Hultgren	Rokita
Buchanan	Hunter	Rooney, Francis
Buck	Hurd	Ros-Lehtinen
Bucshon	Issa	Roskam
Budd	Jenkins (KS)	Ross
Burgess	Johnson (LA)	Rothfus
Byrne	Johnson (OH)	Rouzer
Calvert	Johnson, Sam	Royce (CA)
Carter (GA)	Jordan	Russell
Carter (TX)	Joyce (OH)	Rutherford
Chabot	Katko	Sanford
Cheney	Kelly (MS)	Schweikert
Coffman	Kelly (PA)	Scott, Austin
Cole	King (IA)	Sensenbrenner
Collins (GA)	King (NY)	Sessions
Collins (NY)	Kinzinger	Shimkus
Comer	Knight	Shuster
Comstock	Kustoff (TN)	Simpson
Conaway	LaHood	Smith (MO)
Cook	LaMalfa	Smith (NE)
Costello (PA)	Lamborn	Smith (NJ)
Cramer	Lance	Smith (TX)
Culberson	Latta	Smucker
Curbelo (FL)	Lewis (MN)	Stefanik
Curtis	LoBiondo	Stewart
Davidson	Long	Stivers
Davis, Rodney	Loudermilk	Taylor
Denham	Love	Tenney
Dent	Lucas	Thompson (PA)
DeSantis	Luetkemeyer	Thornberry
DesJarlais	MacArthur	Tipton
Diaz-Balart	Marchant	Trott
Donovan	Marino	Turner
Duffy	Marshall	Upton
Duncan (SC)	Massie	Valadao
Duncan (TN)	Mast	Wagner
Dunn	McCarthy	Walberg
Emmer	McCauley	Walden
Estes (KS)	McClintock	Walker
Faso	McHenry	Walorski
Ferguson	McKinley	Walters, Mimi
Fitzpatrick	McMorris	Weber (TX)
Fleischmann	Rodgers	Webster (FL)
Flores	McSally	Wenstrup
Fortenberry	Meadows	Westerman
Fox	Meehan	Williams
Frelinghuysen	Messer	Wilson (SC)
Gaetz	Mitchell	Wittman
Gallagher	Moolenaar	Womack
Garrett	Mooney (WV)	Woodall
Gianforte	Mullin	Yoder
Gibbs	Newhouse	Yoho
Gohmert	Norman	Young (AK)
Goodlatte	Nunes	Young (IA)
Gosar	Olson	Zeldin
Granger	Palazzo	
Graves (GA)	Palmer	

NAYS—190

Adams	Castro (TX)	DeLauro
Aguilar	Chu, Judy	DeBene
Barragan	Cicilline	Demings
Bass	Clark (MA)	DeSaulnier
Beatty	Clarke (NY)	Deutch
Bera	Clay	Dingell
Beyer	Cleaver	Doggett
Bishop (GA)	Clyburn	Doyle, Michael
Blumenauer	Cohen	F.
Blunt Rochester	Connolly	Ellison
Bonamici	Cooper	Engel
Boyle, Brendan	Correa	Eshoo
F.	Costa	Espallat
Brady (PA)	Courtney	Esty (CT)
Brown (MD)	Crist	Evans
Brownley (CA)	Crowley	Foster
Bustos	Cuellar	Frankel (FL)
Butterfield	Cummings	Fudge
Carbajal	Davis (CA)	Gabbard
Cárdenas	Davis, Danny	Galleo
Carson (IN)	DeFazio	Garamendi
Cartwright	DeGette	Gomez
Castor (FL)	Delaney	Gonzalez (TX)

(a) IN GENERAL.—In order to improve visitor experience and multi-modal access to the Smithsonian National Zoological Park, the Board of Regents of the Smithsonian Institution is authorized to plan, design, and