



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 115th CONGRESS, SECOND SESSION

Vol. 164

WASHINGTON, THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 6, 2018

No. 148

House of Representatives

The House met at 10 a.m. and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. VALADAO).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
September 6, 2018.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DAVID G. VALADAO to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

PAUL D. RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 8, 2018, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 11:50 a.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

HE-SAID/HE-SAID DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. GUTIÉRREZ) for 5 minutes.

Mr. GUTIÉRREZ. Mr. Speaker, I have been thinking about all the criminal investigations pointing directly at the President and his associates and the fact that, for many Americans, this has become a he-said/he-said debate.

On the one hand, you have the President saying that this is all a witch hunt: Yes, I fired Comey and ordered to derail the investigation; yes, I knew about and helped conceal the Russia

meeting; and, yes, I knew about the payments to keep people quiet.

Then there is Robert Mueller, the former FBI Director, who really hasn't said a word this whole time, but his efficient, productive, and successful investigations keep rolling right along. I guess he lets his indictments do his talking.

So in this battle of he-said/he-said, who would the oddsmakers pick? If you were a betting man or woman, a Vegas oddsmaker, or just an armchair quarterback, who would you go with?

On the one hand, we have a conservative Republican who was the second longest serving FBI Director. Only Hoover served longer. On the other hand, we have the host of a reality TV show with no political or government or military or law enforcement experience whatsoever.

Hmm, let's continue.

On the one hand, we have a Vietnam veteran with a Purple Heart and a Bronze Star. Director Mueller joined the Marines as a volunteer at the height of the Vietnam war after his high school teammate was killed in action. Mueller enlisted to honor his friend and out of a sense of duty, honor, and obligation to put oneself behind one's country as a matter of honor.

On the other hand, we have the President, who avoided military service by claiming he had bone spurs in his foot, despite ample evidence that was a lie, a complete fiction made up to serve what? His own personal interests above those of the Nation at time of war.

According to what I have read, Director Mueller was a good student at Princeton, and after earning his bachelor's and master's and after serving in Vietnam with distinction, he studied law at the University of Virginia, where he served on the Law Review, a prestigious accomplishment at any law school, let alone one of the best.

The President went to business school and inherited millions of dollars

and started a real estate business because his dad gave him the money.

Director Mueller is a courtroom expert and veteran law enforcement leader. Think about this: He was a private litigator, a prosecutor in the U.S. Attorney's Office, and started serving at the Justice Department under Attorney General Dick Thornburgh, who was Ronald Reagan's and George H.W. Bush's Attorney General.

To be sure, the President has a great deal of courtroom experience, too, but that is mostly related to depositions, civil lawsuits, and criminal cases when he sues people or threatens to sue them.

On a more personal note, Director Mueller's service as FBI Director, as you may remember, was delayed at one point because he was fighting prostate cancer, which he beat.

He is a man of integrity who married his high school sweetheart in 1966, and to the best of everyone's knowledge, it is the only marriage of either one of them.

The President, well, I am running out of time, so I won't be able to discuss his long list of marriages and affairs, which have all become quite public.

Finally, while the President characterizes the Mueller investigation as the most expensive witch hunt in history, I bet the oddsmakers would give a lot of weight to the following facts: The President's campaign chairman has been convicted; his National Security Advisor resigned and pleaded guilty; his personal attorney and long-time fixer in New York pleaded guilty on multiple counts; and people from inside The Trump Organization and inside the campaign and the White House are cooperating with prosecutors as we speak. And this was all despite the President's efforts and with the full cooperation of Republicans in Congress to prevent the truth from coming out.

There are a lot of people in this body who are staking their careers on the

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H7873

President and his influence over their voters in their States or their congressional districts. Okay. You are betting on a guy who is up tweeting at 3 a.m. in the morning.

Look, I am going to bet—when I look at the main protagonist in this legal drama, I will put my money on the law enforcement veteran who, at 3 a.m. in the morning, is working on who he is going to indict next.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President of the United States.

RECOGNIZING UGA'S COLLEGE OF PHARMACY DEAN SVEIN OIE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the University of Georgia's College of Pharmacy's dean, Svein Oie, who stepped down as dean on July 31 after 18 years.

Dean Oie's tenure led to great strides in the reach and capabilities of UGA's College of Pharmacy. Also my alma mater, Dean Oie increased the college's class size, added satellite campuses across the State, began training residents, and created the Center for Drug Discovery to develop new drugs to combat diseases that are, so far, incurable.

Although Dean Oie is stepping down as dean of the college, I am glad that he is going to continue with his teaching profession. With a shortage of healthcare professionals in the United States, his ability to train these individuals is more important than ever.

Thank you, Dean Oie, for your service to the University of Georgia, the field of pharmacy, and healthcare overall in the State of Georgia.

RECOGNIZING PASTOR BILL LIGON

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the work of Pastor William T. Ligon, who is retiring from the ministry after 60 years.

Pastor Ligon's dedication to the Word of God is unparalleled, taking him not only throughout the First Congressional District of Georgia, but across the globe. In the early part of his career, Pastor Ligon served as a Southern Baptist missionary in Barcelona and Valencia, Spain, where he was a professor in the Spanish Baptist Theological Seminary.

When he returned to Georgia, he founded the Christian Renewal Church in Brunswick. A testament to his abilities, Pastor Ligon's new church grew rapidly and now includes seven congregations in three different States. He has been the pastor of the Brunswick location for the past 44 years.

However, much of this would not be possible without Pastor Ligon's wife, Mrs. Dorothy Jean Ligon, whom he has been married to for 60 years.

Thank you, Pastor Ligon, for the wonderful work you have been doing in Georgia and across the world.

RECOGNIZING EDGAR M. EDWARDS, SR.

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Edgar M. Edwards, Sr., who passed away on August 1 at the age of 92.

Known as Mr. Ed to those around him, he will be remembered for his unending passion to give all Georgia students the best possible education.

Mr. Ed began teaching at the Bradwell Institute in Hinesville in 1950, beginning a career that took him through many different perspectives in educating students. He quickly rose from teacher to principal at Bradwell Institute and was rapidly elected superintendent of the Liberty County School system, where he earned the Georgia Superintendent of the Year Award.

Even when he retired from direct involvement with students, Mr. Ed began work for an architecture company to build numerous schools throughout the State of Georgia until he was 90 years old.

Perhaps most importantly, Mr. Ed had perfect attendance for 38 straight years at Bradwell football games.

I truly believe that Mr. Ed's passion and energy to impact the lives of all students who step foot into the Liberty County School system is a model we can all learn from.

RECOGNIZING BOB WARNOCK

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Mr. Bob Warnock on both his 40-year anniversary practicing as a licensed pharmacist and his retirement from the field.

Mr. Warnock is a talented pharmacist who made an impact not only on countless patients, but also numerous aspiring pharmacists. He once said to future pharmacists not to "accept a diminished role. Make sure every day when you go home you can say the life of at least one patient is better because of your efforts."

I have firsthand experience with Mr. Warnock's drive to improve the lives of those around him, as he inspired me to do the same. He was one of the first people to help me when I was trying to start my small pharmacy business, and he remains a lifelong friend to this day.

Now Mr. Warnock oversees PruittHealth's entire pharmacy business, employing thousands of workers and operating in multiple States, a testament to hard work and a compassion for others. I am proud to know Bob Warnock, and I know his expertise and kindheartedness will be missed in the world of pharmacy.

IMPEACHMENT IS THE SOLUTION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, and still I rise. I am always proud to stand in the well. It is an honor to have the preeminent privilege to speak to the Nation from this point, from this very place in Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call to the attention of the American public, the American people, an article that was printed in The New York Times yesterday. It is styled: "I Am Part of the Resistance Inside the Trump Administration."

I cannot vouch for this article, but there is one passage that I can speak of with some degree of credibility. It reads: "... we believe our first duty is to our country..."

Regardless as to what else in this article may or may not be true, this is true: Our country should come first.

I love my country, and I stand here today because I do.

It goes on to say: "and the President continues to act in a manner that is detrimental to the health of our Republic."

This is true. I think there is little debate about some aspects of the things that the President has done that are detrimental to the health of the Republic.

We know that it was detrimental to the health of the Republic for the President to say there were some nice people among the racists and bigots in Charlottesville where a person lost her life.

We know that it is detrimental to the Republic for the President to institute a policy that separates babies from their mothers and not find a way, to this day, to put them back together. We know that that is detrimental to the Republic.

But what we also know is that there are great talking points about what the President has done, great talking points about how he is harming society, great talking points about how he is unfit to be President—great talking points.

But here is the question: Where are the action items?

It is not enough to have great talking points. I hear them all the time, if you will, on various shows on television. You hear people talking about how this is not American; this is un-American—great talking points.

But at some point, we have to go from talking points to action items. At some point, we have to deal with the problem. It is not enough to identify it. We have got to also identify the solution.

There is a solution to an unfit President. I thank God for giving me this opportunity to be in Congress, and I will not let my record show that I was here, and when there was a scourge, if you will, on the country by virtue of the way the President is behaving, I will not let my record show that I didn't take advantage of this opportunity to stand in the well and denounce what this President has done.

There is a solution. Everybody knows it. And we are going to get there. But I will say this to you. We cannot allow political expediency to stand in the way of the moral imperative to remove a President who is doing things that are detrimental to the country.

This is not about Democrats. This is about democracy. It is not about Republicans. It is about the Republic. And if we are going to save this Republic, we have got to remove this President from office.

I have filed Articles of Impeachment to do so. I stand on what I have done, and I stand on this: I will not allow this to continue without a challenge. I will challenge him again. I will challenge this House. I will challenge us because this is our country that is in jeopardy, and we are doing very little to stop it. And we have the power. The Framers gave us the means.

□ 1015

It is not a question of whether there is a way. The question is, do we have the will to stand up for justice and stand up for our country?

There is one solution. Article II, Section 4 speaks to it. There will be an impeachment of this President, or at least an attempt to get him out of office by way of impeachment. I stand on it.

RECOGNIZING 70TH ANNIVERSARY OF FULBRIGHT COMMISSION

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. HOLDING) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HOLDING. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the 70th anniversary of the creation of the bilateral US-UK Fulbright Commission.

I would like to take this opportunity to honor the many exchange scholars who have crossed the Atlantic to strengthen the special relationship between the United States and the United Kingdom. In doing so, these individuals have forged a bond between our two nations, rooted in Senator Fulbright's vision at the end of the Second World War.

I quote his vision: "The vital mortar to seal the bricks of world order is education across international boundaries, not with the expectation that knowledge would make us love each other, but in the hope that it would encourage empathy between nations, and foster the emergence of leaders whose sense of other nations and cultures would enable them to shape specific policies based on tolerance and rational restraint."

The Fulbright program stands out as a symbol of collaboration and friendship between nations. It enables students and scholars of all stages of their academic careers to garner a deeper understanding of and appreciation for a culture and nation different from their own.

While much has changed since the first US-UK Fulbright exchange nearly 70 years ago, much remains the same.

As chairman of the British-American Parliamentary Group, I am proud of the broad bipartisan and bicameral support for the US-UK Fulbright Commission. The special relationship we

have with the United Kingdom has undoubtedly been further cemented by the friendships forged as succeeding generations have come to a deeper understanding of each other through academic exchange.

Important scientific discoveries have been made and Nobel Prizes won. A Fulbright scholarship has been the catalyst for great novelists and playwrights, economists, scientists, entrepreneurs, and, yes, even politicians.

Today, I invite my colleagues to commemorate this 70th anniversary of the US-UK Fulbright program by celebrating the achievements of its alumni and pledging their continued support to ensure its enduring success.

LIMITING GI BILL TRANSFERABILITY BREAKS PROMISE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Connecticut (Mr. COURTNEY) for 5 minutes.

Mr. COURTNEY. Mr. Speaker, in June 1944, 2 weeks after the D-day landings in Normandy, President Franklin Roosevelt signed the Servicemen's Readjustment Act, more commonly known as the GI Bill. That landmark measure created both college tuition grants and a living stipend for returning servicemembers who, according to FDR, had "been compelled to make greater economic sacrifice and every other kind of sacrifice than the rest of us."

Even though World War II would rage on for another year, leaders in Washington at the time recognized that millions of drafted young soldiers, sailors, marines, and airmen would soon be returning to civilian life, and, for their sake and for the sake of the postwar economy, creating an educational pathway to the middle class made tremendous sense.

It has been 74 years since the GI Bill was signed into law, and it is now recognized as one of the most successful pieces of domestic legislation ever enacted. The postwar economic boom of the 1950s and 1960s, and the blossoming of the American middle class, both have been attributed, in part, to the GI Bill.

Many renowned Americans, including Bob Dole, Johnny Carson, Harry Belafonte, Justice William Rehnquist, and even Clint Eastwood, to name just a few, were beneficiaries of the GI Bill.

Economic studies have concluded that for every dollar the U.S. Government spent on the GI Bill, our economy saw nearly \$7 in return in the form of additional economic output and tax revenues from income growth.

Despite its stellar performance, the relative strength of the GI Bill deteriorated over time. By 2008, it was clear that the tuition assistance and living stipends had not kept pace with the rising costs of college education.

As a freshman Congressman on the House Armed Services Committee, I heard from Iraq and Afghan veterans

that, because of the GI Bill erosion, they were forced to choose between dropping out of school and shouldering the burden of student loans.

To fix this inequity, the Post-9/11 GI Bill was passed by a Democratic Congress on a bipartisan basis and signed into law by a Republican President, George W. Bush. And I want to actually take a moment to publicly acknowledge that the late Senator John McCain was deeply involved in the final negotiations that made that passage and enactment successful.

The updated law increased benefits to match the cost of 4-year public university tuition in a servicemember's home State and increased the living stipend to keep faith with the law. Critically, it also allowed GI benefits to be transferred on a one-time basis to a spouse or dependent child, a groundbreaking change that transformed the value of military service.

After the bill signing, I flew to Iraq on a congressional visit and vividly recall being in Baghdad surrounded by hundreds of soldiers bursting with questions about when and how this feature would be implemented.

Over the last 10 years, it has been clear that the transferability of the GI Bill benefit has been an enormous morale booster and a valuable incentive to enlist and remain in service.

Despite the 10 years of success of the new law, however, the Trump Department of Defense announced a new policy this past July 12 that would bar servicemembers with more than 16 years of service from transferring their Post-9/11 GI Bill benefits to eligible family members.

Mr. Speaker, I just want to say, as someone who represents a military district, in the August break when I was home visiting the submarine base in New London and talking to Guard and Reserve members, they were absolutely blindsided, stunned, and angry at this arbitrary change that many of them had built their career decisions about staying in the military to basically qualify for this educational benefit.

The Iraq and Afghan Veterans of America have started a national petition drive to reverse this policy change. Really, it is our duty, as Members of Congress, to make sure that that is successful.

Arbitrarily revoking transferability breaks our commitment to our most dedicated and highly trained servicemembers. Such a policy change sends exactly the wrong message to those who have chosen the military as their long-term career, and sets a damaging and dangerous precedent for the removal of other critical benefits to our all-volunteer force.

Two weeks after the Pentagon announced this policy, 83 of my colleagues joined me in a letter that we sent to Secretary of Defense James Mattis, objecting to this change and calling for its immediate reversal. So far, they have not given a single public explanation for this policy change, and

they are promising that that is coming.

But I will just say this: As someone who was involved when this bill was first passed, we will make sure there will be a legislative response if the Department of Defense does not keep faith with those who wear the uniform of this country and who have volunteered based on reliance of the fact that there would be a GI Bill benefit for them and their spouse and children.

To use FDR's words, protecting transferability "gives emphatic notice to the men and women in our Armed Forces that the American people do not intend to let them down."

SUPPORT OIL REGION NATIONAL HERITAGE AREA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, northwest Pennsylvania has a rich history and vibrant, diverse economy. Its winding trails, beautiful landscapes, recreational and educational opportunities, and thriving communities make Venango and Crawford Counties especially captivating places to live, to work, and to visit.

Many of these attractions are centered around one common theme, the world's first commercial oil well. Colonel Drake successfully drilled this well in 1859, triggering the first oil boom and establishing the oil region as "the valley that changed the world."

His efforts not only made northwestern Pennsylvania the energy powerhouse that it is today, but it also sparked a cultural revolution that came as a result of the booming economy.

We are tremendously proud of our history and heritage in northwest Pennsylvania. We still celebrate these communities that bloomed from Colonel Drake's innovative idea today, and Drake Well continues to have a tangible impact on the area's economy.

In 2004, Congress designated the region as a national heritage area. There are only 49 of these areas across the country that are designated as places where natural, cultural, and historic resources combine to form a cohesive, nationally important landscape.

The Oil Region National Heritage Area was the Nation's 25th national heritage area, and it celebrates the birth of the petroleum industry.

The region is honored to have this important designation, but without action, it will sunset next year. That is why I introduced the Oil Region National Heritage Area Reauthorization Act.

The heritage area's coordinating entity, the Oil Region Alliance of Business, Industry, and Tourism, has taken a grassroots, community-driven approach to heritage, conservation, and economic development.

Through public-private partnerships, national heritage area entities support historic preservation, natural resource conservation, recreation, heritage tourism, and educational projects. These partnerships foster pride of place and an enduring stewardship ethic.

The Oil Region Alliance focuses on heritage development, economic development, and tourism destination marketing. All three of these areas have been successful, and, from 2005 to 2015, the ORA has been able to invest more than \$6.8 million in heritage development projects, invest more than \$6.7 million in economic development activities, and attract nearly 240,000 visitors annually. They have done an excellent job using innovative methods to stimulate the local economy, using a mixture of both Federal and private funds.

Last month, I was with my colleague Congressman MIKE KELLY at the home of the legendary investigative journalist Ida Tarbell. Born in Pennsylvania at the onset of the oil boom, Tarbell is best known for her 1904 book, "The History of the Standard Oil Company."

The ORA recently completed a full restoration of Ms. Tarbell's home, ensuring that it would be preserved for generations to come.

Congressman KELLY and I announced the Oil Region National Heritage Area Reauthorization Act at the Tarbell House as an example of why this designation is important. Our bill would extend Federal funding authorization of our heritage area through 2026.

Extending this funding is crucial for the ORA to continue its mission of preserving the Oil Region's history, stimulating the local economy, and allowing others to appreciate the beauty and the culture of Venango and Crawford Counties.

The ORA's efforts give us the ability to appreciate the rich history of northwestern Pennsylvania and understand the impact that our communities have had on American culture today. While the Tarbell home restoration is just one of the ORA's projects, they have completed countless other projects to support our communities, educate the public, and help local businesses grow and thrive.

I urge my colleagues to cosponsor this legislation, which will directly impact northwestern Pennsylvanians and preserve our rich heritage for all Americans.

PAYING CONGRESSIONAL INTERNS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) for 5 minutes.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the congressional interns who serve in our offices here in Washington, D.C., in my State of Oregon, and around the country, and to ask all my colleagues to make internship opportunities available to more qualified applicants by paying interns for their work.

Congressional internships are highly desirable. They provide students and recent graduates with valuable experience, learning firsthand how Congress and how our government works.

Many current staff members and, in fact, many Members of Congress started their careers as congressional interns and were able to use the skills they learned and the connections they made to leverage future opportunities.

The reality is, however, that most young people do not have the option of coming to work on Capitol Hill as an intern because most internships are still unpaid. Many bright and motivated people simply cannot afford to take an unpaid internship, no matter how prestigious it might be, because they need to earn money to continue paying for college or to support themselves or their families.

No one who is qualified who wants to intern on Capitol Hill should be precluded because of financial barriers.

I am proud that I offer paid internships in my office, so students and recent graduates have an opportunity to work and learn and gain experience.

But paying interns doesn't just help them. It helps us, too. My staff and I benefit greatly from having interns from all backgrounds and all walks of life working in our office. The diversity of perspectives is critical as I consider legislation and think about how to best serve my constituents who are also from diverse backgrounds and all walks of life.

Many of my colleagues understand the importance of equitable intern opportunities and, through the leadership of Representative TIM RYAN and others, are working to increase funding and cut red tape so that all our offices will be able to offer and support paid internships.

□ 1030

Capitol Hill is best served when our offices reflect the diversity of our districts and our country.

I will continue to work with my colleagues to make sure that all qualified applicants can apply for internships and serve as interns regardless of their financial situation. It helps our offices, it helps the interns, and it helps the country.

TAX REFORM 2.0

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, in the short time since we have passed historic tax relief for the American people, we have already seen tremendous results.

By putting in place pro-growth, free market policies, we have unleashed a booming economy with higher wages and more job opportunities. With over 6 million job openings, the unemployment rate at an 18-year low and small business optimism at a 34-year high, our country's economic future looks as bright as it has ever been.

And thanks to tax cuts, 90 percent of Americans have seen an increase in take-home pay, with a family of four in my district keeping about \$2,000 a year.

Now, some people call that crumbs, people, I think, that are disconnected to working families and middle-income families, people who want to raise your taxes because they think Washington knows best when it comes to spending your money. They want to prop up failed government-controlled, top-down healthcare systems that have failed.

West Texans know better than this, and they know that this is real cash in their pockets that will allow them to invest more in their future and in their family's future.

The bottom line is this: tax reform is paying off in a big way for our families all across this great land; companies are giving bonuses, increasing benefits, and hiring new employees and providing workers with new opportunities, and most importantly, we are seeing optimism, optimism spread throughout this great land.

In fact, tax reform has been so successful, that we want to keep building on it and keep the momentum going. That is why I am proud to support Tax Reform 2.0. I want to thank my friend and fellow Texan, chairman of the House Ways and Means Committee, KEVIN BRADY, for leading the charge.

The central point of Tax Reform 2.0 is making tax relief for lower and middle income families and small businesses permanent.

In the first round of tax reform, we cut taxes for individual and small business owners, doubled the standard deduction and doubled the child tax credit. However, under current law, these provisions and others are set to expire in 2025.

We don't need to wait until the last minute to prevent Americans' taxes from going up. We can make tax relief permanent now, and that is where Tax Reform 2.0 comes in.

According to the nonpartisan Tax Foundation, making this tax relief permanent will grow the GDP by another 2.2 percent, boost wages, and create over a million new jobs; this, on top, again, of the significant gains we have seen and experienced from the Tax Cuts and Jobs Act.

Making tax cuts permanent would also allow Americans to plan more confidently for their future, whether that is putting more money away for their kids' colleges or setting more money aside for their retirement or a rainy day fund.

A recent survey found that nearly 80 percent of Americans live paycheck to paycheck and 60 percent of Americans say they couldn't afford a \$500 emergency. Remember, the folks in my district are keeping \$2,000 a year because of the recent tax reform. Sixty percent of Americans say \$500 would put them in a real bind.

Making tax relief permanent is an essential opportunity for us, giving Americans the certainty that they de-

serve in making their financial decisions, and we in Congress can provide that certainty by delivering on Tax Reform 2.0.

Mr. Speaker, currently our economy is growing at a record pace, and we need to keep the policies in place that allow job creators and businessowners of all kinds to keep their foot on the pedal.

Our job creators are always thinking of ways they can be more innovative and competitive, and we in Congress would do well to have that same mentality. We must be proactive and constantly be revisiting our Tax Code and finding ways to improve it, to modernize it so we don't fall behind our foreign competitors.

In order to encourage and reward the risk-taking, the invention, the entrepreneurship that has characterized the great American economy, Tax Reform 2.0 also expands on expensing for startup companies. By allowing new businesses to write off more of their initial costs, we can spur innovation and more job creation new businesses bring to this country and allow us to maintain our position as the economic envy of the world.

Mr. Speaker, the first round of tax reform reflects the timeless truth that the American people know best how to spend their hard-earned money, better than politicians, better than government bureaucrats in Washington, D.C. By cutting the amount that government takes out of people's paychecks, people have more freedom and they have more resources to invest in their families, in their community, and in our economy.

Tax Reform 2.0 would keep our economy growing and ensure America retains our entrepreneurial edge that has made us a magnet for innovation and the most prosperous, the most powerful, and the most generous country in all the world.

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to support Tax Reform 2.0 and I encourage my colleagues to do so.

DETROIT PUBLIC SCHOOLS DRINKING WATER SHUTOFF

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Michigan (Mrs. LAWRENCE) for 5 minutes.

Mrs. LAWRENCE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to address the extremely serious and ongoing issue of safe drinking water in our schools.

This week in my hometown of Detroit, the Detroit Public Schools began the year without safe and clean drinking water. The superintendent chose to shut the water off to the entire school district after 16 of the schools tested positive for elevated levels of lead and copper.

What should have been an exciting first day of school was overshadowed by the fears of lead poisoning and unsanitary learning conditions.

This, unfortunately, is no surprise. We have seen this happen all over the

country, where schools put bags over their drinking fountains because they are not safe for the children to consume the water.

This is a consequence of years of neglecting our Nation's infrastructure. For years, I have spoken out against the severe funding decrease in our infrastructure and our public schools. For too long we have kicked the can down the road and ignored this critical issue of safe drinking water in America.

Deliberately not funding necessary and long overdue upgrades for our water infrastructure hurts women, children, and especially the poor and people of color.

We cannot repeat the Flint water crisis, and we must learn from our mistakes. This situation demands a sense of urgency and should be handled in a timely manner.

As adults, we are responsible for protecting our children. We are the ones who must make the right decisions. This is not a partisan issue, but a public health issue.

The Detroit Public Schools and the Detroit children, every day they work hard to face the challenges to simply obtain an excellent education.

We need to address the immediate health concerns. And we need resources to protect our children from future harm.

Every child must be tested. I appreciate and applaud the superintendent's positive response to this emergency. I urge the school district and the city to use whatever resources are immediately available to test these children for lead poisoning. We need to know how widespread this situation is. The tests will help us understand how much damage our children have been exposed to.

Children covered by Medicare are already required to receive blood lead screening tests. I will work with the city and the State to see how we can get every child in Detroit tested.

Without adequate resources and access to information, we stand to fail our children. This is unacceptable.

We also learned from Flint that professionals, not politicians, should be making health decisions. That is why I introduced H.R. 1909, the Environmental Health Workforce Act.

Only 28 States require the environmental health workforce to be credentialed. And unfortunately, Michigan is not one of those States. This legislation I am proposing will ensure every State has a credentialed workforce.

We would not go to a doctor who did not have an MD. Why would we let someone who is making decisions about our water quality and food do it without proper qualifications.

These emergencies show us that we cannot keep relying on a patchwork of quick fixes. We don't know how many children are in danger until every child is tested. We need to truly invest in long-term solutions.

As I continue monitoring this situation, I will continue pursuing the issue until we have solutions and funding on a Federal level to protect our children.

Water is not a luxury, it is a necessity for life. And the least of ours, our children, should not be put in danger.

RECOGNIZING BRIDLE PATH ELEMENTARY SCHOOL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a school in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania, that has played a critical role in molding the lives of countless young citizens.

Bridle Path Elementary, located in Lansdale, is part of the North Penn School District. The staff at this school understands that the elementary age group encompasses some of the most formative years of a child's life. As such, Bridle Path provides a myriad of opportunities for students to grow, thrive, and explore their interests.

One area in which Bridle Path consistently shines is in the area of music education. Just last year, Bridle Path Elementary School Chorus, under the leadership of band director Michael Klenk, won the 101.1 FM's ninth annual Christmas Choir Competition.

From my experience with this community, I have witnessed their warmth and their dedication to helping each other, and I applaud the work of Principal Heather Mann and her dedicated team of educators and staff, and I wish them continued success.

RECOGNIZING PEBBLE HILL CHURCH

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize a house of worship in Bucks County, Pennsylvania, that last month celebrated its 50th anniversary.

Pebble Hill Church in Doylestown was founded in 1968. In its first decade, the church became known for its fierce advocacy for peace and its willingness to show independence from conventional norms.

In 1983, the Reverend Gary Culp joined the congregation, quickly cementing the church's reputation of community service and mutual understanding.

Each year, Pebble Hill Church honors an individual with the Harold and Alma Able Peace Award. This year's winner was Janet Berkowitz for her work with the organization Suicide Anonymous. September, Mr. Speaker, is Suicide Prevention Month, and I commend Pebble Hill for recognizing Janet and for her work in shining a light on the plight of mental illness.

I applaud the entire Pebble Hill Church family for their sustained commitment to making our world brighter and more peaceful. I wish the current celebration coordinator, the Reverend Larry Hall, and all dedicated members

of the staff, volunteers, and worshippers continued success for years to come.

HONORING THE MEMORY OF RICHARD STRICKER

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor the memory of a community icon in Montgomery County, Pennsylvania.

Richard Stricker, who passed away in late 2015, spent decades dedicated to public service. A former council member who served on the Lansdale Cemetery Board of Directors for over 50 years, Richard was a fixture in Lansdale.

He was fittingly recognized on this year's Founders Day, receiving the Lansdale Borough's Lifetime Achievement Award. Throughout his storied career as a small businessman and a contractor and a politician, and as a driving force in the revitalization of the Lansdale Cemetery, Richard always treated all of his fellow citizens with kindness and with respect.

Said Lansdale Historic Society officer Dick Shearer, you would be "hard-pressed to find someone who gave as much to Lansdale as he did."

I am proud to honor Richard Stricker for a lifetime of service, and would like to thank the Lansdale Borough Council and Councilwoman Mary Fuller and all of the ceremony attendees for their work in honoring the life of this fine citizen.

□ 1045

SHAWKAN AND FREEDOM OF THE PRESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. CICILLINE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak out in support of international press freedom and to highlight, in particular, two egregious cases of government assaults on the rights of journalists.

This Saturday, a court in Egypt will decide whether to execute an award-winning photojournalist for doing his job. While in Myanmar, formerly known as Burma, the Nobel Prize-winning former political prisoner, Aung San Suu Kyi, has overseen the imprisonment and sentencing of two Reuters reporters who were attempting to shed light on the atrocities committed by the Burmese military against the Rohingya minority.

In Egypt, Mahmoud Abou Zeid, who is known professionally as Shawkan, was taken into custody along with two other journalists while photographing the violent dispersal of a protest in Rabaa Square on August 14, 2013. The other journalists were foreign nationals and were released within hours, while Shawkan, an Egyptian, has been abused and beaten, denied his freedom, due process, and adequate medical treatment ever since—simply for doing his job.

In 2016, the U.N. Human Rights Council Working Group on Arbitrary Deten-

tion issued a report on his case, calling his detention "arbitrary" and recommending that he be released immediately.

Shawkan received the 2018 UNESCO Freedom Prize and has been recognized by press freedom organizations worldwide for his outstanding contributions to the profession in the face of danger.

In July, I sent a letter to President Sisi of Egypt urging him to support the immediate release of Shawkan or, at the very least, to support an individual trial instead of the mass trial that serves as a basis of his detention so that evidence specific to his case can be heard and considered. The Egyptian Government has not responded to this letter, and they are planning to sentence Shawkan as early as this weekend.

Unfortunately, Egypt is not alone in its harassment and imprisonment of members of the press. Just this week a Burmese court sentenced Wa Lone and Kyaw Soe Oo, reporters working for Reuters, to 7 years in prison following their arrest while reporting on the mass killing of 10 Rohingya Muslim men in the village of Inn Din, Rakhine State, last September.

This decision is a significant step backward in Burma's transition to democracy and reflects poorly on the Aung San Suu Kyi government's commitment to those same democratic ideals for which he was punished not so long ago.

The freedom to express oneself is a fundamental right enshrined in the Universal Declaration of Human Rights. The freedom of the press and the public's right to information are paramount to the success of a democracy. The censorship and degradation of the press is among the most effective tools for oppression and control.

Thomas Jefferson captured this sentiment when he said, and I paraphrase, if forced to choose, he would prefer newspapers without a government rather than a government without newspapers.

Today, authoritarian rule has targeted members of the press in order to stifle dissent and maintain power. According to Freedom House, only 13 percent of the world's population enjoys a free press. Global press freedom has declined to its lowest point since 2013 amid unprecedented threats to journalists in major democracies and attempts by authoritarian states to control the media, even beyond their borders.

We are witnessing a new era in press suppression as even politicians in democracies attempt to shape news coverage by undermining traditional media outlets, exerting influence over public broadcasters, and favoring friendly private outlets.

Unfortunately, the current President of the United States has led the charge against the press with nearly daily tirades against the media, branding them as the enemy of the state and rejecting the news media's role in holding public servants accountable. Just

yesterday, President Trump suggested he would like to change libel laws in order to prevent negative news stories about himself, a tactic more suited to Russian or Iranian leadership than the world's greatest democracy.

And let there be no doubt that leaders around the world take note of the President's attacks on the press. They know that the Trump administration has no interest in lecturing them about their human rights abuses and no leg to stand on if it did.

So the Egyptians and Burmas of the world will continue to ignore national norms while the Trump administration looks the other way or worse. That is why, as Members of Congress, it is absolutely imperative that we remind the world that, no matter what the President says, we have not forgotten our values, those universal values that apply to every man, woman, and child. We must remain vigilant and defend against even the smallest attacks on the free and independent press, because the loss of this freedom creeps slowly like a cancer on our democracy.

I urge the Governments of Egypt and Burma to do the right thing and end their attacks on the media and release Shawkan, Wa Lone, Kyaw Soe Oo, and all other political prisoners. I will continue to use my voice to advocate for them and the hundreds of other journalists around the world whose freedoms are at risk because of their work and because of what they do every day, and I hope my friends on both sides of the aisle will join me in this effort.

HONORING UNITED STATES NAVY CHIEF PETTY OFFICERS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. RUTHERFORD) for 5 minutes.

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor our United States Navy's chief petty officers and their families and loved ones who are gathering today at the Jacksonville Veterans Memorial Arena and Wall for CPO Pride Day. This annual event celebrating their service is held in different regions across the country, and I can tell you, it holds significance for me.

Mr. Speaker, my father, James A. Rutherford, was a young sailor who was deployed abroad on the USS *Waccamaw* the day I was born in September of 1952. He proudly worked his way through the ranks to later attain the position of chief petty officer.

Like so many military families both then and now, my father and other CPOs sacrificed a great deal to defend our freedoms.

Mr. Speaker, chief petty officers are the backbone of the Navy, responsible for training junior officers. They lead a division of sailors and petty officers and inspire them to be part of something bigger than themselves.

North Florida is incredibly proud to be home to so many sailors and their

families, and our community gratefully celebrates chief petty officers today, for we owe them a debt of gratitude that can never be repaid.

Congratulations and best wishes to them on this CPO Pride Day.

CONCERN OVER LEADERSHIP

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) for 5 minutes.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my deep concerns over the leadership coming from our Nation's White House.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to quote the words of a White House staff member that was recently published by The New York Times in an op-ed:

The dilemma—which the President does not fully grasp—is that many of the senior officials in his own administration are working diligently from within to frustrate parts of his agenda and his worst inclinations.

This comes directly from a staffer at the Trump White House.

It is scary to think that the policies that have come out of the White House already publicly aren't even the President's worst inclinations.

It is scary to think that separating children from their mothers, as young as 9 months old, is not the President's worst inclination.

It is scary to think that the rhetoric being launched at immigrants, hateful rhetoric launched against immigrants from all parts of the world—this is a nation of immigrants—that that is not part of the President's worst inclination.

It is scary to think that arming teachers not with a book, not with a laptop, but with weapons is not the President's worst inclination.

There is a quiet resistance within the administration of people choosing to put country first. That is what the staff member said in that op-ed. People before party. Country before party.

That is what the staff member has said in this op-ed, and I stand here today to say to my Republican colleagues: Where are you? Will you put country before party?

Where is your courage to do what is right? Will you put country before party?

Where is your courage to hold the President accountable, to exercise the checks and balances that are given to us by the Constitution?

Trump's circle of chaos runs deep within the administration. To my colleagues: Where are you?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Members are reminded to refrain from engaging in personalities toward the President.

HONORING KENNEWICK POLICE CHIEF KENNETH HOHENBERG FOR 40 YEARS OF SERVICE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from

Washington (Mr. NEWHOUSE) for 5 minutes.

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor Kennewick Police Chief Kenneth Hohenberg for 40 years of service to the Kennewick Police Department.

Chief Hohenberg began his career as an officer at age 22, making him the city's longest serving employee. He rose quickly through the ranks. He served on patrol, both as a motorcycle cop and a DARE officer, a sergeant, a lieutenant, and then captain. He attended the FBI National Academy, an honor few police officers receive, and was named chief in 2003.

Not only is Chief Hohenberg one of the most respected police chiefs in the State, but he is also a widely admired member of our community. He has been named Benton-Franklin United Way Volunteer of the Year, Kennewick Man of the Year, and Tri-Citizen of the Year.

In central Washington, we know him as a man who is constantly looking for opportunities to help and always willing to serve in and out of the police department.

I ask my colleagues to join me in thanking Chief Ken Hohenberg for his tremendous service to the city of Kennewick and to Washington's Fourth Congressional District.

CONGRATULATING ROWDY BARRY

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate Rowdy Barry, Kennewick's own professional bullfighter, on a successful 33-year career.

Rowdy grew up around rodeos and has been bullfighting rodeos of all sizes since he was 18 years old. Putting himself between bulls and bull riders requires a true dedication to the sport. Rowdy sacrificed his time, as well as several injuries and broken bones, to keep riders safe and to provide a few additional laughs for the audience. On September 15, Rowdy will be hanging up his bullfighting hat for good at the Othello Rodeo.

Earlier this year, he was inducted into both the Kennewick Rodeo and Omak Stampede Halls of Fame. The Walla Walla Frontier Days posters honored him with some of his own artwork.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating Rowdy on a career that will not be forgotten in central Washington. I wish him the best in his future.

CONGRATULATING JAMES WEBB

Mr. NEWHOUSE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize James Webb, a Yakima native, for receiving the prestigious Louis H. Bauer Founders Award by the Aerospace Medical Association this year.

It is not every day that a man born and raised in central Washington is awarded the Aerospace Medical Association's highest honor, and Mr. Webb deserves it.

After graduating from the University of Washington, James joined the

United States Air Force, where he completed 175 combat missions and received the Distinguished Flying Cross as well as several other awards.

James was inspired to research altitude decompression sickness, finding solutions to help astronauts and pilots across the country and around the world.

Before receiving the Founders Award, James won five other awards from the association and also served as president.

Mr. Speaker, I thank James Webb for his contributions to aerospace medicine. I urge my colleagues to join me in congratulating him on this award.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until noon today.

Accordingly (at 10 o'clock and 57 minutes a.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1200

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker at noon.

PRAYER

Reverend Alexander Breckinridge IV, St. Thomas Episcopal Church, Medina, Washington, offered the following prayer:

God of love and mercy, the fountain of all wisdom, whose will is gracious and whose law is truth, fill the people of this Nation with a zeal for justice and hearts for mercy that we might each walk humbly before You all the days of our lives.

In times of prosperity, may we be filled with gratitude and thanksgiving, and in the day of trouble, let not our trust in You fail.

Grant that the Members of this House assembled may be guided by Your will to enact only such laws as are pleasing in Your sight to the glory of Your name and the well-being of our Nation and all the world; and let our words spoken here be charitable and patient and kind, that they may be a reflection of Your tender love for all Your people.

All these things we pray in Your most holy name.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER. Will the gentlewoman from Hawaii (Ms. GABBARD)

come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Ms. GABBARD led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

WELCOMING REVEREND ALEXANDER BRECKINRIDGE IV

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the gentlewoman from Washington (Ms. DELBENE) is recognized for 1 minute.

There was no objection.

Ms. DELBENE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Reverend Alexander, or Lex, Breckinridge, and to thank him for offering this morning's prayer. Father Lex serves as the rector of St. Thomas Episcopal Church in my hometown of Medina, Washington.

He always felt the call to ordained ministry in the church, but it took him awhile getting there. He was born in West Virginia. He went on to school in New Hampshire and North Carolina, and practiced law in New Orleans before attending a seminary in Austin, Texas. After serving the church in Austin, he found his way to the great Northwest and to our community.

Reverend Breckinridge is joined today by his wife, Zonnie. They have three children and have enriched the Medina community for 9 years. We value his service and appreciate his leadership and guidance that continues to impact so many lives. We appreciate him flying across the country to be with us today.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida). The Chair will entertain up to 15 further requests for 1-minute speeches on each side of the aisle.

NEVER FORGET SEPTEMBER THE 11TH

(Mr. WILSON of South Carolina asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. WILSON of South Carolina. Mr. Speaker, next Tuesday is the tragic 17th anniversary of the terrorist attack by radical Islamic jihadists who sought to destroy our freedoms on September the 11th, 2001.

The memories of the 3,000 innocent civilians who were killed at the Pentagon, the World Trade Center, and in rural Shanksville, Pennsylvania, will never be forgotten. We are reminded of the incredible heroes of that day, the selfless commitment of so many first responders helping their neighbors, co-workers, or complete strangers, with the leadership of President George W. Bush.

Since that fateful day, our Armed Forces have courageously fought to

prevent another tragedy by eliminating safe havens overseas. These servicemembers and their families who have paid the ultimate sacrifice deserve our eternal gratitude.

Unfortunately, the global war on terrorism is generational, as Islamic terrorists continue to barbarically murder civilians, killing people of Islamic faith first, in their attempt to establish safe havens to plot mass murder in America, as were the acts of 9/11. Today, I am grateful that President Donald Trump is rebuilding the military to protect American families.

In conclusion, God bless our troops, and we will never forget September the 11th in the global war on terrorism.

NEW TARIFFS RESULT IN HIGHER PRODUCT COSTS

(Mr. HIGGINS of New York asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. HIGGINS of New York. Mr. Speaker, the White House's proposed list of new tariffs includes headwear, hats, and headgear. If a 25 percent tariff on these products were imposed, New Era Cap, the largest headwear company in the United States and based in my district, would be hurt.

Based in Buffalo, New Era employs 800 people in 19 States. New Era supplies official headwear for the National Football League, the National Basketball Association, and Major League Baseball.

Mr. President, you can't tariff your way to economic growth. A tariff is a tax levied by a government on imported goods by placing taxes on foreign component parts. These products become more expensive for American consumers. The imposition of these tariffs are a race to the bottom and will result in higher product costs for all Americans.

PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. WILLIAMS asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, today I want to take a moment to talk about something very dear and near to my heart.

This year, over 160,000 men will be diagnosed with prostate cancer in the United States. That is one man every 3.2 minutes.

Many of my colleagues here today may not know this, but 3 years ago, I was one of those men. Fortunately, the cancer was caught early, and I was able to survive the diagnosis. Unfortunately, and it pains me to say this, this is not the case for roughly 30,000 men every year.

Mr. Speaker, the month of September is National Prostate Cancer Awareness Month, and we need to talk about this. It is the most common cancer among American men, and over 12,000 will be diagnosed this year in just Texas alone.

Education and early detection is critical to stopping prostate cancer in its tracks, and, therefore, we need to better educate our fathers, brothers, sons, and friends. All men are at risk, and as a survivor, I encourage the men of Texas District 25 to participate in regular screenings. Together, we can beat prostate cancer.

In God we trust.

TEXAS ACA LAWSUIT

(Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, Texas Attorney General Ken Paxton and more than a dozen Republican attorneys general began their case in a Texas Federal court arguing that the Affordable Care Act's preexisting protection is unconstitutional.

According to the Department of Health and Human Services, nearly 130 million adults under age 65 have preexisting conditions. Prohibiting health insurance providers from denying coverage to Americans with preexisting conditions remains one of the most popular parts of the Affordable Care Act.

If the court were to strike that part of the law, thousands of American families would be denied coverage or go broke because of the unaffordable health costs. We can't roll back the clock.

I am shocked it is my home State taking the lead on this divisive issue when Texas still has the highest number of uninsured individuals in the Nation. What is more frustrating is Mr. Paxton stated in court briefs that States challenging the ACA should be able to eliminate protections if the judge does not decide to strike the law entirely.

People need certainty in their healthcare, not politics.

RECOGNIZING 200TH ANNIVERSARY OF CLEARFIELD PRESBYTERIAN CHURCH

(Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to congratulate the Clearfield Presbyterian Church on its 200th anniversary.

First organized in 1818, groups of worshippers met in private homes and places of public gatherings. That same year, Hugh Jordan and Archibald Shaw were ordained and installed as ruling elders. In 1825, the Reverend Gary Bishop was called to be a pastor of the church, and he served from 1826 to 1834.

The first church was erected in 1841, but it was removed in 1867 to build the new stone church. It was dedicated in 1869, and the cost exceeded \$41,000. The church was known for its 150-foot steeple, which was the highest in the community.

This Sunday, September 9, the church will celebrate two centuries of delivering the good news of Jesus Christ to members of its congregation, both near and far.

Mr. Speaker, generations of Pennsylvanians have gathered in this beautiful church to hear the Word of the Lord. On this special occasion, I both congratulate and pray for the Clearfield Presbyterian Church, its leaders, and the entire congregation, both past and present.

ATROCITIES COMMITTED AGAINST CIVILIANS IN YEMEN

(Ms. GABBARD asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. GABBARD. Mr. Speaker, for too long, the United States has turned a blind eye to the atrocities being committed against civilians in Yemen by the Saudi-U.S. coalition.

Just last month, the Saudi-led coalition dropped a U.S.-made bomb in a devastating attack on a schoolbus that killed 40 children, just the latest in the long string of horrors in this genocidal war that has killed tens of thousands of Yemeni civilians with bombs and mass starvation, creating the worst humanitarian crisis in the world. Yet today, in Yemen, our military continues to wage this interventionist war alongside Saudi Arabia, unauthorized by Congress.

The time for crocodile tears and baseless platitudes is over. Enough is enough. The U.S. must end its support for Saudi Arabia and stop waging interventionist wars that increase destruction, death, and suffering around the world, drain our resources here at home, and threaten our own national security.

HONORING FIRE CHIEF MICHAEL REESE

(Mr. SMUCKER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. SMUCKER. Mr. Speaker, it is with a heavy heart that I rise today to honor and remember a dedicated public servant in our community who just passed away 2 weeks ago today at the young age of 53—Willow Street Fire Chief Michael Reese.

Chief Reese's career as a firefighter, which spanned four decades and began when he was a teenager, stands out in our community as one of service, pride, and bravery. His loss is a tremendous loss to our community as well as his fellow firefighters. President Bob Kiesel said recently in a statement, and he said it best: "Chief Reese's life was dedicated to helping others."

In addition to his 39 years as a firefighter and EMT, Chief Reese spent 17 years as an emergency dispatcher and assistant supervisor with the Lancaster County-Wide Communications. Chief Reese focused his entire career on serving others, on making our commu-

nity a safer place, and on saving the lives of those he was charged with protecting.

Michael served alongside his brother, David, who is the deputy fire chief in Willow Street. David and all the firefighters in Willow Street and across central Pennsylvania will carry Michael's spirit with them for the rest of their lives.

I am extraordinarily grateful for his service. We owe a debt of gratitude to Chief Reese, his wife, Susan, and to his entire family. His memory will not soon be forgotten.

STUDENTS RETURNING TO SCHOOL IN THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

(Ms. PLASKETT asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. PLASKETT. Mr. Speaker, 1 year ago today, Hurricane Irma struck my home, the Virgin Islands of the United States. Much was lost, but we were bent but not broken, and our good God has preserved our spirit.

This week, many Virgin Islands students return to school. Some still await their facilities being prepared for them. It is a significant step forward. It also serves as a reminder that there is much work yet in restoring an environment wholly conducive to the needs of our students.

After the hurricanes, both school districts lost estimates of \$700 million in facility supplies and food for educational purposes. It is incumbent on all of us—all of us—to put our shoulders in to push our children forward.

I want to thank those who have been gifted with one of the most important roles in our community: the hard-working teachers, administrators, faculty, and staff who played an integral role in our students returning to school this week in the Virgin Islands. We are grateful for your efforts.

□ 1215

REMEMBERING AND HONORING VICTIMS OF SEPTEMBER 11, 2001, ATTACKS

(Mr. YODER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. YODER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to remember and honor those who lost their lives on September 11, 2001. On that tragic day, nearly 3,000 innocent Americans were killed in the attacks on the World Trade Center in New York, the Pentagon in D.C., and those on Flight 93 in Pennsylvania. Some of those who perished included brave first responders who ran into the burning buildings as others were running out.

That horrific day changed our great Nation forever. It became clear that there was an ever-present threat by those who wish to attack our country and its citizens.

Eleven days after these attacks, the Department of Homeland Security was created to make a more secure America that is better equipped to confront the range of threats that we face.

As the current chairman of the Homeland Security Appropriations Subcommittee, I am working to ensure that the Department is provided with the resources to accomplish their mission. Working to keep our Nation safe is one of my top priorities, and one of the primary roles of the Federal Government.

Together, we must work to make sure that terrorist attacks like 9/11 never happen again.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6691, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Rules, I call up House Resolution 1051 and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 1051

Resolved, That upon adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to consider in the House the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of “crime of violence”, and for other purposes. All points of order against consideration of the bill are waived. The bill shall be considered as read. All points of order against provisions in the bill are waived. The previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and on any 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 the Judiciary; and (2) one motion to recommend.

SEC. 2. It shall be in order at any time on the legislative day of September 13, 2018, for the Speaker to entertain motions that the House suspend the rules as though under clause 1 of rule XV. The Speaker or his designee shall consult with the Minority Leader or her designee on the designation of any matter for consideration pursuant to this section.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of debate only, I yield the customary 30 minutes to the gentleman from Florida (Mr. HASTINGS), 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. BUCK. 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 Colorado?

There was no objection.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of the rule and the under-

lying legislation. This rule makes in order one bill dealing with a pressing legal issue.

Mr. Speaker, under the Immigration and Nationality Act, or INA, an immigrant convicted of certain felonies is subject to deportation. In order to qualify for this particular provision of the INA, an immigrant must be convicted of a crime of violence.

The statute defines “crime of violence” as an offense that, “by its nature, involves a substantial risk that physical force against the person or property of another may be used in the course of committing the offense.”

This has been a longstanding and roundly accepted policy of the U.S. Government. For years, we have deported dangerous criminal immigrants.

However, earlier this year, the U.S. Supreme Court ruled that how the law defined “crime of violence” was impermissibly vague. The result of the ruling threw all of these kinds of deportation cases into question.

Historically, this realm of immigration law has never been an area of law to which the Court has applied constitutional rights. But writing the ruling for the majority, Justice Elena Kagan applied due process rights afforded by the Constitution to the removal process of criminal immigrants. Because the Court applied the Constitution in this manner, it concluded that the term “crime of violence” could be applied arbitrarily and unpredictably.

Chief Justice John Roberts warned of the path down which this ruling could lead as it pertains to other provisions of Federal criminal law. In fact, his concerns were justifiable.

In May, the Tenth Circuit struck down a similar provision in another portion of Federal law relating to using weapons in the commission of a crime. That particular case resulted in the sentence of a man convicted for firebombing a store with a Molotov cocktail being vacated.

Then again, in August, the D.C. Circuit struck down convictions of two men who were convicted for a violent criminal act. This ruling opened up the possibility that convictions for criminal acts involving firearms can be overturned.

Mr. Speaker, this is the backdrop against which we consider this bill today. This legislation, the Community Safety and Security Act, plugs the gaps in Federal law created by these recent court rulings.

It specifies the circumstances by which a criminal offense should be construed as a crime of violence. In particular, a crime of violence will include crimes of murder, sexual abuse, kidnapping, robbery, domestic violence, human trafficking, and many other types of violent acts.

By clearly outlining Congress’ intent of what constitutes a violent crime, this bill will eliminate the Court’s concerns about ambiguity and will allow our law enforcement agencies to con-

tinue carrying out their duties to protect the American public.

Mr. Speaker, law and order is a crucial component of a healthy society. We are beginning to see the effects of feel-good policies in some locales on the crime rate in those areas, particularly the violent crime rate. When law and order breaks down in our communities, the residents suffer.

I am confident there is no intention to erode law and order or embolden criminals. However, the effects are just the same. That is why this legislation is so critical.

We need to ensure that there is a clear definition of violent crime, so that courts across this country are not boxed in by this Supreme Court ruling and do not have to vacate sentences or release violent criminals onto our streets.

Mr. Speaker, I have spent more than 2 decades fighting crime, both at the Federal level and in my own community. The impact of crime, and violent crime in particular, on victims is heartbreaking. Watching someone suffer the worst of societal ills is bad enough when justice is served. But watching a victim suffer not just the crime, but the lack of justice, is infuriating.

We need to fix this loophole carved by these rulings and defend our communities from criminals. We need to stand up for victims of violent crime and see that the justice that we all want for them is served.

I support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

I thank the gentleman, my friend from Colorado, for yielding me the customary 30 minutes for debate, and I am proceeding under the assumption that we will conclude this pretty rapidly.

Once again, my Republican colleagues have decided that the best way to govern is through a rushed and closed process, all in an obvious attempt to throw red meat to their base. Let’s not parse words. This is an ill-thought-out bill trying to score cheap political points with the Republican base.

Mr. Speaker, this bill takes up no small feat. It attempts to utterly redefine what is meant by “crime of violence” in our criminal code. Our need to revisit the definition is due to the fact that the United States Supreme Court has now twice held that what is known as the residual clause under this particular area of our criminal code is unconstitutional because it is so broad it violates a person’s constitutional right to due process.

Such a reality does not invite this body’s attention, but demands it. However, with that demand comes a great responsibility, a responsibility to take the time necessary to do it right; a responsibility to ensure that members of the committee of jurisdiction, and other Members of Congress, are consulted; a responsibility to ensure that

we hear from public defenders, prosecutors, judges, and criminal justice and immigration reform experts, for this bill touches upon all of these areas, and not one person, let alone an expert, has been consulted in the drafting of this bill, at least not in the light of day.

Ostensibly, this bill was dropped to address the Supreme Court decisions just noted, the most recent of which was handed down in April of this year. I presume the composition of the bill was started soon after the Court dropped its decision, and, therefore, the author had from that time until last Friday to prepare today's bill. I think it only fair, then, that we have a similar amount of time to consider such an important matter.

Of course, I know that is not going to happen. No, instead, my friends across the aisle have, once again, insisted on engaging in fly-by-night legislating and, in so doing, shutting out not only Democrats but Republicans, and not only Democrats and Republicans, but the American people.

Mr. Speaker, this is the 96th closed rule of this session, and that is record-breaking in and of itself. That means that Members don't have an opportunity to have input to substantive legislation, and somehow or another, with no hearings, or any markup or anything, a measure like this is before us.

While home for the district work period, my constituents didn't talk to me about replacing the definition of a "crime of violence" in the Federal criminal code. They did talk to me about a number of circumstances, but they didn't talk to me about liquefied natural gas, one of the other bills the House is going to consider this week.

On the other hand, they did ask about what Congress is going to do to address the gun violence epidemic ravaging our country, including, regrettably, today, in Cincinnati, Ohio.

They asked about what Congress is doing to ensure that DACA, the Dream recipients, and temporary protected status holders have a pathway to citizenship, and they asked what Congress is going to do to address the Nation's need for serious and sustained investments in our infrastructure.

□ 1230

And high among the things that I heard from my constituents was about the cost of drugs and the rising cost of insurance.

Let us also include with those very important issues, including today, there are nine legislative days until the government runs out of money. I had representatives from the National Association of Air Traffic Controllers visit me an hour and a half ago explaining to me what a government shutdown would do to that particular agency.

We once again are forced to stare down the very real possibility of another government shutdown. And what are my friends across the aisle doing to thwart that inevitability? Nothing.

Mr. Speaker, we have some serious issues to tackle, and so I am discouraged to be on the floor today focusing on yet another messaging bill. I call on my Republican friends to put their perplexing fear of governing aside in the final days before we leave Washington, so that we may get to the people's business.

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

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I would make an inquiry of my friend. I have no Members here to speak, and I am prepared to close if my friend is.

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

We were supposed to have a speaker speak to the previous question, and she may not be here to discuss it.

Mr. Speaker, last night at the Rules Committee, I heard my colleague, Mr. BUCK, discuss how one of the root causes of rising crime in this country is our broken education system.

And now I will say to the gentleman that Ms. BONAMICI has arrived, and like him, she was just a little bit delayed. So she will speak to this issue once I finish my comments, and then that will be our only speaker, I would urge my friend.

I also would like to say, it is not often in this body that Members say that they made a mistake. In an exchange last night in dialogue with my friend from Colorado, he commented that Florida's violent crime had gone down, and I mistakenly said to him that he was in error.

He was correct. It has gone down. I indicated to him last night that I would speak with him more about it. And there are some particulars that I will share with him, not so much in this particular setting, but I will get a chance to talk to him. There are some things where crime did go up, and Florida still ranks fifth in the Nation in violent crime, but I do want to say to him that I was mistaken when I spoke last evening.

Mr. Speaker, I don't disagree with my friend from Colorado about education, and I believe every Member of this House is concerned about the education of our children in this country. We are failing our younger generations. We need to make monumental strides in this country to better our education system, and I believe that starts with childcare.

And I always make a caveat there, because when I am asked about education at home, and my opponent brought it up often in the election that I was involved in, and I constantly reminded her that the Federal Government only provides less than 7 percent of the budgets of our local communities. So this is largely a matter where we talk a lot up here, but the local communities are where the rubber hits the road.

We need to make these strides because of the problems that we are seeing. We obviously need more pre-K, we obviously need more Head Start, but in

the past decade, the cost of childcare has increased by 25 percent. In 33 States and the District of Columbia, infant care costs exceed the average cost of a 4-year in-state college tuition. This is a huge financial burden that is only worsening.

Mr. Speaker, families need access to a system that provides high quality, affordable early learning and care that will prepare children for success without breaking the bank.

That is why, if we defeat the previous question, I am going to offer an amendment to the rule to bring up Education and the Workforce Committee Ranking Member SCOTT's bill, H.R. 3773, the Child Care for Working Families Act. This bill will establish a new Federal-State partnership to provide high quality, affordable childcare from birth through age 13.

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. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Florida?

There was no objection.

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Oregon (Ms. BONAMICI) to discuss our proposal.

Ms. BONAMICI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, there is bipartisan consensus that our Nation's families, on behalf of our Nation's children, who are our future and our future leaders, must be able to access affordable, high quality childcare and other early learning opportunities to fulfill their potential and succeed in college and career and in life. In fact, a recent poll done by the First Five Years Fund found that 89 percent of voters, including 82 percent of Republicans, support making quality early childhood education more affordable for working families.

Last year, I joined Ranking Member BOBBY SCOTT and more than 120 of my colleagues to introduce the Child Care for Working Families Act.

This bill would ensure universal access to quality early learning programs for all families making less than 150 percent of their State's median income.

Today, the average annual cost of full-time, center-based childcare in the United States exceeds the average annual cost of in-state tuition.

In Oregon and other places around the country, lower and middle-income families are forced to pay up to 30 percent of their annual income on childcare, with many of the lowest income families unable to afford care at all.

The Child Care for Working Families Act is a bold solution to fix this national problem. The legislation would mean that no family of four earning an annual household income below \$139,000 per year would pay more than 7 percent of that income for quality childcare.

This legislation would also ensure that early learning teachers and caregivers finally get the time, attention, training, and resources they deserve. Whether in childcare, preschool, pre-kindergarten, or in other early learning environments, every child should receive quality care.

Parents are out working hard. They deserve the peace of mind that comes from the confidence of knowing that childcare and early learning professionals are well trained, and that means well paid. No longer would a full-time early learning professional have to enroll in public assistance to make ends meet.

Decades of research shows that properly nurturing children in the early years of life is instrumental in supporting enhanced brain development, cognitive functioning, and emotional and physical health. Research also shows what all of us know: investing in quality early learning programming leads to better educational outcomes, stronger job earnings, and lower crime rates.

Quality early learning helps prevent and mitigate academic achievement gaps, it provides indisputable long-term benefits for our Nation. And nothing returns more money to the Treasury than investments in early learning programs. Our Nation receives \$7 in economic benefit for every \$1 invested in these programs. That, my colleagues, is a good investment in our future, our children. This bill is not only the right thing to do, but also the smart thing to do.

The Child Care For Working Families Act lays out the path of what early learning in America could and should look like. If we want a promising future for our children, if we want strong and stable families, we must make sure that all families can access high quality early learning opportunities. Quality childcare is a national priority. This bill deserves immediate attention and, importantly, bipartisan support. Our future is at stake.

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

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Mr. Speaker, the people's House should be approaching our work in a manner that is fair to all Americans, in a manner where the committees of jurisdiction hold hearings and markups, in a manner where experts in the field are consulted, in a manner where members of both parties have an opportunity to offer amendments and debate the contents of the bills that come before this body.

None of that happened with today's bill.

Instead, for reasons beyond understanding, we have to vote on a bill that no person in this body had sufficient time to understand, let alone time to consider the far-reaching consequences it could have on people living in this country and on our Constitution. The fact that Republican leadership insists

on governing in such a manner is, as always, as disappointing as, in my opinion, it is shameful.

Now, listen: 96 closed rules. I am fond of talking about when I first ran for Congress in 1992, the then leadership of the Republican Party did an effective job saying to the American public that the then leadership of the Democrats were having closed rules and closing out the process.

Newt Gingrich was the person that was the author of that, in many respects in retrospect, brilliant strategy. That was one of the tenets that he put forward, that it was not right for Democrats to have as many closed rules as they had at that time. I don't remember the exact number, it was a number, but it didn't come close to 96. And now, if we flip the script, what we have is 96 closed rules.

I serve on that Rules Committee with my friend from Colorado. And repeatedly, you look around this room, on an ordinary, regular order process, we would have at least five or six speakers on either side to substantive legislation, or we would have had an opportunity for Members to offer amendments that could have been considered in a germane or non-germane manner to be able to come out here on the floor.

The American people are being shut out, not just Republicans and Democrats. It is not right, and we shouldn't go forward that way.

I promise you that we are doing a disservice when we do not allow for measures of this consequence. We don't know what the outcome of this is going to be.

I can't disagree with a thing my friend from Colorado said with reference to the measure and the clarification that is needed after the two Supreme Court decisions, but please know this: the proper way to do that would have been for the committee of jurisdiction to hold hearings and then to have a markup and then come to the Rules Committee. But what we saw was, bam, right straight to the Rules Committee, no hearings, no markup, no experts, no prosecutors, no public defenders, no input, and the public not having an opportunity to participate. It is wrong.

Mr. Speaker, I urge a "no" vote on the rule, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

I appreciate my friend from Florida and his views on open and closed rules and the importance of open rules and the importance of amendments and the importance to an open process.

The fact is the Democrats continue to focus on closed rules versus open rules, ignoring the structured amendment process, which has routinely been used by both majorities.

If we are going to use that metric for measuring openness, I want to clarify a couple of points for the record. Sixteen of the closed rules cited by the minor-

ity were rolling back regulations under the Congressional Review Act, which does not allow for amendments, to ensure that only a majority vote is required in the Senate.

□ 1245

Another 12 closed rules were for bills where the majority put out a call for amendments but received no amendments.

And if my friends from the other side of the aisle believe that open rules are the only measure of success, it is only fair that we clarify for the American people the Democrat majority's record.

In the 111th Congress, under Speaker PELOSI, the majority had zero open rules. However, as we have already stated in the past, comparing open to closed rules ignores the structured amendment process. This majority has made it a priority to make in order large numbers of amendments for floor consideration, a majority of those with a Democrat sponsor and/or cosponsor.

In fact, as of July 24, 2018, Republicans in the 115th Congress, in which we serve now, have provided for the consideration of over 1,650 amendments on the House floor; over 745 Democrat amendments, or 45 percent of the total number of amendments; over 630 Republican amendments or 38 percent of the total amendments; and over 280 bipartisan amendments, or 17 percent of the total amendments.

In the 114th Congress, the last Congress to have served, the Republican majority allowed over 1,700 amendments to be considered on the House floor.

In the 113th Congress the Republican majority allowed over 1,500 amendments to be considered on the House floor.

And in the entire 111th Congress, Speaker PELOSI, and the Democrats allowed less than 1,000 amendments to be considered on the floor.

I just wanted to make sure that we put into perspective the arguments from my friend.

Mr. Speaker, it is really fairly simple. Law and order is being jeopardized as it relates to the term, "crime of violence." This bill plugs the gap left in our laws by the court's ruling.

Mr. Speaker, there are a lot of different viewpoints across this country about our criminal justice and immigration system, but there are two nearly universally held beliefs by Americans: one, criminals should receive justice; and two, criminal immigrants should be deported.

While we can debate many aspects of our criminal code, we must not waiver in our commitment to protect the American people from criminals and to bring justice to victims. There have been numerous cases lately of immigrants committing violent crimes against Americans. Some of these cases are too recent to even mention by name here today. We must stand with victims and their families and remove criminal immigrants from this country. It is unjust to do anything else.

Our country is great, in part, because of our commitment to law and order. It is wrong to pursue a softening of our response to violent crime. To do so would invite more crime and produce more victims.

We must uphold the rule of law in America. Americans want it. Americans deserve it. That is exactly what this bill does. It defines violent crimes so that our immigration and criminal justice systems will have the tools necessary to remove violent immigrants from our country.

Mr. Speaker, I call on my colleagues to support this bill. Uphold law and order. Vote “yes” on the previous question. Vote “yes” on the resolution. And vote “yes” on the underlying bill.

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

AN AMENDMENT TO H. RES. 1051 OFFERED BY MR. HASTINGS

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

SEC. 3. 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. 3773) to amend the Child Care and Development Block Grant Act of 1990 and the Head Start Act to promote child care and early learning, 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 Education and the Workforce. 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 recommend 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. 4. Clause 1(c) of rule XIX shall not apply to the consideration of H.R. 3773.

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 offered 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. BUCK. Mr. Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the resolution.

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

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

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

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess for a period of less than 15 minutes.

Accordingly (at 12 o’clock and 49 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1300

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. FRANCIS ROONEY of Florida) at 1 p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Ordering the previous question on House Resolution 1051; and

Adoption of House Resolution 1051, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. The remaining electronic vote will be conducted as a 5-minute vote.

PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 6691, COMMUNITY SAFETY AND SECURITY ACT OF 2018, AND PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The unfinished business is the vote on ordering the previous question on the resolution (H. Res. 1051) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 6691) to amend title 18, United States Code, to clarify the definition of “crime of violence”, and for other purposes, and providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the resolution.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 224, nays 181, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 386]

YEAS—224

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|---------------|
| Abraham | Brooks (IN) | Cramer |
| Aderholt | Buchanan | Crawford |
| Allen | Buck | Culberson |
| Amash | Bucshon | Curbelo (FL) |
| Arrington | Budd | Curtis |
| Babin | Burgess | Davidson |
| Bacon | Byrne | Davis, Rodney |
| Balderson | Calvert | Denham |
| Banks (IN) | Carter (GA) | DesJarlais |
| Barr | Carter (TX) | Diaz-Balart |
| Barton | Chabot | Donovan |
| Bergman | Cheney | Duffy |
| Biggs | Cloud | Duncan (SC) |
| Bilirakis | Coffman | Duncan (TN) |
| Bishop (MI) | Cole | Dunn |
| Bishop (UT) | Collins (GA) | Emmer |
| Black | Collins (NY) | Estes (KS) |
| Blum | Comer | Faso |
| Bost | Comstock | Ferguson |
| Brady (TX) | Conaway | Fitzpatrick |
| Brat | Cook | Fleischmann |
| Brooks (AL) | Costello (PA) | Flores |

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|---------------|-----------------|---------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|-----------------|---------------|
| Fortenberry | Lamborn | Rokita | Payne | Sánchez | Takano | Kinzinger | Noem | Smith (MO) |
| Fox | Lance | Rooney, Francis | Pelosi | Sarbanes | Thompson (CA) | Knigh | Norman | Smith (NE) |
| Frelinghuysen | Latta | Roskam | Perlmutter | Shakowsky | Thompson (MS) | Kustoff (TN) | Nunes | Smith (NJ) |
| Gallagher | Lesko | Ross | Peters | Schiff | Tonko | Labrador | Olson | Smith (TX) |
| Garrett | Lewis (MN) | Rothfus | Peterson | Schneider | Torres | LaHood | Palmer | Smucker |
| Gianforte | LoBiondo | Rouzer | Pingree | Schrader | Tsongas | LaMalfa | Paulsen | Stefanik |
| Gibbs | Loudermilk | Russell | Pocan | Scott (VA) | Vargas | Lamb | Pearce | Stewart |
| Gohmert | Love | Rutherford | Polis | Scott, David | Veasey | Lamborn | Perry | Stivers |
| Goodlatte | Lucas | Sanford | Price (NC) | Serrano | Vela | Lance | Pittenger | Taylor |
| Gosar | Luetkemeyer | Scalise | Quigley | Sewell (AL) | Velázquez | Latta | Poliquin | Tenney |
| Gowdy | MacArthur | Schweikert | Raskin | Shea-Porter | Viscosky | Lesko | Posey | Thompson (PA) |
| Granger | Marchant | Scott, Austin | Rice (NY) | Sherman | Wasserman | Lewis (MN) | Ratcliffe | Thornberry |
| Graves (GA) | Marino | Sensenbrenner | Richmond | Sinema | Schultz | LoBiondo | Reed | Tipton |
| Graves (LA) | Marshall | Sessions | Rosen | Sires | Waters, Maxine | Long | Reichert | Trott |
| Graves (MO) | Massie | Shimkus | Roybal-Allard | Smith (WA) | Watson Coleman | Loudermilk | Renacci | Turner |
| Griffith | Mast | Simpson | Ruiz | Soto | Welch | Love | Rice (SC) | Upton |
| Grothman | McCarthy | Smith (MO) | Ruppersberger | Suozi | Wilson (FL) | Lucas | Roby | Valadao |
| Guthrie | McCaul | Smith (NE) | Rush | Swalwell (CA) | Yarmuth | Luetkemeyer | Roe (TN) | Wagner |
| Handel | McClintock | Smith (NJ) | | | | MacArthur | Rogers (AL) | Walberg |
| Harper | McHenry | Smith (TX) | | | | Marchant | Rogers (KY) | Walden |
| Harris | McKinley | Smucker | Amodei | Huffman | Ros-Lehtinen | Marino | Rohrabacher | Walker |
| Hartzler | Stefanik | Stewart | Barletta | Jenkins (WV) | Royce (CA) | Marshall | Rokita | Walorski |
| Hensarling | Stewarts | Stivers | Blackburn | Maloney, Sean | Ryan (OH) | Mast | Rooney, Francis | Walters, Mimi |
| Herrera Beutler | Taylor | Tenney | Capuano | Moore | Shuster | McCarthy | Roskam | Weber (TX) |
| Hice, Jody B. | Thompson (PA) | Thornberry | Connolly | Neal | Speier | McCaul | Ross | Weber (TX) |
| Higgins (LA) | Tipton | Trott | DeSantis | Palazzo | Titus | McClintock | Rothfus | Westerman |
| Hill | Turner | Upton | Ellison | Poe (TX) | Walz | McHenry | Rouzer | Williams |
| Holding | Valadao | Wagner | Eshoo | Rooney, Thomas | | McKinley | Russell | Wilson (SC) |
| Hollingsworth | Walberg | Weber (TX) | Gaetz | J. | | McMorris | Rutherford | Wittman |
| Hudson | Walorski | Webster (FL) | | | | Rodgers | Sanford | Womack |
| Huizenga | Walters, Mimi | Wenstrup | | | | Meadows | Scalise | Woodall |
| Hultgren | Weber (TX) | Westerman | | | | Messner | Schweikert | Yoder |
| Hunter | Wilson (SC) | Williams | | | | Mitchell | Scott, Austin | Yoder |
| Hurd | Wittman | Womack | | | | Moolenaar | Sensenbrenner | Yoho |
| Issa | Woodall | Yoder | | | | Mooney (WV) | Sessions | Young (AK) |
| Jenkins (KS) | Yoder | Yoho | | | | Mullin | Shimkus | Young (IA) |
| Johnson (LA) | Young (AK) | Zeldin | | | | Newhouse | Shuster | Zeldin |
| Johnson (OH) | Young (IA) | | | | | | Simpson | |
| Johnson, Sam | | | | | | | | |
| Jones | | | | | | | | |
| Jordan | | | | | | | | |
| Joyce (OH) | | | | | | | | |
| Katko | | | | | | | | |
| Kelly (MS) | | | | | | | | |
| Kelly (PA) | | | | | | | | |
| King (IA) | | | | | | | | |
| King (NY) | | | | | | | | |
| Kinzinger | | | | | | | | |
| Knight | | | | | | | | |
| Kustoff (TN) | | | | | | | | |
| Labrador | | | | | | | | |
| LaHood | | | | | | | | |
| LaMalfa | | | | | | | | |

NOT VOTING—24

□ 1326

Messrs. PETERSON, RUSH, and Mrs. BEATTY changed their vote from “yea” to “nay.”

So the previous question was ordered. The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

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

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. HASTINGS. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered. The SPEAKER pro tempore. This will be a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 225, noes 179, not voting 25, as follows:

[Roll No. 387]

AYES—225

| | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|-----------------|----------------|---------------|---------------|
| Adams | Delaney | Kildee | Abraham | Comer | Gosar | Adams | Frankel (FL) | Meeks |
| Aguilar | DeLauro | Kilmer | Aderholt | Constock | Gowdy | Fudge | Meng | Meng |
| Barragán | DelBene | Kind | Allen | Conaway | Granger | Gabbard | Moulton | Moulton |
| Bass | Demings | Krishnamoorthi | Arrington | Cook | Graves (GA) | Gallego | Murphy (FL) | Murphy (FL) |
| Beatty | DeSaulnier | Kuster (NH) | Costello (PA) | Cramer | Graves (LA) | Garamendi | Nadler | Nadler |
| Bera | Deutch | Lamb | Bacon | Crawford | Graves (MO) | Gomez | Napolitano | Napolitano |
| Beyer | Dingell | Langevin | Balderson | Crist | Griffith | Gonzalez (TX) | Nolan | Norcross |
| Bishop (GA) | Doggett | Larsen (WA) | Banks (IN) | Culberson | Grothman | Green, Al | O'Halleran | O'Rourke |
| Blumenauer | Doyle, Michael | Larsen (CT) | Barr | Curbelo (FL) | Guthrie | Green, Gene | O'Rourke | O'Rourke |
| Blunt Rochester | F. | Lawrence | Barton | Curtis | Handel | Grijalva | Pallone | Pallone |
| Bonamici | Engel | Lawson (FL) | Bergman | Davidson | Harper | Gutiérrez | Panetta | Panetta |
| Boyle, Brendan | Españillat | Lee | Biggs | Davis, Rodney | Harris | Hanabusa | Pascrell | Pascrell |
| F. | Esty (CT) | Levin | Bilirakis | Denham | Hartzler | Hastings | Payne | Payne |
| Brady (PA) | Evans | Lewis (GA) | Bishop (MI) | DesJarlais | Hensarling | Heck | Pelosi | Pelosi |
| Brown (MD) | Foster | Lieu, Ted | Bishop (UT) | Diaz-Balart | Herrera Beutler | Higgins (NY) | Perlmutter | Perlmutter |
| Brownley (CA) | Frankel (FL) | Lipinski | Black | Donovan | Hice, Jody B. | Himes | Peters | Peters |
| Bustos | Fudge | Loebsack | Blum | Duffy | Higgins (LA) | Hoyer | Peterson | Peterson |
| Butterfield | Gabbard | Lowenthal | Boyd | Duncan (SC) | Hill | Jackson Lee | Pingree | Pingree |
| Carbajal | Gallego | Lowe | Brady (TX) | Duncan (TN) | Hollingsworth | Jayapal | Pocan | Pocan |
| Cárdenas | Garamendi | Lujan Grisham, | Brat | Dunn | Hudson | Jeffries | Polis | Polis |
| Carson (IN) | Gomez | M. | Brooks (AL) | Dunn | Hultgren | Johnson, E. B. | Price (NC) | Price (NC) |
| Cartwright | Gonzalez (TX) | Luján, Ben Ray | Brooks (IN) | Emmer | Huizenga | Johnson (IN) | Quigley | Quigley |
| Castor (FL) | Gottheimer | Lynch | Buchanan | Estes (KS) | Hultgren | Johnson (OH) | Raskin | Raskin |
| Castro (TX) | Green, Al | Maloney, | Buck | Faso | Hurd | Kennedy | Rice (NY) | Rice (NY) |
| Chu, Judy | Green, Gene | Carolyn B. | Bucshon | Ferguson | Issa | Khanna | Richmond | Richmond |
| Cicilline | Grijalva | Carly Fiorina | Budd | Fitzpatrick | Isa | Kihuen | Rosen | Rosen |
| Clark (MA) | Gutiérrez | Matsui | Burgess | Fleischmann | Jenkins (KS) | Kildee | Roybal-Allard | Roybal-Allard |
| Clarke (NY) | Hanabusa | McCollum | Byrne | Flores | Johnson (LA) | Kilmer | Ruiz | Ruiz |
| Clay | Hastings | McEachin | Calvert | Fortenberry | Johnson (OH) | Kind | Ruppersberger | Ruppersberger |
| Cleaver | Heck | McGovern | Carter (GA) | Fox | Johnson (OH) | Krishnamoorthi | Rush | Rush |
| Clyburn | Higgins (NY) | McNerney | Carter (TX) | Fox | Jones | Kuster (NH) | Sánchez | Sánchez |
| Cohen | Himes | Meeks | Chabot | Fox | Jordan | Langevin | Schakowsky | Schakowsky |
| Cooper | Hoyer | Meng | Cheney | Gallagher | Joyce (OH) | Larsen (WA) | Schiff | Schiff |
| Correa | Jackson Lee | Moulton | Cloud | Garrett | King (IA) | Larsen (CT) | Schneider | Schneider |
| Costa | Jayapal | Murphy (FL) | Coffman | Gibbs | King (NY) | Lawrence | Schrader | Schrader |
| Courtney | Jeffries | Nadler | Cole | Gohmert | | Lawson (FL) | Scott (VA) | Scott (VA) |
| Crist | Johnson (GA) | Napolitano | Collins (GA) | Goodlatte | | Lee | Scott, David | Scott, David |
| Crowley | Johnson, E. B. | Nolan | Collins (NY) | | | Levin | Serrano | Serrano |
| Cuellar | Kaptur | Norcross | | | | Lewis (GA) | Sewell (AL) | Sewell (AL) |
| Cummings | Keating | O'Halleran | | | | Lieu, Ted | Shea-Porter | Shea-Porter |
| Davis (CA) | Kelly (IL) | O'Rourke | | | | Lipinski | Sherman | Sherman |
| Davis, Danny | Kennedy | Pallone | | | | Loeb sack | Sinema | Sinema |
| DeFazio | Khanna | Panetta | | | | Lofgren | Sires | Sires |
| DeGette | Kihuen | Pascrell | | | | Lowenthal | Smith (WA) | Smith (WA) |
| | | | | | | Lowe | Soto | Soto |
| | | | | | | Lujan Grisham, | Suozi | Suozi |
| | | | | | | M. | Swalwell (CA) | Swalwell (CA) |
| | | | | | | Luján, Ben Ray | Takano | Takano |
| | | | | | | Lynch | Thompson (CA) | Thompson (CA) |
| | | | | | | Maloney, | Thompson (MS) | Thompson (MS) |
| | | | | | | Carolyn B. | Tonko | Tonko |
| | | | | | | Massie | Torres | Torres |
| | | | | | | Matsui | Tsongas | Tsongas |
| | | | | | | McCollum | Vargas | Vargas |
| | | | | | | Esty (CT) | Veasey | Veasey |
| | | | | | | Evans | Vela | Vela |
| | | | | | | Foster | Velázquez | Velázquez |

NOES—179

| | | |
|-----------------|----------------|---------------|
| Adams | Frankel (FL) | Meeks |
| Aguilar | Fudge | Meng |
| Amash | Gabbard | Moulton |
| Barragán | Gallego | Murphy (FL) |
| Bass | Garamendi | Nadler |
| Beatty | Gomez | Napolitano |
| Bera | Gonzalez (TX) | Nolan |
| Beyer | Gottheimer | Norcross |
| Bishop (GA) | Green, Al | O'Halleran |
| Blumenauer | Green, Gene | O'Rourke |
| Blunt Rochester | Grijalva | Pallone |
| Bonamici | Gutiérrez | Panetta |
| Boyle, Brendan | Hanabusa | Pascrell |
| F. | Hastings | Payne |
| Brady (PA) | Heck | Pelosi |
| Brown (MD) | Higgins (NY) | Perlmutter |
| Brownley (CA) | Himes | Peters |
| Bustos | Hoyer | Peterson |
| Butterfield | Jackson Lee | Pingree |
| Carbajal | Jayapal | Pocan |
| Cárdenas | Jeffries | Polis |
| Carson (IN) | Johnson, E. B. | Price (NC) |
| Cartwright | Kaptur | Quigley |
| Castor (FL) | Keating | Raskin |
| Castro (TX) | Kelly (IL) | Rice (NY) |
| Chu, Judy | Kennedy | Richmond |
| Cicilline | Khanna | Rosen |
| Clark (MA) | Clark (MA) | Roybal-Allard |
| Clarke (NY) | Kilmer | Ruiz |
| Clay | Kind | Ruppersberger |
| Cleaver | Krishnamoorthi | Rush |
| Clyburn | Cohen | Sánchez |
| Cohen | Cooper | Schakowsky |
| Cooper | Correa | Schiff |
| Correa | Costa | Schneider |
| Costa | Courtney | Schrader |
| Courtney | Crowley | Scott (VA) |
| Crist | Cuellar | Scott, David |
| Crowley | Cummings | Serrano |
| Cuellar | Davis (CA) | Sewell (AL) |
| Cummings | Davis, Danny | Shea-Porter |
| Davis (CA) | DeFazio | Sherman |
| Davis, Danny | DeGette | Sinema |
| DeFazio | Delaney | Sires |
| DeGette | DeLauro | Smith (WA) |
| | DelBene | Soto |
| | Demings | Suozi |
| | DeSaulnier | Swalwell (CA) |
| | Deutch | Takano |
| | Dingell | Thompson (CA) |
| | Doggett | Thompson (MS) |
| | Doyle, Michael | Tonko |
| | F. | Torres |
| | Engel | Tsongas |
| | Españillat | Vargas |
| | Esty (CT) | Veasey |
| | Evans | Vela |
| | Foster | Velázquez |

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|---------|
| Visclosky | Waters, Maxine | Yarmuth |
| Wasserman | Watson Coleman | |
| Schultz | Wilson (FL) | |

NOT VOTING—25

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|--------------|
| Amodei | Jenkins (WV) | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Barletta | Johnson (GA) | Royce (CA) |
| Blackburn | Maloney, Sean | Ryan (OH) |
| Capuano | Moore | Speier |
| Connolly | Neal | Titus |
| DeSantis | Palazzo | Walz |
| Ellison | Poe (TX) | Webster (FL) |
| Eshoo | Rooney, Thomas | Welch |
| Huffman | J. | |

□ 1334

So the resolution was agreed to.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

REMOVAL OF NAME OF MEMBER AS COSPONSOR OF H.R. 6417

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I be removed as a cosponsor of H.R. 6417.

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

There was no objection.

ENSURING SMALL SCALE LNG CERTAINTY AND ACCESS ACT

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and to include extraneous material on the bill, H.R. 4606.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to House Resolution 1049 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill, H.R. 4606.

The Chair appoints the gentlewoman from Wyoming (Ms. CHENEY) to preside over the Committee of the Whole.

□ 1338

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H.R. 4606) to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, with Ms. CHENEY in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to the rule, the bill is considered read the first time.

The gentleman from Texas (Mr. OLSON) and the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I rise in support of H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale

LNG Certainty and Access Act, a bill written by the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON).

This important bill will speed up the review of applications to export small amounts of natural gas to the emerging small LNG markets in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. This bill will strengthen our energy security, create jobs at home, and open new markets for Americans.

This bill is about creating a level playing field for the smallest projects. Right now, to export natural gas to a country that we have a free trade agreement with, it is approved without red tape. We want to do that for very small projects, too, no matter the buyer.

H.R. 4606 is truly focused on “small-scale” projects. We are talking about projects that amount to maybe one-tenth of 1 percent of the natural gas America consumes every single day. It is only 0.14 billion cubic feet per day. The big LNG products that you hear about are more like 2 billion cubic feet per day. That is 0.14 versus 2 billion cubic feet. These are tiny projects worth looking at. We want them to make their way to the emerging markets.

But don't let the small size fool you. Just as larger LNG exports help us push back against Vladimir Putin and help free Eastern Europe, small LNG will preserve American influence in Latin America. We can give our trading partners a cleaner, more dependable option than unreliable and unstable Venezuelan exports. That is why I call our LNG exports “liquid American freedom.” America will never turn off the spigot over politics.

Madam Chair, this is a bipartisan bill. It went through regular order in the Energy and Commerce Committee, where we held hearings and accepted a bipartisan amendment to perfect the bill.

The Department of Energy is also in support of this bill's intent. Passing this bill, they said, means “saving several months of review time, at a minimum.”

We have also heard from LNG producers, terminal operators, and overseas developers. One said it will provide certainty and speed up “America's rise as a world-class exporter of natural gas, creating U.S. jobs, growing our economy, strengthening global energy security, all while reducing emissions and pollution.”

I believe it is important to point out that H.R. 4606 makes absolutely no changes to environmental law. In fact, at our markup we accepted a bipartisan amendment that clarifies that any project would have to qualify for a broad exclusion under NEPA to be put on the fast track. This bill is not about waiving environmental laws.

□ 1345

Most importantly, DOD is working on the same problem and is improving their rules as we speak. They say that

many of the countries in the Caribbean and Latin America don't have enough demand to cover the costs of enormous import terminals for huge ships. The small-scale LNG export market is the only path that makes sense to bring affordable American energy to these projects and countries.

Congress needs to put DOE's policy into law. That is the only way we can create certainty. No one wants to make investments on a single administration's policy. Congress must create certainty, and this bill does just that.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this bill. It is good for our economy, our jobs, and our economic diplomacy.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

This bill is unnecessary because the Department of Energy is aggressively approving liquefied natural gas exports. DOE currently conducts a public interest review of all applications to export LNG to a country without a free trade agreement with the United States, and this process is working just fine.

To date, DOE has granted final approval for 29 applications to export LNG. Over the past few years, the U.S. has emerged as one of the largest exporters in the world.

There is no backlog of applications or delay at DOE to speak of, and the Trump administration has taken every opportunity to promote U.S. natural gas abroad.

In July, the Department of Energy finalized a rule to automatically approve applications to export less than 0.14 billion cubic feet per day of LNG. It declares in this rule that all small-scale exports are always in the public interest, removes longstanding consumer protections of the Natural Gas Act, prevents the public from having the opportunity to know about or provide input on export proposals, and violates the public hearing requirements of the Natural Gas Act.

Rather than stand up for American consumers and manufacturers who benefit from low natural gas prices, the Trump administration is boosting the profits of oil and gas special interests by allowing them to export LNG without any regard for domestic impacts.

This bill is intended to codify DOE's small-scale LNG rule, but proponents have not justified the need for swift congressional action on a rule that was just finalized.

There are drawbacks to codifying the rule with such a prescriptive volume requirement. For example, should the circumstances arise where exporting this amount of LNG is no longer in the public interest, Congress would then have to enact a new law to make any necessary changes.

In addition, Madam Chair, an unrestricted export policy could lead to even higher levels of LNG exports, which could have significant impacts

on domestic natural gas prices and adversely affect American consumers and manufacturers.

Unfettered exports would also exacerbate climate change by encouraging more fossil fuel extraction and displacing carbon-free sources of power. High methane leak rates and increased demand for LNG exports would likely offset any climate benefits associated with natural gas use.

For Congress and the Trump administration to prioritize such a policy at a time when methane pollution from U.S. oil and gas operation is expected to warm the planet as much as coal is, in my opinion, completely reckless.

Madam Chair, beyond that, the use of floor time on such an unnecessary bill is just the latest example of our current reality. Republicans are running a government of, by, and for the corporate interests, not a government for the people.

This bill will not create a single new job.

Madam Chair, the House has just 16 legislative days remaining before the election and just 8 legislative days before the end of the fiscal year. The farm bill expires this month. So does authorization for FAA and the Land and Water Conservation Fund. We also need to fund the government to prevent another Trump shutdown.

We should be focusing our limited time on legislation that would fix our crumbling infrastructure, create jobs that pay a livable wage, and move America toward a smarter, greener energy future.

We need a practical balance and sustainable energy policy. What we do not need are bills like this that target problems that don't exist. We don't need to be throwing more bones to the fossil fuel industry.

I will be opposing this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. JOHNSON), the author of the bill.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I have said it many times this week, and I will say it again. The legislation before us today, H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act, will help the United States fully realize its economic potential regarding small-scale liquefied natural gas exports and associated technologies.

This bill addresses current permitting concerns, but it is also forward looking. H.R. 4606 will help the United States to grow as a reliable, trusted trading partner. It can help reduce trade deficits, promote new job opportunities at home, and strengthen ties with our allies abroad.

Specifically, this bill provides that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas will be granted without delay, but only if they

do not require an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act. This means that both FERC and DOE must continue to fully comply with NEPA regulations and that they must evaluate the potential direct and indirect impacts, consult with other agencies, and receive public input.

Importantly, this bill is the product of bipartisan compromise and work. During markups at the House Energy and Commerce Committee, Representative GENE GREEN and I worked together so that both sides of the aisle could support this commonsense legislation. I appreciate his hard work, along with the work of many of my other colleagues.

As a result, this bill has support from a diverse group of stakeholders, including the Center for Liquefied Natural Gas, the National Association of Manufacturers, the Laborers' International Union of North America, the American Petroleum Institute, and Citizens for Responsible Energy Solutions.

Now, as the Representative for rural eastern and southeastern Ohio, I have long recognized the benefits of excess natural gas exports. Because of the shale gas boom, new opportunities are emerging for Ohio and the surrounding States virtually daily, as ethane cracker plants and ethane storage hubs begin to take shape.

Reports show that this trend will only continue, as one study predicts that the region has sufficient ethane feedstock to support up to five ethane cracker plants.

These opportunities are huge and have become viable thanks to new technologies that have led to an increase in natural gas production. But it is also due to an increase in production resulting from the growing demand for excess U.S. natural gas.

In fact, natural gas production is at an all-time high, and reserves are so large that they are predicted to meet domestic demand for almost a century. Ohio alone reached new highs in October 2017, as natural gas production reached 5.5 billion cubic feet per day.

H.R. 4606 can play a role in furthering America's economic progress by allowing our domestic producers and gas providers to export small quantities of natural gas to neighboring countries in a more efficient manner.

Don't misunderstand this. There is an interest for U.S. natural gas in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America, although not in the quantities that the current large-scale domestic exporting facilities were built to address via conventional liquefied natural gas tankers.

This bill will help our job creators meet that demand and take full advantage of our economic opportunities throughout our Western Hemisphere. And, with the certainty provided by H.R. 4606, companies currently in operation or those exploring new small-scale possibilities will be incentivized to move forward with new investments

with the increased certainty provided by H.R. 4606.

This is especially important considering that the Dominican Republic is the only country in the Caribbean with a free trade agreement that can get our excess natural gas easily. And, as Puerto Rico continues to rebuild after the devastating hurricane in 2017, increased shipments and availability of American small-scale LNG can help the island meet its energy needs.

H.R. 4606 will also better allow our domestic providers the opportunity to deliver a stable source of U.S. energy to countries currently relying on Venezuelan fuel oil, which has been used to gain influence within countries throughout the region.

This effort to increase U.S. energy opportunities within this area of the world is not new, as the previous administration also sought increased engagement through the creation of the Caribbean Energy Security Initiative. Similarly, the Department of Energy recently issued a final rule very similar to H.R. 4606.

Now I would like to quickly address a few concerns that we have heard about this bill during debate. Some of my colleagues have said that the bill is unnecessary because it would replicate a Department of Energy regulation that was recently finalized, while at the same time arguing that this bill would lead to an unrestricted natural gas export policy with dire consequences.

I disagree with both of those statements, as it is important for Congress to exercise its authority and not leave policy solely up to the administration, and this bill by no means promotes an unrestricted policy. What is telling about these conflicting statements is that they simply cannot both be true at the same time, and it leads me to question the sincerity behind the statements.

Additionally, I have heard arguments that this bill could allow companies to skip the review process for larger projects by splitting them into smaller pieces.

Now, these LNG companies are building to economies of scale. These are expensive projects. The financial viability of stacking or combining many small-scale trains is simply not viable, and the operating costs would surely cause the cost of gas to be uncompetitive in the global market.

Madam Chair, the benefits of natural gas exports are clear. As numerous Department of Energy studies and various independent studies have concluded, they are a net positive to our U.S. economy. These studies have found that LNG exports support thousands of American jobs, many of them within manufacturing.

In fact, the Department of Energy once again highlighted the benefits of LNG exports with a study it released in June. This study, which is in addition to four other studies commissioned by the DOE since 2012, presented additional data that demonstrates how

LNG exports are a net benefit to our economy.

With U.S. natural gas reserves as large as they are, and with new technological advancements allowing our producers to access an increasing amount of natural gas each and every day, it is imperative that the United States takes full advantage of this important and abundant energy resource.

H.R. 4606 is a step in that direction. It will strengthen U.S. geopolitical ties, increase job creation, and promote domestic economic growth as a result.

Madam Chair, I hope all of my colleagues will join me in supporting this important bipartisan legislation today.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. GENE GREEN).

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, I want to thank our ranking member for yielding me the time.

I rise in support of H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act. This bill has been worked on in good faith with Mr. JOHNSON—I thank him for his kind words—which would expedite U.S. small-volume LNG exports, so long as they do not require an environmental impact assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act, or NEPA.

Natural gas production has dramatically increased all across the country thanks to the energy revolution that we have seen in the last 10 years. We are now able to get gas out of shelves long thought impossible.

The U.S. has enough natural gas to meet our own energy needs for over a century. Soon, we also will be able to be a net exporter of these petroleum products.

Despite being the world leader in production of natural gas, many companies are unable to export the small quantities of LNG, or liquefied natural gas, to neighboring countries in the Caribbean.

□ 1400

If the U.S. does not have a free trade agreement with another nation, natural gas exports must go through a lengthy national determination at the Department of Energy. Currently, the U.S. has only a free trade agreement with the Dominican Republic in the region.

DOE recently recognized that this placed an undue burden on small volume exports and issued a rule similar to this bill to address the issue. The dominant fuel source in the region for these countries is Venezuelan fuel oil, a source that is not geopolitically friendly or environmentally sound.

What we would like to have is more natural gas being used for electricity in the Caribbean and Puerto Rico instead of fuel oil, which is an environmental disaster.

U.S. LNG in the region would drastically reduce emission rates from burning fuel oil for power generation. The benefits of H.R. 4606 are not limited to other countries. As I said, Puer-

to Rico continues to rebuild with the devastation of Hurricane Maria.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas. Madam Chair, to rebuild from the devastation of Hurricane Maria, this LNG has the potential to reshape the Puerto Rican grid, making it safer and more reliable and more environmentally safe.

This bill also protects the environment. No application for export under the Natural Gas Act will be granted unless the applicant qualifies for a categorical exclusion under NEPA, ensuring that there won't be an adverse environmental impact.

Study after study has shown natural gas exports are a clear net positive to our domestic economy. Moreover, energy ties develop diplomatic ties with countries that they go to. This bill will strengthen U.S. ties with countries throughout the region.

I urge my colleagues to support this important bill.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. CARTER).

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Madam Chair, I rise today in support of my good friend, Mr. JOHNSON's bill, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act.

As many Members are aware, we are currently in the midst of a natural gas boom, with liquefied natural gas more of a resource than ever before. We have seen how this increase in production has benefited not only the United States, but some of our closest allies and trading partners. Now we have an opportunity to continue to build and foster those relationships while stimulating American industries.

For over 60 years, the United States has been a net importer of natural gas, relying on other countries to supply our LNG needs. I have seen it firsthand, as I have a facility in my district that was once an import facility for natural gas. That has changed as they are undergoing a massive overhaul to allow for the export of natural gas.

This bill will help to address backlogs and delays in the application process by allowing small shipments of LNG to be exported, so long as they don't go over the threshold set forth in this legislation. That would have major implications for our regional trading partners, especially those in the Caribbean and Latin America, which don't have access to consistent and reliable forms of energy production.

I applaud my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee for their bipartisan work on this legislation, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI).

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Chair, who doesn't want to export natural gas? I

suspect we all do. We like to do it in the proper manner, and this is the debate to be had over whether it should be done with or without this exemption from the normal process.

But there is another issue at hand. Clearly, natural gas is a strategic national asset. Both sides would agree to that. I don't think there is any debate whatsoever—a strategic national asset. And it is certainly going to be to the benefit of certain parts of this Nation that happen to have shale gas available. It is also going to be a benefit to the petroleum industry and those that are able to extract the natural gas—all good.

But why don't we use this strategic national asset to support another strategic national asset, our maritime industry?

It used to be when the north slope of Alaska opened up that all of that oil that was exported from Alaska had to be on American ships with American sailors. Over the years, that disappeared. But we have an opportunity right here with this piece of legislation to really enhance the benefit that comes from this strategic national asset.

I am all for the Caribbean. Good for them. Good for us. But what if that was shipped on American ships, built in American shipyards by American workers, and the steel was American steel?

What if we made it in America? What if we used this natural gas export, LNG, for the benefit of the broad American economy, not just for a few places that are fortunate enough to have the gas in the ground and those that extract it?

Why not require that a small percentage—1, 2, 5, 10 percent—of that gas be on American-built ships with American mariners?

Spread the benefit of this extraordinary natural resource, this strategic national asset to the broad width of America, the shipyards of America located on our coasts, the steel mills of America, the engine manufacturers. Americans throughout could benefit.

The CHAIR. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield an additional 1 minute to the gentleman from California.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Well, let me wrap this up very, very quickly in the next 60 seconds.

A strategic national asset, natural gas, coupled with another strategic national asset, our mariners, our shipyards, our steel industry, our manufacturers of pumps and motors, take a small percentage.

By the way, we have a bill to do this, bipartisan, bicameral, Senator WICKER, Senator CASEY, good men and women in California, in the legislature here on this side, all of us supporting this. So why don't we amend this bill in the process?

In the meantime, I will vote it out of here, but let's remember, this asset

could be for the benefit of all America, not just a narrow portion of it.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BARTON), the former chairman of the Energy and Commerce Committee and the current chairman and a senior member of the Texas Delegation.

(Mr. BARTON asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. BARTON. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4606.

I want to compliment Congressman JOHNSON for his leadership and, also, on the Democratic side, Congressman CUELLAR. I don't know if he is in the room. I compliment him for being an original sponsor. I am kicking myself that I am not an original sponsor. I don't know how that happened, but I am proud of them.

This is a straightforward bill, Madam Chair. It simply says, as long as you are below a certain threshold, 0.14 BCF a day, you still have to file an application with the Department of Energy to export natural gas, but it shall be in order to be approved. So you still have to apply, but it is specific in the law that the answer will be "yes" as long as it is below this threshold.

You might think: Well, that is not very much. Why even bother?

Well, we still want to make sure that we know where it is going, so that is a good reason to do it. And the good news is that there is a market for small-scale LNG, certainly our partners in the Caribbean and South America. And who knows, if this works, maybe we can increase the number later on if we make sure that we don't do any environmental damage.

This is a good piece of legislation. I am proud that it is bipartisan. I hope that, when we pass it, it will be taken up very quickly in the other body and the President will sign it. I am strongly supportive, and I urge a "yea" vote.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. CUELLAR).

Mr. CUELLAR. Madam Chair, I want to thank the ranking member, Mr. PALLONE, for yielding and his leadership in the committee, for all the work that he and his staff have done. I also want to thank my fellow Texan, Mr. OLSON, for bringing this legislation to the floor. I want to thank my colleague, Representative JOHNSON, for introducing this bipartisan bill, along with my friend GENE GREEN, also from Texas.

In particular, the dean, Mr. BARTON, I want to thank Mr. BARTON because, back in December 2015, Mr. BARTON and I worked along with a team here to lift the ban on oil exports, and that has been the boom for not only Texas, but for the rest of the country.

Today's legislation, Madam Chair, deals with H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act. This bipartisan legislation codifies the Department of Energy's recent efforts to encourage the exports of

small volumes of natural gas as countries in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America look to the United States to meet their natural gas needs.

Let me give you an example, a different type of country, Mexico.

Mexico is getting a lot of natural gas from us and refined products. In fact, the U.S. has an \$8 billion surplus when it comes to natural gas that we are sending off, so we can also help our friends in the Caribbean and Central America and South America if we do the same thing.

The bottom line is this means jobs.

I have the Eagle Ford area, and I know about the jobs. Whether they are at \$60,000, \$70,000, or more, those are good jobs, and if we are able to export, we will be able to create jobs also. This is why it is important that we continue working with our former Governor, Rick Perry, in the Energy Department, to approve any application to import or export small amounts of LNG if there is no environmental review required and that application waiting time will be reduced by several months. Those several months mean jobs.

Right now, the U.S. is currently the world's largest producer of natural gas, with trillions of cubic feet of recoverable natural gas. And again, if we work together, especially with Canada, the U.S., and Mexico, we will be the new Middle East of the world by sticking together and working together.

Again, this bipartisan piece of legislation will benefit our economy, strengthen our ties with allies abroad, reduce our allies' reliance on Russian natural gas.

Again, this is good for the country, and we need to support this bipartisan piece of legislation, so let's move this bill forward to that particular goal.

Again, I want to thank all of you all for working on this bipartisan piece of legislation.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GOSAR), the chair of the Western Caucus.

Mr. GOSAR. Madam Chair, I rise in strong support of H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act, bipartisan legislation introduced by my good friend and colleague, Representative BILL JOHNSON.

I applaud the gentleman from Ohio for his strong leadership in bringing forward this important bill. This commonsense legislation will further increase American energy dominance by expediting the permitting process for the small-scale liquefied natural gas, or LNG, market. Such action will create thousands of jobs, increase regulatory certainty, and help reduce global emissions.

Thanks to American ingenuity and the efforts of private companies, the United States is now the world's leading producer of oil and natural gas. Despite this remarkable achievement, businesses still face a plethora of bu-

reaucratic hurdles that are unable to export small quantities of LNG expeditiously. Removing unnecessary roadblocks that are shackling LNG job creators will foster economic growth and increase global influence.

As DOE Secretary Rick Perry likes to say, we are not just exporting energy, we are exporting freedom. I saw that firsthand in Lithuania last year.

Further, the U.S. has the highest regulatory standards for producing and exporting oil and gas in the world. Put quite simply, if we aren't making it in America, someone else will, and they will most likely do it in a way that is worse for the environment.

I urge adoption of this excellent legislation introduced by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. RUSH), the ranking member of the Energy Subcommittee.

□ 1415

Mr. RUSH. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act.

Madam Chair, this bill is unnecessary, as the Department of Energy has already finalized a rule that would approve any application to import or export as much as 0.14 billion cubic feet of natural gas per day if no environmental reviews are required.

Additionally, Madam Chair, I offered an amendment to this bill that would have protected the property rights of landowners, but that amendment was refused by the Rules Committee.

Madam Chair, my amendment would simply have ensured that eminent domain would not be exploited for the construction of any pipeline used to import or export any of the gas through this expedited process.

Madam Chair, Members from both sides of the aisle have been bombarded with complaints from their constituents who have been forced to defend their own property rights due to aggressive tactics employed by companies seeking to appropriate their land in order to make a profit.

Congress should stand on the side of these constituents, as my amendment would have ensured, instead of making it easier for private companies to seize land from American citizens. This is especially true in cases where applications are expedited, with little or no opportunity for public input or public debate through the process, as the underlying bill mandates.

Madam Chair, although my constituents are strongly opposed to this bill, and although my amendment was not made in order, I would urge my colleagues to support both of the amendments offered by my colleagues on the Energy and Commerce Committee.

Ranking Member PALLONE's amendment would require public hearings so that the American people will have the opportunity to have their voices heard in this process.

Additionally, Congresswoman DEGETTE's amendment would require LNG export applications to demonstrate that the natural gas was produced in a manner that minimizes dangerous methane emissions.

A June 2018 report by Science magazine found that 13 million metric tons of methane are emitted yearly by the oil and gas industry, despite the fact that there is already existing cost-effective technology available to reduce these emissions.

So, Madam Chair, I strongly urge all of my colleagues to support both the Pallone and the DeGette amendments. If those two amendments are defeated, then I would urge all of my colleagues to oppose the underlying bill, H.R. 4606.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentlewoman from Arizona (Mrs. LESKO).

Mrs. LESKO. Madam Chair, while in the district, I met with the Puerto Rican Center of Arizona, including Gretchen Patterson, the founder and president, Leticia Jimenez, Jose Moro, Claudio Medina, and Maria Romero. They are advocates for Puerto Rico and have family members still on the island. They work in Arizona communities to share the culture of Puerto Rico and educate people about the island. They described devastation on the island caused by Hurricane Maria. They also talked about the problems with the electrical grid, even before Hurricane Maria.

This legislation, H.R. 4606, will help Puerto Rico and other Caribbean islands by expediting the approval of projects to export small shipments of LNG to Caribbean island nations, which are in desperate need of natural gas to modernize their electric grids and supply more affordable fuel and feedstocks for manufacturing.

H.R. 4606 will also help our U.S. citizens living in Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands who are still recovering from Hurricane Maria. While the territories don't need a special permit to receive U.S. natural gas shipments, they would certainly benefit if we allow more U.S. small-scale LNG exports to other destinations in the Caribbean.

H.R. 4606 will jump-start investments and jobs, which will create economies of scale. With more competition, Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands will have more supply options and lower costs.

The Caribbean islands have some of the highest fuel and electricity prices. We shouldn't deny them the opportunity to share in some of our surplus natural gas.

H.R. 4606 isn't a silver bullet, but it will help deliver cleaner and more affordable fuel to those remote locations.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I understand the previous speaker, my colleague from Arizona's interests in helping our friends and neighbors in the Caribbean, but nothing in this bill or the rule requires small-scale shipments to go to the Car-

ibbean area. And, in fact, Puerto Rico is the largest importer of LNG in the region, and the problems associated with getting them natural gas are due to Jones Act restrictions, not DOE approval of export applications.

I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. MARSHALL).

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Chair, I rise today to support my colleague, BILL JOHNSON's legislation, H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act. With its passage, there will no longer be unnecessary restrictions placed on small-scale liquefied natural gas exports, creating more open, transparent, and competitive markets for our natural gas industry.

H.R. 4606 includes a rule finalized by the Department of Energy that expedites approval for small-scale gas exports, ending the several-months wait in the review process.

These simple fixes are so common-sense that the bill itself is significantly bipartisan which, as you know, is a rarity here in Washington. But I am pleased to see that when the good clearly outweighs the bad, both sides really can come together, and that is what we see here today.

This legislation would also place small-scale exports on a level playing field with Canada and Mexico, and open new markets in the Caribbean, Central America, and South America. As a result, this bill would create new jobs in the United States, boosting our local economies.

I spent most of the day yesterday with the Farm Bill Conference Committee, where the biggest theme we heard was the need to have certainty. That desire for policy certainty is something that transcends parties and, in this case, committees. This legislation would provide that assurance to our energy folks and protect jobs and investments in the United States.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I have no additional speakers, and I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Chair, LNG exports are clearly a priority for this administration, and I see no indication that this trajectory is changing, so we don't need this bill to enshrine the prescriptive and problematic small-scale LNG rule into law.

Passing this bill will not create new jobs or approve any small-scale LNG applications. It is solely a political win for the fossil fuel industry at the expense of American consumers and manufacturers.

Those who are against unrestricted export of natural gas argue that cheap, domestic natural gas prices are providing a big boost and competitive advantage to U.S. manufacturing. They are worried that exporting large volumes of LNG will drive up domestic natural gas prices, harming American manufacturers and consumers.

Madam Chair, I believe it is reasonable to question the wisdom of export-

ing too much of our natural gas and to consider whether such an approach will hurt our domestic manufacturing base, and giving the fossil fuel industry a green light to extract and export unlimited amounts of natural gas will only lead to greater methane leaks and the displacement of carbon-free energy sources. So I urge my colleagues to vote "no" on the bill.

I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I yield myself the balance of my time.

It is real simple. This bill is about good-paying, American jobs, American energy going to our neighbors in Latin America, South America, Central America, and the Caribbean.

This bill does not skate around any environmental laws. You have to comply with all the rules as they exist today to export this natural gas.

This bill is bipartisan as here today, two speakers from the other side spoke in favor of this bill. I ask my colleagues to join those Members and our Members and vote for this good bill for American jobs, American security, and great foreign relations.

I yield back the balance of my time.

The CHAIR. All time for general debate has expired.

Pursuant to the rule, the bill shall be considered for amendment under the 5-minute rule.

It shall be in order to consider as an original bill for the purpose of amendment under the 5-minute rule the amendment in the nature of a substitute recommended by the Committee on Energy and Commerce, printed in the bill. The committee amendment in the nature of a substitute shall be considered as read.

The text of the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute is as follows:

H.R. 4606

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

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act".

SEC. 2. SMALL SCALE EXPORTATION OR IMPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS.

Section 3(c) of the Natural Gas Act (15 U.S.C. 717b(c)) is amended—

(1) by striking "For purposes" and inserting "(1) For purposes"; and

(2) by adding at the end the following:

"(2) For purposes of subsection (a), and in addition to any importation or exportation of natural gas described in paragraph (1), importation or exportation of natural gas shall be deemed to be consistent with the public interest, and an application for such importation or exportation shall be granted without modification or delay, if—

"(A) the application for such importation or exportation proposes to import or export a volume of natural gas that does not exceed 0.14 billion cubic feet per day; and

"(B) the Commission's approval of such application does not require an environmental impact statement or an environmental assessment under the National Environmental Policy Act of 1969."

The CHAIR. No amendment to the committee amendment in the nature of

a substitute shall be in order except those printed in part B of House Report 115-919. Each such amendment may be offered only in the order printed in the report, by a Member designated in the report, shall be considered 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.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to consider amendment No. 1 printed in part B of House Report 115-919.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I have an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as follows:

Page 3, line 18, insert "after opportunity for hearing and public input," after "delay,".

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Resolution 1049, the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) and a Member opposed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New Jersey.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, one of my biggest concerns with this bill, and DOE's Small-Scale LNG rule, is the removal of public hearing requirements for LNG export applications. This is drastic change in the approval process, and my amendment seeks to restore the ability for public input through a public hearing.

Section 3 of the Natural Gas Act requires DOE to grant an application to export natural gas to a non-Free Trade Agreement country, unless it finds that the proposed export is not consistent with the public interest. And typically, notices of non-FTA applications are posted in the Federal Register for public comment, which ultimately informs DOE's evaluation of an application's consistence with the public interest.

DOE evaluates a range of factors when performing a public interest review, including economic impacts, international considerations, U.S. energy security, and environmental considerations. And these are important considerations that are unique to each export application, and the public plays a key role in DOE's decision-making process.

□ 1430

But DOE recently turned this process on its head for small-scale exports.

Hidden in its small-scale LNG proposed rule, DOE proclaimed that: "This proposed rule, and the 45-day comment period for this proposed rule, would constitute the notice and opportunity for hearing on all prospective small-scale natural gas export applications."

What that means, Madam Chair, is that all qualifying small-scale export applications would be approved without any public notice or comment, or

need for a unique public interest determination, in perpetuity.

I think that is pretty outrageous, and I would argue it violates the public hearing requirements of the Natural Gas Act.

DOE failed to justify the sweeping change to the existing approval process. Congress should avoid the same mistake.

Congress should not be in the business of limiting the participation of the American public in such a debate, but that is exactly what H.R. 4606 does.

By codifying the DOE rule, this legislation reduces the ability of communities directly impacted by these projects to give meaningful input during the review process.

Exporting America's resources to foreign nations while creating domestic environmental and public health impacts is not in the public interest, nor is cutting the public out of the process by which we express our interest.

Congress should not create laws to export our natural resources wealth at the expense of our environment and our manufacturers while simultaneously limiting the rights of Americans to comment on natural gas export projects in their communities.

My amendment is a commonsense proposal to fix this problem in the underlying bill. It is good government. It is in the public interest that consumers and communities have the ability to provide input on export applications, no matter how small.

Madam Chair, for these reasons, I urge adoption of my amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Ohio is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, this amendment adds an additional round of DOE hearing and public comment on proposed small-scale LNG exports. Unfortunately, this amendment is designed to undercut the important benefits of this legislation, and we simply cannot accept it.

H.R. 4606 was narrowly drafted with bipartisan input throughout the committee process, as the ranking member knows very well. In fact, at committee, I worked with Mr. GREEN and other Democrats on a bipartisan amendment that ensures that DOE and FERC must fully comply with NEPA and the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations under this bill. This means they must evaluate the potential direct and indirect impacts, consult with other agencies, and, most importantly, receive public input.

Not only has this idea been vetted through hearings and markup on the Energy and Commerce Committee, but, additionally, this concept has already been thoroughly vetted and subjected to a fully transparent rulemaking process at the Department of Energy, complete with public comment and input.

We simply want to put this in the right lane. It should be the Congress

that is passing law, not putting it solely in the hands of the administration.

Today's amendment serves only one purpose, and that is delay.

The purpose of H.R. 4606 is to help the United States fully realize its economic potential regarding small-scale liquefied natural gas exports and associated technologies. It will strengthen U.S. geopolitical ties, increase job creation, and promote domestic economic growth as a result.

This amendment jeopardizes those goals and it denies nations in the Caribbean and Latin America the opportunity to have an inexpensive, reliable source of energy from right here in the United States.

Madam Chair, I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, I just wanted to read some parts of a letter from the Industrial Energy Consumers of America in support of the amendment.

Let me just say to my colleagues on the other side, the purpose of the amendment is not delay, but public input for the public interest.

The Industrial Energy Consumers write: "In behalf of the Industrial Energy Consumers of America, IECA, we support your amendment to provide consumers of natural gas an 'opportunity for hearing and public input' for small-scale LNG export applications, in advance of final approval by the U.S. Department of Energy. It is good government and in the public interest that consumers have the ability to provide input.

"Every study conducted by the U.S. Department of Energy on the potential economic impacts of LNG exports concludes that exports of LNG increase the price of natural gas and electricity. Although we do not anticipate this being a significant problem in the short term, public policy must consider longer term potential impacts. It is for this reason that it is wise to provide for public input. Consumers of natural gas deserve that option.

"The manufacturing sector consumes about 25 percent of all U.S. natural gas and demand is increasing annually. IECA members are mostly energy intensive trade exposed, EITE, companies, which means that relatively small changes to the price of natural gas and electricity can have relatively large impacts to competitiveness and jobs. For the majority of our applications, there is no substitute for natural gas."

And then it is signed by the president, Paul Cicio.

Again, Madam Chair, I would urge support of my amendment. There is nothing wrong with public input. It is part of the democratic process.

I do think we need to be concerned about the increased price of natural gas from LNG exports and what it might mean not only for consumers, but for manufacturing. If manufacturing is decreased because of the increase, then that means fewer jobs for Americans.

So I appreciate the support from the Industrial Energy Consumers.

Madam Chair, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair, I include letters of support in the RECORD.

CLNG, CENTER FOR LIQUEFIED
NATURAL GAS,
December 11, 2017.

Hon. GREG WALDEN,
Chairman, Committee on Energy and Commerce,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.
Hon. FRANK PALLONE, Jr.,
Ranking Member, Committee on Energy and
Commerce, House of Representatives, Wash-
ington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN WALDEN AND RANKING
MEMBER PALLONE: Regulatory certainty is
vital to U.S. LNG and bipartisan legislation
like the Unlocking Our Domestic LNG Pot-
ential Act (H.R. 4605) and The Ensuring
Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act
(H.R. 4606) take steps to provide a clear and
straightforward path for the industry. Pro-
viding a certain pathway for U.S. natural gas
to be sold abroad will create thousands of
good paying jobs right here in the United
States, generate millions in tax revenue for
the federal, state, and local governments,
and supply our allies and trading partners
with a reliable, clean, safe source of energy.

The United States is awash with natural
gas, with more discoveries almost daily, and
in order for the U.S. natural gas industry to
continue to be an engine for growth, reliable
exports offer a perfect solution. Legislation
by Congress that creates a more certain reg-
ulatory process enables our country to cap-
ture this narrow window of opportunity to
export LNG internationally and sends a
strong signal to our allies and trading part-
ners that the U.S. is committed to its role as
a global energy leader.

Bi-partisan support for LNG certainty
highlights how important the issue is. Pol-
icymakers from both sides of the aisle can
appreciate good paying jobs here at home
and energy choices for allies around the
globe. Representatives Johnson and Ryan
have a long history of support for U.S. LNG
and we look forward to working with them
and others in the future on LNG issues.

We urge support for Representative John-
son and Ryan's Unlocking Our Domestic
LNG Potential Act and The Ensuring Small
Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act.

Sincerely,

CHARLIE RIEDL,
Executive Director, Center for LNG.

LIUNA!,
September 5, 2018.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Minority Leader, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER AND LEADER PELOSI: On
behalf of the 500,000 members of the Labor-
ers' International Union of North America
(LIUNA), I want to express our support for
H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small Scale LNG Cer-
tainty and Access Act, offered by Represent-
ative Bill Johnson of Ohio. This bipartisan
bill amends the Natural Gas Act by granting
approval to applications, without modifica-
tion or delay, seeking to export 0.14 billion
cubic feet (Bcf) per day or less, that do not
require an Environmental Assessment (EA)
or an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS)
under the National Environmental Policy
Act (NEPA).

H.R. 4606 solidifies and provides certainty
to a recently enacted rule made by the De-
partment of Energy (DOE) that mirrors Rep.

Johnson's legislation. This cuts the red tape
for small-scale exports and imports of lique-
fied natural gas. This bill not only continues
to promote our Nation's economic growth, it
also guarantees job security for the thou-
sands of skilled working men and women we
proudly represent within the energy sector.

LIUNA believes in an all-of-the-above en-
ergy policy. Our members work across vir-
tually every sector of our domestic energy
production. Whether it is solar-panel fields,
wind farms, pipelines, or hydro power, our
members are working to bringing our Na-
tion's abundant energy resources to market.

This legislation has bipartisan cosponsors,
and was voted out of committee with even
stronger bipartisan support. I urge you to
support H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small Scale LNG
Certainty and Access Act.

With kind regards, I am
Sincerely yours,

TERRY O'SULLIVAN,
General President.

CITIZENS FOR RESPONSIBLE
ENERGY SOLUTIONS,
Washington, DC, September 5, 2018.

Speaker PAUL RYAN,
House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: On behalf of Citizens
for Responsible Energy Solutions (CRES), I
am writing in support of H.R. 4606, Ensuring
Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act.
CRES urges the House to pass this legisla-
tion.

H.R. 4606 would expedite approvals for
small-scale exports and imports of liquefied
natural gas (LNG) up to 0.14 billion cubic
feet per day if no environmental reviews are
required. The legislation would help mod-
ernize U.S. energy policy by facilitating ex-
ports and imports of LNG which is critical as
the U.S. continues to position itself as a net
energy exporter over the next decade. The
legislation would support the growth of jobs
in the LNG space because of greater cer-
tainty in permitting and because it would
allow for the greater use of LNG terminals
already built or under construction. This
economic growth would be achieved without
substantively greater risk to the environ-
ment due to a strict adherence to National
Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) require-
ments.

H.R. 4606 is important legislation for grow-
ing domestic jobs and for elevating the U.S.'s
position in global energy markets. We en-
courage Congress to pass this legislation as
soon as possible.

Sincerely,

HEATHER REAMS,
Managing Director.

Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio. Madam Chair,
I have before me a letter from the Center
for Liquefied Natural Gas. It says: "The
United States is awash with natural gas,
with more discoveries almost daily, and in
order for the U.S. natural gas industry to
continue to be an engine for growth, reliable
exports offer a perfect solution."

They go on to say: "Bipartisan support
for LNG certainty highlights how important
this issue is."

I also have a letter here in front of
me from LIUNA, and they say this: "On
behalf of the 500,000 members of the
Laborers' International Union of North
America, LIUNA, I want to express our
support for H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small
Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act."

They go on to say: "LIUNA believes
in an all-of-the-above energy policy."

Madam Chair, that is exactly what
H.R. 4606 promotes.

I also have a letter here in front of
me from Citizens for Responsible En-
ergy Solutions. There is nobody any
more concerned about our energy pol-
icy than the American people. We talk
about it here all the time in Wash-
ington, D.C., oftentimes in political
terms, ideological terms, but it is the
American people who are going to ben-
efit from the results of LNG exports,
whether it is along the Ohio River or
all across America.

This is a job creator. It is an oppor-
tunity creator. It strengthens our geo-
political ties. And we can't underesti-
mate the strength of that geopolitical
tie factor in what we are doing.

We have countries like Russia that
are using their energy resources to
hammer other countries, to use it as a
leverage point to force them into obe-
dience. The last thing that we want is
for countries in the Caribbean and
Latin America to have to face going to
Russia or other countries to get their
energy resources when they could be
getting those from us.

Right here, this letter from Citizens
for Responsible Energy Solutions says:
"On behalf of Citizens for Responsible
Energy Solutions, CRES, I am writing
in support of H.R. 4606, Ensuring Small
Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act.
CRES urges the House to pass this leg-
islation."

Madam Chair, I yield back the bal-
ance of my time.

The CHAIR. The question is on the
amendment offered by the gentleman
from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE).

The question was taken; and the
Chair announced that the noes ap-
peared to have it.

Mr. PALLONE. Madam Chair, I de-
mand a recorded vote.

The CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of
rule XVIII, further proceedings on the
amendment offered by the gentleman
from New Jersey will be postponed.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE

The CHAIR. It is now in order to con-
sider amendment No. 2 printed in part
B of House Report 115-919.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chair, I have
an amendment at the desk.

The CHAIR. The Clerk will designate
the amendment.

The text of the amendment is as fol-
lows:

Page 3, line 22, strike ";" and" and insert a
semicolon.

Page 4, line 2, strike "of 1969" and all that
follows through the end and insert "of 1969;
and".

Page 4, after line 2, insert the following:
"(C) with respect to an application for such
exportation, the application includes suffi-
cient information to demonstrate that the
natural gas to be exported was produced
using available designs, systems, and prac-
tices to minimize methane emissions from
leaks or venting."

The CHAIR. Pursuant to House Reso-
lution 1049, the gentlewoman from Col-
orado (Ms. DEGETTE) and a Member op-
posed each will control 5 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentle-
woman from Colorado.

Ms. DEGETTE. Madam Chair, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Chair, H.R. 4606, the Ensuring Small Scale LNG Certainty and Access Act, is far from perfect, as several of our colleagues have noted. The amendment I am offering today would reverse most of the bill's most egregious shortcomings and help ensure that liquefied natural gas exports benefiting from expedited approval truly are in the public interest, as the original bill purports to do.

This amendment would help keep methane waste to a minimum for the LNG exports permitted by the bill. It requires export applications to show that the natural gas was produced using available techniques and technologies to minimize methane emissions from leaks or venting.

In other words, this amendment would require companies developing liquefied natural gas for export to actually develop and export the natural gas rather than venting vast quantities into the atmosphere or lighting it on fire.

This requirement is easy to implement with readily available technologies. Many companies are already working to reduce their methane emissions.

Sara Ortwein, president of XTO Energy, a subsidiary of ExxonMobil, just this week stated her company's continued support for Federal methane regulations, and she is far from alone.

In Colorado, we have had strong methane rules in place since 2014, and our oil and gas industry has continued to thrive, even as it is required to find and stop the leaks.

Stopping these leaks has real benefits. There is widespread scientific consensus that methane leaks into the atmosphere significantly contribute to climate change. The volatile organic compounds released with the methane increase ground-level pollution and harm public health. When natural gas is produced on public land, it leaks rob taxpayers of royalties on the wasted gas.

So we can and we must prevent such needless harmful emissions wherever possible, and this measure is one way to do it. It would increase the royalties collected for taxpayers; it would reduce climate-changing emissions; and it would protect public health.

Vote for it and you will vote for a better future for our constituents, for our children, and for generations to come.

Now, colleagues who are considering whether to support this amendment may be interested to learn that national and regional polling consistently show strong bipartisan support for methane rules. Sixty to 80 percent or more of those polled expressed their approval.

Now, there may be many reasons for which some people will oppose this amendment, but I can't think of any that would stand up to scrutiny. I would look forward to discussing those reasons here. And if you oppose this amendment, let's talk about it.

Otherwise, we can reduce these emissions; we can pass this bill; and it would go a long way toward cleaning up our environment and saving money.

Madam Chair, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, I rise in opposition to the amendment.

The CHAIR. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Madam Chair, this amendment is unnecessary and misguided because emissions from natural gas wells are already regulated by the EPA and States under the Clean Air Act.

H.R. 4606 applies only to projects that have already undergone rigorous environmental review and are eligible for an exclusion under the National Environmental Policy Act.

□ 1445

Other than the Natural Gas Act, DOE has the responsibility to protect the public interest. In doing so, DOE must consider whether the project applicant is following the laws and regulations, including those under the Clean Air Act.

Let's be clear about the environmental benefits of natural gas in general and this legislation, specifically.

U.S. carbon emissions in 2017 were the lowest they have been since 1992 because we are using more clean natural gas. Unfortunately, carbon emissions are increasing in other parts of the world because they don't have access to clean-burning natural gas. Our friends in South America, Central America, and the Caribbean are still burning Venezuelan fuel oil in places where our U.S. LNG can replace that fuel oil.

H.R. 4606 is good for our economy. It is good for new American jobs, and it is good for our environment. This legislation will start America's rise as a world-class exporter of natural gas, which will help reduce emissions and pollution all across the globe.

If you really care about reducing emissions, you can't deny the benefits of this legislation.

I urge a "no" vote on this amendment, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, just quickly, these rules that the gentleman referred to, alleging that they solve the problem, I would just say the BLM Methane and Waste Prevention rule was eliminated by the Trump EPA under Scott Pruitt, and so that is not controlling the public lands emissions right now, which is what this amendment would do. And the EPA rule under the Clean Air Act is also under attack.

Really, if it is current law, why not just support it? Why not say, if we are going to be developing this LNG, let's stop these leaks? Because it helps our environment, it helps with our air and our climate change, and it also helps with profits. And, frankly, for the BLM lands and the other Federal lands, it will help the taxpayers recover money.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, again, this bill is all about good-paying American jobs.

American exports of liquefied natural gas help our neighbors in South America, Central America, and the Caribbean. This bill makes our air cleaner. Let's lock those benefits in for years to come.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 4606 and oppose this amendment.

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

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. CALVERT). The question is on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE).

The question was taken; and the Acting Chair announced that the noes appeared to have it.

Ms. DEGETTE. Mr. Chairman, I demand a recorded vote.

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, further proceedings on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado will be postponed.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Chairman, I move that the Committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Ms. CHENEY) having assumed the chair, Mr. CALVERT, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4606) to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, had come to no resolution thereon.

MOTION TO INSTRUCT CONFEREES ON H.R. 6147, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, FINANCIAL SERVICES, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, pursuant to clause 1 of rule XXII and by direction of the Committee on Appropriations, I have a motion at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mr. Calvert moves that the House take from the Speaker's table the bill, H.R. 6147, with the Senate amendment thereto, disagree to the Senate amendment, and request a conference with the Senate thereon.

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

Mr. CALVERT. Madam Speaker, this is a necessary step to continue to move the fiscal year 2019 appropriations process forward under regular order.

On July 19, the House passed H.R. 6147 by a vote of 217-199, which includes the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies and the Financial Services and General Government bills.

The Senate has now sent H.R. 6147 back to the House with the Agriculture

and Transportation bills added to the package. With the appointment of these conferees, the House and the Senate may begin to resolve differences, with the goal of passing H.R. 6147 before the end of the fiscal year.

As such, I strongly support this motion.

Madam Speaker, I yield back the balance of my time, and I move the previous question on the motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The motion was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I have a motion to instruct conferees at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

Ms. McCollum moves that the managers on the part of the House at the conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the Senate amendment to the bill H.R. 6147 be instructed to agree to section 114 of division A of the matter proposed to be added by the Senate amendment.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XXII, the gentlewoman from Minnesota (Ms. MCCOLLUM) and the gentleman from California (Mr. CALVERT) each will control 30 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Minnesota.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam 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 gentlewoman from Minnesota?

There was no objection.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Madam Speaker, this motion would instruct conferees to use a provision from the Senate Interior Appropriations bill that guarantees full funding for the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program. The Payment in Lieu of Taxes program—or PILT, as I will refer to it from now on—provides Federal payments to local governments to help offset the loss of property taxes due to nontransferable Federal lands within their boundaries.

Since local governments cannot tax Federal lands, PILT payments help defray the cost for maintaining vital community services, such as police and fire protection and construction of schools and roads in many cases. It also provides much-needed search and rescue operations.

To date, including fiscal year 2018 payments, approximately \$8.5 billion in payments have been made to local units of government. These payments are a vital lifeline for communities across this country.

Originally, PILT was part of the discretionary appropriations process; but often, Congress failed to provide enough funding for our counties and

they ended up being shortchanged. To stop this from happening and to correct the problem, the program was made mandatory. However, Congress has failed to authorize the PILT program, so we are back to funding PILT through the Interior Appropriations bill.

Funding PILT through the discretionary appropriations process creates uncertainty and unpredictability for local governments across this country. Why? Because the amount available to be appropriated for PILT is constrained by the 302(b) allocation provided in the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee. And with less than a 1 percent funding increase for 2018 and 2019, it just goes to show that the Interior allocation cannot continue to keep pace with the rising cost of PILT.

At the same time, we need to meet other important obligations in the Interior bill, such as providing healthcare for Native Americans and Alaskan Natives, addressing the backlog of deferred maintenance on Federal lands, and maintaining our national parks, only to name a few.

In the past 25 years, PILT has grown from \$103 million to \$553 million in fiscal year '18. The estimate for this year is again going to exceed \$500 million.

I agree with our local units of government; PILT should be funded as a permanent mandatory program. But with the reauthorizers not having completed their work, the next best thing we can do is to pass this motion to guarantee full funding for our counties.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to pass this commonsense motion, and I reserve the balance of my time.

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

Madam Speaker, I rise in reluctant opposition to the motion to instruct conferees. The House and Senate, both Democrats and Republicans, have been working together to complete work on as many appropriations bills as possible as quickly as possible. We face a looming deadline of September 30. We are making great progress.

The conferees recognize the importance of the four bills included in this conference package: Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies; Financial Services and General Government; Agriculture, Rural Development, Food and Drug Administration, and Related Agencies; and Commerce, Justice, Science, and Related Agencies. These programs support economic growth, the preservation and promotion of our natural resources and agricultural products, and critical law enforcement functions.

As chairman of the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee, I am determined to complete this legislation, a commitment I know my friends on the other side of the aisle and on the other side of the Capitol also share.

As we are doing with the two other conference committees, both of which I am serving on, we are negotiating in good faith and working to ensure that the agencies and departments under these bills are adequately funded.

The House and Senate are returning to regular order, and this is great news for the American people. We should let the process work as intended.

Given this, this motion to instruct is unnecessary. I am sure it is going to be one of the items we will be discussing over the next few days. We should not risk any delays to completing the final conference report for these four bills, particularly given the deadline and limited number of legislative days ahead.

Madam Speaker, I urge my colleagues to reject this motion to instruct conferees, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, I yield myself the balance of my time.

Madam Speaker, I appreciate the chairman's reluctance in opposing this because the Payment in Lieu of Taxes program is a nonpartisan issue and it is something that the Interior, Environment, and Related Agencies Subcommittee has been struggling with over our allocations, and it is something, as I bring up, that the Senate has in their bill, something which I think is a good idea and should be discussed. I look forward to further discussions on this, as well as with the other conference committee the chairman and I serve on, Madam Speaker.

But we have a precedent for using this provision. In fact, it a fiscal year 2018 enacted bill. This provision would simply ensure that 100 percent of the PILT payments will be made even if the cost exceeds the cost of the Interior Department's original estimate.

So this is a backstop. This is a guarantee. We still need the authorizers to do their work, but this is to make sure that we don't shortchange any of the other important programs that we fund in the Interior bill. So in my opinion, this is a commonsense issue, and I would urge my colleagues to vote "yes" on that.

Madam Speaker, I thank the chairman for his comments and look forward to going to conference and completing our goal together.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. All time for debate has expired.

Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to instruct.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to instruct.

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

Ms. MCCOLLUM. Madam Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 187, nays 218, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 388]

YEAS—187

Adams Gabbard Nadler
 Aguilar Gallego Napolitano
 Barragán Garamendi Nolan
 Bass Gohmert Norcross
 Beatty Gomez O'Halleran
 Bera Gonzalez (TX) O'Rourke
 Beyer Gottheimer Pallone
 Bishop (GA) Green, Al Panetta
 Blumenauer Green, Gene Pascrell
 Blunt Rochester Grijalva Payne
 Bonamici Gutiérrez Pelosi
 Boyle, Brendan Hanabusa Perlmutter
 F. Hastings Peters
 Brady (PA) Heck Peterson
 Brown (MD) Higgins (NY) Pingree
 Brownley (CA) Himes Pocan
 Bustos Hoyer Polis
 Butterfield Jackson Lee Price (NC)
 Carbajal Jayapal Quigley
 Cárdenas Jeffries Raskin
 Carson (IN) Johnson (GA) Rice (NY)
 Cartwright Johnson, E. B. Richmond
 Castor (FL) Jones Rogers (AL)
 Castro (TX) Kaptur Rosen
 Chu, Judy Keating Roybal-Allard
 Cicilline Kelly (IL) Ruiz
 Clark (MA) Kennedy Ruppersberger
 Clarke (NY) Khanna Rush
 Clay Kihuen Sánchez
 Cleaver Kildee Sarbanes
 Clyburn Kilmer Schakowsky
 Cohen Kind Schiff
 Connolly Krishnamoorthi Schneider
 Cooper Kuster (NH) Schrader
 Correa Lamb Scott (VA)
 Costa Langevin Scott, David
 Courtney Larsen (WA) Serrano
 Crist Larson (CT) Sewell (AL)
 Crowley Lawrence Shea-Porter
 Cuellar Lawson (FL) Sherman
 Cummings Lee Sinema
 Davis (CA) Levin Sires
 Davis, Danny Lewis (GA) Smith (WA)
 DeFazio Lieu, Ted Soto
 DeGette Lipinski Suozzi
 Delaney Loeb sack Swalwell (CA)
 DeLauro Lofgren Takano
 DelBene Lowenthal Thompson (CA)
 Demings Lowey Thompson (MS)
 DeSaulnier Lujan Grisham, Tonko
 Deutch M. Torres
 Dingell Luján, Ben Ray Tsongas
 Doggett Lynch Vargas
 Donovan Maloney, Veasey
 Doyle, Michael Carolyn B. Vela
 F. Matsui Velázquez
 Duncan (TN) McCollum Visclosky
 Engel McGovern Wasserman
 Espallat McNeerney Schultz
 Esty (CT) Meeks Waters, Maxine
 Evans Meng Watson Coleman
 Foster Moore Welch
 Frankel (FL) Moulton Wilson (FL)
 Fudge Murphy (FL) Yarmuth

NAYS—218

Abraham Byrne Estes (KS)
 Aderholt Calvert Faso
 Allen Carter (GA) Ferguson
 Amash Carter (TX) Fitzpatrick
 Amodoi Chabot Fleischmann
 Arrington Cheney Flores
 Babin Cloud Fortenberry
 Bacon Coffman Foyx
 Balderson Cole Frelinghuysen
 Banks (IN) Collins (GA) Gaetz
 Barletta Collins (NY) Gallagher
 Barr Comer Garrett
 Barton Comstock Gibbs
 Bergman Conaway Goodlatte
 Biggs Cook Gosar
 Billirakis Costello (PA) Gowdy
 Bishop (MI) Cramer Granger
 Bishop (UT) Crawford Graves (GA)
 Black Culberson Graves (LA)
 Blum Curbelo (FL) Graves (MO)
 Bost Curtis Griffith
 Brady (TX) Davidson Grothman
 Brat Davis, Rodney Guthrie
 Brooks (AL) Denham Handel
 Brooks (IN) DesJarlais Harper
 Buchanan Diaz-Balart Harris
 Buck Duffy Hartzler
 Bucshon Duncan (SC) Hensarling
 Budd Dunn Herrera Beutler
 Burgess Emmer Hice, Jody B.

Higgins (LA) Hill
 Holding Hill
 Hollingsworth
 Hudson
 Huelskamp
 Hultgren
 Hunter
 Hurd
 Jenkins (KS)
 Johnson (LA)
 Johnson (OH)
 Johnson, Sam
 Jordan
 Joyce (OH)
 Katko
 Kelly (MS)
 Kelly (PA)
 King (LA)
 King (NY)
 Kinzinger
 Knight
 Kustoff (TN)
 Labrador
 LaHood
 LaMalfa
 Lamborn
 Lance
 Latta
 Lesko
 Lewis (MN)
 LoBiondo
 Long
 Loudermilk
 Love
 Lucas
 Luetkemeyer
 MacArthur
 Marchant
 Marino
 Marshall
 Massie
 Mast
 McCarthy
 McCaul
 McClintock
 McHenry
 McKinley
 McMorris
 Rodgers
 McSally
 Meadows
 Messer
 Mitchell
 Moelenaar
 Mooney (WV)
 Mullin
 Newhouse
 Norman
 Nunes
 Olson
 Palmer
 Pearce
 Perry
 Pittenger
 Poe (TX)
 Poliquin
 Posey
 Ratcliffe
 Reed
 Reichert
 Renacci
 Rice (SC)
 Roby
 Roe (TN)
 Rogers (KY)
 Rohrabacher
 Rokita
 Rooney, Francis
 Roskam
 Ross
 Rothfus
 Rouzer
 Rutherford
 Sanford
 Scalise
 Schweikert
 Scott, Austin
 Sensenbrenner
 Sessions
 Shimkus
 Simpson
 Smith (MO)
 Smith (NE)
 Smith (NJ)
 Smith (TX)
 Smucker
 Stefanik
 Stewart
 Stivers
 Taylor
 Tenney
 Thompson (PA)
 Thornberry
 Tipton
 Trott
 Turner
 Upton
 Valadao
 Wagner
 Walberg
 Walden
 Walker
 Walorski
 Walters, Mimi
 Weber (TX)
 Webster (FL)
 Wenstrup
 Westerman
 Williams
 Wilson (SC)
 Wittman
 Womack
 Woodall
 Yoder
 Yoho
 Young (AK)
 Young (IA)
 Zeldin

NOT VOTING—24

Blackburn
 Capuano
 DeSantis
 Ellison
 Eshoo
 Gianforte
 Huffman
 Issa
 Jenkins (WV)
 Maloney, Sean
 McEachin
 Neal
 Noem
 Palazzo
 Paulsen
 Rooney, Thomas
 J.
 Ros-Lehtinen
 Royce (CA)
 Russell
 Ryan (OH)
 Shuster
 Speier
 Titus
 Walz

□ 1528

Mrs. COMSTOCK, Messrs. LEWIS of Minnesota, HUNTER, TURNER, GRIF-FITH, Ms. GRANGER, Messrs. DENHAM, ROKITA, COLLINS of Georgia, BOST, DUFFY, and STEWART changed their vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. CROWLEY and DONOVAN changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So the motion to instruct was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated against:

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 388.

ENSURING SMALL SCALE LNG CERTAINTY AND ACCESS ACT

THE SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. RUTHERFORD). Pursuant to House Resolution 1049 and rule XVIII, the Chair declares the House in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill, H.R. 4606.

Will the gentleman from Texas (Mr. WEBER) kindly take the chair.

□ 1530

IN THE COMMITTEE OF THE WHOLE

Accordingly, the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill (H.R. 4606) to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, with Mr. WEBER of Texas (Acting Chair) in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The Acting CHAIR. When the Committee of the Whole rose earlier today, a request for a recorded vote on amendment No. 2 printed in part B of House Report 115-919 offered by the gentleman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) had been postponed.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR. Pursuant to clause 6 of rule XVIII, proceedings will now resume on those amendments printed in part B of House Report 115-919 on which further proceedings were postponed, in the following order:

Amendment No. 1 by Mr. PALLONE of New Jersey.

Amendment No. 2 by Ms. DEGETTE of Colorado.

The Chair will reduce to 2 minutes the minimum time for any electronic vote in this series.

AMENDMENT NO. 1 OFFERED BY MR. PALLONE

The ACTING Chair. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentleman from New Jersey (Mr. PALLONE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been requested.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This will be a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 176, noes 227, not voting 26, as follows:

[Roll No. 389]

AYES—176

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

Hastings Maloney, Sánchez
 Heck Carolyn B. Sarbanes
 Higgins (NY) Matsui Schakowsky
 Himes McCollum Schiff
 Hoyer McGovern Schneider
 Jackson Lee McNeerney Schrader
 Jayapal Meeks Scott (VA)
 Jeffries Meng Scott, David
 Johnson (GA) Moore Serrano
 Johnson, E. B. Moulton Sewell (AL)
 Jones Murphy (FL) Shea-Porter
 Kaptur Nadler Sherman
 Keating Napolitano Sinema
 Kelly (IL) Norcross Sires
 Kennedy O'Halleran Smith (WA)
 Khanna O'Rourke Soto
 Kihuen Pallone Suozzi
 Kildee Panetta Swalwell (CA)
 Kilmer Pascrell Takano
 Kind Payne Thompson (CA)
 Krishnamoorthi Pelosi Thompson (MS)
 Kuster (NH) Perlmutter Tonko
 Langevin Peters Torres
 Larsen (WA) Pingree Tsongas
 Lawrence Pocan Vargas
 Lawson (FL) Polis Veasey
 Lee Price (NC) Vela
 Levin Quigley Velázquez
 Lewis (GA) Raskin Visclosky
 Lieu, Ted Rice (NY) Wasserman
 Lipinski Richmond Schultz
 Loeb sack Rosen Waters, Maxine
 Lofgren Roybal-Allard Watson Coleman
 Lowenthal Ruiz Welch
 Lowey Ruppertsberger Wilson (FL)
 Lynch Rush Yarmuth

Sanford Stivers Weber (TX)
 Scalise Taylor Webster (FL)
 Schweikert Tenney Wenstrup
 Scott, Austin Thompson (PA) Westerman
 Sensenbrenner Thornberry Williams
 Sessions Tipton Wilson (SC)
 Shimkus Trott Wittman
 Shuster Turner Womack
 Simpson Upton Woodall
 Smith (MO) Valadao Yoder
 Smith (NE) Wagner Young (AK)
 Smith (NJ) Walberg Young (IA)
 Smith (TX) Walden Zeldin
 Smucker Walker
 Stefanik Walorski
 Stewart Walters, Mimi

Hoyer Jackson Lee Maloney, Sánchez
 Jayapal Jayapal Carolyn B. Sarbanes
 Jeffries Matsui Schakowsky
 Johnson (GA) McCollum Schiff
 Johnson, E. B. McGovern Schneider
 Kaptur McNeerney Schrader
 Katko Kapture Scott (VA)
 Keating Katko Meeks Scott, David
 Kelly (IL) Keating Meng Serrano
 Kennedy Kelly (IL) Moore Sewell (AL)
 Khanna Kennedy Moulton Shea-Porter
 Kihuen Khanna Murphy (FL) Sherman
 Kildee Kihuen Nadler Sinema
 Kilmer Kilmer Napolitano Sires
 Kind Krilmer Nolan Smith (NJ)
 Krishnamoorthi Kind Norcross Smith (WA)
 Kuster (NH) Krishnamoorthi Soto
 Lamb Kuster (NH) Stefanik
 Langevin Lamb Swalwell (CA)
 Larsen (WA) Langevin Pascrell Takano
 Larson (CT) Larson (CT) Payne
 Lawrence Lawrence Pelosi Thompson (CA)
 Lawson (FL) Lawson (FL) Perlmutter Thompson (MS)
 Lee Levin Peters Tonko
 Lewis (GA) Lewis (GA) Pingree Torres
 Lieu, Ted Lieu, Ted Price (NC) Tsongas
 Lipinski LoBiondo Quigley Upton
 Loeb sack Loeb sack Raskin Vargas
 Lofgren Lofgren Reichert Veasey
 Love Love Rice (NY) Visclosky
 Lowenthal Lowenthal Richmond Wasserman
 Lowey Lujan Grisham, M. Schultz
 M. Lujan, Ben Ray Waters, Maxine
 Lynch Lynch Ruppertsberger Welch
 MacArthur MacArthur Rush Wilson (FL)
 Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—26

Joyce (OH) Rooney, Thomas
 Larson (CT) J.
 Maloney, Sean Ros-Lehtinen
 McEachin Royce (CA)
 Neal Russell
 Noem Ryan (OH)
 Nolan Speier
 Palazzo Titus
 Perry Walz

□ 1535

Mr. MEADOWS changed his vote from "aye" to "no."

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

Stated against:

Mr. PERRY. Mr. chair, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 389.

AMENDMENT NO. 2 OFFERED BY MS. DEGETTE

The Acting CHAIR. The unfinished business is the demand for a recorded vote on the amendment offered by the gentlewoman from Colorado (Ms. DEGETTE) on which further proceedings were postponed and on which the noes prevailed by voice vote.

The Clerk will redesignate the amendment.

The Clerk redesignated the amendment.

RECORDED VOTE

The Acting CHAIR. A recorded vote has been demanded.

A recorded vote was ordered.

The Acting CHAIR. This is a 2-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 195, noes 210, not voting 24, as follows:

[Roll No. 390]

AYES—195

Abraham Emmer Latta
 Aderholt Estes (KS) Lesko
 Allen Faso Lewis (MN)
 Amash Ferguson LoBiondo
 Amodei Fitzpatrick Long
 Arrington Fleischmann Loudermilk
 Babin Flores Love
 Bacon Fortenberry Lucas
 Balderson Foxx Luetkemeyer
 Banks (IN) Frelinghuysen Lujan Grisham,
 Barletta M.
 Barr Gallagher Luján, Ben Ray
 Barton Garrett MacArthur
 Bergman Gibbs Marchant
 Biggs Gohmert Marino
 Bilirakis Goodlatte Marshall
 Bishop (MI) Gosar Massie
 Bishop (UT) Mast
 Black Granger McCarthy
 Blum Graves (GA) McCaul
 Bost Graves (LA) McClintock
 Brady (TX) Graves (MO) McHenry
 Brat Green, Gene McKinley
 Brooks (AL) Griffith McMorris
 Brooks (IN) Grothman Rodgers
 Buchanan Guthrie McCaul
 Buck Handel Meadows
 Bucshon Harper Messer
 Budd Harris Mitchell
 Burgess Hartzler Moolenaar
 Byrne Hensarling Mooney (WV)
 Calvert Herrera Beutler Mullin
 Carter (GA) Hice, Jody B. Newhouse
 Carter (TX) Higgins (LA) Norman
 Chabot Hill Nunes
 Cheney Holding Olson
 Cloud Hollingsworth Palmer
 Coffman Hudson Paulsen
 Cole Huizenga Pearce
 Collins (GA) Hultgren Peterson
 Collins (NY) Hunter Pittenger
 Comer Hurd Poe (TX)
 Comstock Jenkins (KS) Poliquin
 Conaway Johnson (LA) Posey
 Cook Johnson (OH) Ratcliffe
 Costello (PA) Johnson, Sam Reed
 Cramer Jordan Reichert
 Crawford Katko Renacci
 Culberson Kelly (MS) Rice (SC)
 Curbeo (FL) Kelly (PA) Roby
 Curtis King (IA) Roe (TN)
 Davidson King (NY) Rogers (AL)
 Davis, Rodney Kinzinger Rogers (KY)
 Denham Knight Rohrabacher
 DesJarlais Kustoff (TN) Rokita
 Diaz-Balart Labrador Rooney, Francis
 Donovan LaHood Roskam
 Duffy LaMalfa Ross
 Duncan (SC) Lamb Rothfus
 Duncan (TN) Lamborn Rouzer
 Dunn Lance Rutherford

Adams Clarke (NY) Dingell
 Aguilar Clay Doggett
 Barragán Cleaver Doyle, Michael
 Bass Clyburn F.
 Beatty Coffman Engel
 Bera Cohen Espallat
 Beyer Connolly Esty (CT)
 Bishop (GA) Cooper Evans
 Blumenauer Correa Fitzpatrick
 Blunt Rochester Costa Foster
 Bonamici Costello (PA) Frankel (FL)
 Boyle, Brendan Courtney Fudge
 F. Crist Gabbard
 Brady (PA) Crowley Gallego
 Brown (MD) Cuellar Garamendi
 Brownley (CA) Cummings Gomez
 Bustos Curbelo (FL) Gonzalez (TX)
 Butterfield Curtis Kelly (MS)
 Carbajal Davis, Danny Green, Al
 Cárdenas DeFazio Green, Gene
 Carson (IN) DeGette Grijalva
 Cartwright Delaney Gutiérrez
 Castor (FL) DeLauro Hanabusa
 Castro (TX) DelBene Hastings
 Chu, Judy Demings
 Cicilline DeSaunier
 Clark (MA) Deutch Himes

Dunn Lamborn
 Emmer Lance
 Estes (KS) Latta
 Faso Lesko
 Ferguson Lewis (MN)
 Fleischmann Long
 Fortenberry Loudermilk
 Foxx Lucas
 Frelinghuysen Luetkemeyer
 Gaetz Marchant
 Gallagher Marino
 Garrett Marshall
 Gibbs Massie
 Gohmert McCarthy
 Goodlatte McCaul
 Gosar McClintock
 Gowdy McHenry
 Granger McKinley
 Graves (GA) McMorris
 Graves (LA) Rodgers
 Graves (MO) McCaul
 Griffith Meadows
 Grothman Messer
 Guthrie Mitchell
 Handel Moolenaar
 Harper Mooney (WV)
 Harris Mullin
 Hartzler Newhouse
 Budd Hensarling Norman
 Burgess Herrera Beutler Nunes
 Byrne Hice, Jody B. Olson
 Calvert Higgins (LA) Palmer
 Carter (GA) Hill Paulsen
 Carter (TX) Holding Pearce
 Chabot Hollingsworth Perry
 Cheney Hudson Peterson
 Cloud Huizenga Pittenger
 Coffman Hultgren Poe (TX)
 Cole Hunter Poliquin
 Collins (GA) Hurd Posey
 Collins (NY) Comer Jenkins (KS)
 Comer Johnson (LA) Ratcliffe
 Comstock Johnson (OH) Reed
 Conaway Johnson, Sam Renacci
 Cook Jones Rice (SC)
 Cramer Jones Roby
 Crawford Jordan Roe (TN)
 Culberson Joyce (OH) Rogers (AL)
 Curtis Kelly (MS) Rogers (KY)
 Davidson Kelly (PA) Rohrabacher
 Davis, Rodney King (IA) Rokita
 Denham King (NY) Roskam
 DesJarlais Kinzinger Ross
 Diaz-Balart Knight Rothfus
 Donovan Kustoff (TN) Rouzer
 Duffy Labrador Sanford
 Duncan (SC) LaHood Scalise
 Duncan (TN) LaMalfa Schweikert

NOES—210

NOES—227

NOES—210

| | | |
|---------------|---------------|-------------|
| Scott, Austin | Thompson (PA) | Wenstrup |
| Sensenbrenner | Thornberry | Westerman |
| Sessions | Tipton | Williams |
| Shimkus | Trott | Wilson (SC) |
| Shuster | Turner | Wittman |
| Simpson | Valadao | Womack |
| Smith (MO) | Wagner | Woodall |
| Smith (NE) | Walberg | Yoder |
| Smith (TX) | Walden | Yoho |
| Smucker | Walker | Young (AK) |
| Stewart | Walorski | Young (IA) |
| Stivers | Walters, Mimi | Zeldin |
| Taylor | Weber (TX) | |
| Tenney | Webster (FL) | |

NOT VOTING—24

| | | |
|-----------|----------------|------------|
| Blackburn | Jenkins (WV) | Royce (CA) |
| Capuano | Maloney, Sean | Russell |
| DeSantis | McEachin | Rutherford |
| Ellison | Neal | Ryan (OH) |
| Eshoo | Noem | Speier |
| Flores | Palazzo | Titus |
| Gianforte | Rooney, Thomas | Walz |
| Huffman | J. | |
| Issa | Ros-Lehtinen | |

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE ACTING CHAIR

The Acting CHAIR (during the vote). There is 1 minute remaining.

□ 1541

So the amendment was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The Acting CHAIR (Mr. FERGUSON). The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The Acting CHAIR. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly, the Committee rose; and the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WEBER of Texas) having assumed the chair, Mr. FERGUSON, Acting Chair of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H.R. 4606) to provide that applications under the Natural Gas Act for the importation or exportation of small volumes of natural gas shall be granted without modification or delay, and, pursuant to House Resolution 1049, he reported the bill back to the House with an amendment adopted in the Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

The question is on the committee amendment in the nature of a substitute.

The amendment was agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was read the third time.

MOTION TO RECOMMIT

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I have a motion to recommit at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is the gentlewoman opposed to the bill?

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. I am.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the motion to recommit.

The Clerk read as follows:

Mrs. Watson Coleman moves to recommit the bill H.R. 4606 to the Committee on En-

ergy and Commerce with instructions to report the same back to the House forthwith, with the following amendment:

Page 3, line 22, strike “; and” and insert a semicolon.

Page 4, line 2, strike “of 1969” and all that follows through the end and insert “of 1969; and”.

Page 4, after line 2, insert the following: “(C) such importation or exportation will not involve the use of any pipe line with respect to which eminent domain was, or will be, used to acquire land or other property necessary for its construction, operation, or maintenance.”.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to dispense with the reading.

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

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman from New Jersey is recognized for 5 minutes in support of her motion.

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, this is the final amendment to the bill, which will not kill the bill or send it back to committee. If adopted, the bill will immediately proceed to final passage, as amended.

We are here because our Constitution provided for a body that would represent the interests of the people. There are 435 of us, and our mandate is to represent the interests of individuals from coast to coast, and beyond to our territories, ensuring that our laws help each of them work toward the American Dream.

For many Americans, owning property is the pinnacle of that dream. Once they have achieved it, that is not something we, the Federal Government, should take away lightly, and that is a principle upon which I think my colleagues on the other side of the aisle would be particularly willing to agree. It is certainly not something that we should be letting companies impede upon.

Yet, current law allows pipeline companies, with authorization of the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, or FERC, to circumvent landowner opposition and to use eminent domain to acquire people’s lands so that they can build pipelines, even if the product of those pipelines ends up being used overseas.

Why would we allow private companies, shipping our resources overseas for a profit, with no benefit to us here at home, to take away privately owned land from owners who don’t want to lose their property?

Worse still, compensation provided to the property owners is often far from fair or just, and the negotiations are rarely conducted in good faith. That is to say nothing of the polluting nature of these companies or our Nation’s continued reliance on fossil fuels.

When you take away all the environmental considerations and look only at the basic transaction here, we are giving away people’s private land to pipeline companies for no public benefit. In

fact, we are giving away people’s private land so that private companies can profit from selling liquefied natural gas to customers outside of the United States.

This body has fallen into a bad habit of corporate giveaways, but this is one of the worst.

With the recent boom in the domestic gas production, this is happening across the United States and harming property owners in many of our districts.

In my own State of New Jersey, residents, including my own constituents, are deeply concerned about the PennEast Pipeline Project, a proposed 118-mile, 36-inch gas pipeline stretching from northeast Pennsylvania to my district. More than 500 landowners, many of whom have vocally opposed the pipeline, will now have their properties cut up for construction.

Preventing these private, for-profit companies from having access to the eminent domain authority in section 7h of the Natural Gas Act would immediately halt abuse of that authority by private gas pipeline companies. It would place public interests over private profit. Most importantly, it will protect our constituents’ hard-earned pieces of the American Dream.

This is an opportunity for each of us to show that we are for the people, that we acknowledge our job is to serve the people’s interests, and that corporations shouldn’t be able to take private land.

It shouldn’t be a difficult choice because, if you are not here for the people, then you shouldn’t be here at all.

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, I rise in opposition to the motion to recommit.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, this is just a procedural motion to deny the important benefits of this bipartisan legislation to American workers, businesses, our energy security, and global American energy dominance. It fits a pattern of delay and obstruction that we simply can’t afford.

Our neighbors in South America, Central America, and the Caribbean are praying for American LNG instead of fuel oil from unstable and collapsing Venezuela. Let’s answer those prayers today. Vote against the motion to recommit and for final passage.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the previous question is ordered on the motion to recommit.

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion to recommit.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was 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 passage.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 178, noes 231, not voting 20, as follows:

[Roll No. 391]

AYES—178

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

Gabbard
Gallego
Garamendi
Gomez
Gottheimer
Green, Al
Grijalva
Gutiérrez
Hanabusa
Hastings
Heck
Higgins (NY)
Himes
Hoyer
Jackson Lee
Jayapal
Jeffries
Johnson (GA)
Johnson, E. B.
Jones
Kaptur
Keating
Kelly (IL)
Kennedy
Khanna
Kihuen
Kildee
Kilmer
Kind
Krishnamoorthi
Kuster (NH)
Langevin
Larsen (WA)
Larson (CT)
Lawrence
Lawson (FL)
Lee
Levin
Lewis (GA)
Lieu, Ted
Lipinski
Loeback
Lofgren
Lowenthal
Lowe
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
Lynch
Maloney,
Carolyn B.
Matsui
McCollum
McGovern
McNerney
Meeks
Meng
Moore
Moulton
Murphy (FL)
Nadler

Napolitano
Nolan
Norcross
O'Halleran
O'Rourke
Pallone
Panetta
Pascarell
Payne
Peters
Pingree
Pocan
Polis
Price (NC)
Quigley
Raskin
Rice (NY)
Richmond
Rosen
Roybal-Allard
Ruiz
Ruppersberger
Rush
Sánchez
Sarbanes
Schakowsky
Schiff
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suoizzi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Vislosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOES—231

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Balderson
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum

Bost
Brady (TX)
Brat
Brooks (AL)
Brooks (IN)
Buchanan
Buck
Bucshon
Budd
Burgess
Byrne
Calvert
Carter (GA)
Carter (TX)
Chabot
Cheney
Cloud
Coffman
Cole
Collins (GA)

Collins (NY)
Comer
Comstock
Conaway
Cook
Costello (PA)
Cramer
Crawford
Cuellar
Culberson
Curbelo (FL)
Curtis
Davidson
Davis, Rodney
Denham
DesJarlais
Diaz-Balart
Donovan
Duffy
Duncan (SC)

Duncan (TN)
Dunn
Emmer
Estes (KS)
Faso
Ferguson
Fitzpatrick
Fleischmann
Flores
Fortenberry
Foxy
Frelinghuysen
Gaetz
Gallagher
Garrett
Gibbs
Gohmert
Gonzalez (TX)
Goodlatte
Gosar
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Handel
Harper
Harris
Hartzer
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger

Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Newhouse
Norman
Nunes
Olson
Palmer
Paulsen
Pearce
Perry
Peterson
Pittenger
Poe (TX)
Poliquin
Posey
Ratcliffe
Reed
Reichert
Schneider
Schrader
Scott (VA)
Scott, David
Serrano
Sewell (AL)
Shea-Porter
Sherman
Sinema
Sires
Smith (WA)
Soto
Suoizzi
Swailwell (CA)
Takano
Thompson (CA)
Thompson (MS)
Tonko
Torres
Tsongas
Vargas
Veasey
Vela
Velázquez
Vislosky
Wasserman
Schultz
Waters, Maxine
Watson Coleman
Welch
Wilson (FL)
Yarmuth

NOT VOTING—20

Blackburn
Capuano
DeSantis
Ellison
Eshoo
Gianforte
Huffman
Jenkins (WV)
Maloney, Sean
McEachin
Neal
Noem
Palazzo
Rooney, Thomas J.
Ros-Lehtinen

□ 1558

Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi changed his vote from “no” to “aye.”

So the motion to recommit was rejected.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

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

RECORDED VOTE

Mr. PALLONE. Mr. Speaker, I demand a recorded vote.

A recorded vote was ordered.

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

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—ayes 260, noes 146, not voting 23, as follows:

[Roll No. 392]
AYES—260

Abraham
Aderholt
Allen
Amash
Amodei
Arrington
Babin
Bacon
Balderson
Banks (IN)
Barletta
Barr
Barton
Bergman
Biggs
Billirakis
Bishop (MI)
Bishop (UT)
Black
Blum

Gosar
Gottheimer
Gowdy
Granger
Graves (GA)
Graves (LA)
Graves (MO)
Green, Al
Green, Gene
Griffith
Grothman
Guthrie
Harper
Harris
Hartzler
Hensarling
Herrera Beutler
Hice, Jody B.
Higgins (LA)
Hill
Himes
Holding
Hollingsworth
Hudson
Huizenga
Hultgren
Hunter
Hurd
Issa
Jackson Lee
Jenkins (KS)
Johnson (LA)
Johnson (OH)
Johnson, Sam
Jordan
Joyce (OH)
Katko
Kelly (MS)
Kelly (PA)
King (IA)
King (NY)
Kinzinger
Knight
Kustoff (TN)
Labrador
LaHood
LaMalfa
Lamb
Lamborn
Lance
Larsen (WA)
Latta
Lesko
Lewis (MN)
Lipinski
LoBiondo
Long
Loudermilk
Love
Lucas
Luetkemeyer
Lujan Grisham, M.
Luján, Ben Ray
MacArthur
Marchant
Marino
Marshall
Massie
Mast
McCarthy
McCaul
McClintock
McHenry
McKinley
McMorris
Rodgers
McNerney
McSally
Meadows
Messer
Mitchell
Moolenaar
Mooney (WV)
Mullin
Murphy (FL)
Newhouse

Rogers (KY)
Rohrabacher
Rokita
Rooney, Francis
Roskam
Ross
Rothfus
Rouzer
Russell
Rutherford
Sanford
Scalise
Schweikert
Scott, Austin
Sensenbrenner
Sessions
Shimkus
Shuster
Simpson
Smith (MO)
Smith (NE)
Smith (NJ)
Smith (TX)
Smucker
Stefanik
Stewart
Stivers
Taylor
Tenney
Thompson (PA)
Thornberry
Tipton
Trott
Turner
Upton
Valadao
Wagner
Walberg
Walden
Walker
Walorski
Walters, Mimi
Weber (TX)
Webster (FL)
Wenstrup
Westerman
Williams
Wilson (SC)
Wittman
Womack
Woodall
Yoder
Yoho
Young (AK)
Young (IA)
Zeldin

NOES—146

Adams
Aguilar
Barragán
Bass
Beatty
Bera

Beyer
Blumenauer
Blunt Rochester
Bonamici
Boyle, Brendan F.

Brownley (CA)
Bustos
Carbajal
Cárdenas
Carson (IN)
Castor (FL)

| | | |
|--------------|----------------|----------------|
| Chu, Judy | Jeffries | Pingree |
| Cicilline | Johnson (GA) | Pocan |
| Clark (MA) | Johnson, E. B. | Price (NC) |
| Clarke (NY) | Jones | Quigley |
| Clay | Kaptur | Raskin |
| Cleaver | Keating | Rice (NY) |
| Clyburn | Kelly (IL) | Rosen |
| Cohen | Kennedy | Roybal-Allard |
| Connolly | Khanna | Ruiz |
| Courtney | Kihuen | Ruppersberger |
| Crist | Kildee | Rush |
| Crowley | Kilmer | Sánchez |
| Cummings | Kind | Sanford |
| Davis (CA) | Krishnamoorthi | Sarbanes |
| Davis, Danny | Kuster (NH) | Schakowsky |
| DeFazio | Langevin | Schiff |
| DeGette | Larson (CT) | Schneider |
| Delaney | Lawrence | Scott (VA) |
| DeLauro | Lawson (FL) | Scott, David |
| DelBene | Lee | Serrano |
| Demings | Levin | Shea-Porter |
| DeSaulnier | Lewis (GA) | Sherman |
| Deutch | Lieu, Ted | Smith (NJ) |
| Dingell | Lofgren | Smith (WA) |
| Doggett | Lowenthal | Soto |
| Engel | Lowe | Suozi |
| Espallat | Lynch | Swalwell (CA) |
| Esty (CT) | Maloney, | Takano |
| Evans | Carolyn B. | Thompson (CA) |
| Foster | Matsui | Tonko |
| Frankel (FL) | McCollum | Torres |
| Fudge | McGovern | Tsongas |
| Gabbard | Meeks | Vargas |
| Galleo | Meng | Vela |
| Garamendi | Moore | Velázquez |
| Gomez | Moulton | Vislosky |
| Grijalva | Nadler | Wasserman |
| Gutiérrez | Napolitano | Schultz |
| Hanabusa | Pallone | Waters, Maxine |
| Hastings | Panetta | Watson Coleman |
| Heck | Pascarell | Welch |
| Higgins (NY) | Payne | Wilson (FL) |
| Hoyer | Pelosi | Yarmuth |
| Jayapal | Peters | |

NOT VOTING—23

| | | |
|-------------|---------------|----------------|
| Blackburn | Huffman | Rooney, Thomas |
| Butterfield | Jenkins (WV) | J. |
| Capuano | Loeb sack | Ros-Lehtinen |
| Coffman | Maloney, Sean | Royce (CA) |
| DeSantis | McEachin | Ryan (OH) |
| Ellison | Neal | Speier |
| Eshoo | Noem | Titus |
| Gianforte | Palazzo | Waltz |

□ 1609

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

APPOINTMENT OF CONFEREES ON H.R. 6147, INTERIOR, ENVIRONMENT, FINANCIAL SERVICES, AND GENERAL GOVERNMENT APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the Chair appoints the following conferees on H.R. 6147:

Messrs. FRELINGHUYSEN, ADERHOLT, SIMPSON, CALVERT, COLE, DIAZ-BALART, GRAVES of Georgia, YOUNG of Iowa, RUTHERFORD, Mrs. LOWEY, Messrs. PRICE of North Carolina, BISHOP of Georgia, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. QUIGLEY, and Ms. PINGREE.

There was no objection.

MOMENT OF SILENCE HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

(Ms. LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise to remember the life and legacy of a great statesman and social justice warrior,

Congressman Ron Dellums, who passed away on July 30.

Mr. Speaker, the contributions that Ron made to our community, the Nation, and the world are endless. As a former marine and the first African American to serve on the House Armed Services Committee and later to become its chair, he was a true patriot and a hero.

As cofounder of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus, Ron fought for the civil and human rights for everyone in America and around the world; also, he fought to end poverty.

As a social worker, Congressman Dellums made it his life mission to fight for the most vulnerable. That was evident in his fight against the brutal apartheid regime leading to the passage of his South Africa Sanctions Bill after introducing it 11 times. President Reagan vetoed the bill and Congress overrode the veto.

I am blessed to call Ron my dear friend, my predecessor, my mentor, and my former boss. I miss him tremendously, and I will hold him dear to my heart and the lessons that I learned from this great public servant.

My condolences are with the Dellums family, friends, and loved ones. His legacy and his spirit will be with us forever.

Now I ask my colleagues to join me, please, in a moment of silence for our great fallen hero.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. LEWIS of Minnesota). All Members please rise for a moment of silence.

ERDOGAN THE BULLY

(Mr. POE of Texas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. POE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, our supposed Turkish allies are holding Americans hostage. At least two Americans, Andrew Brunson and Serkan Golge, are being held by the Turkish regime on fake charges.

President Erdogan, an Islamist who has arrested thousands of Turks who oppose him and puts them in jail, believes that he can also imprison Americans and use them as bargaining chips. He hopes that he can trade American hostages for his political opponents that have fled Turkey.

Even if the individuals Erdogan wanted had clearly committed crimes, which there is absolutely no evidence they have, we should never engage in rewarding Turkey for taking hostages.

Erdogan the bully has proven he has no respect for the rule of law, and, instead, rules by fear, intimidation, threats, and terror. We must not assist him in his destruction of his own democracy.

American hostages like Pastor Andrew Brunson, who has been held for more than 600 days, must be returned immediately to America. Until then, Turkey should no longer be considered an ally of Americans but a kidnapper of Americans.

And that is just the way it is.

□ 1615

PERIPHERAL ARTERY DISEASE

(Mr. PAYNE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to call attention to an epidemic, a pandemic of unnecessary amputations in our country. In the 21st century, non-traumatic amputations should be a thing of the past, but they are not.

Poor blood circulation because of peripheral artery disease often leads to amputations, and minorities are suffering disproportionately. In fact, African Americans with PAD are more likely to be amputated and less likely to have their lower limbs revascularized.

Across this country, people are having their limbs and digits amputated simply because they are poor, simply because they don't have access to healthcare until it is too late.

Yesterday, Mr. PAULSEN and I brought together experts from across the country to discuss ways Congress can prevent this unnecessary amputation issue. This is serious.

The problem is no one checks or does any screening prior to amputations. If a woman went in to her doctor and found a lump in her breast today and the doctor said well, we are just going to have to do a mastectomy, we would go crazy. So we need testing in this area as well because these limbs can be saved and Americans can go on and live the quality of life that they deserve in this Nation.

This is a serious health issue that affects people in all of our districts, and I look forward to continuing to work with both Democrats and Republicans to reduce unnecessary amputations.

SEPTEMBER IS NATIONAL CHILDHOOD CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

(Mr. OLSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, September is the National Childhood Cancer Awareness Month. It is a month about a young lady from home. Her name is Marlee Pack.

On April 10 of 2015, she was told a small bump on her left foot was cancer. Two weeks later, her left foot was cut off. Next was 40 straight weeks of chemotherapy in Houston. The chemo took all of her hair, but it never took her smile.

She kept smiling when her cancer came back in July of 2017. She smiled because she beat her cancer again. Marlee smiles because she is bathed in love from her parents, a teacher who let Marlee shave her head at school,

and a parade at her school, Sienna Crossing Elementary in Fort Bend County.

But Marlee's biggest smile is yet to come. Soon, she will ring that bell that she is cancer-free. Let's smile with Marlee and make D.C. gold this month.

A PICTURE IS WORTH A THOUSAND WORDS

(Mr. CICILLINE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. CICILLINE. Mr. Speaker, they say a picture is worth a thousand words. This is a the moment when Judge Brett Kavanaugh refused to shake the hand of Fred Guttenberg, a man whose 14-year old daughter was murdered during a school shooting at Parkland, Florida earlier this year.

Instead of shaking his hand, Judge Kavanaugh buttoned up his jacket, turned and walked away. That moment said all I need to know about Judge Kavanaugh. It is clear he doesn't possess the empathy necessary to serve on the highest court in the land.

Yesterday, Judge Kavanaugh said he wants both parties in his cases believing he gave them a fair shake. And yet, when facing a man who lost his daughter in one of the most horrific school shootings in our country's history, he wouldn't even shake his hand.

As a judge, Brett Kavanaugh said he believes a ban on the sale of semiautomatic assault weapons is unconstitutional. That is his record.

On the Supreme Court, he will allow the unrestricted sale of weapons like the one used to kill Mr. Guttenberg's daughter. But as a person, his actions toward Mr. Guttenberg on Tuesday speak louder than any legal opinion he could write.

The Senate must reject his nomination.

HUMAN TRAFFICKING

(Mr. ESTES of Kansas asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. ESTES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise to offer thanks to the Wichita Police Department, FBI, and ICE for making a series of arrests last month to help end human trafficking in my community in Wichita, Kansas.

On August 23, several raids began after an investigation into possible child sex trafficking led to a tip from a 15-year-old female victim. Information this brave young girl provided led to the arrest of eight people for charges of aggravated human trafficking, as well as illegal firearms, drug possession, and rape. This would not have been possible without the partnership between the local Wichita police, the FBI, and the Homeland Security Investigations unit of ICE.

People may not be aware, but human trafficking is one of the most heinous crimes investigated by ICE. Rather

than disavow ICE and all law enforcement, these brave men and women deserve our support for their service.

So, Mr. Speaker, as a member of the Homeland Security Committee, and Representative from Wichita, I ask my colleagues to join me today in thanking all law enforcement for keeping communities like mine safe.

HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

(Ms. JACKSON LEE asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I look forward to having the opportunity to speak about former Congressman Ron Dellums at a lengthier time, but I wanted to stand and pay tribute to him at this time, and to indicate what an important experience it was to serve with him for the short period of time that I had to do so.

One of my predecessors, the Honorable Mickey Leland, who died in Ethiopia some many years ago trying to serve those who were starving, had a strong bond and friendship with Congressman Ron Dellums, and it was clear, when I came to the United States Congress, why. Both men had a deep and abiding passion and conscience for what is right.

And even as Mr. Dellums ascended to the chairmanship or leadership of the Armed Services Committee, he was always committed and dedicated to his values, and that was peace, and reconciliation, and the idea that it was important to invest in people, as opposed to investing in enormous, large budgets for the defense.

We thank him for his work on HIV/AIDS but, more importantly, on his counseling and mentoring, and we are grateful to his family for sharing him with America.

RECOGNIZING CHIEF JIM DEMANN

(Mr. PAULSEN asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I want to recognize the service of Eden Prairie Police Chief Jim DeMann, who will retire at the end of September after a career of dedication to the safety of Eden Prairie and Minnesota families.

Chief DeMann spent his entire career in law enforcement serving our community in Eden Prairie. In fact, his 31 years of service began back in 1983, as a Police Department intern. But by 1987 he was a sworn officer, and he served for almost a decade as a canine officer.

I have known Jim for years, and his leadership will surely be missed because he led by example and has seen a lot of growth in our community. But incoming Chief Greg Weber now will surely be up to the task.

On behalf of our entire Eden Prairie community, I want to thank Chief DeMann for his service to the entire

Eden Prairie community, and I wish him all the best in his retirement.

PREVENTING ALL-OUT CHAOS

(Ms. NORTON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, because of our diversity of interests and constituents, Congress is an inherently volatile body. For stability, the Nation typically looks to the President, the one official elected nationwide.

This President has abdicated his role as a unifying figure. Instead, he daily takes radically disconcerting actions, alarming residents who do not know what to expect from 1 day to the next.

The Republican majority does not even try to help, so, instead, Trump's own appointees now seek to reassure the public and our allies that someone on the inside is trying to prevent all-out chaos.

Those who want the author of the uncontradicted New York Times op-ed to resign need to explain how that would quell the undeniable chaos in the administration or reassure the American public that responsible officials are looking out for them.

RECOGNIZING NICK RATLIFF, 2018 CARHARTT BASSMASTER CLASSIC COLLEGE SERIES INDIVIDUAL CHAMPION

(Mr. COMER asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. COMER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize Nick Ratliff, a native of Elizabethtown, Kentucky, and a senior at Campbellsville University, who recently earned the title of individual champion at the 2018 Carhartt Bassmaster Classic College Series.

The grueling competition at Milford Lake in Junction City, Kansas, tested Ratliff's endurance and fishing prowess, with only 4 ounces ultimately separating him from his competitor. After 3 days of challenges, and battling stormy conditions, Ratliff emerged the champion with a 13-pound, 8-ounce catch.

Following this incredible victory, he has earned the right to compete at the 2019 Bassmaster Classic on the Tennessee River in March of 2019 in Knoxville, Tennessee.

I join with his family and friends, as well as his coach, Pete Hedgepath, in congratulating him on this great accomplishment. I wish him the best of luck in his future competitions, and look forward to many more titles and championships as a result of his continued dedication to his sport.

HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

(Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman JAMIE RASKIN for organizing a Special Order to follow the 1 minutes to honor the memory of our dear friend and former colleague, Congressman Ron Dellums.

Ron Dellums was an unabashed progressive icon, and a strong and outspoken advocate for his constituents, veterans, people of color, and other vulnerable communities during his 13-term tenure in the United States Congress.

Understanding the unique problems facing the African-American community, Ron Dellums joined with 12 fellow civil rights giants, including Lou Stokes, Bill Clay, Shirley Chisholm, to create the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971. True to his creed, the CBC remains the conscience of the Congress today and has grown to a historic 48 members.

As a former U.S. Marine, Ron Dellums was one of the most outspoken opponents of the Vietnam war. In Congress, he led an effort to educate the American public of war crimes that were committed during the Vietnam war.

In 1993, he also made history as the first African American chair of the House Armed Services Committee.

However, one of Ron Dellums' greatest achievements is one that is also dear to my heart, ending apartheid in South Africa. As a member of the California State Assembly and a national board member of Trans Africa, I had the privilege of working with Ron Dellums to pass legislation at the State and Federal level that forced the United States to divest from apartheid, the regime in South Africa.

CENTRAL NEW YORK MEMORIAL STAIR CLIMB

(Ms. TENNEY asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. TENNEY. Mr. Speaker, 343 firefighters, 70 law enforcement officers, and 8 emergency medical technicians. Seventeen years ago our Nation was changed forever. While the Twin Towers burned, thousands of first responders rushed to save the lives of their fellow citizens, knowing the dangers ahead; 421 first responders made the ultimate sacrifice that day. Side by side, they climbed 110 flights of stairs, in nearly 70 pounds of gear. It was the largest high-rise rescue operation in history.

"We climb because they climbed."

In an inspiring, touching tribute this Saturday, hundreds of our local first responders will take part in the annual Central New York Memorial Stair Climb. Wearing the same 70 pounds of gear, they will make the same climb at the Utica State Office Building to keep the memory of our fallen heroes alive.

Mr. Speaker, in the face of the worst of humanity, our Nation saw the best

of humanity in those brave men and women. Let us never forget their selfless sacrifice.

□ 1630

HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

(Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Representative Ron Dellums, who, among other things, was known as one of the most outstanding, articulate, and eloquent persons to ever serve in this House of Representatives.

He was a political, social activist who used his voice and his mannerisms to educate millions of people throughout the world about issues, AIDS, HIV, Free South Africa.

He was an icon. He is an icon and will always be an icon, a great Member of this body.

HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. RASKIN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RASKIN. Mr. Speaker, thank you very much for this Special Order hour, which we have decided to devote to the life and career of an extraordinary former colleague, Ron Dellums, the giant who has fallen and whose death has deeply affected this body. We have invited Members who have reminiscences and appreciations to come forward and to participate in remembrance of the life of Ron Dellums.

I just have a few things to say. I never had the good fortune of serving with Congressman Dellums, but he was a very close friend of my family's, so, as a little boy, I grew up admiring him.

He was an incredibly warm and dynamic, charismatic and brilliant man who really exuded love of people wherever he went.

Among his many extraordinary achievements in public life, one of them was to bring into politics and government service our distinguished colleague BARBARA LEE, who succeeded him in office and who will be taking over the Special Order hour after I say just a few words, but we should not understate the importance of that achievement.

Congresswoman LEE served as his chief of staff for many years; she will tell you that story. Then he backed her for the seat that he occupied, so she is the proud and worthy successor to Congressman Dellums.

But I wanted to say that, in a professional field where so many participants are known for putting their finger up to the wind and following simply what the pollsters or campaign donors are telling them to do, Ron Dellums was a diamond in the rough from day one. He

always put his ideals and his values first, and he didn't waver from them, no matter how politically tough it became.

He was raised in a politically engaged environment. His father was a longshoreman who was deeply involved in the labor movement. His uncle, Cottrell Lawrence Dellums, was instrumental in helping A. Philip Randolph organize the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters before being elected president of that union in 1966.

Now, Ron, when he graduated from high school, enlisted in the United States Marine Corps and spent several years in the Marines before an honorable discharge.

He went on to college and to receive his master's in social work and became a psychiatric social worker in the California Department of Mental Hygiene.

He was elected to the Berkeley City Council in 1967 at the age of 32. He was deeply involved in the movement against the Vietnam war, which profoundly affected his political outlook and his development as a leader. He was elected to Congress in 1972.

I will allow my colleague to talk about the various legislative efforts they were involved in with Congressman Dellums, but I will say, when I was in college, he was a great hero to college students across the country and to anti-apartheid activists, not just across America, but across the world for his leadership for comprehensive sanctions against South Africa, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, which was passed as a culmination of a movement that he organized that involved civil disobedience at the South African Embassy.

I was very proud to have played a tiny part in that as a college student, to have come and participated and submitted to arrest, along with thousands of other people who did that at that time in order to galvanize public opinion against American complicity and involvement with apartheid in South Africa.

But I would say that one other thing that always made such a powerful impression on me was that Congressman Dellums, like another great leader for peace, George McGovern, was himself a veteran, and he saw no conflict between the two. He was someone who proudly served in the Armed Forces of his country and nobly did so, but thought that it was equally noble to fight for peace and to make sure that our defense budget was one that was very closely tethered to the actual military and national security needs of the country, not one that is bloated and subject to waste and corruption and graft and embezzlement and kickbacks and so on.

That has been a historic struggle that goes back to the very beginning of our Republic. We want a military that actually serves the people, that serves the Republic, and is not an opportunity for other people to rip off the taxpayers.

He was very focused on making sure that our military budget was really targeted to the actual defense and security of the country, and that America was a force for human rights and security of all peoples and peace all over the world.

So he leaves an extraordinary and inspiring and difficult legacy for all of us to live up to.

I am very proud at this point to turn it over to Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who has become, in her years in office, also a great and famous leader for peace, human rights, and social justice.

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

HONORING RONALD V. DELLUMS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) is recognized for the remainder of the hour as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the subject of our Special Order tonight.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to really celebrate the life and legacy of my mentor, my former boss, and my dear friend, Congressman Ronald V. Dellums.

I had the privilege to serve as an intern in Ron's Washington office during the Watergate hearings of 1974 and as a senior member of his staff for 11 years.

First, my deepest condolences to Ron's beloved family, friends, and our community, who he loved so deeply, as we continue to come to grips, quite frankly, with the grief in the passing of this tremendous voice, yet we honor and celebrate Ron's magnificent legacy.

Mr. Speaker, let me thank Congressman JAMIE RASKIN for being a part of this Special Order tonight and for co-leading it. Congressman RASKIN's father, Marcus Raskin, was a close and cherished friend of Ron's. They deeply loved and respected each other.

Let me also thank all of my colleagues in the Congressional Progressive Caucus and the Congressional Black Caucus for holding this Special Order tonight to remember a truly historic figure, the late, great Congressman Ron Dellums.

Congressman Dellums was a founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus and the Congressional Progressive Caucus, and I know this celebration of his life would mean so much to him.

Ron will be remembered not only for his many accomplishments, but for his integrity and his brilliance. He was a

courageous statesman, a warrior for world peace, a soldier for social justice, and a son of west Oakland. He served his country in both the Marines and in this Congress, with distinction, for 27 years and as mayor of Oakland for 4 years.

He was beloved by his east bay constituents, regarded by his colleagues from both sides of the aisle, and respected as a global leader.

Above all else, Congressman Dellums was a visionary, and his conscience guided him in the pursuit of peace and justice and equality in all forms.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. LEWIS), one of Ron's very close friends, a person whom he loved dearly, who is an icon in his own right, someone who led the fight for our voting rights.

Mr. LEWIS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank my beloved friend, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, for holding this Special Order.

You know, Ron Dellums was a special human being, special leader. He was one of a kind. He was born and grew up in due season.

Those of us who worked with him and got to know him, we loved him. We admired him. I can see him now saying, "Hi, bro. What is going on?"

We must continue to stand up and speak up and fight the good fight.

You know, Ron never gave up; he never gave in. He never became bitter. He was never hostile. He loved people. He worked so hard and tirelessly for what he believed in.

As Congresswoman BARBARA LEE has stated so well, Ron was the founding member of the Congressional Black Caucus. But I tell you, he was a peaceful warrior. He believed in peace.

He struggled to help build what I call a true democracy in America. He fought to build what Dr. King called the beloved community. He wanted to redeem the soul of America.

He wanted to bring people together. It didn't matter whether they were Black or White, Latino, Asian American, or Native American. He saw us as one people, one family living in the same house, not just the American house, but the world house.

I tell you, as one Member who came here after winning an election in 1986, coming here in 1987, I would talk with Ron a great deal. I learned a great deal from him.

He used his leadership of the Armed Services Committee to highlight the senseless nature of war and to press for greater investment in the public good. He fought for peace at home and abroad.

As a Member of Congress, he was the author of legislation and the movement for corporate divestment in South Africa.

As a political leader, he was an inspiration to people all over the world. People admired him. People loved him.

You know, he was tall. He stood up; he stood out. And he spoke with passion.

In his passing, the Nation has lost a strong and powerful crusader for justice, for equality, and for peace.

He was cool before it became popular to be cool. He dressed so well. You knew Ron Dellums was coming when you saw him before he made it to you.

□ 1645

For many of us, he was our hero. Activists of the 21st century, and all of the new Members of Congress who seek progressive change in America would do well to take several pages from Ron Dellums' book. It would make you a better Member of this body.

His voice made him a force to be reckoned with as a committee chair, as a legislator, as a leader. He insisted in his call for justice for his cause for peace. He will be deeply missed all over America, not just in California, not just in Oakland, but all over America and around the world, for people who long for peace, for justice, for equality.

Thank you, Ron Dellums, for all that you did to help make our country and make our world a better place. I thank the gentlewoman, BARBARA LEE, for this Special Order.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LEWIS for that very beautiful tribute to Ron. It was a loving tribute, and I know personally how much Ron loved him and, in many ways, looked up to him and respected him as a human being and for his tremendous leadership. So I thank the gentleman on behalf of Ron's family, friends, and our community.

Now I would like to ask Congresswoman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON to come forward. Congresswoman NORTON knew Ron very well, served with Ron, and Ron served as chair of the District of Columbia Committee when I was actually a staffer during that period. They had many, many struggles during that day. Ron and ELEANOR remained friends, and he loved her dearly and always asked about her.

I yield to the gentlewoman from the District of Columbia (Ms. NORTON).

Ms. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank my very good friend, Representative BARBARA LEE from California, who has the great honor of serving in the seat that Ron held. And she has that honor because of her work with Ron and because those who lived in his district understood that Ron did not serve them alone.

I think that for BARBARA LEE to have risen from intern to chief of staff to Ron Dellums says everything about her service in the Congress. She is just the right person to be leading this special honor for our good friend, the dapper, the brilliant, Ron Dellums.

Ms. LEE shows us that Ron had an eye for talent, and I thank her for sharing that talent now with the Nation.

It is true that my district and I had a special relationship with Ron Dellums; and, therefore, a special love. Because for 14 years, he chaired the old District of Columbia Committee, which he helped me get rid of, understanding

that the District deserved equality with other districts.

Yet, I have to say how fortunate we were that Ron chose to use one of his committee seats for the District of Columbia. Why would Ron Dellums do that? There is not a vote in the District of Columbia for Ron Dellums—much as people would have loved to vote for him—but there wasn't a single vote because he didn't live in the District of Columbia.

This was such an unselfish human being. He went where he thought he was needed. And I do need to tell you how unusual that is, because most Members choose their committees, and this applies to his choice of the Armed Services Committee, as well as the District Committee. You choose your committee because it allows you to bring home something to your constituents, and I am the perfect example.

I have chosen committees which have helped me rebuild entire sections of the District of Columbia, the Wharf, or the Southwest Waterfront, the Southeast Waterfront, and other sections of the city. That is how most of us operate.

Well, let me tell you something: It is hard to bring home peace. Yet, that is why Ron Dellums chose to serve on the Armed Services Committee, as he unselfishly served on the District Committee. I will have a word to say about that—it was because he could not bear to see any Americans treated as less than full American citizens.

I must note, though, because I don't want to leave you with a sense, a parochial sense of Ron Dellums, or think I am just here because of what he did for my district. That would be reason enough for me to be here, but I am here to note the uniqueness of Ron Dellums as a Member of Congress, because not before, and not since, has there been a Member like Ron Dellums.

As a lawyer, I am going to prove this point. I hope you will agree before I sit down.

First of all, here was a Marine Corps vet—a pretty tough branch of the armed services—and, of course, this gave Ron special credibility when he became the leader of antiwar efforts in the Congress of the United States. Whether House or Senate, this was the leader of antiwar efforts when we were in Vietnam and when we were in wars since.

Never before or since has a Member who opposed most of the mandate of a committee been elected to chair that committee, as Ron was elected to chair the Armed Services Committee. Now, remember, you don't get appointed to chair these committees. You have to earn the respect of your colleagues on the committee so that they want to elect you to chair them.

I defy my colleagues to find any other Member of Congress who has gotten elected or could get elected chairman of a committee with a mission they oppose.

Ron Dellums was the leading advocate for peace in the Congress, winning

the votes of his colleagues to chair the Armed Services Committee, which has, if you will forgive me, little to do with peace. They have to do with preparing for war.

I begin there to make you understand what manner of man I am talking about. Now, he didn't just decide when he came to Congress: Wouldn't this be a cute thing to do given where I stand on these issues to chair, to grow up as it were in Congress to chair the Armed Services Committee. He started right where he ended. As a freshman, Ron introduced a resolution calling for an investigation of war crimes, or what he regarded as war crimes in Indochina. Particularly as a freshman, that was refused.

So instead of walking away as virtually any Member would, especially a freshman, he said: I am going to call some unofficial hearings on this very subject and he was able to lure some of his colleagues with him, despite many colleagues regarding the introduction of the resolution as an outrage to begin with.

Here is a Member of Congress whose reputation for fairness, whose congeniality was such that when time came to elect a chairman, many Republicans as well supported him to become chairman of the Armed Services Committee. The defense establishment that was certainly rattled. What to expect from this man? Well, this is what you got. You got leadership from a man who managed every bill to increase defense funding with great equanimity and fairness, while opposing his own bills. That is what you got. Find yourself that kind of a Member, much less a chairman, today in the Congress of the United States.

You got a man who was, in fact, very much for equal rights for gays in the military, but ushered through his committee a ban on gays serving openly in the military regardless. He understood the difference between Ron Dellums the man and Mr. Chairman. That is an important difference. And because Members tend not to understand that difference, they tend not to get elected chair of a committee whose mandate they oppose.

I must say, because I was not a Member of Congress at the time of the Free South Africa movement, but, was a leader of that movement, how much Ron was appreciated throughout the country for his leadership as the chief sponsor of the bill that produced sanctions against South Africa for its apartheid policies, and, ultimately, the release of Mandella from prison.

Finally, if I may say to my friend from California, a word of special thanks regarding Ron Dellums' service on the District of Columbia Committee. He served on it from the moment he was in Congress, and he chaired the committee for, as I indicated, 14 years. It is interesting, that this was a committee he wanted to eliminate as one of the first supporters for statehood for the District of Colum-

bia when the District of Columbia was just trying to get the local vote, or what we call home rule.

Some of his words deserve repeating. For example, he said: "I am an advocate, not an overseer of District affairs." Now, Ron was the committee chairman. He clearly was the overseer. We didn't want that power. He had it. This is how he approached his work as chair of a committee that had nothing to do with his district. This is how he approached giving the District the respect that it deserved.

I was not a Member of Congress at the time, but I know that my friend, Walter Fauntleroy, who represented the District at the time, deeply appreciated Ron Dellums, in particular.

When I indicate that Ron was for D.C. statehood, you might think, well, you are for D.C. statehood. What do you expect? Remember, we didn't have good home rule then. We didn't get that until 1994, and we were just getting to the point where people understood the inequality of the residents who live in the District of Columbia. But Ron Dellums understood, you have got to advocate for what people deserve, not where they are now in getting what the Congress wants to give them.

His service as chair of the District Committee was long ago, it meant everything to the District to have a chairman who loved the District of Columbia as he loved his own city who understood what the District needed and wanted, and who always consulted with the District.

Yes, California is far away from the District of Columbia, but notwithstanding the distance, I stand here this evening with the greatest gratitude for the 700,000 people I represent now and for all those who at the time had the great privilege of having Ron as the chair of the District Committee.

I stand here to thank Representative Ron Dellums, to let him know he will be forever remembered in our city, and to let him know that he has not been and never will be forgotten by the people of the District of Columbia.

My thanks to my good friend for leading this Special Order.

Ms. LEE. I thank Congressman ELEANOR HOLMES NORTON. Let me say that Ron passed away in his home here in Washington, D.C., on July 30. She was his Representative.

□ 1700

Ron loved the District of Columbia, as Ms. NORTON said. His children went to Alice Deal Junior High School and Woodrow Wilson High School. He worked with Ms. NORTON, as well as Hilda Mason, who was on the city council and was a strong activist for statehood. So I thank Ms. NORTON for reminding us of Ron's wonderful history in the District of Columbia.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON), my friend, a member of the Judiciary Committee and the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, but a prior member of

the House Armed Services Committee. I thank Congressman JOHNSON for being with us tonight.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I express my sincere condolences to the family and friends of a great patriot, Representative Ron Dellums. My sincere condolences for their loss.

It is my great honor to be here tonight to pay my respects to a man who was a true giant of this body, the United States House of Representatives, as well as in American life, a man who, I think we can all say with assurance, was one upon whose shoulders we all stand.

Before we had the incomparable JOHN LEWIS and the inimitable MAXINE WATERS in Congress, there was Ron Dellums, who left us his distinct mark, not just on this august body, but the San Francisco Bay Area, the Nation, and the world.

He left an indelible impression upon me as a Congressman.

The greatest legacy that he left us, however, was his successor, Congresswoman BARBARA LEE, who carries on his legacy.

For 10 years, I was honored and privileged to serve as a member of the House Armed Services Committee. Ron Dellums' portrait hanging in the committee room was a constant reminder of the type of committee member who I aspired to be.

"If being an advocate of peace, justice, and humanity toward all human beings is radical, then I am glad to be called radical," he once said. I will repeat that: "If being an advocate of peace, justice, and humanity toward all human beings is radical, then I am glad to be called radical." That is what Ron Dellums said.

He further stated, "And if it is radical to oppose the use of 70 percent of Federal moneys for destruction and war, then I am a radical."

That quote, ladies and gentlemen, has stuck with me. It has guided me in my public service.

Ron Dellums would never allow the powers that be, or the corrosive forces of Washington, D.C., to put him in a box. He never allowed labels to define who he was. Rightwing critics called him a Communist. But Ron shot back and described himself as a "commie pinko, Afro-topped, bell-bottomed dude from Berkeley." He was a true Renaissance man. And he was cool before Congress knew what cool was, a bell-bottomed cat from Berkeley.

Who other than Ron Dellums could rise from the streets of Oakland to become a Congressman, a mayor, and one of the guiding forces behind a 14-year campaign against apartheid in South Africa that helped bring down that racist regime? Who else but Ron Dellums could help form the Congressional Black Caucus, and from his seat and chairmanship on the powerful House Armed Services Committee propose

spending not for war and weapons, but instead for education, jobs, housing, healthcare, assistance to the poor, and programs to fight drug abuse?

Ladies and gentlemen, Ron Dellums set the ultimate example for us today with the powerful message and legacy of being true to one's self, a man who stood tall for the people, and not just for the people of America. Ron stood for the people of the world.

He was a unique and authentic human being, and his presence will be missed.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Ron for his guidance and for his example that we can look to as a beacon as we make our way, moving our country forward during these turbulent times. The lessons we have learned from his example will serve us well as we continue the good fight for peace, justice, and humanity toward all human beings.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman JOHNSON for that very beautiful tribute.

I know one of Ron's greatest gifts was mentoring those who came after him, and I know he certainly appreciated Mr. JOHNSON's leadership on that Armed Services Committee and talked a lot about the great work that he was engaged in.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from California (Ms. PELOSI), our leader, who knew Ron very well, even before Ron and NANCY served together in Congress. I thank her so much for being here and for paying tribute.

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. LEE for bringing us together for this Special Order to honor a very, very special person, Congressman, Mr. Mayor, Ron Dellums.

She has worked with him, so she saw close up his commitment to values to make the future better for everyone in our country.

She also participated in his collaboration, that when an issue arose or even was anticipated, he engaged the entire community in the discussion, in the collaboration of what was best for the community, not deigning to tell them, but listening. He listened, and we all listened.

When Ron Dellums came to the floor, it was an occasion. Everything stopped, as we wanted to hear what he had to say, because we knew it would be substantial. But we also knew it would be eloquent and, on occasion, humorous.

He was an absolute star in the Congress of the United States, like no other in the galaxy of stars here that many of us have served with. He shined so much brighter, and the world is a duller place for his leaving us.

What is important about Ron are some of the things that our colleague Mr. JOHNSON referenced about apartheid in Africa, how important he was in that fight, and how effective he was as a leader in that fight.

When he assumed the chairmanship of the Armed Services Committee, a progressive from Berkeley, he under-

stood that our country had to be strong, but he measured our strength not only in our military might, but the health, education, and well-being of the American people. He saw them go together. Without that piece of it, we could never really reach the potential of strength that America is about.

We will have a number of occasions, one in Oakland on Sunday, to share some stories, then at a later date here in Washington, D.C., again, and many times in between, about Ron Dellums. But I know, for anyone who served with him—and he was in Congress long before I came, but I had the privilege of serving for a while—anyone who served with him considered it a tremendous honor to call him colleague. For those of us who had the privilege to call him friend, that was a joy in our lives.

As Californians, though, we took special pride in Ron Dellums. One story that I love about him, there are many, but one that I love about him is—this is a prince. You see how elegant he is, dressed meticulously, so beautifully.

But one story that he told is that, the first time he went to Africa, a person who was proud of his skin color and proud of the community he represented and sprang from, but to be on a continent and visit countries where the leaders of the country were African, to see people who shared his ethnicity lead their countries and be respected, it was something he brought home to us with great emotion and great pride.

With great emotion and great pride, I am grateful that I had the opportunity to serve with him.

I know time is limited, so I will save some stories for Oakland on Sunday, but I thank Ms. LEE again for not only bringing us together here, but for honoring the legacy of Ron Dellums and his long career as a Member of Congress, honoring the values they shared, making her own mark in the Congress, and now keeper of the flame of Ron Dellums.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Leader PELOSI for those remarks.

Let me just say one thing to Ms. PELOSI in terms of Ron's sensitivity and an example of his humanness. He was so happy she reached out to him during his last few days on this Earth. I was with him, and after he spoke with Ms. PELOSI, he had tears in his eyes. He talked about how much he missed her and how much he loved her. He was so grateful that she gave him that call, so I thank her very much.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Missouri (Mr. CLAY). Congressman LACY CLAY, of course, is the son of a great hero, Congressman Bill Clay, with whom Ron served. Also, he was so proud of LACY, because he knew Congressman CLAY as a teenager. He may want to share some of his stories about that period of time also.

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ms. LEE for teeing that up, our good friend Congresswoman BARBARA LEE who succeeded my friend Ron Dellums. Ron was a giant, and I truly admired him.

Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight in honored memory of a great American who served with distinction in this House for 27 years, the late gentleman from California, former Congressman Ron Dellums.

Like my father, former Congressman Bill Clay, Congressman Dellums will forever be revered as one of the founding members of the Congressional Black Caucus, and he was also a founding member of the Congressional Progressive Caucus.

Ron was a legendary figure. Whatever task he took on, he excelled in it. I first met Congressman Dellums when I was a very young man in college and I was assigned to this Chamber as an assistant door keeper. My door was what is known as the west door, and I had to know Ron.

I remember two instances where one time Ron Dellums portrayed the iconic figure of Frederick Douglass in a play, and I was so impressed with that.

He was also a member of the congressional baseball team and played first base.

Whatever he did, he did it well.

Our families became close, and when I came back to this body as a Member, our professional relationship continued. When I first met him, I was immediately impressed, not just with his powerful intellect, but with his fearless advocacy to end the war in Vietnam, protect the right to vote, speak truth to power in defense of our most vulnerable citizens, and his unyielding demand that America must be a beacon for human rights around the world.

During his first run for Congress in 1970, former Vice President Spiro Agnew branded Ron Dellums as a “dangerous radical” for his vigorous opposition to the Vietnam war. In response to that, Ron Dellums said, “If it’s radical to oppose the insanity and cruelty of the Vietnam war; if it’s radical to oppose racism and sexism and all other forms of oppression; if it’s radical to want to alleviate poverty, hunger, disease, homelessness, and other forms of human misery, then I’m proud to be called a radical.”

□ 1715

Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand on the shoulders of Ronald Dellums as we continue the unfinished struggle to make America live up to all that we promise as a great nation, and I hope all Members will join me as we send our deepest condolences to the family and give thanks for his courageous leadership.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman CLAY for some of the stories he shared that many of us as a former staffer remember.

Yes, I remember Ron playing the role of Frederick Douglass, and it was unbelievable because it didn’t take much for the transformation. Sometimes we would say: Who is this, Ron or Frederick?

So I thank the gentleman for reminding us of that tonight.

Mr. Speaker, Ron’s family hailed from Texas. Congresswoman JACKSON LEE was a friend of Congressman Dellums. She currently serves on the Judiciary Committee, Homeland Security Committee, and the Budget Committee. Also, Ron was very proud of SHEILA, and he loved hearing the gentlewoman speak and listening to her insights about criminal justice reform in our judiciary.

So I thank the gentlewoman again for being here tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentlewoman from the great State of Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am honored to stand here with our good friend just leaving the podium, the Honorable LACY CLAY.

It is good to see the kind of family attitude that we are all expressing. Each person has gone to hug the Honorable BARBARA LEE because she is the closest to Congressman Ron Dellums, and we want his family to know of the intensity of our love and respect.

Congressman LACY opened up the gate for me and the door for me because I think Congressman Ron Dellums understood, as Frederick Douglass did, that, where there is no struggle, there is no power. Without struggle, there is no power. For all that he stood for, even in his early years, he had no fear of struggle.

So I stand today on the floor of the House to be able to pay tribute to our friend and, might I say, our brother, to be able to thank the gentlewoman from California for her wisdom in allowing us to share this time with him. I thank the gentlewoman so very much for giving us this beautiful portrait for us to stand next to and for America to be reintroduced to the Honorable Ron Dellums.

Ron Dellums was a Member of Congress, former bay area Congressman and Oakland mayor, first African American elected to Congress from northern California, tireless champion of racial and social justice, Marine Corps veteran and peace warrior, and Congressional Black Caucus and Congressional Progressive Caucus co-founder. That is a long litany of brilliance, but, as well, a pioneer—legendary, brilliant—and a dynamic former chairman of the House Armed Services Committee. And the fact that he represented constituents so ably.

I am glad, as I came here as a newbie, as a new Member of the United States Congress, wasn’t I fortunate to get the last years of service of the Honorable Ron Dellums? I saw him as the lead Democrat on the Armed Services Committee, just missed his service as a chair of the Armed Services Committee.

I listened to Leader PELOSI, and she will be able to tell her stories going forward as they celebrate in Oakland. Might I pay tribute to his family members who will celebrate in Oakland.

Let me say to the family members, my deepest sympathy, but joy for his

life, and thank you for sharing him with us.

I must start with the story that I heard, which was of the appointment of Ron Dellums and Pat Schroeder to, I believe, the Armed Services Committee, as the committee was convened then by individuals who held themselves high and mighty, including the chairman. There was only one chair, and that chair had to be shared by the first woman and the first African American to be on that committee.

Yes. Can you imagine? They were told to sit in one chair.

But I am grateful that through that struggle—power in his birth in 1935; power to his parents, Verney and Willa Dellums, and all of his relatives; and, as well, power in what he did in life—his engagement and his passionate commitment were traits of the Dellums family.

His father was a longshoreman. There lays the foundation for his love of labor. I understand Cottrell Laurence Dellums helped Asa Philip Randolph organize the Brotherhood of Sleeping Car Porters, of which my grandfather was a member.

He graduated from high school. He enlisted in the Marine Corps during the Cold War, but he also came back to his community and used the GI Bill. He developed a pathway for education, an associate of arts degree out of Oakland City College, then on to get a bachelor of science degree from San Francisco State. What I want most of all to say is that he then carved his pathway.

And BARBARA LEE continues to remind us that she is a social worker. Well, Ron Dellums got his MSW from the University of California at Berkeley in 1962.

Yes, this manly man, this man of men, was a social worker who understood the needs of people who were vulnerable, a psychiatric social worker where he worked in the department of mental health and mental hygiene and taught at San Francisco State.

Interestingly enough, he became a council member, of which I was one as well, at a young age, served only for a short time. And then, in his thirties, he went to the United States Congress and never looked back. He never lost. He ran against an incumbent as an antiwar, anti-Vietnam candidate, and he won overwhelmingly.

Again, there is no power without struggle. That was not a friendly place to be, against the war. It was well known to follow you throughout your career. It was viewed as unpatriotic, maybe even as NFL players today are viewed as they take a knee for issues that they believe in.

But Ron Dellums was a dignified patriot. He loved his country. He loved his flag. And he came to this Congress with a love of the institution as he served on so many committees, Foreign Affairs.

I remember the Post Office Committee because Mickey Leland was on the Post Office Committee, and they

served together. They became good friends. It is important to acknowledge them together as good friends.

I met Ron, maybe for the first time, as an unelected official when Mickey brought the Congressional Black Caucus to Houston, Texas. It was a day we will never forget. It was a day of happening. It was a day of celebration. We couldn't believe it. The Congressional Black Caucus was coming to Houston, Texas, to the Shamrock Hotel that used to be a segregated hotel, and all of us came to pay homage, tribute, and honor to these Congresspersons who had come to celebrate.

He was of grand stature, being a member of the Permanent Select Committee on Intelligence, and then, of course, going on to be a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus. I stand here as the chair of the Congressional Black Caucus Foundation to express my deepest appreciation for that service.

In the Progressive Caucus, Ron Dellums again became a soldier on the battlefield for so many issues, in particular, ending and breaking the shackles of apartheid in South Africa.

Remember, when I started out, there is no power without struggle. He participated in that struggle, and I remember that fight, that magnificent day when he brought forward this bill in 1986 to overturn Reagan's veto, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986. He had a congressional override where the President of the United States was vetoing the sanctions that Congress was attempting to put forward. That was a legacy, or that was the pathway, the struggle, that helped to propel the end of apartheid, the vicious cycle of apartheid in South Africa.

He continued to champion Africa even after he retired. He continued to mentor and to stay around to give us inspiration, to tell us that we could do it, that we could be strong.

Of course, how I remember when this Congresswoman, the Honorable BARBARA LEE, came and touched all of us and came with that inspiration and that idea and vision that Ron Dellums had about ending the horrors of HIV/AIDS in Africa, the whole idea of PEPFAR, the whole idea of the Millennium Fund. All of these were visionary ideas that came about for him to help save lives.

So as I said, in my early years, he retired in 1998, but he then continued on to be the man that he is, being the mayor of Oakland, and being a striking mayor, a truth-telling mayor, somebody who was loved and beloved by all those whom he had the privilege of serving.

Then, of course, to his family, he was that giant, that husband, that father and brother and just someone whom they could look up to.

So I thank the gentlewoman for organizing this Special Order, and I thank this giant of a man in stature but, as well, in purpose and in heart. I thank

him so very much for serving his nation and showing us what patriotism is, what the flag really means. It is the opportunity to protest, petition, and to speak to your government, and also to protest to make your government a better place.

This is a great, great nation. Ron Dellums understood that. Marine Corps Ron Dellums understood that. Social worker Ron Dellums understood that. Husband, father, and relative understood that. And, of course, United States Congressperson Ron Dellums understood that.

But never would he yield his values, his heart, his passion, and his sense of justice just because he had a title. He believed that America's greatness was one based upon her people's willingness to challenge her and to make her the very best that she can be.

My heart goes out to his family and I continue to mourn, but I celebrate his life with joy.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congresswoman JACKSON LEE for reminding us what a visionary and a leader Ron was.

Mr. Speaker, I remember when we came to Houston, Texas, Ron was determined to put together a coalition between African Americans and Latinos to look at our common issues. He and Mickey Leland were very close, and he worked very closely with the Latino community to really put together the agenda that spoke to both of our communities. So I thank the gentlewoman very much for being here and reminding us of that.

He was a coalition builder. I called him the father of coalition politics, and the gentlewoman laid that out tonight.

Mr. Speaker, how much time do I have remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). The gentlewoman from California has 6 minutes remaining.

Ms. LEE. Mr. Speaker, we have heard quite a bit tonight of the life and legacy of a great human being and a great warrior for peace and justice, Congressman Ron Dellums. Let me highlight a couple of stories that weren't highlighted tonight that I would like to share.

First of all, Ron really worked in a bipartisan fashion on many, many issues. I remember that Ron and former Speaker Newt Gingrich were talking about collaborating on a book together. This was really a time of true bipartisanship.

Also, Ron called himself a feminist, and he believed in equality for women. This just wasn't lip service. He followed his convictions in his hiring practices. Ron hired women and women of color in the early 1970s and took pride in employing a diverse staff.

When I worked for Ron in the seventies, I was one of a very few African Americans and only a couple African American women in key senior staff positions on Capitol Hill, but he made

certain that I was treated fairly and empowered me to manage his office.

Ron had remarkable female role models, including his mother, Mrs. Willa Dellums. She was a major influence on Ron and taught him to be proud that he was an American of African descent. She taught him that his culture and his heritage was an important part of who he was as a human being and as an elected official.

Ron was really the big brother that I never had. He gave me personal advice and support as a single mom raising two boys here in Washington, D.C. He loved children.

When my son, Craig, graduated from Brent Elementary School around the corner from the Capitol, he asked Ron to be his graduation speaker. Mind you, this was, I believe, in the sixth grade.

Ron left the Hill, spoke at the graduation, took pictures, and talked to the children afterwards. Mind you, these were young children. They didn't have political clout and they couldn't vote, but Ron didn't mind. He did this out of the goodness of his heart because he loved children and cared about their future.

When Ron retired, I announced my candidacy for his seat. He introduced me at my campaign kickoff, and he literally passed a blue baton to me at that kickoff, which I will cherish forever. But that baton reminds me of his impact on the world both in the policies that he championed and in all of those he inspired to follow in his footsteps.

□ 1730

Ron didn't serve in public office for the glory. He served to make life better for other people. He used to tell his staff: "Don't measure decisions by what is politically expedient. Just ask yourself: Is this the right thing to do? And if it is, then go ahead and do it. You don't need to ask me about that."

In his final weeks on this Earth, I had the privilege to visit Ron several times. I spent my birthday, July 16, with him in the evening. He was in rare form, telling stories, toasting our friendship, and singing happy birthday to me. Yet he was frail, in pain, but all along he demonstrated a sense of hope and courage, even as he knew he would meet his Maker soon.

As Ron lived with dignity and respect, doing it all "his way," he left this Earth exhibiting courage and a sense of peace, reminding me of the Scripture 2 Timothy 4:7, "I have fought the good fight, I have finished the race, and I have kept the faith."

There is no more fitting way to honor the memory of Congressman Dellums than for us to lift his legacy in the spirit of respect for different points of views, sticking to one's values and principles, and fighting to make this a better world for all.

It is an honor of a lifetime to carry the baton which Ron passed on to me in our shared fight for justice, peace,

and equality. But most importantly, as Ron said, we must secure the future for generations yet unborn. That is what this blue baton reminds me of.

I thank all of those who have been here tonight to share the memory and celebrate the life and mourn the loss of my friend, my former boss, the great Congressman Ronald Dellums.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Rep. Lee and my other colleagues tonight who have gathered to pay tribute to our former colleague Rep. Ron Dellums, who passed away on July 30. I rise to join them in remembering Ron, who was my friend and with whom I served in this House for many years.

Ron Dellums's entire career was spent in service—to his community, his city, and his country. As a U.S. Marine, he proudly wore the uniform of our nation at a time when the peace of the world was threatened by cold war. As a city councilman in Berkeley, he drew on his family history of labor activism to fight for better conditions for working families. As a Congressman, he led the fight for sanctions against apartheid South Africa and chaired the Armed Services Committee as our military challenges were changing from a Cold War to a post-Cold War environment. He was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, which today is the conscience of the Congress. Later, as Mayor of Oakland, Ron worked hard to make neighborhoods safer, improve local schools, and bring new infrastructure funding to the city.

Ron fought with tenacity for the causes he believed in. One of those was human rights and the equal dignity of all people. When a presidential veto threatened to block his anti-apartheid legislation, he rallied support to override it. As Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he earned the respect of his Committee colleagues and military leaders, and he worked diligently to transition our military to meet the threats of the twenty-first century. It came as no surprise to those of us who served with him that when he retired in 1998, praise for his service and leadership came from both sides of the aisle.

I was deeply saddened to learn of Ron's passing. Our nation lost a faithful public servant and a champion for working families and those working hard to make it in America. I mourn with the people of California and my colleagues in this House who served with Ron. I mourn with his wife Cynthia and the Dellums family. I mourn the loss of a man who gave service his all and contributed so much to the nation he loved and this institution he so faithfully served.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I would like to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman JAMIE RASKIN for organizing a Special Order Hour to honor the memory of our dear friend and former colleague, Congressman Ron Dellums.

Ron Dellums was an unabashed, progressive icon, and a strong and outspoken advocate for his constituents, veterans, people of color, and other vulnerable communities during his 13-term tenure in the U.S. Congress.

Understanding the unique problems facing the African American community, Ron Dellums joined with 12 fellow civil rights giants, including Louis Stokes, Bill Clay, Sr., and Shirley

Chisholm, to create the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971. True to its creed, the CBC remains the 'Conscience of the Congress' today, and has grown to a historic 48 members.

As a former U.S. Marine, Ron Dellums was one of the most outspoken opponents of the Vietnam War. In Congress, he led an effort to educate the American public of war crimes that were committed during the Vietnam War. In 1993, he also made history as the first African American Chair of the House Armed Services Committee.

However, one of Ron Dellums's greatest achievements is one that is also dear to my heart: ending apartheid in South Africa. As a member of the California State Assembly and a national board member of TransAfrica, I had the privilege of working with Ron Dellums to pass legislation at the state and federal level that forced the United States to divest from the apartheid regime in South Africa.

While I authored, and fought to enact California Assembly Bill 134, which passed in August 1986 and made California the first state to divest its \$12 billion in state pension funds tied to the apartheid regime in South Africa, Ron Dellums was simultaneously championing similar legislation in the U.S. Congress. His historic bill, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, gained enough support to not only pass in both chambers of Congress, but to also override President Ronald Reagan's veto in 1986.

Though he retired from Congress after 27 years of service, Ron Dellums maintained his dedication to his community and was elected mayor of his hometown, Oakland, California, in 2007.

The incomparable Ron Dellums—a passionate drum major for peace, inspiring community leader, effective politician, and lifelong public servant—left an indelible mark on the City of Oakland and in the hearts of so many people across this country who also love him.

Though our hearts are heavy, I join the Congressional Black Caucus and the entire U.S. Congress in celebrating his service to our nation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who I was honored to call a mentor, colleague, and dear friend, former Representative Ron Dellums.

Ron was an extraordinary man who wore many hats. He was a determined public servant who was dedicated to improving the conditions of humankind. He was also a marine, a social worker, a titan for civil rights here and across the world, a chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and a founding member and past chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. Representative Dellums was a true advocate for fairness, human rights, and justice.

Congressman Ron Dellums was an icon. I served with him early during my career in Congress. He demonstrated courage, compassion, fairness, character, and dignity as a Member of Congress and as a man. He was a great role model for people of conscience to emulate. I will be forever grateful for his wise counsel, friendship, and his legacy of service to humankind.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor the legacy of my dear colleague, the Honorable Ronald V. Dellums. Although it saddens my heart to see that we have lost an-

other great trailblazer, I would be remiss if I didn't take the time to honor his life and the change he brought to this great country.

Dellums was not only a patriarch for the Congressional Black Caucus, but he was trailblazer for change all around the world. With a political career of over forty years, he was determined to help those around him and provide hope for his community. As a former member of the Berkeley City Council, United States House of Representatives, and mayor of Oakland, Dellums always inspired to pave the way for the next generation to be advocates and a voice.

During his 14 years in the U.S. House of Representatives he became the first African American to chair the Armed Services Committee. Dellums used this platform not for his own benefit, but to create an agenda to ensure civil rights and programs for people ahead of weapons systems and warfare. He was also the antiwar activist to hold that post. As a Congresswoman who proudly stands in the gap for my constituents, I always admired how Congressman Dellums fought hard and served his constituents with distinction and treated his colleagues with the utmost respect. He was determined to share his light with the world.

As a dedicated leader in human rights and civil rights in America and around the world, Congressman Dellums worked tirelessly to pass anti-apartheid legislation against South Africa. After a 14-year campaign against apartheid in South Africa, he wrote the 1986 legislation that mandated trade embargoes and divestment by American companies and citizens of holdings in South Africa.

Congressman Dellums was not only a leader; he was a person of incredible intellect who possessed the ability to build alliances with people and groups from diverse backgrounds and varying interests. He was a co-founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, which he chaired from 1989–1991, and a co-founder of the Congressional Progressive Caucus in 1991. After retiring from Congress he remained involved and determined to be a light for his people. He worked in the private sector on global aids, healthcare and transportation. He returned then to his native Oakland, in 2006, and was elected Mayor, serving one term and retiring from elective office in 2011.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Congressman Dellums for his outstanding and dedicated service.

TERM LIMITS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. ARRINGTON) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, George Mason, the patriot, said:

“Nothing so strongly impels a man to regard the interest of his constituents as the certainty of returning to the general mass of the people, from whence he was taken, where he must participate in their burdens.”

Translation: The Founding Fathers wanted us to come here and do the people’s business and then go home, back to the “farm,” and live under the rules we passed. They want us to come up here and represent the people, their interests, and no other; the public’s interests, no other; America’s interests, no other.

They wanted us to come here with a singular purpose and that is to do what is right and good for the American people and to have the courage to step up to the plate, because every generation is called to do so, and to make the sacrifices and to make the tough calls and take on the tough issues of the day and solve them, even if that causes you to have a shorter political career than you anticipated. That is the theme of this Special Order, Mr. Speaker. It is term limits.

We the Members who gather today to talk about it might be taken off some of the Christmas card lists of some of our friends and colleagues. But this does not in any way disparage Members who served here for many years and many terms. I think you have folks here—and I think in fact I can name some—who have done a good job, who have served well. But I don’t think it is healthy.

Just because you can do it doesn’t mean we shouldn’t create an environment and have the right incentives for the right behavior. I think there are just too many forces that pull us as Members in directions other than doing what is best and right for this country and for the people we came here to represent.

So I think there is an ideal way. And I think we are off the mark from that ideal, from the spirit and the intent of what George Mason said in that quote, and what our Founding Fathers believed from the very outset.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues who will speak here in a moment, we didn’t run just to rearrange the furniture in the people’s House. We ran to make a real difference, to advance real reform, so that this country and its leaders could govern and solve problems and move this Nation forward.

So my greatest calling, I believe, isn’t just to advance reforms to education or to healthcare or to the Tax Code. I think this is a season for reforming this institution, first and foremost. I think that we are long overdue, but I think the time is right for structural, fundamental, systemic reforms to the United States Congress.

As a new Member and as a new generation of Members, I cannot tell you how excited I am to stand with my colleagues today, Republican and Democratic, and talk about one of those structural reforms that I think will strike at the heart of some of the prob-

lems with Washington and the culture of Washington.

Woe to me and any Member who comes up here just to change the course, the policy course of this country, and not do anything to affect the broken culture of this body. I think it is incumbent upon us to do that and to change this broken culture.

I think if we take anything away from this last Presidential election on either side of the aisle and whatever party you claim, we can all agree that the American people are fed up with the status quo. They don’t want business as usual. I think there is a crisis in confidence in this institution.

When I ran, I ran railing against the culture of Washington and the fundamental changes and the brokenness of this institution. Now I am a Member. Now it is time to act on the things that I so boldly proclaimed that we needed to do.

I think that for this reason Republican and Democrats alike have come together to support a constitutional amendment that would limit the number of terms an individual may serve in the United States Congress.

There are different ways to organize it, structure it, but I think the intent and the heart of all these reform initiatives around term limit are getting after, I think, the same desired outcome. We believe that, above and beyond Tax Code reform, bettering the healthcare system, limiting regulatory burden, and so on and so forth, we have got to change this institution.

We have a great chance. I do think the timing is right. Our Founders never intended these public servants to be professional career politicians. They didn’t want a permanent political class to rule the land from Washington. Instead, they envisioned this sort of citizen-legislator way of leading and serving, and then living back among our brothers and sisters.

People say this is tilting at windmills and this is an unproductive quest. But all you have to do is look at George Washington and the example he set by custom, by tradition. When asked to serve more than two terms as President, he said: We got rid of a King George. We don’t need a King George. I wanted to serve my people as President. It is time for me to go back to the farm.

For 100 years, that custom was honored. And then, FDR ran for a third and fourth term. The people reacted, and we had the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution and we have term limits on our Presidents.

I think that if it can happen for Presidents, where the people say, We don’t want kings, I believe—and especially today, in these times—that the people are speaking, if we will just listen and respond. They don’t want career politicians either. Neither are healthy for this great country.

There was a recent survey, as recent as February of this year, where over 80 percent of the American people—Demo-

cratic, Republican, Independent—say that this initiative of term limits being effectuated in an amendment to the Constitution would make this institution run better and would change the culture for the better. They support it. I am old-fashioned enough to believe if 80 percent of the people want something, they ought to get their chance to at least debate it and vote on it. I am grateful for this time that we have to talk about it.

I am looking at my colleagues here in the Chamber and I see RO KHANNA, my friend from California. We have very different backgrounds. We come from different places and different ideological places. We have different thoughts about policy reforms on various issues.

But when we met during orientation as two new Members—a former member of the George W. Bush administration and a former member of the Obama administration—you couldn’t have two more different people. But we had a great conversation, we struck up a friendship, and our families love each other, care about each other, and I want him to be successful. I want his family to be successful. We came together on one thing in particular and it was this notion of term limits.

We introduced what I think is still the only bipartisan, Democratic and Republican-introduced legislation to limit Members of Congress’ terms. I am grateful for his friendship and I am glad he is here.

I think I am going to stop talking, Mr. Speaker, and ask my colleagues to share their thoughts. I am going to start with a dear friend, Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, District Eight.

Brian is the heart and soul of this initiative. We went to see the President of the United States on this, Republicans and Democrats, and he said: This is the most energized group I have met with. It is because we believe that we can actually make real change with real reforms like term limits.

Brian has been the heart and soul of this. He, like myself, is very passionate about this. He has dedicated a lot of his time and effort introducing congressional reform and anticorruption legislation to fix Washington’s broken system. These measures include his own term limit legislation, a constitutional amendment that would prevent Members of Congress from being paid unless a budget is passed, and a balanced budget amendment that would force Congress to stop kicking the can down the road and address our national debt now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am doing something a little bit unconventional here. I am actually speaking from the left side of the aisle in a sign of solidarity with our good friend and colleague, RO KHANNA, on an issue that, as JODEY ARRINGTON pointed out,

doesn't just unite Americans, it unites 80 percent of Americans. Eighty percent. How many issues are out there that enjoy the support of 80 percent of the American people?

A lot of our colleagues here, when you are dealing with the rigors of this job, say one thing, give you one piece of advice: Never forget why you ran. Just remember that theme that caused you to make that difficult decision.

I think that the reason we all ran was this: term limits to fix a broken system. The genesis of that desire, the genesis of that belief may vary amongst many of us. I can tell you where it came from with me, Mr. Speaker, and that was my time running the political corruption unit at FBI headquarters right down this road here, where you are responsible for a lot of cases.

Like many jobs, when you go home at night, sometimes you take a step back and you think: Well, if I were ever given the opportunity to have a policy-making role to change this brokenness, what would I do?

At the top of that list, Mr. Speaker, was legislative term limits.

You heard my friend and colleague, JODEY ARRINGTON, talk about George Washington, my favorite President ever, for this very reason: he set this tradition in motion. He said he only wanted to serve one term, go back to his farm in Mount Vernon, live under the laws he helped pass, make way for a new generation of leadership. That is the most organic way to serve a democracy. It is the healthiest form of democracy.

They talked him into a second term. He said: No more. It was a tradition that every single President honored, up until FDR served four terms, at which point Congress passed the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution. But true to form, they applied it to the executive. They did not apply it to themselves.

□ 1745

We need a constitutional amendment for term limits in this country.

Is there anybody in this Chamber who does not agree with this very basic principle, this very basic premise, that more organic change in this organization, in this body, is a good thing?

Mr. Speaker, in the FBI, we had term limits in the Bureau. If you were a supervisor, you had to serve up to 7 years—no more, not a day longer than 7 years.

Do you lose some good people? Of course you do.

Overall, did it benefit the institution? You bet you it did. You bet you it did. It brought people in from different places, different perspectives, different educational backgrounds. They had an opportunity to serve and lend their area of expertise.

That is a good thing for this institution. It is a good thing for our country. It is not just from the corruption standpoint; it is from the getting along standpoint.

I can tell you how proud I am of this freshman class—so proud. I am particularly proud of RO KHANNA, mostly because he is from Bucks County—the most special place in America, I might add—and now representing Silicon Valley.

Here you have an issue. RO and I come from different parties. We checked different boxes on our voter registration form when we were 18 years old. We grew up in the same community; we care about the same things; and we have an issue here that unites us.

JODEY ARRINGTON, a very wise man, identified this—and I couldn't agree more—as a root issue. So much of what we deal with in this House, so much of what we deal with in this country are symptoms. It is symptomatic of what the root issues are. The root issues get to the functionality of this body.

The Problem Solvers Caucus introduced a Break the Gridlock package essential to changing the way things operate here. The government reform, anticorruption legislation that several Members have introduced, myself included, on term limits, on dealing with things like no budget, no pay, these are important things that will fundamentally change the way this body works. And when we do that, we will win back the trust and support of the American people, too many of whom have lost faith in this institution—and for good reason.

We can make those changes. This is Exhibit A of what we need to do to fix a broken system, to restore that trust. Mr. Speaker, it is an 80 percent issue.

How dare we not address, on the floor of this House, an issue that addresses the root cause of our problems that is supported by 80 percent of the American people. We have to get this done.

I want to thank my colleague, JODEY. This is an issue that fires both of us up. We talk about it every single day we are on the floor of the House of Representatives: my friend MIKE GALLAGHER from Wisconsin, who did the first Special Order on term limits shortly after we got sworn in, and my friend RO KHANNA, who has shown incredible courage. This is a man who could serve here for a long, long time, but he is making a courageous decision to stand for what is right, what is good for this institution, what is good for this country. God bless Mr. KHANNA for doing that.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I think anybody who heard the remarks from my friend BRIAN FITZPATRICK is, without a doubt, inspired by the new blood and the new fire in the belly of this new membership of this institution that, again, wants to make real change.

I love what he said to me—and he may be mad when I quote him, but he said: If we could get a vote, if we could just get a vote. And if we got a vote, I believe it would pass because I think the American people would put too much pressure on our colleagues, which

is a good thing. That is how it works. And we would pass this, and we would be able to have this new dynamic which would get at that root cause and change the behavior of this institution and the culture.

He said: If I could get that, I would be willing to leave tomorrow, if that is what it took. If I knew I could leave knowing that that would happen, I would leave tomorrow.

Thank God for people like BRIAN FITZPATRICK. I am so proud to serve with the gentleman, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue. He really is the heart of this movement in our class. And I know that it extends beyond our class, but I think there is a sense of urgency to do something real in this class.

This isn't the silver bullet. This isn't the panacea. There is a list of things that are root causes and fundamental structural reforms, but I think this one should be the easiest to pass this House. And the people want it, as the gentleman said.

Mr. Speaker, now I am going to introduce another member of this new class of Representatives, from the great State of Wisconsin, another dear friend, MIKE GALLAGHER.

During his first 100 days in office, MIKE introduced a number of bills to drain the swamp, including his own term limit legislation, a 5-year lobbying ban for retiring Members, reforms to the congressional pension, and the Do Your Job Act, which would prevent Congress from leaving for recess until it passed all its appropriations bills.

This is a guy who wants to make a real difference, and he is willing to stick his neck out and do it. Probably, none of these are very popular here, but I guarantee you they would be powerful in implementation and the change—the good change—that they would make.

Since taking office last year, he has made decreasing the size and influence of the Federal Government, restoring power back to the people, a top priority; and he is an original cosponsor of RO KHANNA and my term limit legislation and led the first Special Order to discuss term limits in this Chamber. I thank Mr. GALLAGHER for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues here: Mr. ARRINGTON from Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KHANNA.

I want to say, since we started on this journey a year and a half ago, I have been blown away by the response that I have gotten from constituents in my district.

RO KHANNA and I wrote an op-ed together very early on in Congress where we laid out three priorities for draining the swamp, one of which was term limits; and to this day, I still have people coming up to me on the street saying: I love that. I just love the fact that you

were willing to write an op-ed with a Democrat.

I just think it gets to what my colleagues have laid out, which is that issues like this cross party lines. They have the overwhelming support of 80 percent of the American people.

We have to ask ourselves the serious question as to whether we are willing to disregard the wisdom, the common sense of 80 percent of the American people. I think we do so at our own peril.

I recognize that there are principled and serious objections to the idea of term limits, and I would like to address what I think are the three most salient, albeit briefly.

The one thing I hear a lot from opponents of term limits is that, well, we already have term limits built into the system. We have term limits every 2 years in the House and every 6 years in the Senate in the form of elections.

I understand the logic there, but anyone who is taking a serious look at how elections work in this country cannot conclude that there is an honest chance for newcomers to overcome the serious hurdles that we have placed to them running for office and to overcome the serious advantages that we have given incumbents.

I think my friend, Mr. KHANNA, is the one pointing out that, in many cases, the turnover rates among Members of Congress is actually lower than in certain European monarchies, which goes to the fact that incumbency comes with enormous advantage.

Think of how many good people, good citizens who love this country aren't even willing to run because they see it as such an insurmountable task. That shows how far we have gotten away from the model of the citizen legislator.

I won't even get into the issue of PAC money that is available to incumbents, as well as the way in which incumbents are able to use their official budget to contact voters in a way that people trying to challenge incumbents are not. So I don't think that argument stands up to serious scrutiny.

The second thing I have heard, which I take seriously, is that term limits have been tried at the State level, and there have been mixed results. In some cases, there are arguments that they have actually had a negative effect. I would say that, most basically, that experiment has not been run enough times to be significant in a meaningful, statistical sense.

Contrarily, we have actually run this experiment here over and over again, and we have seen the results of careerism and the use of congressional office as a stepping stone and as a means to enrichment.

But I would also say you have to make a fundamental distinction between service at the Federal level and service at the State and local level. And it is my belief that the Founders intended service at the Federal level to be, as my colleague JODEY ARRINGTON

more eloquently pointed out, a season of service.

You want expertise and authority concentrated at the lowest possible level that is responsible, where it can be more responsive to the needs of the people and, also, more accountable. So I bring that up to say you have to make a distinction between service at the State level and service at the Federal level.

The final thing I hear, and I think it is actually the most serious objection, is that, if you term-limit Members of Congress, you will only empower the staff; you will further empower a staff that, by the way, is already over-empowered and already running this place because Members do not take an interest in the serious work of legislation and, instead, are only interested in perpetuating the Kabuki theater that dominates what we do in this place.

I am a former staffer. I worked in the Senate. I was paid to advise Members of the Senate on how they should make decisions. I can tell you that staff power is inversely proportional to Member interest. In other words, if Members are not interested in doing the hard work of showing up to their committee hearings, legislating, then staff is going to run the place.

If you create a dynamic where Members feel they have a limited period of time to make an impact via term limits, then it is my firm belief that you will actually have the opposite effect, that you will have Members taking ownership of the legislative process rather than outsourcing it to not only unelected congressional staff, but unelected members of the executive branch and the judicial branch whom the American people did not hire to make laws.

They hired us to make laws, but we are failing in that fundamental duty. We have placed most of the Federal Government on autopilot, and we are more than happy to outsource consequential decisions that we should be making constitutionally to Article II and Article III.

The final thing I will say, though: Put aside all the philosophical arguments for or against term limits. Given what my colleagues have laid out, given the historically low levels of approval that this body faces right now, the shared sense among all of us that Congress, as an institution, is fundamentally broken, that it is in need of some serious reform, we need to do something different.

I cannot promise you that term limits will solve all of our problems, but I believe firmly that, if nothing else—if nothing else—it will send a signal to the American people that we are interested in changing the status quo and the fundamental dynamic here in Washington, D.C., because the American people have made their opinion clear over and over again, and that is that they are not satisfied with the status quo.

To continue business as usual, to continue making the same mistakes over and over again, would satisfy the literal definition of insanity; and I would hope that we could avoid that, at the very least. What my colleague Mr. FITZPATRICK said and my colleague JODEY ARRINGTON echoed, that we should demand a vote, is absolutely right.

We are going to have a Speaker's race no matter who wins the election. This should be a key part of that debate. Getting a vote on the House floor is something that we should demand, and this is an idea whose time has finally come.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, that is the courage of a captain in the Marine Corps. I am grateful for his service to this country in the armed services. I am blessed to call him my friend. And again, the fire in the belly to come up here and make lasting reforms for our children and grandchildren—and game-changing reforms.

So I am grateful to Mr. GALLAGHER, and I thank the gentleman for being a leader on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to introduce a dear friend whom I mentioned earlier, RO KHANNA, a Democrat from California.

I want to just also note before Representative GALLAGHER may have to leave, but he is speaking from the traditionally Democratic podium. I don't know. There is not a law. I don't think there is even a House rule that says you have to speak on the right side or the left side. But he speaks over there, and our Republican colleague BRIAN FITZPATRICK also stood over there, not just in solidarity on this issue, but with the spirit of friendship and the notion of restoring civility in this body.

When I look at you guys across the aisle and I see a Republican and Democrat on the Democratic side, traditionally, I am reminded of our class signing the civility agreement and sitting in the middle of this Chamber as a message to others and as an affirmation to each other that part of the culture change that we are talking about—in this respect, it is term limits, but it is more than that. It is some of the things that Mr. GALLAGHER is pushing through legislation, but it is also the softer issues, the intangible cultural issues like civility.

With that, I want to say that I thank Mr. KHANNA for his leadership. His folks are well represented by him. He knows what he believes. He fights hard for his beliefs and his constituents, but he remains independent to those beliefs and to those interests. I am proud to call RO KHANNA my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

□ 1800

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ARRINGTON for his friendship. One of the things I get asked all the time as a freshman is: What is it like in Congress? Do you actually know people on the other side?

I always say that, actually, one of my closest friends in Congress is JODEY ARRINGTON. I really value the friendship we have formed, that our families have formed, much at his initiative. I mean, he struck up a conversation with my wife, and he has been so gracious as we have had our own family.

It is one of the things I have enjoyed most about our class, to have relationships that transcend the rancor and the partisanship. You get to know people and know that everyone, in their own way, cares about the country, and there are things that we can do in common.

I so admire Mr. ARRINGTON's leadership from day one on term limits and trying to find common ground on making sure that this is an issue that isn't partisan, that you can be a Democrat, a Libertarian, a Republican, and still have a belief in what Thomas Jefferson said, that we should live under the laws that we make.

I still have a belief that these jobs weren't supposed to be a career. They were supposed to be ones that were inspired out of answering the Nation's call to service and then returning home to your community.

I also want to recognize my friend MIKE GALLAGHER, recognize, of course, his extraordinary service to our Nation as a marine, but also his desire to cross the aisle. I was honored to host him in Stanford, where he had great ideas on cybersecurity. I know Mr. GALLAGHER has been championing political reform, term limits, and is sincere about wanting to see progress.

BRIAN FITZPATRICK left, but I have a soft spot for BRIAN because we are both Bucks County kids. We grew up in Bucks County, and BRIAN is relentless, as JODEY ARRINGTON has pointed out. We had that meeting with the President, and BRIAN would chime in and challenge the President whenever he wanted to push further for term limits, in a respectful way, but wanting to really advocate for this issue as the most important issue.

So I am really honored to work with Representative ARRINGTON, Representative FITZPATRICK, and Representative GALLAGHER on this. They have made most of the points. I will just add a few more.

Representative GALLAGHER referenced the Economist article, which I was shocked to see, where they had the turnover rate of European monarchies. They showed that the turnover rate of the United States Congress was less than European monarchies. I thought that is why we fought a revolution, that we didn't believe in dynastic rule. We didn't believe that people should just be in power for decade after decade.

Yet, the incumbent reelection rate remains at 95 or 98 percent. And you wonder, you say, how is it possible that our approval ratings are at 10 percent as a body, and yet 95 or 98 percent are getting reelected?

Sometimes, when I talk to friends, I say, it is as if there is a company that

is going bankrupt and all the presidents and vice presidents are fighting over who gets to be CEO.

Sometimes I think that is what the American people think. We are here fighting about who gets control, who gets to chair a committee, and the institution isn't working.

They are saying: Why don't the men and women fix the institution first? That is what term limits will do. I have seen it in my own class. I have seen how people of both sides of the aisle—and let's not be Pollyannaish about it. We probably vote differently on 95 percent of the issues. But I have seen that people in this class have come here with a sense of wanting to restore our democracy, of trying to fix something and make it functional, because we all heard that out on the campaign trail.

I get the loudest applause in one of the most liberal districts when I talk about working on legislation with a Republican like we did on the VALOR Act or writing an op-ed together and reaching across the aisle. That is what people are hungry for.

I believe that, if you have term limits and if you take the careerism out of it and if people know they are going to have about a decade to have an impact, you are going to encourage more efforts to find that common ground, more efforts to be willing to compromise when it makes sense for the Nation to look for some overlap in issues.

So I am committed to this. I really respect JODEY, again, in his leadership in pursuing this. It is not easy to make change, and a lot of times, after we do one of these things, it is easy to say: Okay. It is out in the press. We have had a meeting. We made the point.

But Mr. ARRINGTON has been so persistent about getting us back together, continuing to fight for this, and I echo the call that we should have a vote on the House floor, whoever the Speaker is, to make sure that the American people have their voices heard, and we can get a vote on term limits.

Mr. ARRINGTON, Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KHANNA. I think we would do a lot for the confidence of the American people if we could get a vote on it. I think they would believe that this body is actually responding to them, instead of just talking to each other in this bubble up here in Washington.

Again, there are good people, but there is a bad dynamic. You put good people in a bad dynamic and a history that creates a bad culture and you get bad outcomes.

So this isn't to disparage anybody on either side. It is to align the incentives so that we can be most responsive and do what was expected when the folks hired us to do this job, and that is to focus on their interests, the interests of our country, do the right thing, and put America first.

I am reminded from the comments of Mr. KHANNA that, when we had the meeting with the President—and I

want to say that Mr. MARK MEADOWS, the Representative from North Carolina, helped us a great deal to get that audience with the President. I think everybody here is grateful for his efforts to do that. We knew that, from the outset—Mr. KHANNA and I talked about this—that if we were going to have a path to success and not just make this part of the sort of rhetoric or some political box-checking exercise, but if we were going to really try to get this across the goal line with many others who have other pieces of legislation similar to our term limits legislation: A, it needed to be bipartisan; and, B, we needed buy-in from the drainer of the swamp in chief.

If there is anything that the man in the Oval Office, Donald J. Trump, represents, it is shaking up this culture. Whether you like the way he is shaking it up or not, that was the message, that they wanted change. They didn't want business as usual.

This is a proud moment for me because of my colleagues' response to the President when he said: Do you really think we are going to get a vote on this? Do you really think that you are actually going to get a vote whereby your fellow Members, who have been there longer than you all, would actually term limit themselves?

That is when my new friends and colleagues, Republican and Democrat, said: Mr. President, grandfather them in. Term limit us. Start with our class and every class that follows. Don't worry about the ones who are there. They may want a term limit, they may not. But we are not going to get into that. We don't want to slow this down. We want to be successful.

I really appreciate that response. I believe in it wholeheartedly. I am all in, and I am a true believer in what we are doing. So I thank Mr. KHANNA.

Now, Mr. TOM MARINO, the United States Representative from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the 10th District, he has been working on this before probably my freshmen colleagues had thought to even run for this in their respective offices. He introduced term limit legislation to help "return our government" to one that truly is for the people and by the people.

He believes, like I do, and the gentleman you heard speak earlier, that it is well past time to get Washington back to work for the American people.

So may God bless my friend TOM MARINO, as I yield to him to speak about this term limit effort.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ARRINGTON for providing this opportunity to talk about term limits, and I thank my colleagues who were here to comment on it.

First of all, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute and thank our veterans, our law enforcement, our emergency service people, and their families for how they protect us. If it weren't for them, we would not be able to be in this Chamber doing what we are doing tonight.

Now, I am probably, in years, age, the oldest Member here who is talking about term limits. I am in my eighth year, so it is my fourth term. When I first ran for Congress in 2010, I advocated for term limits, and I have introduced legislation in the past three election cycles for term limits.

President Trump ran on draining the swamp, and I believe that term limits are the exact way to ensure that we drain the swamp and effectively serve the American people. I can remember when I was on the campaign trail many, many months with the President, and one of the things he asked me, he said: What would you do to change Congress?

I said: Term limits.

He said to me: You would be putting yourself out of a job.

I said: It wasn't designed to be a lifetime career.

When he went out and spoke to the people, he raised that issue of term limits.

Now, I am not criticizing my colleagues who have been here longer than 12 years, because my term limit legislation is 12 years. But times have changed, and we have to change with the times to improve the quality of life for people.

As I said, my legislation would limit any Senator or any House Member to 12 years in office. Now, let me explain something on this concept. First of all, we use the word "Congress"; we use the word "House Member"; we use the word "Senator." Most of my colleagues know this, and most of the people know it, but Congress represents the House and the Senate.

The Members of the Senate are Members of Congress. The Members of the House are Members of Congress. For some reason, the Senate goes by "Senate," and we go by "Congress" or "House Members."

But I don't mean 12 years serving in the House and then 12 years in the Senate or vice versa. I mean 12 years and you are out. That would be six terms for Congressmen and two terms for a Senator, or vice versa, however they wanted to do it.

I was once told by a reporter who asked a Member, and I won't mention that Member's name in Congress, and you don't know if it is in the House or in the Senate: What do you think of MARINO's term limit legislation of 12 years?

The reporter told me that the elected official responded by saying: Well, we are only beginning to learn what is going on here and how it works in 12 years.

So my term limit legislation would hinder Congress' ability to get things

done. How's that been going? I completely disagree.

Opponents say we will not have the experience. Wrong, and that is a lame excuse.

They say that staff members will be making the decisions. Well, if there is a Member in the House or the Senate who is letting their staff members make the decisions, that elected official shouldn't be here.

Part of my background is that I worked in a factory until I was 30, started sweeping floors and worked my way up. I started college 2 weeks after my 30th birthday and then went on to law school. Having a background in the private sector, I can tell you that if a person in the private sector or who worked for someone in business were to argue that I need 12 years to start being successful or doing my job correctly, they would be fired in the first week.

□ 1815

The President is limited to two terms, 8 years. Many governors are limited to two terms. State House and Senate elected officials in some States are limited in their terms.

Why not Congress? It is not a lifetime career.

I am only advocating for term limits at the Federal level, not at the State level. It is completely ridiculous for a lawmaker to state that they are unable to serve their constituents unless they are here for longer than 12 years. Knowing that one is limited to 12 years, or a variation of that, then the elected official knows what they have to do to get the job done, what they promised.

We need to change the culture here in Congress, and term limits is the only way to accomplish this.

According to the most recent clear politics polling average, 18.4 percent of the American public approves of the job that Congress is doing. What does that tell us?

This certainly seems like a good argument for why we need turnover in Congress and new ideas consistently coming through the doors.

CEOs, chief executive officers, presidents of companies, chairmen and women of corporations leave or are asked to leave their position after 8 to 10 years, on average. And why is that? That is because the company wants fresh ideas. That is because that person who is in that position feels that they have accomplished all that they can and they move on to their next goal.

Serving in Congress was originally never viewed as a career or a lifetime appointment. We need new ideas from new Members, women and men, young and not so young.

There is a great deal of talent here in Congress and, with term limits, newer Members will have the ability to chair committees, instead of waiting for 15 or 20 years to be a chairman or a chairwoman.

We have, in the House, a person can serve 6 years on one committee as the

chair, and then move to another committee for 6 years. That is 12 years. I understand that that is the Republican side. I understand, and someone correct me if I am wrong, on the other side of the aisle it is lifetime in situations.

That doesn't give the talent, the new talent, the ability to move up and have a say of how things are run. It gives the new talent ability to get into leadership without having to be here 20 years.

The framers of the Constitution were not full-time legislators. They were businessmen, they were entrepreneurs, they were farmers, they were inventors, et cetera. They spent very little time actually in Philadelphia and in New York. They went back home with their constituents, and back home to their jobs.

See, there was a difference there between representing the people, putting together a Constitution, and then going back to your job.

There was also never supposed to be a permanent class that would rule over the citizens and without term limits that is what we have.

In 2016, 97 percent of all House Members who were seeking reelection won their races. We also must change, in Congress, the rules. They are outdated; they are old; they are inefficient, in both Chambers, in the House and in the Senate. But to do this, we need term limits.

As I said, I have brought up term limits the last three elections. I can't even get a hearing on it.

It is not healthy for our republic or for our constituents who deserve better.

I ask my constituents every time I am out in my district, and when I am speaking around the State, and in other States: Do you support my term limit of 12 years? And overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, it is a resounding yes. I have had people say to me, I never used to support term limits, but now I do.

I want to, again, thank Congressman ARRINGTON and the other Members that were here for holding this Special Order Hour to discuss this very important issue. I would encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting term limits to help drain the swamp and maintain a healthy legislative branch, or at least get it to a debate. This is a game-changer, term limits, and will improve the quality of life for Americans.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and his passion and his focus on the things that will really move the needle and really change the culture and really make a difference for his kids and grandkids. And I am thankful that he came and expressed his sentiments and the history behind his leadership and experience long before I showed up; and he has plowed some good ground for the new Members who spoke today, and we greatly appreciate that.

Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, I think we can be successful, I really do, and here is why. I think we have the precedents of the 22nd Amendment, which was done in the shadow that was cast by one of our greatest leaders, George Washington, and the custom and tradition of the 2 terms for President.

But the people, with angst and vehement opposition to more than two terms as President, spoke, and there was enough critical mass where we had the 22nd Amendment. We passed a constitutional amendment. It has already happened and it can happen again. I believe that we are embarking on such a time and a season in the life of this country.

And the public frustration, we have talked about the approval rating, popular reform. We talked about the polls. Over 80 percent of the American people want this. And then we talked about the man in the Oval Office who ran on draining the swamp. And this is a definitive measurable way to do that. It is not the only way; it is not the panacea for all of the ills culturally in this institution, but it would certainly be a big start.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to my colleagues for the support and for their eloquent and passionate remarks to advance this.

And I want to say a special thanks to the President for tweeting out on this after our meeting, for endorsing our efforts, and I encourage him. There are two things we need. We need the President to continue to make this a priority, and we need him to continue to talk about it; and we need the next leadership of this body, whatever that looks like and however that sorts out, we need the leadership to bring this to a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). It is not on the issue of term limits. It is on another very important issue.

RECOGNIZING ELI HERMAN

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas, Mr. ARRINGTON, for leading this Special Order and yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to share the story of a young American entrepreneur, Eli Herman, who lives with his parents, Teresa and Ritchie Herman, on their farm in Alexander County.

I met Eli and his parents at the Alexander County Draft Horse Pulling Contest recently, where he opened the contest by riding into the arena with his ponies and the American flag.

It was clear from the beginning of our meeting that Eli is not a typical 11-year old boy. This young man truly embodies the American entrepreneurial spirit and exudes patriotism.

At his young age, Eli has big dreams and the self-motivation he needs to accomplish them. Starting at a very young age, Eli raised his own calves and was able to earn some money from that endeavor. He made the decision to

use that money to purchase ponies and a wagon.

Now Eli owns 11 ponies, which he shows. He participates in events to promote American values, and will be participating in the North Carolina State Fair in October, where I know he will be a big hit.

Eli's long-term dream is, one day, to follow in the footsteps of his hero, Randy Derrer, the driver of the Wells Fargo stagecoach. He has my best wishes to achieve that dream, and it is my good fortune to have met him and his parents and know that they are among the many wonderful people in the Fifth District of North Carolina that it is my privilege to represent.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina. And I just say, in conclusion, before I yield the balance of my time back, Mr. Speaker, that, and I was remiss to not mention that this would be the appropriate way to conclude.

I want to thank the majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, for allowing my colleagues and I to speak on this issue on the floor of the House, of the people's House, and being open to allow Members to bring their ideas and the things that they ran on, the things that they are passionate about, that they believe will make the biggest difference for the future of this country.

To me, that is a big part of leadership, being big enough to allow people to take the microphone and speak on these issues, whether he believes in it, supports it or not, I don't know. But I know that he is a good leader for allowing us to speak about it, and I am grateful for that.

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

HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

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

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, tonight, in this hallowed Chamber of the House, in the U.S. Capitol, we pay tribute to a good friend, a patriot, a loyal Member of this House of Representatives, and the Senate, and that is John McCain, who we lost last week, after a long and productive life.

It seems fitting that we are here in the House Chamber with the portraits of George Washington and the Marquis de Lafayette, two generals in the army of the liberation in our American Revolu-

tion, two comrades at arms, two people who set the standard for high, ethical standards of leadership, and leading us in what we treasure today, our United States of America. And really John McCain epitomized that.

Mr. Speaker, it may be unusual that a Member from Arkansas would lead a tribute in honor of our distinguished former colleague, but there is a connection, because when I started, one of my earliest jobs was serving Senator John Tower of Texas, on his personal staff and on the staff of the Senate banking committee.

You couldn't work for John Tower and not be a friend to John McCain, because John McCain was, as a young captain, the liaison to the Senate between 1977 and 1981, and then he ran for office in 1982 in his home State of Arizona.

He said it was hard to decide to run. He didn't really have a home. The longest place he had lived before he ran for Congress from Arizona was in the Hanoi Hilton, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1830

And John Tower broke his promise to not campaign and mess around in a Republican primary by traveling Arizona and Texas helping John McCain win his election in 1982.

They were, like Lafayette and Washington, comrades in arms, both Navy men: Tower, the seniormost enlisted man elected to the Senate, and John McCain, a captain, son and grandson of admirals.

Tower's favorite story about John was when they went to Oman, and Captain McCain was his escort officer on a codel, and they were with the Sultan of Oman out in the desert in a tent, arrayed on beautiful carpets.

As you know, it is bad protocol to show one's soles of the feet in the Arab culture, and John McCain, Mr. Speaker, could not bend his legs from his beatings in the Hanoi Hilton. And so there he was, cross-legged—or tried to be cross-legged—in that tent in Oman with the soles of his feet pointing directly at the sultan.

It was Tower who said: Your Majesty, please understand that Captain McCain can't properly cross his legs, as he was a POW in Vietnam and is crippled from that horrible ordeal.

And the Sultan of Oman said: My dear Senator, I am a graduate of Sandhurst and a former captain in the British Army of the Rhine. I understand. And it is a pleasure to have Captain McCain at our table.

Years later, it was John McCain who worked his tail off to try to have John Tower confirmed as Secretary of Defense in 1989 for my old boss, President Bush, to no avail. But in the minutes before that failed vote in the Senate, McCain turned to Tower and said: God bless you, John Tower. You are a damn fine sailor.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to John McCain, his comradeship, his friendship with John Tower, his

service to this country, his undenied patriotic leadership and strength in the country that we have today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to call on my friend from Texas, and it is a special call, it is an emotional call for all of us in this Chamber tonight, to ask SAM JOHNSON to come to the podium, SAM JOHNSON, who spent 7 years in the Hanoi Hilton, 42 months in solitary confinement, a 29-year career in the Air Force.

So, Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend, the gentleman from Texas (Mr. SAM JOHNSON), and thank him for sharing his thoughts on his comrade in arms, former Senator John McCain.

Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for recognizing me, and I appreciate those comments.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to thank my colleague, FRENCH HILL, for arranging this Special Order to honor John.

Mr. Speaker, John was more than just a colleague in Congress. We were friends, and that friendship was forged in the infamous Hanoi Hilton. Not everyone knows that he and I shared a cell there together for a time.

I can testify to the fact that John did everything he could to defend freedom and honor our great Nation, not just in that hell on Earth, but beyond those bleak years. This is most evident in his service in the United States House and Senate.

John, we will remember your strength of spirit, your commitment to our servicemembers and our democracy, and your love of country.

I would now like to tap a special message for John and his family, who remain in my prayers. This tap code was used by the POWs to resist our captors.

That is a G. That is a B. And that is a U. And that is what we all used to use, "God bless you."

God bless you, partner. I salute you. Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank our good friend for his service.

SAM JOHNSON has served this Chamber so nobly during his years on Ways and Means and ends his career in the people's House this term. All of us treasure our time with him, our work together, and his leadership, and we treasure his remarks tonight in honor of his great comrade.

And, sir, we salute you and we thank you, and God bless you for all you have done for this great country.

With that, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. DENHAM), who serves on the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, Natural Resources. Also, he served this great country in the Air Force for 16 years, fought in Operation Desert Storm in Iraq, Operation Restore Hope in Somalia. We welcome him, and we thank him for his comments tonight.

Mr. DENHAM. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL for recognizing me.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to honor John McCain, a family man, a war hero, United States Senator, and a very, very close friend.

John was a one-of-a-kind, a man with an undeniable spirit, an incredible gift to work alongside people of different beliefs and backgrounds for the good of all people.

As a veteran, I recognized John's service went above and beyond the call of duty.

McCain was not the kind of man to put his brothers in arms at risk to save his own skin. Even as a POW, he put country first.

His patriotism was inspiring. It was so inspiring that, as a young airman at the time—I was going to junior college at Victor Valley College, became the student body president, and the first time they sent somebody to Washington, D.C., it was me. It was my first trip to Washington, D.C., and I actually got to meet the man that I had only read about and really got to know him, know John and his real character.

It was an honor to be with him in the 2000 campaign and again in the 2008 campaign. In 2008, we spent a lot of time traveling together throughout the West Coast, even spending some time in my district in Modesto, California.

Sonia and I were lucky enough to witness John at his happiest on his ranch in Sedona, working the grill, surrounded by family, to see the joy in the man's face just flipping shrimp and burgers and being around family in a very serene, beautiful spot.

John never lost sight of what truly mattered. He was willing to take on great risk in his political career, as he did in his military one, not because it was convenient or because it would benefit him, but because he knew it was the right thing to do.

John and I worked together to create a bipartisan fix for our broken immigration system. Together, we drafted the Uniting and Securing America Act, the USA Act, as he introduced it in the Senate, one that would provide a compromise for children who were brought here through no fault of their own and deserve an opportunity in this great country.

He and I had sat down initially in 2010 when I was first elected to Congress to talk about my idea on the ENLIST Act and talk about how you could show the ultimate act of patriotism and allow these kids in our high schools to be able to serve in the military. Together, we made sure our country had a serious discussion about real immigration reform for the first time in over 20 years.

Here in the U.S. House of Representatives and across the country, we must not lose sight of the vision John had for this Nation. His America was one defined by bipartisanship, optimism, and hope, looking forward to a brighter tomorrow where our Nation can come together as one; and I, too, believe in that vision.

I will be forever grateful to John for making me part of his incredible journey, and I pray that the example he set will serve as an inspiration for this Congress, for our Nation, and for generations to come.

Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL very much for yielding to me tonight and for honoring our great friend.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California. I appreciate his personal testimony about John's service and his friendship. I thank him again for his service to our country, not only in the people's House, but in the U.S. Air Force.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to my friend from Memphis, my neighbor from across the Mississippi River, the gentleman from Tennessee (Mr. COHEN), a Representative from Memphis who serves on the Committee on Ethics, where he is a ranking member. I am proud to have his contributions tonight in tribute and memory to our former colleague, Senator McCain.

Mr. COHEN. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL for scheduling this Special Order. It is most appropriate that we meet here and we talk about John McCain, whose elected political career started in this House with two terms in the House of Representatives.

I spent most of my life as an elected legislator, 39 years, and I value my service. I think highly of people who take the oath of office and support it and make people think that government is an honorable profession and encourage younger generations to get involved because they set good examples.

John McCain was one of those people who set a good example for American citizens to think well of their government, to think well of their leaders, and to desire to serve in public office.

John McCain was a person I only had a few opportunities to interact with, and each of those opportunities are ones I will never forget. He was as nice and kind as he could be.

But I knew him from his career. We didn't always agree. He was a conservative and a Republican. But when he was wrong, he learned and he changed, and that is a great sign of a human being, to be able to continually evolve and become a better human being.

When he was running for President, he wasn't able, in South Carolina, in 2000, to come out against the Confederate flag, but he later knew it was wrong, came out against it and admitted his mistake.

He learned about campaign finance and worked with Russ Feingold on campaign finance reform, and on that, he was a maverick.

And he was a maverick on climate change. He recognized science and the need to preserve our planet.

He recognized the need to have reasonable and good immigration laws to not only protect our borders, but to give others an opportunity to come to this country and continue to make our country greater, because what we are is a country of immigrants that has benefited from the brainpower and hard work of immigrants who have sought a better home for themselves and their families.

John McCain was courageous as a military leader in Vietnam when he

was in prison, but he was courageous as a politician. When he stood up to the lady that condemned Barack Obama and was trying to throw scurrilous remarks about Barack Obama—in her mind they were scurrilous—John McCain, the candidate, could have just gone on and let it pass and moved to the next subject, but he didn't because he had character and he had a soul. And he stopped and he told the lady: "No. You are wrong. Barack Obama is a good man. He is a good family man." And he spoke well of his opponent, something that we have not seen in recent Presidential elections, a Presidential candidate who rose above the fight and realized that Barack Obama and he were both Americans and on the same team even though he wanted to be President rather than Barack Obama.

There is so much that John McCain did. And when he came and did that famous thumbs-down on the ACA—yes, I was for the ACA, so I liked that a lot. I don't know if he did that because of the fact that the Senate wasn't following their rules and regular order, which was a good reason not to be for it, or if it was because he had recently found out that he had brain cancer and was undergoing a horrific health experience that he did face with great courage, but he saw that he had had the best medical treatment available, and I suspect he had to think about Americans who needed health insurance if they came into the same situation that he had experienced.

That showed he had empathy and he could grow and vote in a way as a human being and not just as a party person, because of others who suffer from health afflictions.

I watched every minute of the services in Phoenix, here in Washington, and was inspired—inspired—by Meghan McCain and her remarks and the two Presidents who were his opponents who spoke so well of him, and others.

□ 1845

I am sorry I couldn't attend those services on Saturday. I will be in Annapolis, Maryland, and I will visit his grave and pay my respects in person. He was a great American, and he was courageous. We are lucky he came our way.

Fair winds and following seas, John McCain.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Tennessee for his remarks about our friend John McCain.

Now, I would like to ask a colleague of his from Arizona, my friend, who we served on the House Financial Services Committee together, DAVE SCHWEIKERT, who represents Phoenix and Scottsdale and currently serves on the House Ways and Means Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to Representative SCHWEIKERT and thank him for being with us tonight.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL for doing this Special Order.

Mr. Speaker, I am going to give you, actually, a slightly different recollection, because I am one of those who, over the years, since almost 1982, had time around John McCain.

I want to start with the fact that I have had the pleasure of having John McCain step in when I was running for office and endorse me and help me and do things. And I have had the pleasure of having John McCain step into one of my races to oppose me and work against me.

It was always a really interesting experience, because one of the reasons I have never held hostility, and, actually, always really appreciated him, it is something that rarely happens around this body. Someone fusses at you and a couple of hours later calls you and says: Hey, I thought about that. We need to talk it through. I think there is a way we can fix it. Hey, I didn't mean that.

To have a U.S. Senator sometimes being frustrated with what you were doing, and then a couple of hours later call you and say: Hey, I am sorry. I was probably a little aggressive on that. I understand. Have you thought about doing it this way?

This place never says sorry. This place never sort of has that type of passion. And you heard over and over in the memorials in Phoenix and here at the Capitol discussions of people who were very close with Senator McCain, this sort of discussion of how human he was, how passionate he was.

I want to make the argument of someone who knew Senator McCain most of his life and interacted with him in and out throughout that life. It is that humanity, that ability to at one moment put a finger in my chest and fuss at me, and an hour later call me and say: David, how can I help you? I want to help you get something done. Can I help you get this done if you do it this way?

That humanity, that passion, is something that desperately is missing around here. We have all become so careful in everything we say and everything we do, because there is always the next moment we are going to get beaten up by someone out in the community, or the press, or those things.

Imagine this body if we all were like Senator McCain, where you just sort of let your passion fly. If you went a little too far, you said you were sorry. If it was something worth fighting for, you stood up and you engaged in it. And then, a few minutes later, you went out and had a hamburger with the very people you were debating.

Some of that is really missing around here, because we are so far in our camps. I am not sure the public completely understands the power, whether it be on the Democratic side or the Republican side, of when the cameras go off, when the reporters aren't around, when we are walking through the hallways, when we are in the elevator. There is this great humanity around here.

I think that humanity was exemplified by my former senior Senator, John McCain.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from Arizona. I thank him for his personal stories tonight and his tribute to our former friend from Arizona.

It is a pleasure for me to ask my friend from Fresno, California, Representative JIM COSTA, to share some thoughts on the life of John McCain.

Mr. COSTA serves on the Agriculture Committee and Natural Resources Committee, and we are grateful for him being with us tonight.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA).

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for giving me this opportunity to pay my tribute to Senator John McCain.

John McCain was clearly an American hero. His love and patriotism for our country knew no bounds. I first met Senator McCain in 2006 when we were on a congressional trip to Antarctica. We spent 6 days together, exploring the science and the efforts that were going on with NASA and with our Defense Department and American universities that were doing valuable research.

I got to witness firsthand his self-deprecating sense of humor. Like he did with many Members and people with whom he came into contact, he gave me counsel. During those days we spent together he said: Hey, kid, if you really want to learn how to do this right—well, first of all, I liked the fact that he called me kid—you ought to listen carefully. Too many people around here don't spend enough time listening.

For me, and for so many other Members and people professionally that Senator McCain came into contact with, he was a role model on how we should conduct ourselves, not only as Representatives, but also as people who want to solve problems. He, clearly, I think, set the bar quite high on how we develop bipartisan compromises.

I gave a speech here last year about what has happened to the art of the political compromise. Has it become a lost art? Well, Senator John McCain had fine-tuned his skills, his efforts to reach across the aisle, to figure out ways in which you could bring people together to find that art of the political compromise.

So his greatness, really, is one that reflects the true values of Americans. For all of us, I think he instilled the nature of—as we know in our country, historically, there is the politics of hope and there is the politics of hate. Many individuals have been successful at practicing both types of politics in their careers.

But Senator McCain's success was the politics of hope, the politics of love, love of country and love of his fellow Americans. It carried him through the trials and difficulties that life brings one's way, both in his service to

his country in the United States Navy and as a prisoner of war.

When he had the opportunity because of his status to leave the Hanoi Hilton early, he made it very clear he would not until every American prisoner of war left, and he suffered great torture as a result of that.

The lessons in life that Senator John McCain learned were lessons that he tried to teach to all of us in his conduct as a public servant, in which he put public service among the highest levels of contribution that one can make to their country.

So not only was he a role model for all of us, for Americans, but throughout the world. When we traveled in the Middle East, in Europe, my Congressman colleague, Congressman MARIO DIAZ-BALART, and I, who worked closely with our European colleagues, John McCain was sought after for advice, for understanding the body politic, what was happening in America, and how we could better work together with our European allies, and the values that we hold most dear, the values of human rights, the values of freedom of speech, the values of ensuring that we protect our democratic institutions.

Senator John McCain really reflected the best that America has to offer, which is why he was so well respected around the world. When you went to countries in which you had autocrats and dictators and you had issues of human rights, he was always sought after by those who were oppressed, because there was, clearly, a sense of empathy that they understood that he had for them.

So as I close, let me say that the tributes that we pay to him are small in comparison to what he gave to our country. The book that President John F. Kennedy wrote, "Profiles in Courage," if there were to be a second book in the 21st century, clearly, Senator John McCain would be one of those individuals who, throughout his career, exemplified what it means to have profiles in courage in his conduct, in his daily life, in the practice of the politics that he led through example, which are lessons for all of us to learn.

Senator John McCain, a grateful Nation can never, ever say thank you enough for all that you did and all that you gave. God bless you.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend from California for his personal memories and tribute to Senator McCain.

It is a pleasure now for me to yield to my friend from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART).

Senator McCain, throughout his life, was such a great voice for our Bill of Rights, for liberty across the world, for the fight against communism during the Cold War, and for the fight for trade and leadership by the American people and our great country around the world.

I think the same of my friend, MARIO DIAZ-BALART from Florida, who with his friend JIM COSTA helps lead our par-

liamentary dialogue between the Transatlantic Economic Council in the EU and the United States.

I thank my friend, also a member of the Ways and Means Committee, for coming tonight and sharing his thoughts on Senator McCain.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I thank Mr. HILL for allowing us, those of us who knew, worked with, admired John McCain, to have this moment, to have this time to honor and to remember and to, frankly, speak about someone who all of us admired so much.

Senator John McCain was, as you have heard from everyone and from all of us who knew him and who had contact with him, he was a patriot and he was a great American hero. I am profoundly blessed to count this man as both a trusted colleague and a loyal friend.

We have heard so many things about him today, tonight, because, again, of this wonderful moment that Mr. HILL has done for us here tonight, allowed us to do tonight.

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

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, Senator John McCain was an extraordinarily brave and noble man—a hero a dedicated husband, father, fighter pilot, and an amazing lawmaker. He endured and overcame unspeakable horrors as a POW, and as a lawmaker never ceased working for members of our armed forces and veterans. And on matters of principle and conviction, Senator McCain was fiercely independent, always willing—even eager—to bend into the wind and not with it.

John McCain and I were colleagues on the House Foreign Affairs Committee when he was in the House. In fact we sat next to each other, and so I got to know him, and valued his intelligence and expertise. Then-Congressman McCain and I were very much in sync on supporting the administration's vigorous opposition to communism, rebuilding of the U.S. military, and its robust internationalism, as well as the re-emergence of a principled commitment to human rights and defense of democracy as core principles of U.S. foreign policy.

He vigorously defended the downtrodden, the underdog, the forgotten and disenfranchised, including the unborn. Already in these years on our committee, his willingness to do the right thing regardless of partisanship was a blessing to this country.

My wife Marie and I will always cherish and deeply respect the incomparable Senator John McCain. Marie joined me and thousands of others at the National Cathedral last Saturday to say goodbye to this great patriot and American hero. All the tributes were extraordinarily moving, including those by Meghan McCain, and Presidents Bush and Obama.

Our nation is deeply grateful for the sacrifice and service of John McCain., and our hearts and prayers are with Cindy, and with his entire family.

HONORING JOHN MCCAIN

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Florida (Mr. DIAZ-BALART) for 30 minutes.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, one thing that some of you may not know about John McCain's time at the Hanoi Hilton was that he spoke of a Castro regime thug and his Cuban underling. They were sent to Vietnam to torture American POWs, to torture John McCain's friends. He had hoped to one day identify those barbaric individuals and bring them to justice.

Sadly, John did not see that egregious injustice, along with so many perpetuated by the Castro regime, resolved in his lifetime.

John witnessed firsthand the evil of communism, along with the tyranny and the inhumanity that it breeds. A tyrant capable of such brutal oppression of his own people could also be responsible for unspeakable atrocities to those who would stand up to the tyranny.

Perhaps that experience, Mr. Speaker, personally motivated John McCain's passionate advocacy for freedom and human dignity, as well as his untiring outreach to those languishing under tyranny anywhere in the world, as Mr. COSTA mentioned just a little while ago.

He was a fitting chairman of the International Republican Institute's board since 1993, an organization whose mission is to promote freedom and civil society and democracy to some of the world's most repressive environments. That mission aligned perfectly with Senator McCain.

So, yes, although I am deeply saddened by a loss of such magnitude, I will tell you that I am encouraged by the knowledge that his example will continue to inspire and educate for many, many generations to come.

There will never be another one like John McCain and we are all fortunate to have had the benefit of his service to our Nation.

Mr. HILL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. I yield to the gentleman from Arkansas.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time to thank my colleagues for coming to the House floor to this hallowed Chamber of the people's House and paying tribute to a distinguished Member of this House, a distinguished United States Senator, and someone who epitomizes the best of American character.

We were all inspired by the stories shared tonight, particularly I think by the touching tribute of a colleague in the Hanoi Hilton, SAM JOHNSON of Texas. I will remember that time for the rest of my days.

In conclusion, Mr. Speaker, let me just say that as John McCain communicated with SAM JOHNSON in the Hanoi Hilton, I say we salute this fine sailor and say God bless you.

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I, again, thank Mr. HILL for bringing us together and for allowing us to remember and to honor a great American hero.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 4318. An act to amend the Harmonized Tariff Schedule of the United States to modify temporarily certain rates of duty.

H.R. 5385. An act to amend the Public Health Service Act to reauthorize the program of payments to children's hospitals that operate graduate medical education programs, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5772. An act to designate the J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Courthouse in Amarillo, Texas, as the "J. Marvin Jones Federal Building and Mary Lou Robinson United States Courthouse".

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. DIAZ-BALART. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 1 minute p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, September 7, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS,
ETC.

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

6153. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval and Air Quality Designation; KY; Redesignation of the Kentucky Portion of the Louisville Unclassifiable Area [EPA-R04-OAR-2017-0390; FRL-9982-70-Region 4] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6154. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Air Plan Approval; Washington; Interstate Transport Requirements for the 2012 PM_{2.5} NAAQS [EPA-R10-OAR-2018-0060; FRL-9982-46-Region 10] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6155. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Approval of Air Quality Implementation Plans; New York; Subpart 225-1, Fuel Composition and Use — Sulfur Limitations [EPA-R02-OAR-2016-0414; FRL-9982-80-Region 2] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6156. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — District of Columbia: Final Authorization of District Hazardous Waste Management Program Revisions [EPA-R03-RCRA-2017-0553; FRL-9982-19-Region 3] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6157. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Oil and Hazardous Substances Pollution Contingency Plan; Na-

tional Priorities List: Deletion of the Ordinance Works Disposal Areas Superfund Site [EPA-HQ-SFUND-1986-0005; FRL-9982-57-Region 3] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6158. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — Partial Approval and Partial Disapproval of Air Quality State Implementation Plans; Arizona; Infrastructure Requirements for Nitrogen Dioxide and Sulfur Dioxide [EPA-R09-OAR-2015-0472; FRL-9982-23-Region 9] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6159. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Rules and Regulations Under the Textile Fiber Products Identification Act (RIN: 3084-AB47) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6160. A letter from the Secretary, Federal Trade Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Energy Labeling Rule (RIN: 3084-AB15) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

6161. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pollock in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG048) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6162. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF902) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6163. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 630 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG078) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6164. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands; 2018 and 2019 Harvest Specifications for Groundfish; Correction [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG158) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6165. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone

Off Alaska; Kamchatka Flounder in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 170817779-8161-02] (RIN: 0648-XG305) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6166. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Merchant Marine Act and Magnuson-Stevens Act Provisions; Fishing Vessel, Fishing Facility and Individual Fishing Quota and Harvesting Rights Lending Program Regulations [Docket No.: 170404355-8455-02] (RIN: 0648-BG80) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6167. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Inseason Adjustment to the 2018 Gulf of Alaska Pollock and Pacific Cod Total Allowable Catch Amounts [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF867) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6168. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Atka Mackerel in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF889) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6169. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Vessels Using Jig Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF894) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6170. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Catcher Vessels Using Hook-and-Line Gear in the Western Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF907) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6171. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Reallocation of Pacific Cod in the Bering Sea and Aleutian Islands Management Area [Docket No.: 161020985-7181-02] (RIN: 0648-XF908) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6172. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pacific Cod by Non-

American Fisheries Act Crab Vessels Operating as Catcher Vessels Using Pot Gear in the Central Regulatory Area of the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 160920866-7167-02] (RIN: 0648-XF940) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6173. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Exclusive Economic Zone Off Alaska; Pollock in Statistical Area 610 in the Gulf of Alaska [Docket No.: 170816769-8162-02] (RIN: 0648-XG076) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6174. A letter from the Deputy Assistant Administrator for Regulatory Programs, NMFS, Office of Protected Resources, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Taking and Importing Marine Mammals; Taking Marine Mammals Incidental to Northwest Fisheries Science Center Fisheries Research [Docket No.: 151027994-6421-02] (RIN: 0648-BF47) received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

6175. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; New Castle, IN [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0290; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AGL-9] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6176. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Establishment of Class E Airspace; Freeport, PA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0426; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AEA-8] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6177. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Chicago Class B and Chicago Class C Airspace; Chicago, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0632; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWA-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6178. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Multiple Restricted Area Boundary Descriptions; Florida [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0728; Airspace Docket No.: 18-ASO-2] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6179. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Lansing, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0101; Airspace Docket No.: 18-AGL-4] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6180. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31206; Amdt. No.: 3811] received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6181. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31207; Amdt. No.: 3812] received August 30, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

6182. A letter from the Chairman, Office of Proceedings and the Office of Economics, Surface Transportation Board, transmitting the Board's final rule — Regulations Governing Fees for Services Performed in Connection with Licensing and Related Services — 2018 Update [Docket No.: EP 542 (Sub-No. 26)] received August 23, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

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. BISHOP of Utah: Committee on Natural Resources. H.R. 6088. A bill to amend the Mineral Leasing Act to authorize notifications of permit to drill, and for other purposes; with an amendment (Rept. 115-921). 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 Mr. COFFMAN (for himself and Mr. HIMES):

H.R. 6713. A bill to promote the creation of State anonymous school threat reporting programs, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 6714. A bill to direct the Director of the Administrative Office of the United States Courts to consolidate the Case Management/Electronic Case Files system, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGEVIN (for himself and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 6715. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 20 Ferry Road in Saunterstown, Rhode Island, as the "Captain Matthew J. August Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. MCKINLEY (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6716. A bill to redesignate certain facilities of the National Aeronautics and Space Administration; to the Committee on Science, Space, and Technology.

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 6717. A bill to amend the Federal Food, Drug, and Cosmetic Act to require

that the label of drugs with an increased risk of suicide or depression present such increased risk prominently, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania (for himself, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mrs. BLACK):

H.R. 6718. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to provide that health insurance coverage statements are required to be provided to individuals only upon request; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (for himself and Mr. FERGUSON):

H.R. 6719. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 120 12th Street Lobby in Columbus, Georgia, as the "Richard W. Williams Chapter of the Triple Nickles (555th P.I.A.) Post Office"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. BUCHANAN (for himself, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. BRAT, Mr. FITZPATRICK, Ms. TITUS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. DONOVAN, and Mr. BLUMENAUER):

H.R. 6720. A bill to prohibit the slaughter of dogs and cats for human consumption, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. BUDD (for himself and Mr. PEARCE):

H.R. 6721. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to modernize the research, development, information sharing, and acquisition process of the Financial Crimes Enforcement Network, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Ms. FUDGE (for herself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H.R. 6722. A bill to amend the Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965 to establish the Stronger Together Program; to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 6723. A bill to amend the National Voter Registration Act of 1993 to prohibit a State from registering an individual to vote in elections for Federal office held in the State unless the individual provides documentary proof that the individual is a citizen of the United States; to the Committee on House Administration.

By Mr. GIBBS (for himself and Mr. WILSON of South Carolina):

H.R. 6724. A bill to limit the authority of a State to require remote sellers to collect taxes and fees owed by purchasers then located in such State incident to their purchases of goods and services from such sellers, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself and Ms. STEFANIK):

H.R. 6725. A bill to authorize the Secretary of Defense, upon request of the Ministry of Defense of Israel and with the concurrence of the Secretary of State, to carry out research, development, test, and evaluation activities, on a joint basis with Israel, to establish directed energy capabilities that address threats to the United States, deployed forces of the United States, or Israel, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services, and in addition to the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. MARCHANT (for himself and Mr. CROWLEY):

H.R. 6726. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to repeal certain provisions

applicable to foreign investment in United States real property; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Ms. MOORE (for herself, Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, and Mr. GALLEGOS):

H.R. 6727. A bill to establish an innovative water technology grant program and to amend the Safe Drinking Water Act and the Federal Water Pollution Control Act to encourage the use of emerging and innovative water technology, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce, and in addition to the Committees on Transportation and Infrastructure, and Natural Resources, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. O'HALLERAN (for himself and Mr. COLE):

H.R. 6728. A bill to protect Native children and promote public safety in Indian country; to the Committee on Natural Resources, and in addition to the Committees on Education and the Workforce, and Energy and Commerce, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. WAGNER (for herself, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, and Mrs. LOVE):

H.R. 6729. A bill to allow nonprofit organizations to register with the Secretary of the Treasury and share information on activities that may involve human trafficking or money laundering with financial institutions and regulatory authorities, under a safe harbor that offers protections from liability, in order to better identify and report potential human trafficking or money laundering activities; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. PRICE of North Carolina (for himself and Ms. MATSUI):

H. Con. Res. 134. Concurrent resolution recognizing September 11, 2018, as a "National Day of Service and Remembrance"; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

By Mr. CASTRO of Texas (for himself, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COURTNEY, and Mr. GALLAGHER):

H. Res. 1052. A resolution affirming United States-Australia cooperation on space research, exploration, and utilization; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. GALLAGHER (for himself, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. BACON, Mr. MOULTON, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. COURTNEY, Mr. AUSTIN SCOTT of Georgia, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. KINZINGER, and Ms. SINEMA):

H. Res. 1053. A resolution supporting renaming NATO Headquarters after the late United States Senator John Sidney McCain III; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. McEACHIN (for himself and Mr. SCOTT of Virginia):

H. Res. 1054. A resolution commemorating Arthur Ashe, a native of Richmond, Virginia, on the 50th anniversary of his historic win at the 1968 United States Open Tennis Championship and honoring his humanitarian contributions to civil rights, education, the movement against apartheid in South Africa, and HIV/AIDS awareness; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the

following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. COFFMAN:

H.R. 6713.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8 of the United States Constitution.

By Mr. COLLINS of Georgia:

H.R. 6714.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the Constitution of the United States of America

By Mr. LANGEVIN:

H.R. 6715.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. MCKINLEY:

H.R. 6716.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. RUSH:

H.R. 6717.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1: "The Congress shall have power to . . . provide for the . . . general welfare of the United States"

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3: The Congress shall have power "To regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes;" and

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18: "The Congress shall have power "To make all laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into execution the foregoing powers, and all other powers vested by this Constitution in the government of the United States, or in any department or officer thereof."

By Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 6718.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution

By Mr. BISHOP of Georgia:

H.R. 6719.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 7, "The Congress shall have Power to . . . establish Post Offices and Post Roads . . ." In the Constitution, the power possessed by Congress embraces the regulation of the Postal System in the country. Therefore, the proposed legislation in naming a post office would fall under the powers granted to Congress in the Constitution.

By Mr. BUCHANAN:

H.R. 6720.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, clause 3 provides Congress with the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Mr. BUDD:

H.R. 6721.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 18 of the United States Constitution.

By Mrs. FUDGE:

H.R. 6722.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, section 8, clause 3, the Commerce Clause.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 6723.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 4, Clause 1: The Times, Places, and Manner of holding Elections for Senators and Representatives, shall be prescribed by each state by the legislature thereof; but the Congress may at any time by Law make or such Regulations, except as to the Places of choosing Senators.

By Mr. GIBBS:

H.R. 6724.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 3 of the Constitution of the United States.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 6725.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8

By Mr. MARCHANT:

H.R. 6726.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section 8 of the U.S. Constitution, which gives Congress the "power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises."

By Ms. MOORE:

H.R. 6727.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. O'HALLERAN:

H.R. 6728.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18

By Mrs. WAGNER:

H.R. 6729.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8, clause 1 (relating to the general Welfare of the United States); Article I, section 8, clause 3 (relating to regulating Commerce with foreign Nations, and among the several States, and with the Indian Tribes); and Amendment XIII (relating to slavery and involuntary servitude, which authorizes Congress to make laws enforcing the extension of civil rights and universal freedom to victims of slavery)

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 242: Mr. RUIZ.
 H.R. 354: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 466: Mr. COOK.
 H.R. 559: Mr. GOWDY.
 H.R. 592: Ms. SANCHEZ.
 H.R. 644: Mr. GIANFORTE.
 H.R. 930: Mr. MITCHELL.
 H.R. 939: Mr. BOST.
 H.R. 1017: Mr. DUNN.
 H.R. 1048: Mr. ALLEN.
 H.R. 1161: Mr. UPTON.
 H.R. 1178: Mr. CLOUD.
 H.R. 1251: Mr. FITZPATRICK.
 H.R. 1275: Mr. CRAMER.
 H.R. 1279: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 1318: Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California.
 H.R. 1421: Mr. LYNCH and Ms. MATSUI.
 H.R. 1552: Mr. WITTMAN.
 H.R. 1605: Mr. MAST.
 H.R. 1615: Mr. SERRANO and Mr. POLIS.
 H.R. 1651: Mrs. TORRES.
 H.R. 1683: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. NORMAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
 H.R. 1881: Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee.
 H.R. 1902: Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
 H.R. 1987: Mr. HASTINGS.
 H.R. 2092: Mr. LARSEN of Washington and Mr. HOLDING.
 H.R. 2248: Mr. LAMB.
 H.R. 2310: Mr. BIGGS.

- H.R. 2327: Mr. GARAMENDI.
H.R. 2328: Mrs. LAWRENCE.
H.R. 2472: Mr. ESPAILLAT.
H.R. 2476: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 2556: Ms. SINEMA.
H.R. 2651: Mr. SCHNEIDER.
H.R. 2814: Ms. GABBARD.
H.R. 3081: Mr. MOULTON.
H.R. 3160: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H.R. 3395: Mr. GIANFORTE.
H.R. 3402: Mr. CRAMER.
H.R. 3513: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 3558: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 3635: Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 3687: Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 3787: Mr. STIVERS.
H.R. 3918: Mr. CICILLINE.
H.R. 3919: Ms. STEFANIK and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4006: Mr. KNIGHT.
H.R. 4099: Mr. EMMER.
H.R. 4107: Mr. THOMPSON of California, Mr. CRAMER, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, and Mr. RENACCI.
H.R. 4143: Mr. RUTHERFORD.
H.R. 4256: Mr. ROGERS of Kentucky, Ms. MENG, Mr. BARR, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. LUCAS.
H.R. 4638: Mr. KILDEE and Mr. CLAY.
H.R. 4647: Ms. KAPTUR, Mr. WELCH, Mr. GAETZ, Ms. JENKINS of Kansas, Mr. FASO, and Ms. BASS.
H.R. 4691: Mr. BARLETTA and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 4693: Mr. MAST.
H.R. 4912: Ms. MCCOLLUM, Ms. JAYAPAL, Ms. MOORE, Mr. COURTNEY, and Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire.
H.R. 4957: Mr. POCAN.
H.R. 5003: Mr. ZELDIN.
H.R. 5006: Mr. STIVERS and Mr. HULTGREN.
H.R. 5060: Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 5115: Mr. ROSKAM, Ms. ESTY of Connecticut, and Ms. BROWNLEY of California.
H.R. 5161: Mrs. TORRES.
H.R. 5191: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5266: Mr. ROYCE of California, Mr. BARR, Mr. LUCAS, Mr. HULTGREN, and Mr. TIPTON.
H.R. 5306: Mr. BARR and Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.
H.R. 5428: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 5429: Mr. COURTNEY.
H.R. 5474: Mr. KENNEDY and Mr. LYNCH.
H.R. 5671: Mr. SUOZZI and Mrs. COMSTOCK.
H.R. 5760: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 5780: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas, Mr. LAMB, Mr. MAST, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Ms. MATSUI.
H.R. 5879: Mr. DUNCAN of South Carolina.
H.R. 5899: Mr. VALADAO.
H.R. 5924: Mr. DESANTIS.
H.R. 5977: Ms. ROSEN and Ms. MCCOLLUM.
H.R. 6043: Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania and Ms. BONAMICI.
H.R. 6048: Mr. GENE GREEN of Texas.
H.R. 6086: Mr. MCNERNEY.
H.R. 6108: Mr. KATKO and Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6114: Mr. WELCH, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. TONKO.
H.R. 6137: Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6227: Mr. CARBAJAL.
H.R. 6236: Mr. DESAULNIER.
H.R. 6246: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H.R. 6251: Mr. HUFFMAN.
H.R. 6275: Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 6292: Mr. CRIST.
H.R. 6315: Mr. BROWN of Maryland, Mr. WELCH, Mr. SIRES, and Mr. HASTINGS.
H.R. 6337: Mr. MARSHALL.
H.R. 6390: Ms. STEFANIK.
H.R. 6417: Mrs. BLACKBURN, Mr. RUSSELL, Mr. POE of Texas, Mr. MESSER, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. KUSTOFF of Tennessee, and Mr. WITTMAN.
H.R. 6437: Mr. O'ROURKE.
H.R. 6474: Mr. TAKANO.
H.R. 6510: Mr. GOTTHEIMER, Mr. DONOVAN, Ms. ESHOO, Mr. SOTO, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. POCAN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Mr. DELANEY, and Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6531: Ms. NORTON, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Ms. KAPTUR.
H.R. 6544: Mr. BRAT.
H.R. 6545: Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mrs. MURPHY of Florida, Mr. DEFAZIO, Mr. AGUILAR, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. GALLEG0, and Ms. MENG.
H.R. 6559: Mr. RICE of South Carolina.
H.R. 6562: Mr. LAMALFA, Mr. STEWART, and Mr. CALVERT.
H.R. 6586: Ms. JAYAPAL.
H.R. 6606: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. COSTELLO of Pennsylvania, Mr. SHUSTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, and Mr. ROTHFUS.
H.R. 6626: Mr. MACARTHUR.
H.R. 6631: Ms. LOFGREN.
H.R. 6649: Mr. SOTO, Mrs. DAVIS of California, Mr. KEATING, and Mr. PETERS.
H.R. 6657: Mr. BUCK and Mr. SMITH of Texas.
H.R. 6692: Mr. CAPUANO.
H.R. 6695: Mr. FLORES.
H.R. 6703: Mr. GOSAR.
H.R. 6711: Mr. ELLISON, Ms. JAYAPAL, and Mr. HIMES.
H.J. Res. 31: Mr. PRICE of North Carolina.
H. Con. Res. 9: Mr. COHEN.
H. Res. 342: Ms. MOORE, Mr. RUPPERS-BERGER, and Ms. FRANKEL of Florida.
H. Res. 864: Mrs. LAWRENCE, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. RUSH, Mrs. BUSTOS, and Ms. BARRAGAN.
H. Res. 910: Mr. SCHWEIKERT, Mr. MAST, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. POCAN, and Mr. ELLISON.
H. Res. 930: Mr. PETERS.
H. Res. 931: Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York.
H. Res. 991: Mr. MAST.
H. Res. 1022: Mr. DENHAM, Mr. RENACCI, and Mr. RYAN of Ohio.
H. Res. 1025: Ms. MOORE.
H. Res. 1026: Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BLUM, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. BACON.
H. Res. 1031: Mr. CUMMINGS, Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, and Ms. JUDY CHU of California.
H. Res. 1034: Mr. GOHMERT, Mr. CURBELO of Florida, Mr. DONOVAN, Mr. LOUDERMILK, Mr. MARCHANT, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. BISHOP of Michigan, Ms. CHENEY, Mr. DAVID SCOTT of Georgia, Mr. CHABOT, Mr. PITTENGER, Mr. TIPTON, Mr. LATTA, Mrs. MIMI WALTERS of California, Mr. WENSTRUP, Ms. MICHELLE LUJAN GRISHAM of New Mexico, Mr. MAST, Mr. PALLONE, and Mr. SAM JOHNSON of Texas.
H. Res. 1036: Mr. SIRES.

DELETIONS OF SPONSORS FROM PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were deleted from public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 6417: Mr. BISHOP of Georgia.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 3 of rule XII,
121. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Gregory D. Watson, a citizen of Austin, TX, relative to urging Congress to cease the appropriation of United States Federal Government funds for financial aid to foreign nations; which was referred to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.