Federal Employee Retroactive Pay Fairness Act.

This bill is unusual. Usually you do everything you can when you introduce a bill to get it passed. You work hard to get it written into law. But this bill, I will do everything I can to prevent it from being considered because, if it becomes law, it means that Congress has failed and we have shut down our government.

Republicans hold the White House and both Chambers of the Congress, so what happens next is up to them. I hope my friends here will have nothing to do with the White House plan to hold hostage the budget agreement and payments to stabilize health insurance rates. I urge my colleagues to act swiftly and responsibly to work out a bipartisan funding bill and avoid a government shutdown.

ESSENTIAL AIR SERVICE FUNDING CUTS

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

Mr. BERGMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise on behalf of communities across Michigan's First District that depend on Essential Air Service funding for industry, mobility, and economic success. I believe that, when it comes to protecting taxpayer dollars, we as Congress have a fiduciary responsibility to the American people. We owe it to them to evaluate what is working and what isn't and make the appropriate adjustments.

The Essential Air Service program is a great example of a program that is working, and I am proud to support it. EAS grants make it possible for 8 of the 10 airports in Michigan's First District to provide reliable air services, promote economic stability and job growth, and support a healthy tourism industry in the Upper Peninsula and throughout northern Michigan.

The benefits that this program provides to small towns and cities in Michigan and across the United States are well worth the investment, and I look forward to working with my colleagues in Congress to ensure full Essential Air Service funding.

HONORING THE LIFE OF SHARON GIESE

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

Mr. BIGGS. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to commemorate the life of Sharon Giese. Sharon passed away unexpectedly in Arizona last week, a few short days after the death of her husband, Burt.

Sharon was a respected, admired, and cherished member of our community. She had a long history of promoting conservative principles, and everyone she touched will miss her steady voice. Sharon Giese was a steadfast icon of the conservative movement in Arizona and a former Republican National Committeewoman.

Mr. Speaker, I pray that the family of Burt and Sharon will receive peace in remembering their lives of purpose and distinction. These two individuals made a difference for Arizona and for the causes they dedicated themselves to. Burt and Sharon left behind a wonderful legacy for their family, community, church, and State.

Like Sharon, we do not have knowledge of the moment of our life's final breath, but we are exhorted to run with endurance the race that is set before us. Sharon Giese ran her race with an abundance of endurance and inspired countless individuals around her. Her example will be celebrated and her loss mourned.

AUTISM SPEAKS OUT

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

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise tonight to recognize the beginning of World Autism Month. I am wearing this blue pin to raise awareness for those impacted by autism around the country.

There are over 70 million people with autism worldwide, with more children diagnosed each year than with AIDS, diabetes, and cancer combined. This disease impairs the ability for folks to communicate and socialize. This April, it is my goal to join forces with my House colleagues to recognize what has become the fastest growing serious developmental disorder in the United States, one that early intervention can greatly help.

On average, having a child with autism costs a family $60,000 per year, an expense that many families cannot afford but are left with no choice. School-based services provide vital education and developmental tools for children with autism, but what happens when the schooldays are over? Once a child with autism reaches the age of 18, many families face a services cliff. They are no longer able to access the care they need.

As we work to reform health care in this 115th Congress, we must ensure that individuals have access to the affordable treatment they need and improve the outcomes for youth who are transitioning out of the school system as well. Go to autismspeaks.org, and let's deal with and work for quality of life improvements for these folks. I urge my House and Senate colleagues to do the same.

MAKE IT IN AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZPATRICK). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, the good news is this will probably be about 15—maybe 20—minutes, but it is a subject that is very, very important to all of us.

Actually, I am going to start on a slightly different subject, and that is what is wrong with this picture. A master sergeant at one of the air bases in the United States who has served for some almost 30 years, married the last 18 years to a young woman with three children. She attempted to return from deployment in the United Kingdom, had her passport removed, and she was deported to Mexico. Her children are in the United States. She served for 18 years alongside her husband as he built and maintained America's fleet of spy planes.

What is wrong with this picture, America, that a wife of a servicemember who served for 18 years alongside her husband, a master sergeant, cannot come back into the United States because of an error that was made years and years ago?

We are going to follow this up. When our generals talk about taking care of their troops, may I suggest they also take care of their spouses. We have got work to do here.

But the subject matter for tonight is a little different, although that issue is much on my mind. Some of you may have seen this on the news a month and a half ago. That is the Oroville Dam spillway. A maintenance problem not paid attention to over the years resulted in a massive failure of the spillway and put 188,000 of my constituents and Mr. LAMALFA's constituents at risk.

This is the Interstate 5 bridge in Washington State connecting the United States to Canada. It collapsed. We could put up pictures of other bridges in Minnesota, et cetera. What we are talking about tonight is infrastructure, not just about infrastructure. The President wants a trillion-dollar infrastructure program, and we await his proposal. It would be good. We would put millions of Americans to work if we were to have that infrastructure program.

But there is more to it than just infrastructure. In the last 5-year transportation bill, I was successful in working with other Members here to insert into that bill that at least 70 percent of the value in our transit systems be American made. So tonight's subject matter is really about the failing infrastructure, but it is also about making it in America.

This is a subject matter that, for 7 years, I have talked about on the floor here: Make It In America. Our President wants to talk about this and, in fact, recently issued an executive order that says we ought to make it in America. He instructed his administration, as few as they are, to make sure that, in every effort, the Buy American provisions be honored. That has not been the case in the past. What we need to do is make certain that we make it in

America, that we spend the American taxpayer money on American-made products.

Let me give you an example of what it means when you actually do that—or maybe an example of what it means when you don't do that.

Now, Californians take great pride in their State. We have the Golden Gate Bridge. We have Yosemite. We have the great industries of southern California—the entertainment, the movie industries and the rest—and we have San Francisco. We also have major policy problems. Make It In America: I want to give you two different examples.

The San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge, now completed. It is a beautiful bridge, and it replaces an old bridge that was built in the 1930s that was seriously deficient. However, it was made with a large, large input of Chinese steel. It actually came in $3.9 billion over budget, but we did provide some 3,000 jobs in China, and we allowed the Chinese steel industry to build a new steel mill to be able to produce the very high-quality steel that was supposed to be in the bridge. However, the steel that they shipped wasn't exactly high quality, the welds weren't exactly good, and we wound up seriously over budget for that as well as other reasons.

So maybe Californians don't always have the position of taking pride in all that is done. This I take no pride in. This was a serious mistake by the State government, a serious mistake by the agency that ran and put this bridge into process. What would it mean if, for example, instead of trying to save 10 percent on the cost of steel, our Californian colleagues would have actually said, well, maybe those jobs should be in America and that new steel mill should be in America? Could have, should have, but it didn't happen.

Now, on the other side of the continent we have New York. Now, we Californians don't much like to talk about New York but, hey, here is something to talk about. Here is something that really worked out well.

It seems as though New York wanted a new bridge over the Hudson River, the new Tappan Zee Bridge in New York, and they made a decision: it was going to be built with American steel. Wow, what a noble thought. And all of that from New York, as opposed to California that said: Oh, let's go with China.

So what happened? The steel arrived. The steel was quality. The bridge was built, $3.9 billion, on budget, on time, and there was some 7,700-plus American jobs. It makes a difference when you make it in America and when your tax dollars—State, local, and Federal—are spent on American-made equipment and supplies: American steel, American jobs, an American bridge.

The Oakland Bay Bridge, San Francisco-Oakland Bay Bridge: Chinese steel, Chinese jobs, over budget, bad quality, and the story is not a good one.

So the issue of the day is: Buy American. Yes, indeed, we should and we could. Let me give you an example of what happens.

My Republican colleagues like to take on the bailout. They like to talk about how bad the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act was. It wasn't bad. It was actually very good. It could have been better if there had been more infrastructure and more Buy American, but there is one provision in the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that really made a difference.

□ 1945

It was for the Amtrak systems. Basically, the systems here on the East Coast, the electrification. New locomotives for the East Coast corridor. Wow. Some $700 million. I think it was 80, maybe 90 new locomotives to be built.

American companies looked at this and said: We don't build locomotives anymore. We certainly don't build diesel electric or all electric locomotives, so we will let this one go.

Well, there is that German company called Siemens.

They said: $700 million, 80 or so locomotives.

We have a manufacturing plant out in Sacramento, California. We make light rail cars out there and transit cars.

You say: 100 percent American made? Everything from the electric motors to the brakes, to the wheels, to the paint, 100 percent American made?

The German company said: We can do that. We could make it in America.

And they did. The last train has been produced. This is the first train.

Don't tell me we can't make it in America. Don't tell me that our American taxpayer dollars should be spent in China, Japan, or someplace else. No. Build it in America. Buy American. And we will put thousands—in fact, tens of thousands of people to work.

I want to give you another example. The American maritime industry has been in a very steep decline for the last 4 decades. Following World War II, we had over 1,500 American ships. A decade ago we had over 200 ships on the ocean. Our shipyards were making LNG tankers 20 years ago, and they were American flagged. There were American mariners on those ships. Today, we have less than 80 American flagships, and we don't make large commercial ships in the United States, except on rare occasions.

The maritime industry is absolutely critical for national defense.

How do you think our men, women, and equipment get to the troubled spots of the world?

You don't fly the M1 tank on an airplane. You put it on a ship. You put the trucks on a ship. You put the artillery on a ship.

But where are the American ships?

Oh, I know. We will call China and they will deliver our goods to the South China Sea. I doubt it. I don't think so.

If you are concerned about national security, you had better be thinking about the American maritime industry.

Are you thinking about it? Are you thinking what is really possible if we were to write 16 lines of law this year?

It has to do with the export of two strategic national resources: oil and natural gas.

Now operating in Texas is an LNG—liquefied natural gas—facility exporting American natural gas. They liquefy it, put it on a ship, and off it goes to somewhere in the world like China. That is okay.

It will take 100 or more LNG tank ships to meet the full export potential of that one facility when it comes fully on line. There are five other LNG export facilities licensed in the United States, one which is being built near the Washington Capital, in Maryland.

Perhaps 250—225 new liquefied natural gas tank ships are going to be needed in the next decade or so.

Are any of them to be built in America?

No, nada, none, unless we pass a piece of legislation that we call energizing American shipbuilding. There are 16 lines of law that say it is a strategic national security issue to be able to build commercial ships in the United States. The export of an equally strategic national asset—LNG and crude oil—should be on those ships.

This is not new policy. When the North Slope of Alaska opened nearly 50 years ago, it was American steel in the pipeline, it was American ships that were taking that crude oil out of Valdez, Alaska. Over the years, we kind of forgot about that and the law disappeared. Now it is not American ships and not American sailors.

We can do this. The energizing American shipbuilding piece of legislation will be introduced this week. We have some 20 or more coauthors. We want to follow what our President says about: Buy American, build it in America.

How many jobs are we talking about?

Well over a couple hundred thousand in the shipyards. And if that bill passes as we have written it, that would require that the engines, the compressors, the pumps, the anchors, and the electronic equipment be American made also. We are talking about a whole supply train throughout most every State and businesses that are as reflective as the American manufacturing sector used to be.

There is enormous potential in public policy that actually puts in place laws that build upon the strength of America, strengthening our national security, and at the same time strengthening a critical industry in America: the shipbuilding industry.

And, of course, American ships will be American flagged with American mariners.

This is a good thing for America. This is a very good thing for our national security. It is a very good thing for jobs.

For our taxpayers, what does it mean?

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

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

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

Really?

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

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

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

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

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

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

We have done the studies, and there is some question about whether there is or is not contamination. But I know that in California, we have the strictest laws concerning the quality of the food, both on the tree and in the can.

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

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

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

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

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

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

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

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

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

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

ADJOURNMENT

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

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

OATH OF OFFICE MEMBERS, RESIDENT COMMISSIONER, AND DELEGATES

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

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

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

RON ESTES, Fourth District of Kansas.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

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

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