

passed down from generation to generation. That would lead us to an aristocracy; that would lead us to a monarchy; and that would lead us to Presidents of the United States who would think that they don't have to show you their income taxes, Presidents of the United States who think it is okay to spend public money on fancy vacations for their family and Secret Service all over the country and the world and having a winter or a summer escape at Mar-a-Lago, Florida, and so on. Go back, please, I beseech the citizens of America, read Thomas Jefferson about inherited wealth.

Now, our laws today don't even have the estate tax or the inheritance tax starting until millions of dollars. The vast majority of Americans are not even affected by it. It applies right now only to the smallest sliver of the wealthiest Americans. I think—and forgive me for not having the facts in front of me—again, we are just getting this all right now, but I think we are now somewhere around \$4.5 million. So if you die with \$4.5 million, your estate is not going to be taxed. That is enough to send the kids and the grandkids to college. It is enough for people to inherit a house or two houses. That is not bad. But the fact that we would tax beyond that means that we are not going to get a society that is based on inherited wealth and deep, profound political and economic inequality which were totally anathema to the Founders of the country, and also, by the way, totally antithetical to the vision of Adam Smith who is the big hero to my conservative friends on the other side of the aisle.

Adam Smith was someone who said: You don't want to have inherited wealth in a society like that. That is dangerous. It will promote idleness and irresponsibility among the people who inherit hundreds of millions or billions of dollars. It will increase political inequalities and class tension in the society, and it will lead to irresponsible behavior by the people who have that kind of wealth.

People will get the idea that they can buy a public office. In America, public office is something that you earn. It is not something that you buy; but, right now, there is a model for elective politics around the country which is you don't have to be involved in politics, you don't have to be involved in social movements, you don't have to be involved in public service, and you don't have to do anything for anybody. As long as you have got enough money, you can go in, you can buy the consultants and the pollsters, and you can go right to the head of the class, and then you can get into office.

What is so dangerous about that? Well, look around the world. What is happening? There is a whole new model of government that is popping up from Putin's Russia to Duterte's Philippines to Orbán's Hungary to Le Pen's France. And the model is this: that people get into office, and government becomes a

moneymaking operation for them and their friends, for a tiny elite. That totally contradicts the promise of America. Our Founders were concerned with making sure that there would be public virtue, that we would put people in office who were committed to the common good, to the public interest of everybody, not to the goal of enriching themselves or their hotel partners or people they are in business with in Russia or in Saudi Arabia or all over the world. That is not the model. In America, the government has got to be devoted to the people.

So, America, read the fine print here. This tax plan contradicts everything that we were founded on as a country. It upsets the very idea of democracy—abolishing the estate tax, abolishing the alternative minimum tax, driving all the wealth up the income and wealth ladder. That is not America. We have got to stand up for what American values really are. We are not Russia. We are not a kleptocracy. We are not Azerbaijan. We are not Saudi Arabia. This is the United States of America. We need a government that is committed to the economic success of every family and of every person.

So I am urging the public to do exactly what you did with that terrible health proposal they came forward with that would have thrown 24 million Americans off health insurance in order to create hundreds of billions of dollars of tax breaks for the wealthiest Americans. Reject it. Don't accept it.

America needs to know that all of the protests and the popular participation is working. The Women's March set the whole context for discussion about what is going to happen here because we know that President Trump campaigned like William Jennings Bryan, like he was a big populist. He was going to be on the side of the working people. But he got in, and the very people he denounced, like Goldman Sachs, have come to run his government. It is a Wall Street Cabinet. It is the wealthiest Cabinet in the history of the United States. That is who this government represents today. That is what this tax plan represents today.

So they are going to try to jam it down Congress over the next 24 hours. We are going to do everything to stop it. We need the help of the American people to stand up and say: No; what is the rush? Let's take time, and let's analyze what is in there. Let's see if it is consistent with our values. Let's see if it is going to blow a multitrillion-dollar hole in the U.S. deficit. Let's see if it is sustainable, and let's see if this is the best way to do this.

This is not a way to run Congress of the greatest democracy on Earth—springing things at us in the last minute, just like they did with the healthcare plan. The Affordable Care Act that they are so eager to slice and dice at this point came about after 70 hearings in this body, after a year and a half of debate, and after town meetings all over America. Their plan to de-

stroy it they brought in on Monday night, and they voted it in on Wednesday with no hearings, with no witnesses, with no deliberation and discussion. Now they want to try the same magic trick with their tax plan.

They have got a royal straight flush. Let's be clear, they control the House, the Senate, the White House, and now, with the confirmation of Mr. Gorsuch, the Supreme Court. All that we have on our side are those three beautiful words that kick off our Constitution: we the people. We the people have to stand up and say that this is not what anybody voted for. It clearly was not what the majority of the country voted for because a majority of the people did not vote for Donald Trump. But it is not even what the States and the electoral college who were on his side wanted. Nobody was talking about a tax plan that would bring havoc and ruin to our economy and drive working class and middle class people even further into a position of submission to the wealthiest people who now appear to want to govern us in all things.

We don't begrudge anybody their wealth. It is great. This is a country where people can get rich. That is great. But your wealth does not give you the right to control everybody else. Your wealth does not give you the right to govern the rest of America. That is the principle at stake here.

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

DILIGENT CONSIDERATION OF LEGISLATION

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it has been interesting hearing about a situation in the country—and it is amazing how some of us can look at the same thing and see very different situations. I know there are some that think we should stay in session all the time, but as is normally said back in Texas about the Texas legislature—and it applies even more so to the U.S. Congress—and that is, when legislature is in session, neither man nor property is safe.

We are voting on bills every day we are in session. As I understand it, there was a time when Congress could be in session, have hearings during the day, maybe vote in committee but not actually have votes on the floor during the day. But I think over the years, the concern has been if we are not voting on the floor where it is recorded, then people might not show up. There is certainly a body of evidence to support the country being better off when Congress doesn't come into session.

I had read that one of our Founders, Thomas Jefferson, for all his wisdom and his incredible draft—his was the first draft of the Declaration of Independence—Jefferson was not actually there in Philadelphia to help draft the

Constitution in 1787. But I had read that he sent a letter and remarked that if he had one thing that he could get into the Constitution—realizing, of course, it was too late at that point—but it would be a requirement that no bill could be voted on in Congress until it had been on file for a year.

Some might immediately respond: well, gee, there are so many bills that we pass as emergency bills; and I would respond that yes, and usually those things that are drafted so quickly are more problematic than other legislation that goes through a lengthy and more diligent look at what is in the bill before it is passed.

In fact, if we had such—and I am not advocating that we have this constitutional amendment—but I am noting, Mr. Speaker, the merits of having bills on file for a lengthy period of time so people have a chance to think about it, talk about it, weigh the merits, and go back to our districts and talk about the merits there.

Of course, I am not talking about going back and having these fake news townhalls where people who supported opponents demand townhalls, and they have their playbook for how you go about trying to intimidate your Member of Congress and keep intimidating until your Member of Congress becomes a coward and he is afraid not to have, or she is afraid not to have, a townhall. And then once you have cowarded them into having a townhall, then they have the playbook for how you totally disrupt the townhall.

□ 1715

That is not what I am talking about. I am talking about going all over your district talking to people eye-to-eye, heart-to-heart, and finding out where people are. It is incredible how people have come to be hurting over the last 8 years.

For all the talk that President Obama had about Fat Cats on Wall Street, it was as if there was a wink and a nod: Okay, I am going to refer to you guys on Wall Street as Fat Cats, but I am going to make you richer than you have ever been. I am going to stack the deck in your favor. All you have to do is endure me calling you Fat Cats, making references to you being so greedy. I may even refer to you being Republican, even though probably more of you donate to me than did my opponents. But that will be our little game. Then, of course, when I am out of office, you can pay me \$400,000 for giving you an hour of my time. That is another wink and nod. It is just a friendly reward for how good I did for you while I was President.

Let's face it, the Democrats got through the Dodd-Frank bill that was supposed to punish the banks that brought us to the brink of ruin, but instead of punishing or reining in the investment banks on Wall Street that brought us to the brink of ruin, Dodd-Frank has overseen the demise of hundreds, even thousands of community

banks that did not bring us anywhere close to the brink of economic disaster. In fact, they were the backbone.

As President George W. Bush was going out of office, he got \$700 billion handed over to the Treasury Department so they could reward people like those at Goldman Sachs who helped bring us to the brink of desperation. In fact, I only saw one of the contracts that were drafted by the Treasury Department some years back. Lo and behold, it was one of the firms that was listed as being appropriate for the Treasury to contract with. Goldman Sachs was right in there.

Of course, with the disdain that Secretary Paulsen had for Goldman Sachs, he wasn't about to let their competitor, Lehman Brothers, survive. He was able to keep them from surviving, not helping them. God bless Ford Motor Company. They were able to turn down any government assistance that GM and Chrysler took.

There was a remedy, if we hadn't panicked and followed the advice of former FDIC Chairman Isaac. I found out from my Democratic friend BRAD SHERMAN that he actually was the one that first brought former Chairman Isaac to the Hill. He had a good solution that would not have caused us to take what was referred to by socialists the day after it passed as the biggest step toward socialism in the last 50 years, and that was the Federal Government crawling in bed and calling the shots with the investment banks on Wall Street, much to the ruin of so many community banks.

We gave advantages to the big banks. We hurt the community banks who were not able to compete as well. God bless all of those that have hung in there. I hope that we can rectify things better than that.

The bottom line, I think, testifying about what the Obama years were about—and was even acknowledged by President Obama—a few years ago, he actually acknowledged that his Presidency oversaw a record that had never happened before in U.S. history. Ninety-five percent of the income in the United States—that was under Obama's policies—95 percent of all American income went to the top 1 percent in America.

If you were looking for one fact to really characterize the abuses of the preceding 8 years, I think that would be in contention. Ninety-five percent of the income went to the top 1 percent, not under George W. Bush, not under George H.W. Bush, not under Ronald Reagan, not under Richard Nixon, not under Dwight Eisenhower, not even under Harry Truman, but under Barack Hussein Obama's policies.

During his Presidency, the way the deck was tilted against the middle class and shrunk as the poor in America grew under Obama's policies, we actually hit a milestone in American history. Ninety-five percent of the income went to the top 1 percent income earners. That is pretty amazing.

I do personally, Mr. Speaker, think that has something to do with the Republicans gaining the majority in the House, in the Senate, and getting the Presidency. Americans, by a huge margin of electoral votes, and if you look at the map, who voted for Donald Trump and who voted for Hillary Clinton, it pretty well establishes the Democratic Party as the fringe party of America. They won the fringes, other than some major cities here and there. They are the fringe party.

All across America—the bulk of America, when you look at the map, voted to change course. Let's try something different so that 95 percent of America's income doesn't end up in the pockets of the top 1 percent—those same 1 percent that will be paying former President Obama \$400,000 for 1 hour of his time.

Where have we heard that recently?

Well, I don't believe that was George W. Bush speaking to the disabled veterans getting that kind of money. Oh, yes, I recall now. It was Hillary Clinton. It was Bill Clinton. Bill Clinton earned massive amounts for speeches while his wife was the Secretary of State. And, wow, all of those tens, hundreds, millions of dollars coming to the Clinton Foundation amazingly at the time that this company that ends up being controlled by the Russians are allowed by Hillary Clinton to buy 25 percent or so of our uranium production.

Let's recap briefly what the Clinton family has done for us. Well, we know that in the nineties, when it comes to foreign affairs, North Korea was a threat to the world, to freedom, because they had a crazy leader, Kim Jong-il, and the world was concerned that North Korea might get nuclear weapons.

So what happened through the Clinton administration?

Well, they sent Wendy Sherman and some other folks and they negotiated with the North Koreans and said: If you will just sign and say you are agreeing not to develop nuclear weapons, we will make sure you have everything you need to make nuclear weapons, but you will have to sign saying that when we give you everything, make sure you have everything to make nuclear weapons, you just won't make them into nuclear weapons.

I mentioned before, it reminds me of that routine Jeff Foxworthy talks about when he was not doing very well financially and a guy comes to take his car because he hasn't been able to make his payments, and he said: Look, man, please don't take my car. If you take my car, I can't do any more gigs and I can't make any money, and then I have no chance of paying you.

The guy said: Buddy, I am sorry, but my instructions were to either take the car or cash or a check.

Foxworthy said: Check? You mean I can just sign something and you will take that and leave me alone? Oh, I can give you a check. I didn't know that was going to be good enough.

I thought about Kim Jong-il thinking: You mean you will give me everything I need to create a bunch of nuclear weapons and you will accept my signature and that is good enough for Wendy Sherman and all those other people—our Under Secretary of State under Bill Clinton?

It is amazing that she has had the nerve to come out critical of any other Secretary of State after the disaster she presided over.

Yes, he was glad to sign whatever the Clintons wanted him to sign. He said: Sure, if Ms. Sherman wants me to sign something, I will sign whatever you want.

And in no time, what does he have?

Nuclear weapons.

President Obama comes into office and the whole world is concerned about Iran getting nuclear weapons.

What do they do?

They said: Let's send Wendy Sherman and some of these smart people like John Kerry, who doesn't now how to pronounce Genghis Khan. Let's send them over there to negotiate with Iran so that maybe we can keep Iran from developing nuclear weapons the same way some of these same people kept North Korea from developing nuclear weapons.

So what happens?

They go over and they give the largest supporter of terrorism in the world massive amounts of cash. By massive, I mean pallets of cash and checks; however you may want it. There is no telling. They may have sent some gold or platinum. Who knows? Plutonium.

It will be interesting in the years ahead to just see how terrible the agreement was and how we are finding out—it seems like almost every night in the news we find out some other disaster that the Obama administration provided the crazy supporters of terrorism in Iran. I don't mean the rank-and-file people.

We get the impression possibly a majority of Iranians like Americans. They wish they did not have radical Islamists in control, but they are. The Obama administration provided them murdering thugs who have killed, been responsible for the death of so many in the past, and no doubt will be again in the future, and they are on their way to having nuclear weapons, just like the Clinton administration oversaw with North Korea.

□ 1730

In the meantime, though at the end of the Bush administration, the President Bush administration actually was making progress in making our borders more secure. It never came out during those days, but the Republicans in the Texas delegation in Congress were having meetings once every couple of weeks with people in the Bush administration—Karl Rove, Chertoff—a lot of good that did. But we were getting reports every couple weeks. We wanted to know what advancements, what progress had been made in the pre-

ceding two weeks in securing our border. They were taking steps to do that.

President Obama takes over, and what happens? It is like the floodgates were opened. As the Border Patrol have said to the drug cartels who were responsible from the Mexico side for every inch of the border, if you cross over in one drug cartel's sector, you must make sure you have their permission. Normally that means you must pay or agree to work for them when you get to the U.S. city where you are going.

That is why they called the Department of Homeland Security their logistics, that all the drug cartels had to do is get these people across the border. They would pay thousands to the drug cartels to get them across. They were used as a distraction. They sent them across. The Border Patrol would have to in-process them in accordance with the Obama policies. While they were doing that, they would tell you privately, yes, we know there are drugs coming across at other points in the river down there south of McAllen and southwest of McAllen, but they knew. We are doing our job. We know they are bound to be bringing drugs over while they keep us tied up. What a business model.

Then the Department of Homeland Security would ship many of those people to the places that they would have addresses for, and, as I witnessed myself, there were times when our Border Patrol would say: well, you certainly didn't come up with all the thousands. And ultimately they finally admit: no, they are going to let me work some of that off when I get to the city where I am going.

In other words, they would be their drug mules, they would be their drug salespeople. Some, God forgive us, would get into sex trafficking. The Obama administration allowed this massive network to take off.

At the same time, we heard from FBI Director Comey, we ended up with ISIS cells in every State, we had the drug cells locating all over the country in the last 8 years, we had ISIS creating cells that would be activated at some point and begin to kill Americans, and so it shouldn't have been that big of a surprise to those who were really paying attention that Americans were ready for a change. Not on the fringes, but Americans across the heartland were ready for a change, and they voted for Donald Trump.

This week, I don't know if we are going to vote tomorrow on the American Health Care Act. I indicated now, with the changes that have been made, I think probably 90 percent or so of the Freedom Caucus has now agreed. Because, I mean, we have gotten the best we can get. If we don't do something, people in my district who are just overwhelmed with the prices of their health insurance premiums, the cost of health care, the high deductibles, meaning they are paying for insurance they are probably never going to get anything out of—they have got to have help.

That is one of the reasons, one of the biggest reasons I was a holdout because even though I think CBO was talking about premiums continuing to increase up to 2026, and then 10 years from now start down a little bit, people in east Texas could not afford for premiums to continue to go up for 10 years. I think it was probably more accurate they would be going up for 3 years.

But with what we have done, and the agreement we got—I am telling you, President Trump is a great man to negotiate with. He does want to get a deal done. He was extremely cooperative. He actually can be quite enjoyable to negotiate with. He is an amazing man. But we were having trouble with leaders in the House and the Senate. President Trump would agree to things, and we would have trouble getting it past our own leadership.

Some of us felt all along, if you let the conservative group sit down with the Tuesday Group, we could probably get things worked out, and, really, bottom line is, that is what happened. TOM MACARTHUR is a very dear friend. I know he wants what is best for the people in his district. He is doing all he can to serve them. I know that is what the Tuesday Group wants to do. They want to serve their constituents. We all do.

So now where we are—and hopefully we will have votes and we can get this done. But we have gone from a bill that had 17 percent support of the American people, and now we have gotten an agreement to include provisions that eliminate the taxes immediately that would have been kept in place for the future. Under our agreement, the language is there, those taxes are out immediately. There has also been added a work requirement for people who are Medicaid recipients. If they are able to work, then they should work. If they don't have a job, they still will need to do some work under the work requirements, much like the welfare requirements that were passed in the 1990s by the Republican House and Senate. For the first time in 30 years, a single-mom income, when adjusted for inflation, started going up after the work requirement was added.

We have also agreed to language that will make sure that people who have preexisting conditions can't be shunned by the insurance companies. If you are 26 and you are living with your parents, you can still be on their insurance. I don't know why we have even an age limit at all. Those things will still be there, despite all the fear mongering that some on the other side of the aisle have done back in Texas that I know of.

Let's make no mistake, this is not a full repeal. There is still a lot of work to be done. But the MacArthur amendment will allow the repeal of some of the mandates—not the preexisting condition or the 26 being on parents' insurance but some of the other mandates that have spiked the insurance costs so high. While this revised version still

does not fully repeal ObamaCare, it will bring down the costs of health insurance. The people I represent just had to have help. At least 75 percent were saying: We have got to have help. So we look forward to working with the Senate and trying to make it even better as it goes through the Senate.

I think I have got just a minute. I just wanted to note, the observance anniversary of the Holocaust this past Tuesday, April 25, was a very somber occasion held in the rotunda. I know the minority leader, Senator SCHUMER, wanted it there. I just continue to hope and pray, as I hope most Americans do, that we will never, ever have another Holocaust. I think one of the things that can help prevent that is if we have effective national days of prayer, as have been going on for so many decades, going back to Washington proclaiming days of thanksgiving and prayer and fasting.

I deeply regret, though, that we thought we were going to be able to fulfill the vision of Anne Graham Lotz, the new chairman of the National Day of Prayer. She took over for Shirley Dobson, who did a magnificent job for the last 25 years as the national chair. She had a vision for doing it in the rotunda, and all that would require, like for the Holocaust observance, would be a unanimous consent agreement in the House and Senate, and then it would have been in the rotunda. It would have needed to have been after 5. Even though the Holocaust occurred during the day, it was clear, and she had agreed, the National Day of Prayer folks had agreed, but any Senator can put a hold on such a thing, and one Senator did. Senator SCHUMER put a hold on the National Day of Prayer being able to use the rotunda.

I hope and pray some day Senator SCHUMER will realize that the best way to avoid a Holocaust in the future is to have effective national days of prayer from the rotunda and everywhere else that we possibly can, as the church services have been held in the Capitol, participated in by Thomas Jefferson and James Madison and so many others. They were nondenominational; so they thought that didn't violate their Constitution.

But it looks like this will be in the area that Senator SCHUMER cannot stop from being used. It is totally under the control of the House. I want to thank Speaker RYAN for allowing the use. We will be in statuary hall where nondenominational Christian churches were held on Sunday. It was the largest Christian church in Washington for much of the 1800s. So that is where it will be this year. Hopefully we won't have a Senator who will put a hold on it next year, and Billy Graham's daughter, Anne Graham Lotz' vision will finally be fulfilled.

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

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HIGGINS of Louisiana). Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess subject to the call of the Chair.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 41 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2303

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. WOODALL) at 11 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 99, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2017

Mr. SESSIONS, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 115-97) on the resolution (H. Res. 289) providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 99) making further continuing appropriations for fiscal year 2017, and for other purposes, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 4 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, April 28, 2017, 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:

1167. A letter from the Assistant General Counsel for Regulatory Services, Office of the General Counsel, Department of Education, transmitting the Department's final regulations — Title I—Improving the Academic Achievement of the Disadvantaged (Subpart C—Migrant Education Program) [Docket ID: ED-2013-OESE-0119] (RIN: 1810-AA99) received April 24, 2017, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Education and the Workforce.

1168. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and accessories abroad controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-126, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1169. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and accessories abroad controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-105, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(C); Public

Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 94-329, Sec. 211(a)); (82 Stat. 1326); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1170. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-100, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1171. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for the export of firearms, parts, and accessories abroad controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List, Transmittal No. DDTC 17-008, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1172. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services, Transmittal No. DDTC 17-017, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1173. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license amendment for the export of defense articles, including technical data, and defense services, Transmittal No. DDTC 17-005, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1174. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles that are firearms controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-137, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1175. A letter from the Acting Under Secretary, Bureau of Legislative Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a certification of a proposed license for the export of defense articles that are firearms controlled under Category I of the United States Munitions List, Transmittal No. DDTC 16-074, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2776(c)(2)(A); Public Law 90-629, Sec. 36(c) (as added by Public Law 104-164, Sec. 141(c)); (110 Stat. 1431); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1176. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Commerce, transmitting a report certifying that the export of the listed items to the People's Republic of China is not detrimental to the U.S. space launch industry, pursuant to 22 U.S.C. 2778 note; Public Law 105-261, Sec. 1512 (as amended by Public Law 105-277, Sec. 146); (112 Stat. 2174); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

1177. A letter from the Assistant Legal Adviser, Office of Treaty Affairs, Department of State, transmitting a report concerning international agreements other than treaties entered into by the United States to be transmitted to the Congress within the sixty-day period specified in the Case-Zablocki Act, pursuant to 1 U.S.C. 112b(a); Public Law 92-403, Sec. 1(a) (as amended by Public Law 108-458, Sec. 7121(b)); (118 Stat. 3807); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.