

the winner for the Best Beer Experience among the international applicants. Central Washington's beer industry is thriving and has greatly contributed to the increase in tourism as well as the overall economic development of the area.

As a third-generation hops farmer from the Yakima Valley, I am proud that our fellow growers and our local craft brewers are receiving recognition for their efforts in making our region a unique travel destination.

Please join me in congratulating John, his team, and the entire industry for helping bring such a prestigious award to Washington's Fourth District.

HONORING THE LIFE OF NEW YORK STATE TROOPER JOEL R. DAVIS

(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, I rise today to honor the life of New York State Trooper Joel R. Davis.

Trooper Davis was tragically killed in the line of duty on July 9, while responding to a domestic disturbance call in the town of Theresa, in upstate New York. Another victim was also tragically killed in this terrible accident.

Trooper Davis was a father, son, husband, and a friend to many. He was deeply involved in his community, and also served as the commissioner of a local youth league baseball team. Trooper Davis was well-respected by all those who worked with him and beloved by everyone.

As New Yorkers, we stand in solidarity to mourn the life of Trooper Davis, a dedicated public servant and a life that was too soon lost. At this heartbreaking time, we offer our condolences to his family, community, and colleagues alike.

It is at times like these that we come together and pause to extend our gratitude in all law enforcement in our State and across the Nation who risk their lives every day to protect us and to keep us safe.

We are grateful for their dedication, service, and bravery of outstanding members like Trooper Joel Davis, who will rest in peace.

THANKING JANET BOSLEY

(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 honor the life and public service of Janet Bosley. Janet has been a caseworker in my district office and previously served my predecessor, Congressman Matt Salmon. She is a wife, a mother, a grandmother, and I am very happy to call her my friend.

Janet will soon be retiring. She faithfully served the constituents of Arizona's Fifth Congressional District for

the past 5 years, and her steady presence in the district has been invaluable.

My staff and I are going to miss Janet's infectious smile and her witty stories. She is one of the most engaging people I have known, and my life has been blessed because of her friendship and example.

I wish her the best of luck and happiness as she moves into this new chapter in her life.

Thank you, Janet. May God bless you.

□ 1215

THE ROLE OF GOVERNMENT

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

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. Speaker, there is a lot of discussion as we gather to talk about the role of government and almost everything that we do day to day. I think most Americans, as they go to work and they look at how the government's role is in their lives, they don't really give the government a lot of thought. They want to be left alone.

They are willing to pay some measure of taxes to have things that we all agree on, like schools, roads, bridges, stoplights, national defense, other things. We like to see efficient government. We like to see it small. We like to see it without waste.

If there are things that other services can provide without it being done by government, we like choices. We like privatization. We like the private sector.

But there are certain things, Mr. Speaker, that the government does have a role in. This was recognized by perhaps the finest American we ever produced, Abraham Lincoln, when he said: "The legitimate object of government is to do for the people what needs to be done, but which they can not, by individual effort, do at all, or do so well, for themselves."

Mr. Speaker, there are three sectors in which the government does have a role; and we as conservatives might want limited government, efficiency, and lack of waste, and our colleagues on the other side of the aisle would want similar things, but they might approach it a different way. We all, as Americans, have a moral obligation to protect the security of the United States of America. We have just seen that with the passage of the National Defense Authorization. But what I would like to address today is a breach in one of our pillars of national security with a proposal with our aerospace.

The three areas that we must safeguard and protect are our national defense, our national intelligence, and our national aerospace.

We are considering now an AIRR Act, H.R. 2997, which would take the Fed-

eral Aviation Administration's reauthorization, which we have to do, and it will pretty much remove Federal control of air traffic controllers and the control of our aerospace and put it into private industry. Many of us, in a bipartisan fashion, have grave concerns with this. I am one of them.

If you look at H.R. 2997, what you will find is that the President has diminished authority. In the 1980s, when air traffic controllers, through their unions, went on strike and they said, "We are not going to play; we are going to picket," and it put the United States at risk, Ronald Reagan warned them by saying, "If you do that, you are fired."

They said, "Oh, he is not going to do that. How is he going to control the skies?"

The President, acting on his constitutional responsibilities, fired them. He took control, as he should have, and air traffic controllers, by the thousands, were removed, and others were put in their place.

H.R. 2997 would remove this type of authority that the President of the United States would have. If this bill were to become law, President Reagan would not have been able to do what he did in the 1980s.

It also removes title 31 authority. What is that? Well, title 31 authority is how we, through the appropriations process and through the power of the purse, control and oversee government so that we, the people, and their duly-elected representatives are able to control the aspects and agencies of government; because without this, without this power of the purse and without this powerful oversight tool, you might have bureaucracies become an entity unto themselves.

So title I authority is vital that we have those hearings, controls, measures, and prohibitions so that even if something is decided on, money is not authorized, and, therefore, it gets shut down. Title 31 authority in H.R. 2997 would be removed.

There are also no other oversight provisions that would be put in its place. Why? Because what it is doing is it will take the Federal Aviation Administration's air traffic control system and it will put it into the hands of a private company.

Now, I am all about privatization in business and choices, and there are a lot of things. But going back to the Lincoln quote, there are certain collective things that we cannot do as individuals and that the government has a role.

If waste, inability to procure, inability to modernize, or inefficiencies were a condemnation to privatize everything, then why don't we just privatize national defense? They waste money. They have trouble procuring. They have trouble modernizing. Why don't we just turn over national defense to the private sector?

We would never do such a thing because it would place all of us at risk.

Yet we are going to take the national aerospace control of the skies, and as it stacks up—and there is a lot that goes on up there, as I will illustrate—we are going to put that into the hands of a private company.

This private company would have a board, but it will not have title I authority oversight, and under its current form, the President will have diminished authority only in time of war to take control of the aerospace system.

This is a bad idea.

It also transfers all DOD intelligence agencies, the Department of Defense intelligence agencies, Homeland Security support to this private entity.

Today, the FAA does a lot of things with their air traffic controllers. What do they do? At any given moment, and as many of you flew into Washington, D.C., to come and see your government at work, you flew on an airline. Sometimes there are delays. You get it. There is weather. There are different things. Other times, you are sitting there and it is clear as a bell and you are wondering what is the holdup.

Part of the reason, unknown to even the pilots on the tarmac, is that there are missions that our military performs. There are national intelligence missions that are being performed and surveillance missions that are being performed. There are homeland security and border security missions that are being performed.

When they take priority, they also take priority for air traffic control and the clearances, and many times things will have to be rerouted to accommodate it. The American public and even the pilots on the planes are none the wiser.

Now, under H.R. 2997, the problem that you will have is that all of this authority will now be coordinated with a private entity. I will explain why this is a problem in a moment.

As a conservative, I am all about privatization where it makes sense, but when it comes to national security, as a combat infantryman, a veteran of three wars, someone who served my country in uniform for 21 years, we must protect this great Republic, and there is a role for the United States Government when it comes to our national security.

When we have strayed from this and tried to privatize certain sectors, our greatest embarrassments with national intelligence have been when we have contracted to private entities for that collection. Think Edward Snowden. Think leaks in government with classified information getting out.

Where is that occurring? It is occurring with subcontractors and private entities who we were assured when we passed these laws: Oh, they will be under the same agencies, under the same systems, and everything will be fine. Trust us.

And then we in Congress have authorized that. And then what? We sit at our hearings and our committees with

our bony fingers and our red faces, saying: Mr. Secretary or Mr. Agency Head, how did you let this happen?

All we have to do is look in the mirror. When we take these controls away on things that we must have a government role in—defense, intelligence, and aerospace—we are creating the very construct that causes these problems.

Our alliances were shaken. Our country was embarrassed. Our intelligence was placed at risk. Operators in the field were exposed, some even harmed, because contractors let it get out of hand.

Look at national defense. We see some of the same things. Some of the most embarrassing episodes that we have had have been with security contractors in national defense. We were told: Hey, you don't have time for that; we don't have the budget for that; we can do this more efficiently; you don't need to do this. Yet some of the most black-eyed moments have been with contractors.

Well, what about on the administrative side? That would make sense.

I see my colleague, Representative TED LIEU here. He and I have been very frustrated in seeing some of these types of decisions being made with contracting. The Office of Personnel Management: Hey, let's take this away from the Department of Defense, and let's move all of these classified personnel records, and we will have a clearinghouse, and we can contract that. Everything will be good. You don't have to devote time and treasure to do this.

Yet 25 million exposed records later of those that held security clearances—Mr. LIEU and I both receiving a letter in the mail saying that we had been exposed because we held top secret clearances in the military. And yet when we made these decisions, we said this will be really good if we move this to contracting. It will be more efficient. It will save us money, and it will be just as good. Well, that was not the case.

So now that takes us to national aerospace. What are we talking about here? Tens of thousands of aircraft in the air in flights every single day.

And if it is so broken a system, when was the last time a major, fatal airline crash happened? Can't remember? You would have to go back a ways, which I will cover in a moment. But let's stick with these national security concerns.

H.R. 2997 diminishes the power of the President, takes away title I authority, does not replace it with any other congressional controls. Sure, it has congressional review for fee changes or rulemaking, but nothing else.

It transfers Department of Defense, Intelligence, Homeland Security, Border Security, all of these things, and it places them under a coordination with a private entity. And they assure us, oh, it will be the same system we have now; everything is going to be just fine.

But the problem is that a private entity, unlike today—did you know every

air traffic controller in an air traffic control tower takes an oath of office to support and defend the Constitution of the United States?

Most people didn't even know that, to include those that crafted H.R. 2997.

They take an oath of office. They have to be a United States citizen. Why? Because it is vital to our national security.

Now we want to change that because it is efficient, and it is a broken, archaic system.

Well, we are all about modernizing. That is common ground we can all agree on. We need to modernize. But we do not need to go the direction that H.R. 2997 has, this AIRR Act.

My issues with the bill are purely on policy.

There are excellent people that have worked this issue for a number of years. They have the right motives and the right reasons for approaching this issue. But when it comes to national security, we also have a constitutional and moral requirement to support and defend our great Republic, and here is where some of that is put at risk. Let me enumerate a few of them for you.

Air traffic controllers and managers who work in air traffic control facilities across the country are routinely involved in operations that deal directly with the national security of the United States. How so? Well, most Americans, to include Members of Congress, are not even aware of this facet of their work.

For instance, prior to the beginning of Operation Enduring Freedom—this is a true story—an FAA supervisor placed a number of flight plans in front of an air traffic controller in Kansas City. Those flight plans were for B-2 Stealth bombers that were about to depart from Whiteman Air Force Base, fly across the Atlantic and drop their bombs in Afghanistan, opening the rounds of our response to 9/11, and then they would come back to Whiteman Air Force Base in Missouri.

□ 1230

Now, if you and I were sitting on the tarmac in the Kansas City airport and looking outside, we would say, "Wow, what is the holdup?" totally oblivious.

Yet this is important work. And their mission was obviously classified at that time, but it was FAA U.S. Government air traffic controllers—not private contractors, not private company citizens—controllers and managers working these aircraft in U.S. airspace many hours prior to the start of the armed conflict.

Every time Air Force One takes off from Joint Base Andrews outside Washington, D.C., carrying very important people, to include the President of the United States, it is an FAA U.S. Government air traffic controller clearing that aircraft for takeoff. Not just clearing it, then it is an FAA U.S. Government air traffic controller and manager who ensure the security of the airspace flown by the world's most famous symbol of freedom, the shiny

blue and white Boeing 747 used by Air Force One and Two as a secure way to transport our President, our Vice President, other officials, as they are called and closely monitored by the FAA and other air traffic controllers and managers anytime Air Force One or Marine One aircraft are airborne.

These are operations that go unseen. Many of them and the aspects of them are obviously classified and we could never go into here. But they are vital to our security. They should not be put in a private corporation's hands where there is no oversight and no control.

The FAA air traffic controllers and managers routinely provide airspace security, sometimes for hours on end, at locations across the country as the FBI or State and local law enforcement perform classified missions using government aircraft. In some cases, not even other aircraft know about those missions or what it is that they are conducting, depending upon the sensitivity of what it is that they are doing or is being performed.

U.S. air traffic controllers, government employees, and managers also participate in drug interdiction operations with the Drug Enforcement Administration as well as Customs and Border Protection. This might involve providing intercept vectors due to drug aircraft, drug lords trying to sneak things in or whatever it might be, and that has to alter flight plans and do very complicated things.

It might also involve protecting the airspace for drone operations. Many people are unaware that the FAA U.S. Government-Employed air traffic controllers and managers are also responsible for military flights, not just the kind that I described at our bases and airports, but this includes special-use airspace that maybe has been delegated to the United States in other countries, or to do flight training, refueling, attack and bombing missions. And these same government-employed air traffic controllers and managers are responsible for military aircraft on secret missions, to include drones and drone killers.

They are responsible for the aircraft of military uses to communicate with our nuclear infrastructure so that if we have to, God forbid, defend the Republic in that manner, they are right there in that loop of that system, not some private company.

They are also responsible for the airspace above the areas where our missile defense capacities occur and the testing systems that go on with that. You can see why handing these coordinations over to a private company might be a little problematic.

And then let's look at September 11, 2001. It was FAA U.S. Government air traffic controllers and managers who were responsible for putting over 4,000 aircraft on the ground almost immediately, in very short order, after America was attacked by terrorists using planes as weapons, killing 3,000 of our fellow citizens. But it was the ra-

pidity of response because of the way the network is that they were able to make instant decisions, not having to coordinate through some private corporation, that they were able to do so. And I will speak more about that.

The airspace above this very Capitol and above the White House, the Supreme Court, and all the monuments that you have enjoyed as you have come to Washington, D.C., or as you work here, the symbols of our Republic, are closely watched over by the FAA, and they are air traffic controllers and managers who have sworn an oath, unlike people in private companies. They don't swear oaths. Employees of private corporations do not take oaths, nor do they promise to defend against all enemies, foreign and domestic.

Privatizing the U.S. air traffic control system will not enhance our country's national security.

Unfortunately, the national security role that FAA controllers and managers perform every day is not well known, even among Members here. But one could list a number of functions that our government performs where we do have a vested interest, the people, in saying we give this authority, we the people, to the government because we can't do this as individuals. The Federal Government does have a role.

So is it about modernization or is it about privatization? We are all in agreement on modernization, but privatization, I am afraid, Mr. Speaker, that a lot of us are like a pack of dogs lapping up antifreeze. It smells good, it might even taste good, but it is not without drastic consequence.

Just this week, we narrowly missed having to vote on this bill in its current form next week. This is why I am bringing these points out, so that we do not make this grave mistake that will breach our national security. Well-meaning people, friends, colleagues, people with just as much passion as I may have, but yet we the people have to take a step back and protect our national security.

There are also, in H.R. 2997, no provisions to prohibit in this private corporation foreign nationals working in it. Today, if you are going to be an air traffic controller, you have to be a United States citizen. You have to take an oath of office. Under a private corporation or whom they subcontract with for air traffic control, this bill, were it to become law—and it cannot, we must prevent it—what would happen is there are no prohibitions in that law against foreign nationals guiding your skies or taking an oath of office where they are as committed to our Republic, Mr. Speaker, as any of us with the oaths that we have to take.

The national security concerns are paramount. Until we address them, we should not rush in. We want modernization.

I applaud the President of the United States for wanting to bring this issue

to the light of the public. We need modernization. We agree with that. In fact, just knowing that we have his support to move towards a modernized plan gives us great comfort because we need that backing from the Executive.

But we have to address these national security issues, and right now, this bill does not do that. Even if it did address all of these, there is still a question that remains: Has the government demonstrated that it cannot control the skies and that the FAA's air traffic control system and its controllers are incapable of keeping us safe?

I can see if it is something that is broken and we have to intervene as government and make sure it is more efficient and we have to do the right thing, but in this case, where is all of this brokenness that we are hearing about? Sure, archaic equipment—been there and done that serving in the military. As you heard Chairman THORBERRY say today, half of the Air Force's aircraft would qualify for antique license if they were civilian aircraft and registered in Virginia.

As a soldier, I live by the motto, "I will fight with what I have, and I will win where I fight." Whether it is with flintlocks, hatchets, modern rifles, or modern technology, poor is the workman who blames his tools. And our FAA air traffic controllers do a marvelous job with the systems they have.

That is why almost a decade ago we worked towards the next-generation system to modernize, and it is on track with procured funding like NASA has because it is expensive stuff and it takes time. You don't want that subject to funding problems.

The FAA, as a whole, has those funding problems. You have a continuing resolution or a government shutdown like in 2013, wow, that creates ripples. But if it is about modernization of our control towers, it is on track for the pilots that we might have.

And I know, Mr. Speaker, you have put yourself at the wheel of planes, and in this case there are a lot of things that we can see where the FAA does a marvelous job. It doesn't mean that we have to privatize it.

On 9/11, over 4,000 planes were grounded immediately and safely. What a lot of Americans don't know, Mr. Speaker, is that the FAA's national operations manager who made that unprecedented gutsy call, he was a government employee, you know, one of those bloated government employees we have got to fire and move out. His name was Ben Sliney. And guess what? That was his first day on the job as the FAA's national operations manager. Wow, what a first day.

But he was good. He had taken an oath to the Republic. He made a gutsy call; 4,000 planes put on the ground, and it helped keep our Republic safer, because it could have been worse.

The FAA has clearly demonstrated through its air traffic control system that it can handle the job. When was the last time we can remember a fatal

accident with a major carrier? 2009, and that was a regional carrier.

But also in 2009 there was something else that happened. On the 15th of January, 1 month before the fatal accident in February in Buffalo, New York, with the regional carrier, which was the last time we had a major fatal accident, that was US Air Flight 1549, piloted by Captain Chesley Sullenberger and copiloted by Jeff Skiles.

So what we have seen and what we all know is that the heroism of those two pilots that day put the plane down in the Hudson, saving all onboard. And we saw air traffic controllers doing everything with an emergency at one of the busiest airports, providing so many options.

Well, Mr. Sullenberger, like so many of us, has grave concerns with H.R. 2997. This is not a man that has any government interest or privatization this or that or is up here lobbying or doing anything, yet he is somebody America trusts.

You might be interested in some of his comments, and I am quoting Captain Sully here.

He says: "My real issue, and I think for many people, is that we have a wonderful and unique freedom in this country, this unfettered, wonderful aviation system that anyone can participate in safely and efficiently. In most countries, it's either too restrictive or too expensive for an average person to fly, and the only way you can go is on an airliner or military flight," meaning other nations. "It's just prohibitively restrictive or expensive to do it any other way. That's something that we need to protect and preserve, and so why in the world would we give the keys of the kingdom to the largest airlines?"—under this H.R. 2997 he is referring to. "Because they definitely have their own agenda to lower their costs. Commercial aviation, airline aviation, has become an extraordinarily cost-competitive industry globally, and it becomes more so day by day."

"By removing oversight of the air traffic control system from the FAA and much of the oversight that Congress currently has," Mr. Sullenberger goes on to state, "and giving it to a group of people, stakeholders basically controlled by the largest airlines, to control access to and pricing of access to the air traffic control system. That is an extreme solution to what's really a political budget problem."

Captain Sully goes on to say, "It means bad things for everyone who flies, but especially for people who fly in non-airline ways," meaning general aviation.

□ 1245

"That is a big part of the system," he says. To continue his quote: "I am worried about access. I am worried about equitability. I am worried about safety." Okay, to pause in his quotations here, Captain Sully was the guy on safety. He would go around and this

was his job in the airlines. No man was better when it came to safety standards. And then he demonstrated it that day, that he knew what he was talking about.

For him to make these kinds of comments, I think we need to take pause, and take a step back, and listen. To continue his quote: "There are other, better ways to solve this political budget problem—by giving the FAA, in running the air traffic control system and making capital improvements to the air traffic control system, more predictable multiyear funding—without giving away the keys to the kingdom to the largest airlines to control access and fees and pricing too."

Mr. Speaker, I agree with Captain Sully. I think he knows something about it. Modernization. That is an area we can all agree on. American aviation would suffer terribly without the benefit of the public structure of the air traffic control system, including its accountability to Congress, and the FAA.

Establishing a private air traffic control company, corporation, board, outside the purview of Congress, with the unilateral power to collect fees without controls from the government, and distribute service, would threaten our national security—as I have spoken to already—accessibility and affordability of flights, not maybe immediately in the transition, but, as you read H.R. 2997, it goes on to say that they can do a lot of things in a couple of years.

Pilot generation. Look at general aviation in the examples that they use for comparisons. Many of the proponents of this bill say: Look at Canada. Look at Europe.

I love the Canadian people. I have traveled through most of Europe. I even lived in Germany as an exchange student.

Yes, in Germany today, a pilot can go from 35,000 feet in Lufthansa or an airliner, and he can glide all the way down to Tempelhof Airport in Berlin. Why? Because he doesn't have STEVE RUSSELL, Mr. Speaker, out there in his Cessna 140 in the way. Guess what? In the United States, I have as much right to airspace as a U.S. citizen flying as that Lufthansa pilot, who is, by the way, just coming here to deliver passengers, or any other airline pilot.

That is the beauty of our system. What you won't find in Germany is general aviation. You won't find access. And as Captain Sully correctly stated, it is a wonderful thing. We have access to that. It is one of our hallmark freedoms in the United States.

Now, when he says that we will be handing over the keys to the kingdom, what he means is that it goes to this private corporation, this board, and then they will, for commercial interests, set up—what does that board look like? Well, here it is, right out of the bill.

It will have six of its board members who will be on the commercial side of aviation. Now, I have nothing against

commercial aviation. American Airlines, love them, they brought me home from three wars. I will always have those memories.

Regional carriers probably brought many folks listening to this today. But they have commercial interests, as Captain Sully correctly stated. They will be concerned about those issues. That's fine. They run businesses. They don't have to protect our national security. They fly.

And so what we see with this board is six of them in the commercial side—commercial, regional jets. And then you have got one general aviation, and then one on the business side, which could support general aviation or not. But that clearly, as you lay out the board, two that will be appointed by the Secretary of Transportation—kind of his only say in a lot of this process—and then two that will be appointed by the board itself.

So what you will have is a two-thirds lopsided board that will favor the commercial interests rather than aviation as a whole. This is why Captain Sullenberger, and so many others, have had grave concerns about what it does to our freedoms for flying.

Now, much of my protest against this bill will have been because of the national security pieces. We could lay all of this other stuff aside. We have to solve these national security pieces in the bill, and right now, they are not there.

With modernization, we can get to some of that, but we have the safest airspace in the world. Where is this broken, archaic system that we hear people saying? Canada, love the Canadians. I have driven the Alcan twice. I have been through so much of the country, driven 1,200, 1,300 miles on a dirt road in Canada, a wonderful place. I have lectured in many of their cities in a former life.

But Canada has the population of Texas, and if you were to look at the number of flights it handles each day, probably less flights than Texas. Yes, they have a modern system. We are having a modern system with NextGen. What we need to do is solve the acquisition pieces, the modernization pieces—not the privatization pieces.

Why? We all know that much of North America's security is secured by the United States of America. They don't have to face the same things. That is why they can get away with such a small military. It is not an indictment. It is just the truth.

The bill in question, H.R. 2997, strips oversight authority of our national airspace from the President, the Congress, and gives it to this unelected board of individuals, an action that would threaten the United States' ability to maintain the integrity of our airspace, as I spoke to earlier, Mr. Speaker, on what goes on at altitudes and in missions that most of us really have no clue.

It puts at risk thousands of missions that our military conducts in just

training and safety in our skies every day. It gives private contractors access to classified data.

Let's go back to what we were talking about with Edward Snowden with the leaks that we are seeing out of the intelligence services these days. Where is that coming from? It is coming from the private contractors. It goes lateral.

Do you think it is going to be any different because we here in Congress say: Oh, no, no, no? Hey, it is going to be great. This is going to be—rest assured, and I can already predict what is going to happen, Mr. Speaker. The disasters will strike. We will sit in Oversight and Government Reform with bony fingers and red faces going: How did you let this happen? And all we have to do is look in the mirror, because we are much like dogs lapping up antifreeze, to lick up something that smells good, tastes good, with drastic consequences.

If we want to maintain the safest and best airspace in the world, we have to prevent the passage of H.R. 2997. Now, this is hard for me to do. Why? Because I don't like opposing my own party. I don't like opposing my friends. I have done some terrible things in my life as a soldier. I don't like conflict anymore. I try to stay as far away from that as I can, and there are two veterans over here giving me thumbs up—combat veterans themselves.

But I took an oath to support and defend the Constitution of the United States. I am not saying if you support this bill you are unconstitutional, or that you don't love your country, or that you don't want to protect the Republic. I am not suggesting that at all. I have too many friends who have a counterview to mine. But it is my responsibility to expose what is in this bill and why it is dangerous, and why we can't do it.

Mr. Speaker, we need to call on the American public and have them contact their Members of Congress and tell them to oppose H.R. 2997, to not let privatization of our air traffic control system happen; to keep it into the role that, like Abraham Lincoln said, sometimes things that we can't do ourselves, we need to do collectively, and the government has a role in that. Mr. Lincoln obviously knew what he was talking about.

Modernization, we can all agree on that. Let's work on that. I applaud the President for bringing this issue to the fore. We need to deliver that win for him.

But breaching national security of our airspace and risking our safety on an unproven system is not a win. Mr. Speaker, it is not something that we need to support.

I yield back the balance of my time.

DONALD TRUMP, JR.'S, EMAILS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. GALLEGO) is recognized for 60

minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GALLEGO. Mr. Speaker, on July 11, Donald Trump, Jr., released a series of emails regarding his meeting with a Russian Government lawyer and an individual associated with Russian intelligence.

Don Trump, Jr.'s, emails are a smoking gun. They prove that the Trump campaign was not only aware of the Russian Government's efforts to meddle in our elections, they were enthusiastic about accepting Russia's support.

What follows are the contents of those emails. They painted a disturbing picture of a campaign, and now an administration willing to break the law and sell out to an adversary of the United States in order to advance their own petty interests.

Our hope is that the American people will carefully consider the content of these messages and what they say about the fitness of Donald Trump and his senior advisers to hold high office.

We will begin. There was a comment posted by Donald Trump, Jr., on Twitter on July 11, 2017. "To everyone, in order to be totally transparent"—which we now know he wasn't even in this email—"I am releasing the entire email chain of my emails with Rob Goldstone about the meeting on June 9, 2016. The first email on June 3, 2016 was from Rob, who was relating a request from Emin, a person I knew from the 2013 Ms. Universe Pageant near Moscow. Emin and his father have a very highly respected company in Moscow. The information they suggested they had about Hillary Clinton I thought was Political Opposition Research. I first wanted to just have a phone call but when that didn't work out, they said the woman would be in New York and asked if I would meet. I decided to take the meeting. The woman, as she has said publicly, was not a government official. And, as we have said, she had no information to provide and wanted to talk about adoption policy and the Magnitsky Act. To put this in context, this occurred before the current Russian fever was in vogue. As Rob Goldstone said just today in the press, the entire meeting was 'the most inane nonsense I ever heard. And I was actually agitated by it.'"

End of email.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GALLEGO. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I am going to be reading the email portions of Rob Goldstone to Donald Trump, Jr. On June 3, 2016, at 10:36 a.m., Rob Goldstone wrote to Donald Trump, Jr., the following:

"Good morning.

"Emin just called and asked me to contact you with something very interesting.

"The Crown prosecutor of Russia met with his father Aras this morning and in their meeting offered to provide the

Trump campaign with some official documents and information that would incriminate Hillary and her dealings with Russia and would be very useful to your father.

"This is obviously very high level and sensitive information but is part of Russia and its government's support for Mr. Trump—helped along by Aras and Emin.

"What do you think is the best way to handle this information and would you be able to speak to Emin about it directly?

"I can also send this info to your father via Rhona, but it is ultra sensitive so wanted to send to you first.

"Best.

"Rob Goldstone."

Mr. GALLEGO. On June 3, 2016, at 10:53 a.m., less than 20 minutes after that email, Donald Trump, Jr., wrote back:

"Thanks, Rob, I appreciate that. I am on the road at the moment but perhaps I just speak to Emin first. Seems we have some time, and if it's what you say, I love it especially later in the summer. Could we do a call first thing next week when I am back?

"Best, Don."

Mr. Speaker, "I love it." His response was: "I love it." I worked in politics for a long time. I have never been approached with information from a foreign government. But if I were, my response would not be: "I love it."

My response would be: "This is completely inappropriate." My response would be: "Don't ever contact me again." My response would be: "I am calling the FBI."

In this email, Donald Trump, Jr., showed his true colors. This email proves that he lacks basic integrity. The willingness of Jared Kushner to attend that meeting proves that he, too, is no patriot.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, after we finish reading these emails into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, we are going to discuss why it is a straight-up violation of the Federal Election Campaign Act.

On Monday, June 6, 2016, Rob Goldstone writes back to Donald Trump, Jr., in an email at 12:40 p.m., with a subject heading: "Russia—Clinton—private and confidential."

□ 1300

"Hi, Don.

"Let me know when you are free to talk with Emin by phone about this Hillary info—you had mentioned early this week so wanted to try to schedule a time and day.

"Best to you and family.

"Rob Goldstone."

On June 6, 2016, at 3:03 p.m., Donald Trump, Jr., wrote back:

"Rob, could we speak now?

"D."

Then Rob Goldstone replies to Donald Trump, Jr., that same day at 3:37 p.m.:

"Let me track him down in Moscow.

"What number he could call?"