

who pulls the right number, you get the lottery ticket, and the lottery ticket is coming here to America. It eliminates the diversity visa to increase the number of skilled worker visas. It creates a new agriculture guest worker program.

And I am proud because some of the recommendations we have are in that bill, and so we want to see that pass. This is one of the things that has to happen.

But before we can go forward, we have to make sure that the borders are secured, that the rule of law is enforced, and that we have a good guest worker program. It also requires employers to utilize the E-Verify system to ensure their employees are legally able to work in this country.

The good thing about the E-Verify system, it also gives protection to the employer, knowing that they went through the process that the government says they must go through and they have hired people that the government says are okay. So it gives protection not just to our employers, but it gives protection to the people here, who come here for the privilege of coming to America to work.

It invests in a new security measure for our borders, gives registered DACA recipients a renewable 3-year legal status, while ensuring individuals who could cause harm are not eligible for it. It withholds grants and Federal funding from sanctuary cities and gets rid of the chain migration.

So this, I think, is a very strong bill. I think it is a very good bill, that it accomplishes the goal. It could always be better. It is not comprehensive immigration reform, but it is a great start.

You know, working in the agricultural sector for 35 years of my life as a veterinarian working on the farms, I talked to a lot of the immigrants, and a lot of the immigrants that I talked to were here illegally. And I asked them: Do you want to be a citizen of the United States?

They said: No. The majority of them didn't. They wanted the opportunity—the opportunity—to come here to make some money to go back home, and I think we should accommodate that.

And then if you talk to other immigrants who are here and they migrated here legally, I asked them: Why did you come here? Why did your parents come here?

And do you know what it always comes down to? They wanted opportunity, and they wanted security, and they wanted a better life for their family.

So our broken system does not accomplish that, and it is time to fix the broken system, and this is the time to do it.

With that, I thank the gentleman for bringing up this great topic, this passionate topic, and with your work, your help, we can accomplish this.

Mr. GARRETT. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Florida (Mr. YOH), my friend and colleague, for his comments.

In 42 years, 3,037 Americans have been killed on U.S. soil by foreign-born terrorists. There have been 182 foreign-born terrorists, to be precise, who have taken the lives of almost 3,050 Americans, and 63 of those 182, or greater than a third, came here legally on visas, to include the diversity visa scheme. In fact, our office has tried relatively diligently to calculate the actual death toll of native-born Americans by recipients of diversity visas, unsuccessfully. These are difficult data points.

But just in the last few years, the name Sayfullo Saipov has been in the American news. This jihadist who had an admiration for terrorists, to include the murderous raping, intolerant thugs of ISIS, took the lives of eight Americans and injured many more in a truck attack on Halloween, just last October. He was the recipient of a diversity lottery visa.

Before that, Abdurasul Hasanovich Juraboev from Uzbekistan was also the recipient of a diversity lottery visa, and he was arrested in 2015 for conspiring to “kill as many Americans as he could.” He wrote:

I am in the USA now. We don't have the weapons we need. Is it possible to commit ourselves as dedicated martyrs anyway while here? What I am saying is, to get guns, to shoot Obama, and then maybe get shot ourselves. Would that do? That would strike fear into the hearts of the infidels.

This legal diversity visa recipient from Brooklyn said:

If this is not successful, maybe bomb Coney Island.

Fortunately, he was arrested before he could bring to fruition his plans to assault individuals in the very Nation that had so graciously opened its doors.

It is incredibly interesting to me the results that I learned when my wife and I engaged in that which is all the rage these days and looked at our DNA. I found out I had relatives from multiple continents, and I am proud of that. But I am an American just like those people who stood with me that day at the home of the great American patriot Patrick Henry, from Africa and Asia, the Middle East, South America, Europe, Oceania. They are my American brothers and sisters. They did everything by the numbers and availed themselves of a dream that we all share. Those who do not, cheapen the sacrifice made by so many who have come before them.

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

SUCCEEDING ON BEHALF OF THE AMERICAN PEOPLE

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

Mr. WOODALL. Madam Speaker, I very much appreciate that, and I appreciate you being here with us on a Thursday afternoon.

I know that you came to Congress with the same optimism that I came to Congress with, and that is, if only we work hard enough together, if only we commit ourselves with earnestness to one another, we will be able to make a difference for folks. I still believe that, and I hope you still believe that, too, after your time here.

I still believe that, if only we work hard enough, we are going to be able to serve the American people as we promised we would. But occasionally—occasionally—I don't want to vilify the entire fourth estate today, Madam Speaker. There is not enough time to go through that today. But occasionally, the fourth estate seems to suggest that we are failing the American people when, in fact, we are succeeding on their behalf, and that is what I want to talk about this afternoon.

We just came through a difficult budget time, Madam Speaker. We came through that not because of any failures of any man or woman in this institution. I want to make that clear. This House came together as a body back in July of last year and passed every single national security appropriations bill that was upon us.

□ 1315

July of last year—3 months before the end of the fiscal year—this body came together and did its job to fund our men and women in uniform, fund border security, and fund those incredibly important national security items that every single American family cares about.

The Senate had been unable to get any of those bills passed. That brought us to just a week ago, when the President finally signed into law a funding bill for the United States Government to cover the remainder of fiscal year 2018.

I mentioned the House passed, in July of last year, all of the national security appropriations bills. In September of last year, Madam Speaker, the House passed all the rest of the appropriations bills. So the entire Federal Government, from the perspective of the 435 men and women who serve in the House, that work was completed on time before the end of the fiscal year.

But, again, the Senate was unable to take up any appropriations bills, for a variety of different reasons—and I am not interested in assigning that blame today. I am interested in figuring out what we can do about it going forward—took until just a week ago for the Senate to sign an appropriations bill, craft a plan, and do what we call raising the caps so that we can get a funding agreement that will take us over the next 18 months.

Madam Speaker, you can't see it here, but I have a chart of defense spending going back over the last few years. In fact, I started the chart the year that I was running for Congress for the very first time. It was 2010. I came in in that big class of freshmen. There were 100 of us. Imagine that: 100

out of 435 Members, coming in for the first time, together, in January of 2011, and many of us came here with a desire to balance budgets.

Among the many data points that get shared, Madam Speaker, one was shared with me when I was doing C-SPAN's Washington Journal this week. The host said: ROB, do you think the era of fiscal conservatism is over?

I thought that was odd. I am thinking: No, I serve in a body full of men and women, both sides of the aisle, fiscal conservatives, who want to make sure the American taxpayer is getting a dollar's worth of value for a dollar's worth of taxes, who want to make sure we are not balancing the budget on the backs of our children and grandchildren, and who want to make sure we are not mortgaging the future of our children and our grandchildren.

Why would the era of fiscal conservatism be over? Well, the suggestion was made it is because we just signed a budget deal, and that budget deal raises levels of discretionary spending in this country; and if we are raising levels of discretionary spending, mustn't that mean that our commitment to fiscal responsibility is over?

That led me to come to the floor today, Madam Speaker, because what you can't see on this chart, but I have displayed here, are two lines. One is a red line. Oftentimes, Madam Speaker, folks bring charts to the floor that only show you a part of the picture, so the amplitude is exaggerated. It looks like things are worse or better than they actually are.

I have grounded my chart at zero. This is zero dollars in spending, going all the way up to \$1 trillion in spending. The year I got here, we were spending about \$689 billion a year on defense.

Well, we got together as a body, Madam Speaker. And, I will remind you, Republicans controlled the U.S. House at that time. President Obama controlled the White House, Harry Reid controlled the United States Senate, and the House was in minority hands, being led by Republicans. But we got together, Republicans and Democrats—House, Senate, White House—and we crafted a budget plan forward that reduced spending.

Now, the plan was that we were going to reduce spending on both the defense side of the ledger and the nondefense side of the ledger, and then we were going to come together and deal with those major healthcare entitlement programs that are driving the debt far out into the future, deal with the trust funds for Medicare and Social Security that are underfunded today that cannot sustain the promises that have been made to generations today, that we would repair those programs and make them solvent long into the future.

It was a worthwhile goal. It was a goal worthy of this body, men and women—Republicans, Democrats, House Members, Senate Members—who

came together. But what you can see on this chart, Madam Speaker, is the black line indicates the path we took of funding national security, each year, spending less and less and less.

Now, mind you, nobody thought this was the right plan for how to fund national security. This was designed to be a driver to force folks to come together and deal with those larger entitlement programs that actually are the drivers of the debt. It didn't work.

In fact, we had an entire Presidential election cycle that just went on 15 months ago, Madam Speaker, where you can't name the candidate who ran on either the Republican or the Democratic side of the aisle, who made debt and deficits their priority.

Who was that? Who was that leader running for the White House, the last time around, who focused on debt and deficits as their priorities? For whatever reason, it slipped from the national stage, probably because we had been successfully curbing the needle on spending.

So, fast forward, to just a week ago, Madam Speaker, where we raised defense spending by \$100 billion a year. Now, if you calculate where the caps were going to go and how the sequester was going to happen, you actually turn out to have about a \$150 billion increase over where folks expected us to be.

Well, golly, Madam Speaker, even in Washington, D.C., when you raise a \$550 billion budget to \$700 billion, that is an enormous increase. That is why I was asked: Is the era of fiscal conservatism over?

I direct you to this chart, I show you this enormous increase in defense spending, and I show you that we are still \$100 billion a year lower than Barack Obama, NANCY PELOSI, and Harry Reid had anticipated before I was elected to Congress in 2010.

All of this area, between the red line and the black line, Madam Speaker, are dollars saved for the American people. Now, those dollars came at a price.

I reference testimony that Defense Secretary Jim Mattis, former General Jim Mattis, gave in the Armed Services Committee—this was just a week and 2 days ago—and he said this: "I cannot overstate the impact to our troops' morale from all this uncertainty."

He is talking about these continuing resolutions that get passed. Again, the House passed its bills back last July, the Senate hasn't been able to pass any of its bills, so we were funding the government one short-term bill at the time, creating havoc on the American military.

"I cannot overstate the impact to our troops' morale from all this uncertainty. The combination of rapidly changing technology, the negative impact on military readiness resulting from the longest continuous stretch of combat in our Nation's history, and insufficient funding have created an overstretched and underresourced military."

I don't believe there is a man or woman in this Chamber, Madam Speaker, who would disagree with that, "an overstretched and underresourced military," or "the longest continuous stretch of combat in our Nation's history." This is not an issue that divides this Chamber, this is an issue that unites this Chamber, Madam Speaker. I am proud that we came together, as a House and a Senate, as Republicans and Democrats, to address that failure.

In fact, I will quote from General Mattis. Just two days after that morale quote, after this body had acted, after the Senate had finally acted, after the President had put his signature on the bill, General Mattis said this: "I am very confident that what the Congress has now done and the President is going to allocate to us in the budget is what we need to bring us back to a position of primacy."

"What the Congress has done and what the President will allocate will bring us back to a position of primacy," I mention that again, Madam Speaker, because, among the many conversations we have here about military readiness, General Mattis has expressed confidence that, in a time of war, the Congress would fund the military.

In fact, in that same testimony that I quoted from earlier before the Armed Services Committee, he said: "I know that in time of a major war, Congress will provide our military with what it needs. But money at the time of crisis fails to deter war. . . ."

I know the Congress will provide what we need in a time of crisis, but money at a time of crisis fails to deter that crisis. We could have avoided that conflict had only we been properly funded.

We came together with White House leadership. The President said: I need \$700 billion for 2018; I need \$716 billion for 2019. That is what General Mattis said as well. That is what we are hearing from the entire administration. That is what we came together and gave.

But the era of fiscal conservatism, Madam Speaker, is not over. The era of shortchanging our military, in the hopes that we might come together on a bigger deal, the gridlock that was created by that, that gridlock is over. That uncertainty that General Mattis bemoaned, that is over. But fiscal conservatism continues.

It is not just on the defense side. It is easy to talk about the defense side because I know that is something that unites everyone in the Chamber, Madam Speaker. But let's look at the nondefense side.

Nondefense, as you know, Madam Speaker, is, well, everything else that the Federal Government does—it is not an income support program—from parks to roads to courts, from prisons to education, from investments in NIH and the CDC, from our involvement overseas in hunger programs and refugee programs. Absolutely everything

else the Federal Government does is in the nondefense discretionary side.

I point you to two lines, once again, Madam Speaker. The red line is what President Obama, Speaker PELOSI, AND MAJORITY LEADER HARRY REID ANTICIPATED SPENDING BEFORE I ARRIVED. THE BLACK LINE IS WHAT WE HAVE ACTUALLY SPENT SINCE I ARRIVED.

Among the many changes made in the law, when the President signed the caps deals into effect last week, is that we raised nondefense discretionary spending, too. In fact, over the 2-year deal that the President signed, we are talking about an additional \$300 billion—billion with a B—in additional spending.

Well, by golly, Madam Speaker, if you care about budgets, if you care about deficits, isn't \$300 billion a frighteningly large figure to increase spending in a time of already existing deficits? Of course, it is. Of course, it is.

But let me say, once again, that does not mean the era of fiscal conservatism is over. We had a choice. We could continue to keep the military in that space of uncertainty that General Mattis cited as being so dangerous, or we could cut the deal that we had to cut to break that cycle of uncertainty.

I don't know what kind of negotiating experience you have had, Madam Speaker, but it turns out that when you walk into a negotiation and say, "I have got to have what I have got to have, and I will give you whatever you need in order to get it," you are not in a particularly strong negotiating spot.

That is the position the President found himself in. He was 100 percent committed to our troops, he was 100 percent committed to national security, he was 100 percent committed to that pay raise that we had promised our troops, but we had not funded, and he said: I am going to do whatever it takes to get \$700 billion in 2018 and \$716 billion in 2019, to make sure national security is protected and our troops are served.

Well, what that led to was an increase in nondefense discretionary spending as well, Madam Speaker. But still look at these lines. That delta between the top line of where we were going to go and the black line of where we have actually gone is trillions of dollars—trillions with a T—worth of savings.

Between the defense spending, Madam Speaker, which changed dramatically after that big freshman class in 2011 arrived, and nondefense spending, which changed dramatically after that big class in 2011 arrived, trillions of dollars in debt has not occurred. Trillions of dollars in spending of American taxpayer dollars has not occurred.

We have squeezed those budgets: the security budget and the nonsecurity budget, the defense budget and the nondefense budget. We have squeezed each of those budgets to make sure that we are getting a dollar's worth of

value for the American taxpayer out of every dollar that we spend.

The net result of that, Madam Speaker—that and a collection of economic outcomes that have been desirable—has led to a decrease in net interest spending: money that was not borrowed, interest that does not have to be paid—money that was not borrowed. Thus it didn't drive interest rates up. Those interest rates are lower on all the other money that has already been borrowed, not just trillions of dollars in savings on spending that was foregone, Madam Speaker, but trillions of dollars in savings of interest that was not paid.

□ 1330

Why do I take the time to come down to the floor to tell that story, Mr. Speaker?

It is because I grow weary, as I know all of my colleagues do, of reading the defeatist headlines that show up on the paper day after day after day: Congress failing; gridlock prevailing; bipartisanship dead; cooperation extinct.

It is not true.

What we have done together is worth bragging about back home. What we have done together is worth celebrating when we are together. What we have done together is worth using as a model for thinking about what we can do together again tomorrow.

It doesn't matter whether you sit on the furthest right in this Chamber or the furthest left in this Chamber, Mr. Speaker. That dollar worth of taxes raised from that American citizen is a valuable thing. It is a trust. There is a stewardship obligation to each and every one of those dollars.

What do you want to use it for?

Maybe you want to give it back to those American citizens. I am particularly pleased with the tax bill we passed that did exactly that. Again, passed it in the House, passed it in the Senate, moved it to the White House; done in a bicameral way.

I think the American citizen can generally spend their dollar better than we can spend it on their behalf. I know they trust themselves to spend their dollar more than they trust us to spend it on their behalf.

We could take that dollar, we could put it back in an American citizen's pocket. Leave it with them to begin with and never even take it. That is what we did with the tax cuts.

We could invest that dollar in national security. We could look to see what is that additional training an airman might need; what is that additional equipment that a marine might need; what is that additional item that we could research, purchase, improve, repair, that would make a difference in the life of a man or a woman who is serving this country.

We could spend that dollar on national security. We could spend that dollar on nondefense needs; research in Alzheimer's; research at our major universities; research into that next gen-

erational transportation outcome that is going to change the way that we deal with congestion in America.

There are 1,000 different ways to spend each and every one of those dollars. It does not matter where you believe that dollar ought to go. It is a worthwhile purchase to make sure we are using that dollar, either with the American citizen in their pocket, with the DOD in the pursuit of national security, or with one of our great research institutions in pursuit of the next healthcare discovery, rather than paying it in interest to someone around the globe who lent us money in our time of need.

We need to restrain those dollars today, Mr. Speaker, so that when we have a time of need in the future, we will be able to access them. The era of fiscal responsibility is not behind us; it is upon us.

We have an opportunity each and every day together to squeeze those dollars until they scream; squeeze the value out of every nickel that comes through this institution. We have done it together, Mr. Speaker.

This isn't an aspirational goal. This is a certain fact, that we have done it together year after year after year after year. This isn't something that maybe one day, if only we work hard enough, we can do. This is something we have achieved year after year after year after year.

Let's not stop. Let's not stop. And let's not let folks tell us that we can't get it done together. Let's not give in to that devil on the left shoulder that says we should go down and run each other out and talk about why the institution fails.

Let's give in to that angel on the right shoulder that talks about how, if we put our minds together, if we commit ourselves to one another, there is genuinely no limit to what we can do together.

I am not just talking about what we can do together as the body here in the United States House, Mr. Speaker. And I am not just talking about what we can do together as a House and a Senate and a White House. I am talking about what we can do together as the American people.

The strength of this institution has never been the 435 Members who are in it. It has been the 300 million Americans who have sent us here. The strength of this institution has never come from the Members. It has come from the Nation that lends us its power.

I genuinely believe there is no limit to what we can do together. I am genuinely disappointed in those days that we give in to that devil on the left shoulder that tells us that running each other out, running each other down, denigrating the institution, denigrating the Nation, denigrating one another is the pathway to success.

But we have had enough victories together. We have come through enough challenges together. When they said we

would fail, we have succeeded together enough that I have great optimism not just about the next 10 months in this Chamber, but about the next decade, the next generation, the next hundred years for this country.

We don't know when the economy is going to fail us, Mr. Speaker. We have to plan for that rainy day. We have been doing that. We have been doing it with spending at every single level in the government, and it has made the biggest difference in debt and deficits that I have seen in my lifetime.

Let's build on that success. Let's recommit ourselves to that goal. Let's surprise the naysayers about the things that we do together.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, February 16, 2018, at 9 a.m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

4009. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to Libya that was declared in Executive Order 13566 of February 25, 2011, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

4010. A letter from the Acting Director, Consumer Financial Protection Bureau, transmitting the Bureau's Fiscal Year 2016 FAIR Act Inventory, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 501 note; Public Law 105-270, Sec. 2(c)(1)(A); (112 Stat. 2382); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4011. A letter from the Executive Analyst (Political), Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting one action on nomination, and one discontinuation of service in acting role, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 3349(a); Public Law 105-277, 151(b); (112 Stat. 2681-614); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

4012. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Interior, transmitting the Department's draft bill, titled the "Reclamation Title Transfer Act of 2018"; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

4013. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31168;

Amdt. No.: 3777] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4014. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31169; Amdt. No.: 3778] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4015. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31170; Amdt. No.: 3779] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4016. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Standard Instrument Approach Procedures, and Takeoff Minimums and Obstacle Departure Procedures; Miscellaneous Amendments [Docket No.: 31171; Amdt. No.: 3780] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4017. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Greenwood/Wonder Lake, IL [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0459; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-14] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4018. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class E Airspace; Eaton Rapids, MI [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0209; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AGL-9] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4019. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of Class D and Class E Airspace; Truckee, CA [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0565; Airspace Docket No.: 17-AWP-1] received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4020. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Boeing Company Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0807; Product Identifier 2017-NM-080-AD; Amendment 39-19126; AD 2017-25-12] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4021. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Direc-

tives; Airbus Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0627; Product Identifier 2017-NM-037-AD; Amendment 39-19127; AD 2017-25-13] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4022. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Dassault Aviation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0513; Product Identifier 2016-NM-152-AD; Amendment 39-19125; AD 2017-25-11] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4023. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; ATR — GIE Avions de Transport Regional Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1170; Product Identifier 2013-NM-054-AD; Amendment 39-19129; AD 2017-25-15] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4024. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Agusta S.p.A. Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1173; Product Identifier 2017-SW-030-AD; Amendment 39-19131; AD 2017-25-17] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4025. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Airbus Helicopters (Previously Eurocopter France) [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0671; Product Identifier 2016-SW-072-AD; Amendment 39-19135; AD 2017-26-04] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4026. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; The Enstrom Helicopter Corporation Helicopters [Docket No.: FAA-2017-1191; Product Identifier 2017-SW-046-AD; Amendment 39-19134; AD 2017-26-03] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

4027. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Airworthiness Directives; Gulfstream Aerospace Corporation Airplanes [Docket No.: FAA-2017-0910; Product Identifier 2017-CE-027-AD; Amendment 39-19136; AD 2017-26-05] (RIN: 2120-AA64) received February 14, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows: