

Lipinski	Panetta	Slaughter
Lofgren	Pascarell	Smith (WA)
Lowenthal	Payne	Soto
Lowey	Pelosi	Speier
Lujan, Ben Ray	Pingree	Swalwell (CA)
Lynch	Pocan	Takano
Maloney,	Price (NC)	Thompson (CA)
Carolyn B.	Quigley	Thompson (MS)
Matsui	Raskin	Titus
McCollum	Richmond	Tonko
McEachin	Roybal-Allard	Torres
McGovern	Ruiz	Tsongas
McNerney	Rush	Vargas
Meeks	Ryan (OH)	Velázquez
Meng	Sanchez	Visclosky
Moore	Sarbanes	Wasserman
Nadler	Schakowsky	Schultz
Napolitano	Schiff	Waters, Maxine
Neal	Scott (VA)	Watson Coleman
Norcross	Serrano	Welch
O'Rourke	Sherman	Wilson (FL)
Pallone	Sires	Yarmuth

## NOT VOTING—23

Black	Green, Gene	Poe (TX)
Burgess	Jackson Lee	Polis
Cleaver	Johnson, E. B.	Scalise
Cramer	Lieu, Ted	Shea-Porter
Cummings	Marchant	Stivers
Curbelo (FL)	Nolan	Veasey
DeFazio	Olson	Walz
Gohmert	Pearce	

## ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore (during the vote). There are 2 minutes remaining.

□ 1625

So the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

Stated for:

Mr. CURBELO of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 95.

## PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. SCALISE. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably detained. Had I been present, I would have voted "nay" on rollcall No. 94 and "yea" on rollcall No. 95.

## RESIGNATION AS MEMBER OF COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation as a member of the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,  
Washington, DC, March 6, 2018.

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

DEAR SPEAKER RYAN: I, Val Butler Demings, am submitting my resignation from the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform in compliance with the Rules of the Democratic Caucus. It has been a privilege and honor to have served on this Committee.

If you have any further questions, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,

VAL BUTLER DEMINGS,  
Member of Congress.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, the resignation is accepted. There was no objection.

## ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Mr. CROWLEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Democratic Caucus, I offer a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 764

*Resolved*, That the following named Members be and are hereby elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

(1) COMMITTEE ON OVERSIGHT AND GOVERNMENT REFORM.—Mr. Gomez (to rank immediately after Mr. Raskin), Mr. Welch, Mr. Cartwright, Mr. DeSaulnier, Ms. Plaskett, and Mr. Sarbanes.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

□ 1630

## HONORING MARVIN KAHN, FLORIDA CITRUS GROWER

(Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Mr. THOMAS J. ROONEY of Florida. Mr. Speaker, when you drive through Florida's heartland in Highlands County, you will probably see signs that say "Kahn Groves," and then you will drive through miles of citrus groves.

Marvin Kahn has been a passionate advocate for citrus over the last five decades, leading his management company from managing 400 acres to over 5,500 acres at its peak.

Mr. Kahn is one of the State's most innovative growers, caretakers, and marketers. He served on the Florida Citrus Commission for 8 years and worked on the long-range planning committee for several years after that. His devotion to Florida citrus and agriculture was real, and he did everything he could to share his passion with others, especially with young people.

Each year, the Florida Citrus Hall of Fame honors the most distinguished leaders who have made significant contributions to the Florida citrus industry, and there is no one more deserving of a spot on that hall of fame than Mr. Marvin Kahn. When it comes to serving Florida's agriculture industry, his passion for Florida's citrus is unparalleled.

Florida is a better place because of Mr. Kahn, and it has been an honor to serve him in the House of Representatives.

## COLORECTAL CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

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

Mr. PAYNE. Mr. Speaker, colorectal cancer is the second leading cause of death for men and women combined. It

is a silent killer because the disease often has no signs or symptoms. Each year, more than 50,000 Americans die from colorectal cancer even though it is mostly preventable and treatable if caught early.

Six years ago today, my father, the late Congressman Donald Payne, died from colorectal cancer. Colorectal cancer screening just wasn't something people of his generation did.

Mr. Speaker, my father might have lived had he gotten tested for colorectal cancer. That is why each year I sponsor a resolution to recognize March as National Colorectal Cancer Awareness Month, a time to educate the public about the disease and the need for screening.

By educating people, increasing research funding, and making Medicare coverage better for seniors, we can save tens of thousands of lives each year.

I would rather not have to make this 1-minute speech every year, to have my father still be a Member of Congress from the 10th Congressional District.

## MILITARY SAVE ACT

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

Mr. PAULSEN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to speak in support of the Military SAVE Act.

Last year, the Department of Defense reported there were an estimated 20,300 military members who indicated they had experienced a sexual assault the year prior. Many of these military sexual trauma survivors expressed concerns that services available within the VA healthcare system did not meet their post-trauma needs.

This bill will now require the Department of Veterans Affairs to establish a 3-year pilot program to allow these survivors treatment related to their injuries from the provider of their choice. Then the VA will compare the care received from outside providers with the VA so that they can find ways to provide better care for MST survivors.

Mr. Speaker, anyone who is sexually assaulted should be able to receive the care that they need, and that stands true for the men and women protecting our Nation. Members of the military should be confident in the quality of care they receive from the VA, and this new bill, when it becomes law, would help the VA to improve the services that they offer.

## INFRASTRUCTURE

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

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I see my colleagues from the great South

are here, and they should be listening very carefully as we discuss infrastructure. I might like to draw the attention of the House to this, if I might, a fellow that we know etched in marble at the FDR Memorial: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much"—keep in mind the tax bill that passed here and was signed by the President in January. "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much; it is whether we provide enough for those who have too little."

These are words to legislate by, wouldn't you say?

So I ask my colleagues to please keep this in mind and not leave right in the middle of a good discussion. If we are to pay attention to what is important here, keep in mind those who have little.

It turns out that the great tax cut was probably best described by the President. Shortly after he signed the bill, he went down to his Mar-a-Lago club and told his friends who had gathered there, all of whom were the great beneficiaries of that tax cut: I have made you so much more wealthy.

Indeed, that is exactly what the tax cut did. It made the wealthy in America even more wealthy to the tune of several hundred billion dollars. The American corporations saw their tax rate fall from 35 to 20 percent, and the top income earners in America saw their tax rate go down by 2½ percent. It was marvelous if you have a great deal of money, because 80 percent-plus of the \$1.5 trillion—perhaps more—of the benefits went to the top 10 percent: American corporations and the super-wealthy.

Is there such a thing as trickle-down economics? Is there really a probability that the superwealthy are going to buy more cars and build new homes—palatial palaces—in America with all of the new money that they received? The answer is probably not in America but probably on some island somewhere where they can use the new tax breaks for foreign investment that are in this tax bill.

Oh, they were going to close the loopholes for corporations and individuals who wanted to go offshore. No, it didn't happen. Instead, new offshore tax advantages are created for American corporations.

Were inversions eliminated? No. Corporate inversions are not eliminated. They are, in fact, continued and increased.

How did this come to pass? It probably came to pass because there was not one substantive hearing in the Ways and Means Committee and in the Senate Finance Committee on the most important tax bill that has passed out of Congress in the last 25 years.

So now we live with this. Now we live with the situation where the Treasury Department announced a couple of weeks ago that the tax revenues for the

2018 fiscal year—that is now—are down by a couple of hundred billion dollars.

So what is going to happen? When the tax bill was moving along, all of the deficit hawks—and there used to be, I don't know, a couple hundred of them over here on my Republican colleagues' side—left town in December. There was not one word about the new \$1.5 trillion addition to the deficit. But like most migratory birds, they are going to come back when the weather warms up in Washington, and they are going to go after the deficit with a vengeance. I will bet they are not going to propose that we go back and clean up the tax mess that was created.

My guess is what they are going to do is go after programs. I think we know what programs they are, because the Speaker of this esteemed House has very clearly laid out in previous budgets that he wrote when he was head of the Budget Committee that he is going to go after Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid—the programs of the social safety net.

I had a phone call just a few moments ago from a constituent in my district, saying:

You have got to understand that more and more of your constituents are getting elderly. They are getting Alzheimer's, and they need care. Their husband or their wife needs respite care. What about the programs for that?

I had the answer. It doesn't look good, because we know what the Speaker said he wanted when he was chairman of the Budget Committee, and unless he is having an epiphany, he is likely to want it again. In fact, I believe he already said they are looking at cutting Medicare and Medicaid.

So what does that mean for the working men and women who are taking care of their parents? It means there are tough times ahead. It means that the proposed discussion about the reduction in Medicaid is \$1,400,000,000,000 over the next decade. It means that \$500 billion will be cut from Medicare.

So, if you are a senior, you should worry. If you are among the working men and women of America whose father or mother is now a senior, you should worry.

The most expensive illness now and in the future is Alzheimer's. So what of Alzheimer's research? It is going to get reduced.

Oh, and that corporate tax cut for Pfizer? Do you remember how happy they were to have the extra \$12 billion? Are they going to spend it on Alzheimer's research? No, they are not. They stopped their Alzheimer's research. Instead, guess what they are going to do with the money that they were investing in Alzheimer's research. They are going to use it, together with their tax cut money, to buy back their stock which has the marvelous result of increasing the value of their stock because there are fewer shares out there.

It is brilliant for the managers and for the corporate officers because their

pay is based on the stock price. What a marvelous way to use the tax cut: end research on the most expensive illness in America, Alzheimer's and dementia, and instead use that money to buy back stock so that you can increase your pay as the corporate president.

Now, there is a good, American, capitalist idea. That is where we are.

So today we had a hearing on infrastructure in the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, a great opportunity to understand the President's infrastructure plan. Wow. It is big and it is beautiful, he says, and it is going to provide a gazillion jobs.

We took a look at it, and we said: Where is the beef? Where is the money? \$200 billion over a 10-year period, \$20 billion a year, said to be new money.

And then you look at the President's budget proposal and you tee it up with the infrastructure proposal, and you say: Wait a minute. What kind of shell game are you playing here? Your budget removes over \$200 billion from infrastructure, and you come over here on your infrastructure plan and you say you have \$200 billion of new money.

No, you don't. You really don't have \$200 billion of new money. You have \$200 billion of repurposed money in programs that actually devolve the Nation's infrastructure back to the States and the counties so that we will have a disconnect between an interstate in one State and an interstate in another State that connect at the State lines, and one is repaired and the other is not.

□ 1645

So infrastructure and transportation is a national network. But in this case, what happens is that the States are said to be given the responsibility and the Federal Government will simply pick and choose among those programs that the administration happens to like.

I represent a rural area. Sure, it is nice to have an extra \$50 billion for rural infrastructure. That would be great.

But what is the definition of rural?

It is 55,000 people.

How much territory? Is it an entire State?

Well, there is no State that is rural, then.

In a county? In a multitude of counties? In a metropolitan statistical area?

We don't know.

But I will tell you that I do have a rural area. I have got two cities, Yuba City and Marysville together, with 100,000 people. Rural is 10 miles down the road.

So where is the line around this rural area?

I am concerned, particularly because the Federal Government will maintain control of that money. It doesn't go out by formula, at least as we now look at the language.

So it is a grand, a glorious, a wonderful, spectacular infrastructure plan. Incidentally, there is a small problem for

cities and counties. Presently, if the Federal Government is involved in a levee project to prevent floods, an interstate highway or one of the federally designated highways, or an airport, they will usually come up with somewhere between 70 and 80 percent of the money. That is all well.

Well, let's see. It is 70 to 80 percent Federal and another 20 to 30 percent local money. In the President's proposal, that flips. The State and the local government come up with 70 to 80 percent and the Federal Government comes up with 20 to 30 percent. The role of the Federal Government is diminished. It becomes the minor partner, and the State or local community becomes the major partner.

I had a meeting today with Hamilton City, a community of about 1,600 people right on the Sacramento River with a levee that is maybe good for a 10-year high water, but not for any extended amount of flood beyond what normally occurs. They have been trying for 30 years to raise the money locally to match the 80 percent by the Federal Government. They did it.

Are they going to be able, going into the future, to complete that flood project if this program goes into effect and they have got to come up with 80 percent of the money?

It won't happen.

I would dare say, all across this Nation, with the possible exception of Houston, Texas, no community is going to be able to come up with 70 to 80 percent of the money for a flood control project.

This is a role that has traditionally been the Army Corps of Engineers and the Federal Government. But, no. In their infrastructure proposal, this administration flips it over so that now the great burden lies with the local government.

"Oh, that is fine," you say. Well, I think not. All across this Nation, small communities, rural communities, and even urban communities do not have the resources.

So here we are. Here we are in a situation where we had a massive tax cut that benefits the superwealthy and American corporations. The American corporations clearly indicate—not from me; go look at the Wall Street folks that have done the analysis—clearly indicate that that tax reduction, which is now in the pockets of the corporations, is not being used for higher wages, is not being used for the plant and equipment and new jobs above the 16 percent. The rest of the money is used for acquisitions and buying back stock. So much for trickle down.

Of course, how much can the superwealthy possibly spend? How much can you possibly spend on your McMansion? How much can you possibly spend on a fleet of Mercedes?

The bottom line of it is, when it comes to infrastructure, there is no money. It is gone. It disappeared with the tax cut.

Think about what could have been done if that tax bill had actually had hearings in which the Democrats could have put forth proposals that we have introduced in bills—proposals to repatriate the offshore earnings of corporations with a lower tax and then use that money for infrastructure. We would have real dollars for an infrastructure program to the tune of maybe \$50 billion to \$100 billion over a period of time.

But, no. No hearings, no amendments from Democrats. No, not at all.

We could have used that tax bill to create infrastructure banks so that there would be a financing mechanism for those small communities around the Nation that needed to build a road, needed to build a levee, needed to build broadband infrastructure for their community.

But no, that didn't happen either. Not one hearing. Not one Democratic amendment to that tax bill. Therefore, we go into the great infrastructure program where we really need to do some things.

What do we need to do?

Some of you may have noticed just 12, 13 months ago the man-made creation of the biggest waterfall in the world, Oroville Dam, and the breakdown of the spillway. And 200,000 of my constituents had to evacuate within hours because that spillway, the emergency spillway next to it, was being overtopped by the river and eroded at the base and a 30-foot wall of water almost descended upon those 200,000 people. The number of deaths would be unknown, but it would have been in the thousands because they couldn't get out of town fast enough.

Thankfully, the rain stopped and the reservoir receded. Had it not, had it continued and the water continued to spill over the emergency spillway here, it would have been an unmitigated disaster.

Why did this fail?

This failed for lack of repair, for lack of maintenance. It is just one example of the thousands of dams in America that could fail. We saw this potential failure in Puerto Rico with one of the major reservoirs there. Fortunately, a third hurricane didn't occur.

Or maybe you are interested in bridges. This isn't a picture of a bridge to nowhere. This happens to be one of the main bridges on Interstate 5, an interstate highway system that goes from Vancouver to Tijuana, Mexico. It goes down through Oregon, Washington, and California. It is the major trade route on the West Coast. This is about 7 years ago. The bridge fell down.

I could put a picture up here showing another bridge that failed on the Mississippi River, in the Twin Cities area. We could put thousands of pictures up here of bridges that could fail and have failed.

This is an infrastructure structure issue. Where is the money to rebuild this?

Well, it is in the hands of the corporations who are spending it to buy

back their stock and to increase the stock price so that the corporate officers can have a higher paycheck.

Oh, did I forget to mention how generous they were in bonuses?

We are talking about one-time bonuses here. We are not talking about increasing the paycheck over time. We are talking about one-time bonuses.

I do like my San Francisco-based Wells Fargo, that so generously said: "We are going to increase the pay for the minimum wage workers."

Good for you. You are obeying the State laws that require minimum wage increases. Good for you, obeying the law. Take credit, if you will, but it is not out of the generosity.

Where is the money for all this?

It is gone.

What if we had a chance in that tax bill to talk about a program the Democrats have been putting forth for the last year?

It is A Better Deal for America, a tax policy that actually provides benefits to the working men and women of America and the families that are on the edge of poverty. It actually provides an infrastructure program that has real money—money that can be used to build the foundation for economic growth, money that can be used for employing people in high-paying construction jobs.

By the way, it is not at all clear—in fact, there are those of us who think this may actually be in the present infrastructure plan—all of the talk about Buy American, Build America. It appears that language in that infrastructure plan would do away with the Buy American provisions in highway infrastructure.

We can't let that happen. A Better Deal for America would be tax policy. It would be a program that would provide the education and training for the men and women who we need in our manufacturing sector.

Every 6 months, I do a manufacturing advisory organization meeting of manufacturers. Every time over the last 8 years we have met, they have come back with the very same concern. And that concern is: We need highly skilled workers.

How do you get highly skilled workers?

You train them. You provide the job training for those who have lost their jobs, for those who want to improve themselves.

Whatever happened in our high schools to technical training, vocational training?

It is critically important. The programs that are out there need this support. The programs where American unions have apprenticeship training are a critical way of building our economy. They are highly skilled men and women that earn a good, solid living as welders, plumbers, and technicians of all kinds. That is what we want. It takes money to do those things.

So what are we going to do?

I don't know how we are going to come back from this tax cut. It is not

going to be done anytime soon. But I know this: we are going to be really, really short of money. It has been estimated that in this current budget year, the deficit will reach \$1 trillion.

I know that we are just weeks away from the return of the deficit hawks on this floor who are going to say: "Oh, my goodness, the money is gone. We are going to have to make cuts. We can't have these kinds of deficits."

I can hear them already. I hear the voices of the past and I hear the voices of the future. I know they are going to come back. They are going to go after programs that are absolutely essential.

We have got work to do. We have got things we need to do in America.

The American Society of Civil Engineers points out where we need work.

Aviation. We got a D for how good our aviation system is.

Bridges, C; dams, D; drinking water, D.

Is anybody here from Michigan?

Is anybody here from the Central Valley of California?

Shall we talk about water supplies?

I remember when I was in college, you would never go outside the United States and drink the water from the tap. Now you don't go to the United States and drink water from a tap, because there is a high probability that it is contaminated. We have seen this story. We have seen this story in Flint, Michigan. We have seen this up and down the Central Valley of California.

So what are we spending our money on?

Not on drinking water, not on energy systems, hazardous waste, or inland waterways.

Oh, this is a good one. If you are on the Mississippi and the Ohio River and you have got your tugboat and a fleet of barges, you depend upon the Federal Government lock system so that you can travel up and down the river.

□ 1700

If you are out there in the maritime and you are an international shipper and you want to go into one of the harbors on the East Coast, where is the money for dredging?

Well, it disappeared with the tax cuts. It is not there.

So is your ship going to run aground?

No, you won't let that happen. What you do is you will go to some other port.

Cuba. We love to talk about Cuba, so let's talk about Cuba. At Mariel, they are building an international port for the purpose of taking the new ships that are able to go through the Panama Canal, bring them to Cuba, offload them, and put them on a smaller ship so they can get into American harbors. Now, there is an American success story. We don't have the money to dredge our harbors, but we have the money for a new Mercedes for the superwealthy.

Parks and recreation. Ports. Rail systems.

Rails are doing pretty good, but not Amtrak. The President's budget pro-

poses to cut Amtrak—to basically defund Amtrak. If you want to go on the East corridor here, if you want to go from Washington to Boston, if you want to take a plane, well, we know we have an aviation problem. If you want to take the train, I guess you are going to hop a freight train, because Amtrak isn't going to be around to run. That is the President's budget proposal.

Schools, D-plus.

Solid waste. Transit. Wastewater.

The American Society of Civil Engineers rate America in the D range. We should be so proud of the most advanced Nation in the world. No, I think not. I certainly wouldn't take pride in our infrastructure. But it takes money.

Where did the money go?

Well, it just happens I like charts.

The Trump infrastructure scam cuts more than \$168 billion from existing transportation and infrastructure programs.

I haven't talked about this one.

Do you remember I told you about the flip—80 percent Federal, 20 percent local flipped to 20 percent Federal, 80 percent local, unless you happen to be a private investor. Do you want to buy Dulles International Airport or maybe Reagan National—excuse me, I promise not to do that. Whatever the name of that airport here is. Okay, I will say Reagan. The Reagan National Airport. Do you want to buy it? It is up for sale, according to the Trump administration. And, by the way, the Federal Government will come up with 80 percent of the money. Not a bad deal.

Slashes Federal investments and passes the buck back to the local governments. We just talked about that.

We haven't talked about the environmental programs, the environmental protection programs that are significantly harmed, reduced, gutted in the proposal. The Senate is going to speed up projects. Hello? Does anybody around here know that over the last two transportation programs this Congress, with Democrat and Republican support, significantly reduced the time for an infrastructure program to be done? It is not 14 years.

The laws that have been in place now for the last almost decade significantly reduced the processing time for infrastructure projects in which the Federal Government is involved in, without harming the vital environmental protections that are out there: clean water, clean air, all of those things. Anyway, they are gone.

We have a task before us. I see my Republican colleagues anxious to get up and engage me in a debate. If they want to, I could yield to them, and we could debate the wisdom of what has happened here, but that is not happening.

What is happening is there is an alternative, an alternative that we put forth from our side that, unfortunately, was not considered in the tax legislation.

We are going to be working on the infrastructure bill. I dare say that the

President's infrastructure program is going nowhere in Congress. At least it shouldn't.

We are going to have to find the money as best we can. And I have an idea. Over the next 15 years, we are going to spend \$1 trillion rebuilding our entire nuclear armaments. All of the delivery system, all of the bombs, all of the satellites, all rebuilt. So will Russia and so will China, and we are in the midst of a nuclear arms race—well into the second quarter of a new nuclear arms race, exceedingly expensive and exceedingly dangerous, because the delivery systems are stealthy, designed not to be observed. That is a problem because that increases the risk.

Maybe we can use some of that money to build the infrastructure to educate our kids, to provide for seniors who have Alzheimer's, to care for the caregivers that are taking care of their parents, to build an infrastructure program that really gives America a solid foundation for economic growth, one in which the research facilities are the most modern and in which the most advantageous research is conducted. Maybe we could find, amongst our choices here, money to build a highway system that is worthy of this Nation, one in which there are not potholes every 100 yards, one in which bridges don't collapse; that we can build water systems in which you can take tap water from every fountain in this Nation and drink it, without a concern about contamination of lead or something else. We could do that. We could make some choices.

We can go back and revisit the tax scam in which there are specific inducements for offshoring American jobs. Maybe we can do that.

Maybe we can look at some of the military spending and say: Why does it cost \$1 billion to launch a satellite with one system and \$90 million with another system to do the same thing? There are things we can do.

And, most of all, it is time for a better deal for America: a better deal for the working men and women, a better deal for the elderly, and a better deal for the children. That is what we need to do.

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

#### TAX REFORM

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. MITCHELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the topic of my Special Order.

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