

1786, which grew into the First Amendment in our Constitution and other Bill of Rights, that freedom is under assault.

Courts, time and again, try to strike down the ability for people to peaceably assemble, peaceably speak their religious views, whether it is on a football field after a game or even extending so much to people objecting to what they are going to do in their bakery with what kind of products they are going to put out. We have folks that seem to think that religion is some kind of a plague in this country.

Yes, maybe it is an inconvenience if your neighbor worships in a way that is different from you; but that is something that we have always, in the term "tolerance," worked to get along with.

Indeed, this House Chamber, every day, opens with an invocation; and right above the podium here, it says: "In God we trust."

Are we going to trust ourselves as a nation to allow each other to worship freely? Or are we going to have an oppressive shutdown of that by out-of-control courts?

We need to hold on to religious freedom.

HONORING FORMER CONGRESSMAN AND CINCINNATI MAYOR TOM LUKEN

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

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I rise this evening to honor former Congressman and Cincinnati Mayor Tom Luken, who passed away last week at the age of 92.

Tom Luken was a Democratic stalwart and something of a local political legend representing the people of Cincinnati for 15 years in this body.

I learned firsthand just how tough a politician he was when I ran against Tom in 1988. He won. But I also learned a great deal about Tom Luken, the man, during that race. He was a dedicated public servant who always focused on the needs of the people he represented. He was a devoted husband, father, grandfather, and great-grandfather.

As many probably know, his son Charlie was also Cincinnati mayor and also served in this body for a term.

Mr. Speaker, even though we were from different political parties and disagreed on a lot of issues, I have always respected Tom for his commitment and dedication to our community and to our Nation. I hope that his wife, Shirley, and his entire family know just how much Tom Luken will be missed.

A BETTER DEAL FOR AMERICA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. 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, with all the things that are happening in

Washington, it is pretty easy to feel concerned and to lose faith in what it is that we are doing here. It is language, questions of racism, questions of tax policy, winners, losers.

Mr. Speaker, I decided today to be optimistic, to be upbeat, and to say: Hey, there really are things that we can do if we just put our minds to it and begin to work together.

Before I start these sessions on the floor, I always like to ground myself in what is it that I would like, and that I would like my colleagues, to accomplish. I always turn to Franklin Delano Roosevelt, who brought us through the Great Depression and the Great War. Etched in the marble at his memorial here in Washington, D.C., are these words: "The test of our progress is not whether we add more to the abundance of those who have much . . ."

I probably ought to repeat that. "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."

I always want to start with that because it grounds me as I look at the multiple opportunities we have here to do just this: add more to those who have much.

For example, the tax bill that passed just before Christmas and was signed into law clearly does more for those who have much. Well over 80 percent of the \$1.5 trillion—actually, far more than that—that were involved in the tax giveaway went to the superwealthy and America's major corporations.

But I said I was going to be positive and I didn't want to drag all of us down further in that tax scam, but what I really want to talk about is what we can do to add for those who have too little. So let me start with that.

My Democratic colleagues and I have been talking for the better part of 6 months now about a better deal for America, things that we can do to improve the lot of everyday Americans so we can provide enough for those who have too little. We all know that middle class America has stalled out over the last 20 years. So we set up a series of policies, programs, and legislation to improve the situation for working men and women of America, for those who clearly have too little and those who are struggling every day to meet their mortgage, keep their kids in school. So it is really about investing in America and making it in America, a series of programs and policies.

I am not going to talk about all of those tonight, but I want to focus on this one: making it in America and investing in America.

Before I go on to explain more about it, the rest of the program, really, is this: better jobs, better wages, and a better future.

So when we talk as Democrats about a better deal, a better deal for America, we are really talking about these three fundamental things: better jobs, better wages, and, therefore, a better future for Americans.

□ 1930

There are many different ways that this can be done. One of the principal ones is this: those of you who follow this—and I suspect there are very few of you—but if you have been following these floor sessions that I and others have been doing for the last, in this case, 6 years, we developed this little placard: "Make It In America. Manufacturing Matters." It is pretty fundamental.

Over the years, we have looked at the hollowing out of the great manufacturing centers of America. Some people like to say it is the Rust Belt. Well, the Rust Belt is coming back, and it can come back, roaring back, if we pay attention to the policies that create manufacturing opportunities.

The President has talked about this, but, unfortunately, the policies that actually have emanated from the administration, in many cases, harm the manufacturing sectors—I am the ranking member of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee—maritime, ocean, inland waterways, the great Mississippi, the Ohio River system, the Great Lakes of America; and, of course, the coasts; the harbors, New York Harbor; Charleston; the harbors in Florida and across the Gulf Coast; in California, the great harbors of San Diego, Los Angeles, Long Beach, and the San Francisco Bay Area; and further North, Oregon and up into Washington.

These maritime opportunities are enormous. And, unfortunately, we, far too often, ignore those opportunities. And so on the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee of the Transportation and Infrastructure Committee, we are trying to focus on ways in which we can actually rebuild the great American maritime industry.

If you go back in the history of this Nation, back to its very earliest days, in the early policies of George Washington and Alexander Hamilton, they set out policies to encourage the maritime industry. By the way, for those of you who really want to know where the first inheritance tax came into being, it was John Adams. He actually put the inheritance tax in place to build a frigate for the U.S. Navy. So it goes way, way back.

That takes me back to tax policy, and I said I wouldn't deal with that too much, but it is hard to ignore the fact that it was a very bad tax bill for the working men and women. One of the reasons it was a bad tax bill is that we need to build our infrastructure. There is going to be a lot of talk here in the next several weeks about the President's infrastructure plan—\$1 trillion infrastructure plan. Good idea. Let's do it.

What was that movie? That famous line? "Show me the money." It disappeared. It disappeared in that tax bill. Where did it go? It went to the superwealthy. Maybe they will build the infrastructure. I am sure the top 1 percent, the top 10 percent, would be

happy to build a road if, of course, they could charge a fee to get the people who use the road to pay that fee. But that doesn't make much sense.

I will take you back to Alexander Hamilton and George Washington. They put into America's public policy, in the very first Presidency, a road-building policy, and it has, more or less, been with us over the years where the public pays for this in fees and services. But the money disappeared. It is gone. It is gone in the tax cut. It is not there. \$200 billion will be discussed over the next several weeks.

Where are you going to get \$200 billion in this year's budget? More than \$150 billion disappeared now in the tax scam. So maybe they can find it somewhere. The military wants another \$50 billion, and, of course, there are healthcare services, and there is a need for education and so forth.

So here is what we can do without going into the budget bill, without trying to find new money, but, rather, to use a public policy that was first enunciated and written into law when the Arctic opened. Do you remember the North Slope of Alaska back in the 1960s, when the U.S. Government decided to allow oil drilling on the North Slope of Alaska? It was written into that law that allowed for the pipeline to be built from the North Slope down to Valdez in southern Alaska, that all of the oil that would come through that pipeline would have to be on American-built ships with American sailors.

And guess what? Ships were built, mariners were hired, and oil was put on those tankers and shipped into the American ports. Later, that oil was shipped offshore to Japan. And over the years, the petroleum industry was able to whittle away at that requirement of American ships built in America with American mariners. And so today, there is no requirement that any oil developed in the United States, any natural gas developed in the United States and exported, be on American-built ships.

So what does it mean? It means that ships are coming into our ports to take a strategic national asset, our oil and our natural gas. It is being put on a foreign-built ship with foreign sailors, foreign mariners who come and go, who don't pay taxes in the United States; ships that are not built in the United States with American steel, American-made engines, and all of the electronics and pumps, and all of the other equipment, not made in America.

So here is the deal. What if we decided to go back to the future? What if we decided the future ought to be like the past, and this strategic national asset be used to rebuild our shipyards, to employ our mariners, to give us in the United States the ability to build commercial ships of all sizes, and, at the same time, enhance the productivity of our shipyards as they build our U.S. Naval vessels and our Coast Guard vessels?

What if we were to do that? Well, we would employ thousands of people in the shipyards; our steel companies operating, taking ore from the North, bringing it to the steel mills, manufacturing that steel for the shipyards, the engines that go into those ships—which, by the way, are maybe about a quarter of the size of this room. I mean, huge diesel engines—and all of the other pumps and all of the other equipment, what if we were to do that? Why not? What would that mean? Well, let's see. We could make it in America, or they could continue to be built in China, Korea, India, but not in America.

Here is the deal: all we need to do is to write a law. All we need to do is to go back and copy the law that was written in the 1960s that required that the oil from the North Slope of Alaska, coming down the pipeline to Valdez, be on American ships. That is all we have to do. And if we were to do that, wow, we would employ thousands of people in our shipyards. We would have thousands of men and women on those ships across the oceans delivering a strategic national asset to far places in the world, to Japan, to China, and to beyond.

It is possible. Our work here is to have a better deal for America, a better deal for Americans, policies that lead to the employment of Americans, policies that help to rebuild our steel industry, that bring strength back into our shipyards so that we can provide the jobs.

We are not talking about minimum-wage jobs here. We are talking about jobs that are at the higher echelon of the middle wages, of middle America. We are talking about skill sets, welders, pipefitters, steamfitters. We are talking about engineers who design these ships. We are talking about marine architects. We are talking about the financing of these.

We are talking about thousands upon thousands of jobs spread out across America, and all we need to do is to go back, visit the past, bring it forward into law, and make sure that a strategic national asset is used to bring jobs to America.

It would be nice if 100 percent of that oil and gas were on American-built ships, but, frankly, the American shipyards don't have the capacity to do it. Now and probably never would they have the capacity to build all of the ships that are necessary. Right now, at a facility in Texas, the Sabine Pass, a company called Cheniere Energy is shipping natural gas taken from the ground in the United States, brought to Texas, put on ships that are taking that natural gas all around the world—most of it going to Asia.

That natural gas could also go to Europe, and if we were to work out a deal with the European Union and the countries in Europe, we would use that natural gas as a strategic asset to put in place in those countries of Europe that now have to depend upon gas from Rus-

sia. And let's understand this. Russia is using their natural gas as a lever against the European Union and against the Europeans as we try to build our relationship with Europe.

So how many ships are being used? Probably when that one export facility in Texas is up and operating at its full capacity, it will take over 100 LNG tankers to meet the demands of that one export facility. Now, it happens that there are five—maybe six, but certainly five—new export facilities that are being licensed around the United States: one in Maryland, not too far from Washington; another in Oregon; and others in other parts of the coastal areas of the United States.

So how many ships? We don't know for sure. But I do know this: if, over the next 10 years, we were to require that just 15 percent—well, let's make this over the next 20 years—that just 15 percent of the expected export of LNG were to be on American-built ships, we would, in American shipyards, build at least 25 ships. And these are not small, little tugboats. We are talking about major oceangoing LNG tankers.

Now, for the crude oil, if just 10 percent of the crude oil were on American-built ships, by 2032, we would have 31 ships built here in America. So we are talking well over 50 ships built in the United States. To put this in context, major, deep-draft ships built in America's shipyards over the last 3 years, the average number of ships, deep draft—these are big ships—built in American shipyards has been in the range of 10 to 12 ships.

Eight of those are for the U.S. Navy; maybe three have been for the commercial fleet. So we are talking about the potential for a very significant expansion of work in American shipyards if we were to write just a couple of lines of law to require that, beginning in 2022, just 1 percent of the natural gas be on American-built ships. That would bring three ships in. And then they would ramp it up over time, increasing the percentage: 3 percent by 2026, 10 percent by 2034—that would be 16 ships—and 15 percent by 2040. So that would be 25 ships built in America carrying LNG, liquified natural gas.

For crude oil, let's start at 1 percent. That would be three ships; 4 percent by 2026, 12 ships; 8 percent by 2029, 24 ships; and 10 percent by 2032, and that would be 31 ships. This is the art of the possible. What does it mean for America? It means good middle class jobs.

I will give you another example. This is a locomotive, an electric locomotive built in Sacramento. Some 70 of these locomotives were built for the railroads for Amtrak here in the East on the Eastern corridor. It took probably more than 1,000 jobs in Sacramento, California, to build these locomotives. One hundred percent American made.

□ 1945

How did that happen? Do you remember back in the Great Recession in 2009, Congress—Democrats, without Republican support—put in place the stimulus bill, the American Recovery and

Reinvestment Act? Some \$800 million were set aside to provide locomotives for the East Coast, for the Eastern corridor.

Most companies said: We don't build locomotives anymore.

So General Electric and GM just waved off the possibility. But in Sacramento, there was this German company called Siemens that was building light railcars, transit cars and the like, at a newly established plant in Sacramento, California.

They looked at it and said: \$800 million, 100 percent American made. We are a German company, but we are operating in America. Do you want 100 percent American-made locomotives, the wheels, the electrical engines, the electrical motors, all of the electronics? That German company said: Bring it on.

\$800 million, they signed the contract, and they produced 70, 100 percent American-made locomotives.

So what is the point? The point is, maybe 1,000, maybe a little less, middle class jobs in Sacramento, California, and you can bet that steel wasn't made in California. It came from the Midwest. You can bet that those wheels were made outside of California. The electric motors came in from the East and the Midwest.

So this opportunity was spread out all across America. It is exactly the same if we were to require that our liquified natural gas, a strategic American asset, were exported on American-built ships, and the same for the oil that comes from the Bakken up in the North and the Middle American States.

All of that is the art of the possible. So we are all about doing this. We are all about making it in America.

I will take a couple of seconds, and I am going to give you one more example. For those of us in northern California and anybody who wants to tour San Francisco and the San Francisco Bay Area, you will see a fabulous new bridge spanning the bay from Oakland to San Francisco. It is a beautiful bridge.

However, it was a bridge that was built with Chinese steel. It was supposed to be 10 percent cheaper, so they went for the cheap, but they wound up with the crud. They wound up with steel that had weld problems and that had quality problems. It ultimately wound up to be way, way over the budget, and 3,000 jobs and a brand new, high-tech, most advanced steel manufacturing plant perhaps in the world was built in China. No jobs in America, no new steel mill in America, but there was in China. That is what happens when you buy foreign.

I guess New Yorkers were a little smarter than my California colleagues. So in New York, they wanted to build a new bridge called the Tappan Zee Bridge. They said: We are going to make it with American steel. It costs \$3.9 billion, under budget, and there were 7,728 American jobs.

It makes a difference. Public policy makes a difference. If you want jobs in

America, then you set about to give Americans a better deal. Public policy and laws, that is our work. We are your Representatives.

We ought to be representing you, not the Chinese steel mills. We ought to be representing you, not the shipbuilders in Japan or Korea. We should be representing you, the American people, the people who are working in the shipyards of America.

The children of today's shipbuilders need an opportunity to continue the work of their fathers and their grandfathers in America's great shipyards.

I will tell you this: our public safety, the security of America, depends upon the U.S. Navy. The U.S. Navy depends upon shipyards for their ships. The more commercial ships we build in the shipyards, the more competition there will be to build naval ships.

So here it is, a better deal. This is what we Democrats are offering. We are offering a better deal. We are going to focus directly on better jobs.

Tonight, we have talked about American manufacturing. We talked about making it in America. We talked about making ships in America once again. We are talking about high-paid, middle class jobs in American manufacturing, whether it is the shipyard or whether it is where these great engines are manufactured, wherever it may be in the United States.

So better jobs, better wages from these high-quality jobs, and, therefore, a better future for America.

So here, while we spend all of our time wondering what the next tweet will be from our President, I want us also to think about the art of the possible, about legislation that provides Americans with a better deal.

We will talk more about this in future days, but, right now, I want us all to think about what we can do for America so that we will have a better deal for the working men and women of America.

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

RECESS

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

Accordingly (at 7 o'clock and 51 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 2036

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. ADERHOLT) at 8 o'clock and 36 minutes p.m.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. CUELLAR (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of travel delay due to weather.

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

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported and found truly enrolled bills of the House of the following titles, which were thereupon signed by the Speaker:

H.R. 984. An Act to extend Federal recognition to the Chickahominy Indian Tribe, the Chickahominy Indian Tribe—Eastern Division, the Upper Mattaponi Tribe, the Rappahannock Tribe, Inc., the Monacan Indian Nation, and the Nansemond Indian Tribe.

H.R. 4641. An Act to authorize the President to award the Medal of Honor to John L. Canley for acts of valor during the Vietnam War while a member of the Marine Corps.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 37 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 17, 2018, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

3738. A letter from the Program Specialist (Paperwork Reduction Act), LRAD, Office of the Comptroller of the Currency, Department of the Treasury, transmitting the Department's joint final rule — Community Reinvestment Act Regulations [Docket ID: OCC-2017-0025] (RIN: 1557-AE30) January 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3739. A letter from the General Counsel, National Credit Union Administration, transmitting the Administration's final rule — Emergency Mergers—Chartering and Field of Membership (RIN: 3133-AE76) received January 2, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3740. A letter from the Secretary, Securities and Exchange Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Treatment of Certain Communications Involving Security-Based Swaps That May Be Purchased Only By Eligible Contract Participants [Release No.: 33-10450; File No.: ST-09-14] (RIN: 3235-AL41) received January 10, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

3741. A letter from the Deputy Director, Regulations Policy and Management Staff, FDA, Department of Health and Human Services, transmitting the Department's final rule — New Animal Drugs for Investigational Use; Disqualification of a Clinical Investigator [Docket No.: FDA-2011-N-0079] (RIN: 0910-AH64) received January 5, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

3742. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's withdrawal of direct final rule — Air