

some progress. But what we are lacking is the Federal component.

It is essential that we build a transportation and water infrastructure system to meet the 21st century system needs, not only of California, but of our entire Nation, and the valley I have the honor and privilege to represent.

We need a more reliable water system to supply our farms and cities that are growing, and with climate change, we know we have to take that into account. We also need a better 21st century system of transportation.

What is missing? I will tell you what is missing: Federal funding; Federal participation. To make this happen, we in Congress should incentivize States and local governments like in California and the counties I represent that have already raised funds for these projects, with a Federal funding stream that will complement these State and local efforts.

California and the San Joaquin Valley are already doing their part, and we need, here in Washington, to do our part to invest in our country's future. This will require Democrats and Republicans to work together to engage in a serious bipartisan deliberation and negotiations this year to make this national infrastructure project a reality.

Last week, we in the Problem Solvers Caucus released a report to the State of our Nation's infrastructure and made bipartisan recommendations on how we get there. These recommendations can serve as a foundation for consensus on which bipartisan collaboration can build the policy that repairs, advances, and invests in America's infrastructure.

Although we have not seen a lot of bipartisan deliberative policymaking here lately, I am urging my colleagues on both sides of the aisle to show some profiles in courage. We must come together to invest in America's infrastructure if we expect to have the capacity for the economic development and innovation for the future of America in the 21st century.

I have made this a priority throughout my years of service in the San Joaquin Valley, both in Sacramento and now in Washington, D.C. I invite my colleagues to join me in investing in America's infrastructure; work with the President; work on a bipartisan basis.

After all, that is what we are supposed to do in investing in America's infrastructure and, therefore, our future. This has been our tradition in the past and how we have gotten great projects completed, and this is the kind of investment we need to make today for America's infrastructure.

Let us work together. It is the right thing to do.

#### AFGHANISTAN CONTINUES TO BE A FAILED POLICY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from North Carolina (Mr. JONES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JONES. Mr. Speaker, as we in Congress are faced with another continuing resolution, I cannot help but think about the wasted lives and money in Afghanistan.

On Sunday night's 60 Minutes, I watched, with great interest, a segment about the 16-year war in Afghanistan. The title was: "Kabul under siege while America's longest war rages on."

During the interview, Correspondent Lara Logan detailed the growing danger in Afghanistan and interviewed General John Nicholson, commander of American forces in Afghanistan, as well as Afghanistan's President Ghani. While I do not have the time to go into detail, this segment made it very clear—and I think anyone watching would agree—that Afghanistan continues to be a failed policy.

□ 1045

At one time, Lara Logan stated to Nicholson: "A lot of people at home just don't buy that terrorists are coming from Afghanistan to attack them at home. They are worrying about the guy going to rent a truck from Home Depot and drive into a crowd of civilians."

In General Nicholson's response, there was a sentence that caught my attention, where he said: "We need to defeat the ideology."

I was amazed and astonished by his response. It has been said that you cannot kill an ideology with a bullet or a bomb. So why are we still trying?

This is why I am calling on Speaker RYAN, once again, to permit the House of Representatives to have a policy debate on Afghanistan.

Mr. Speaker, I have beside me a poster of a young woman whose husband was killed in Afghanistan. It is so pathetic because the woman and the mother of the little girl sitting in her lap is crying, yet the little girl is looking at the Army officer with a look like: Why am I here? Why is there a flag-draped coffin? Why is my mother crying?

The little girl is too young to really understand what is happening.

Mr. Speaker, I call on Speaker RYAN to let us have a debate on the policy issue of Afghanistan and its future.

I will close with the words of the 31st Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Chuck Krulak, who said: "No one has ever conquered Afghanistan, and many have tried. We will join the list of nations that tried and failed."

Mr. RYAN, the Speaker of the House, it is your time to call for this House to debate the future of Afghanistan. Please make that call to the House of Representatives that we will have that debate.

#### OFFSHORE OIL AND GAS DRILLING

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Maine (Ms. PINGREE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. PINGREE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to voice my strong opposition to

the Trump administration's proposal to lift a decades-old ban on offshore oil and gas drilling on our country's Atlantic and Pacific Coasts.

This proposal has to be one of the most irresponsible actions of the Trump administration. Currently, 94 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf is off limits to drilling, and rightly so, given the importance of protecting the economic and cultural value of the country's coastlines.

The Trump administration has offered a staggering reversal, proposing to open up over 90 percent of the Outer Continental Shelf to oil and gas drilling. While Governors and lawmakers from both parties have risen to voice their opposition to this plan, this administration is moving forward at a breakneck speed. It has given a mere 60 days for the public to comment. In my home State of Maine, which has much to lose from this plan, we don't even get a full public hearing.

This proposal's lack of transparency and fairness couldn't have been more apparent than when Governor Rick Scott of Florida somehow earned an exemption for his State. Everyone can see that this was less about protecting Florida's pristine beaches and coastline, as Governor Scott said, than a political favor from President Trump.

Mr. Speaker, I absolutely have nothing against the Florida coast. But the State shouldn't have to be home to Mar-a-Lago to earn an exemption from this awful plan. All coastal States deserve this protection.

My home State of Maine is one of them. If you measured every inch of our State's jagged coastline and islands, it would measure an incredible 3,500 miles. Those miles include some of the most beautiful places in the world and critical habitat for hundreds of species of fish and wildlife.

That coast is also dotted with dozens of small towns filled with hardworking people who depend on a beautiful, healthy ocean to make their living.

Two of my State's largest industries are tourism and fishing. Tourism in Maine is a \$5.6 billion industry, 71 percent of which comes directly in from the Maine coast. Millions of people visit our State to experience our beautiful coastline, snug harbors, and stunning landmarks, like the Marshall Point Lighthouse in Port Clyde.

Our fishing industry and businesses that support it have even more to lose from this proposal. Thirty thousand Mainers make their living in marine industries. They include boat builders, ground fishermen, clammers, seaweed harvesters, oyster and mussel farmers, and, of course, lobstermen.

Our world-famous lobster fishing industry alone brings in \$500 million annually. I have had so many discussions with the lobster fishermen who tell me about all the difficulties their industry already faces. They want to pass their businesses on to their sons and daughters, but they worry about the future.

Will the Gulf of Maine, which is already warming faster than 99.9 percent

of the world's ocean waters, remain prime habitat for lobster? Will ocean acidification harm the lobster population and shellfish in ways we don't already know about yet?

Do we really need to add the potential of an oil spill to the list of things that already keep them up at night?

In Maine, we know the risk because we have seen the consequences. In 1996, a tanker named the *Julie N.* spilled about 200,000 gallons of heating oil in Maine's Casco Bay. It cost over \$40 million to clean up and it caused lobster prices to plummet.

About 200,000 gallons of spilled oil is a drop in the bucket when you talk about the spilled oil from the Deepwater Horizon, which spilled 200 million gallons into the Gulf of Mexico. The result on the marine environment was devastating. Shrimp, crab, oyster, and other fisheries in those States may never fully recover.

The risks of this proposal to my State and others are simply too great. And for what? Our Nation is already the top producer of oil and gas in the world, and with fuel prices currently low, this proposal would not boost the economy.

If this administration is really worried about remaining internationally competitive in the energy market, it should throw its support behind developing alternative energy sources instead of abandoning them.

This proposal is unacceptable and irresponsible. I will continue to fight back against the environmental and economic harm it threatens for Maine and the Nation. I am proud to cosponsor legislation with my colleagues in New England to prohibit drilling off our States, and another bill to keep the drilling ban in place entirely along the Atlantic and Pacific Coasts. I encourage all my colleagues to do the same and to stop this terrible plan before it is too late.

#### HOPE FOR TERMINALLY ILL PATIENTS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama (Mr. BROOKS) for 5 minutes.

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Mr. Speaker, roughly 4 years ago, Steve Mayfield was a respected high school football coach at Central High School in Lauderdale County, Alabama, who, in October 2014, was diagnosed with ALS.

Steve Mayfield bravely fought his terminal disease and kept a smile on his face throughout his lengthy 3-year battle and ordeal.

In a land of freedom and liberty, Steve Mayfield would have had two choices. On the one hand, he could abide by Food and Drug Administration regulations and recommendations and die; or on the other hand, Steve Mayfield could try experimental treatments that gave some hope of beating ALS and extending Steve Mayfield's life.

Unfortunately, when it comes to terminal illnesses in America, there is no

freedom or liberty. Steve Mayfield not only had to fight ALS, he also had to fight the Food and Drug Administration before he could try experimental but potentially lifesaving treatments.

Sadly, Steve Mayfield lost both fights. Steve Mayfield was barred by the Federal Government from trying possibly lifesaving treatments and, not long ago, passed away. Steve Mayfield's son, Brooks Mayfield, from Florence, Alabama, was with his father when he passed away.

It is in that vein, Mr. Speaker, that I call on the House to have a floor vote on Senate bill S. 204, the Right to Try Act, which passed the Senate last year, that restores the right of terminally ill patients to try experimental treatments that may save their lives. Brooks Mayfield's father might be alive today if the Right to Try Act had been the law of the land.

Mr. Speaker, we must remember who we are as Americans. Our ancestors fought the Revolutionary War over liberty and freedom, yet, today in America, patients who are 100 percent certain to die are denied the freedom, the liberty, the right to decide for themselves whether to try experimental treatments that may save their lives. Every day in America, terminally ill patients and their families are told there are no options but death.

By way of background, fewer than 3 percent of terminally ill patients in America have access to investigational treatments through clinical trials. While the Food and Drug Administration grants compassionate use waivers meant to allow terminal patients access to experimental drugs, only about 1,500 waivers were granted in 2016.

What are other terminally ill Americans to do? Nothing? Just waste away and die without a fight?

Patients shouldn't have to give up their liberty, their freedom, their fight against terminal illness merely because the Food and Drug Administration says so. Terminally ill patients shouldn't have to beg the FDA for a waiver, forcing patients to fight the Federal bureaucracy, when they are already fighting for their lives.

The Right to Try Act gives terminally ill patients access to treatments that have successfully completed the FDA's phase one approval requirement but not yet completed the FDA's lengthy and complex full approval process that can take decades.

Sadly, sometimes when treatments and drugs reach final approval, it is too late for too many patients and their families because the terminally ill patient has already died.

Mr. Speaker, given the stark contrasts between life and death, between freedom and Federal dictates, between hope and hopelessness, the House should take up and pass the Right to Try Act, thereby giving a chance for life to terminally ill patients and their families.

The United States Senate overwhelmingly passed Right to Try legis-

lation last year. It is time for the House to do the same, thereby restoring freedom, liberty, and hope, and giving terminally ill patients across America a better chance to live.

#### DACA

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. LIPINSKI) for 5 minutes.

Mr. LIPINSKI. Mr. Speaker, DACA must be fixed for the good of these young immigrants and for the good of our Nation.

In September, Leaders Pelosi and Schumer and President Trump agreed to protect DACA recipients and improve border security. Since that time, I have worked in the 48-Member, bipartisan House Problem Solvers Caucus to come up with a plan that would do just that.

I thank Senators DURBIN, GRAHAM, BENNET, GARDNER, MENENDEZ, and FLAKE, who have put together a compromise bill in the Senate, which is gaining momentum. After working on this for 5 months, I know just how hard it is to come up with a compromise, so I just want to thank these Senators for what they have done.

The Problem Solvers Caucus continues to work on a plan, and I am hopeful that we will have one imminently because time is running short.

I was very happy to hear Congressman GUTIERREZ right here from this podium a few minutes ago endorse the idea of a compromise even though it is not what he wants, but we need to protect these DACA recipients.

We have to break the status quo in Washington—the bickering and the gridlock—which gets in the way of good solutions for our country. This solution on DACA can and should get done if only we can get away from the rhetoric and use some common sense.

□ 1100

Unfortunately, common sense is not common in Washington. I call on my colleagues to get past the bickering and the rhetoric. Do what is right for the American people. Fix DACA, and let's move on and do great things together for our Nation.

#### RECOGNIZING DR. TIMOTHY M. BLOCK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK) for 5 minutes.

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my constituent Dr. Timothy M. Block, president of the Hepatitis B Foundation, Baruch S. Blumberg Institute of Living Science, and the Pennsylvania Biotechnology Center in my district in Doylestown, Pennsylvania.

Dr. Block was recently named as a fellow of the U.S. National Academy of Inventors. Being elected as a NAI fellow is the highest professional recognition for academic inventors who have