

jokes, and he would end the show with his original song called "High Sierra." So maybe I will share just a few of those lyrics right now:

High Sierra, skies are blue,
Whispering pines remind me of you.
Walking together, over meadows green,
We pledged our love, by a rippling stream.
I can see the sunlight shining on her golden hair

And hear the words she told me as we were standing there.

High Sierra, calling me home.

It is at this point in the show where the credits would fade out. The lyrics would come to an end, and people were already waiting again for next Sunday to come around.

As the song says, High Sierra is once again calling him home. After 93 years of enriching the lives of northern Californians, many of us were fortunate enough to sing along with him during those 93 years. Those memories won't fade. There will never be another like Moriss Taylor. He will be greatly missed, indeed.

High Sierra, calling him home.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. NORMAN). Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ESPAILLAT) is recognized for 57 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

GENERAL LEAVE

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

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I stand on the floor of the U.S. House of Representatives as the clock keeps ticking for us to act on behalf of DREAMers and DACA recipients.

Tonight, this House approved a continuing resolution funding government to continue to stay open for another 4 weeks that did not include a resolution to the dire conditions faced by DREAMers and DACA recipients. It did not include funding for community based health clinics, and it certainly did not adequately support the men and women in our Armed Forces.

Yet, Mr. Speaker, as we continue to move forward, many Members of this House have worked diligently throughout the months to address the issues faced by DREAMers and DACA recipients. In fact, they have engaged in bipartisan legislative solutions. And we currently have three bipartisan bills that could have been voted on today on this very same floor of the House of Representatives. I guarantee you that if they would have been brought here to this floor and they would have given

us the opportunity to vote on them, they would have passed.

Because DREAMers are very popular in America. All polls show that over 80 percent of Americans across the Nation in different States, in different cities, want these young people to stay. Once you meet them, once you see their young faces, their energy, their desire to work and move forward, their patriotism for America, they win you over.

No other immigration-related issue, I believe, has polled as high as the support that DREAMers are getting from across the country. Folks who live in red States and blue States, in districts represented by Democrats, districts represented by Republicans, feel overwhelmingly that these young people should stay here; that they should not be punished and sent back to a country that many of them don't really know, where they have no connection with family members.

Some may not even speak the language spoken in those countries or be familiar with the customs in those nations. They feel they are Americans, and they have contributed tremendously to our Nation. So these bipartisan efforts and solutions that my colleagues have engaged in are very important.

Let's begin by talking about the Dream Act, a clean Dream Act, which is a bipartisan bill led by Representative LUCILLE ROYBAL-ALLARD, a Democrat from California; and Representative ILEANA ROS-LEHTINEN, a Republican from Florida.

This particular bill, the Dream Act, a clean Dream Act, has 200 bipartisan cosponsors, including myself. This is not amnesty. Many have tried to portray the DREAMers' quest and fight as a fight for amnesty. This is not amnesty. This particular bill, which has over 200 cosponsors, asks of the DREAMers that in order for them to be eligible for the Dream Act, that a person needed to have been 18 years of age on the date of entry, that they must have been physically present in the U.S. 4 years prior to the enactment of the legislation.

Any applicant could not be convicted of any offense punishable for more than 1 year, or three or more offenses resulting in 90 days or more of imprisonment. In other words, they had to have a clean record.

This was just to be considered. Once they were accepted into the program, they will get a conditional permanent residency status, a temporary green card. Then to transition to lawful permanent residence under the Dream Act, a DREAMer needed to do certain things. In other words, for them to transition from a conditional green card to a permanent green card, they needed to maintain a clean record for 8 years. They needed to have completed a college degree or 2 years for a bachelor's degree or higher, or they must have served in the military for 2 years.

It further asks that they would have to have been employed for at least 3 years for 75 percent of the time under

the conditional permanent residency status.

In addition to that, only after meeting all of the above, could they then transition to legal permanent status. So after that, they would have to wait an additional 5 years for them to be able to apply for naturalization, citizenship. So they would have to wait in total, from the time they got their temporary green card to the time they actually will be eligible to apply for citizenship, a total of 13 years. More than a decade.

So the campaign to portray the Dream Act or a solution to the DREAMers and the DACA situation as amnesty is totally false. So 13 years—13 long years—they would have to wait from the minute they got a temporary green card to the time they will be eligible to apply for naturalization, citizenship.

So 80 percent of America supports these DREAMers. And this is the Dream Act, a bipartisan bill that has been around for some time, led by Republicans and Democrats that did not have a border security provision to it.

But we heard how the other side of the aisle wanted to address some of the concerns at the border. A group of bipartisan Members of this House led by Representative WILL HURD from Texas and PETE AGUILAR began to put together a second proposal, USA Act. And this proposal currently has 49 bipartisan cosponsors. It came out of efforts put together by a group called the Problem Solvers.

In this particular proposal, in order for you to be eligible for the USA Act, a person needed to be at least 18 years of age on the date of entry and not have been convicted, again, of an offense punishable for more than 1 year, or any combination of offenses resulting in imprisonment for more than 1 year. Then the person could transition to lawful permanent residency.

Again, they had to maintain a clean record for 8 years, and had to complete a college degree or complete 2 years in a bachelor's degree or higher postsecondary vocational programs. They must have served in the military for the entire length of their enlistment contract or been employed for at least 3 years 80 percent of the time they were under conditional permanent residency status. Only after meeting all of the above, could they then transition to legal permanent residency.

□ 2115

Then after 5 additional years, they will have been able to apply for naturalization.

The USA Act has a border security component unlike the clean Dream Act.

These bipartisan Members of this House tried to address some of the concerns of Members from across the aisle who continue to complain and be seriously concerned about border security. They included directing Homeland Security to deploy more technology along

the border and to submit a plan to Congress regarding expansion of vehicle, cargo, and pedestrian inspection lanes on the top 10 high-volume ports of entry.

This last clause in this bill is very important because our ports of entry are very antiquated and dilapidated. This is precisely where most of the illegal drugs, illegal guns, and human trafficking enters our Nation. This particular bill calls for revamping and modernizing these ports of entry. The USA Act also would add an additional 55 immigration judges per year over the next 3 fiscal years.

Finally, this bipartisan bill develops a strategy to address the factors driving migration from Northern Triangle countries in Central America.

So you have the Dream Act, the clean Dream Act, which many of us fought for. You have the USA Act, another bipartisan bill that many in this House fought to put together. But it does not end there.

In addition to these two avenues that could have been taken tonight here in this House to address the plight of 800,000 DREAMers, the Senate acted and sent us over an immigration framework of ideas led by Senators GRAHAM and DURBIN, in addition to Senators MICHAEL BENNET, JEFF FLAKE, and CORY GARDNER, and Senator BOB MENENDEZ from New Jersey.

Under this framework, the eligibility criteria bars DREAMers who have been convicted of crimes, and they must satisfy any Federal tax liability that they may have accrued while receiving work authorization under DACA.

A pathway to citizenship would be 12 years, unlike the other two proposals that call for 8 years, this is at 12 years, and 2 of which they could get credit for for their time under DACA.

This proposal, this framework, coming from the Senate also added additional border security elements which included \$1.459 billion for wall planning, design, and construction, as well as an additional \$1.1 billion for tactical infrastructure, software border surveillance technology, and other equipment.

All three of these bills were crafted under a bipartisan effort by Members from both sides of the aisle. I think that it is tragic that we lost another great opportunity tonight to bring any one of those three bills to this floor to be voted upon by the Members of this House, particularly since the public sentiment—over 80 percent of America feels that these young people should stay in our Nation.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from the great State of Texas, Congressman AL GREEN, who is my good friend and colleague.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I clearly, truly, and sincerely thank the gentleman from New York for yielding to me. I would like to acknowledge that his message was most edifying. It was made perspicuously clear, and anyone having the opportunity to hear his message clearly un-

derstands that there is a pathway to success for the DREAMers. I am grateful that he has given his message, and I am honored that he has yielded to me.

Mr. Speaker, Dr. King—and I mention him tonight because we just celebrated his life and legacy, and I am still celebrating—but Dr. King reminded us that the time is always ripe—r-i-p-e—always ripe to do right. The time is always beneficial, the time is always right to do that which is right. There may appear to be circumstances before you that would cause you to conclude that there are great obstacles in your way, and because of these great obstacles, you probably should wait just a little bit longer. But there are some questions that cannot wait, and allowing time to pass will only allow greater harm to manifest itself. The time is always ripe, and the time is always right to do that which is right.

In the past, the not too distant past, I was accorded the preeminent privilege of bringing a privileged resolution before the Congress, and that resolution was one for impeachment. That resolution received 58 votes to further the opportunity for impeachment to be voted upon. There were a good many people who were of the opinion that this was 57 more votes than expected. I had no idea as to the number of votes that would be cast for moving the resolution forward such that there might be an up-or-down vote on impeachment. I had no idea. Fifty-eight votes was acceptable to me. But I also want the RECORD to show, Mr. Speaker, that if there had been but one vote, that would have been acceptable to me because the time is always ripe to do that which is right, and it was the right thing to do to bring the Articles of Impeachment.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to say that I believe the time is ripe for additional Articles of Impeachment, and, as a result thereof, tomorrow, additional Articles of Impeachment will be brought because the time is ripe and because allowing additional time to pass will only allow additional harm to manifest itself without a proper challenge having been made to things that are occurring from the Presidency that, Mr. Speaker, cannot be tolerated.

Mr. Speaker, I am honored to say that I have no idea as to what the vote will be when we vote tomorrow or within the next 2 legislative days, as required by the rules. My suspicion is that the vote will take place tomorrow. I don't set the time for the vote. I determine when the resolution will be presented, and the Speaker of the House determines when the actual vote will take place. That is his to decide. I respect any decision that he makes.

But as to my colleagues, I am not lobbying anyone to vote for this resolution. Each person must address what his or her conscience dictates. I have no idea as to what the vote will be, and I say this candidly because there are a

good many people who will continually query: How will people vote? What will the outcome be? I have no idea, Mr. Speaker.

But I say this: whatever the outcome, I will know that I have done the right thing. I will know that I will be on the right side of history, and I will know that there are unborn generations who will look back through the vista of time, and they will make decisions about the actions we take at this time. I will let them judge.

It is unfortunate, but the people of the time that we live in can sometimes not be in the best position to judge the things that we do and the actions that we take. So I will know, Mr. Speaker, that we have done the right thing, and I will know that the judges who look through the vista of time will set the record straight for those who may have some confusion about what is happening at this time.

I am confident, Mr. Speaker, that whatever the vote is, it will be a vote that will be recorded on our RECORD. It will be the second vote, and I want the RECORD to show that I repeatedly stood on the right side of history. I will repeatedly do this. For those who may be concerned, this may not be the last vote. So there may be more than two votes that we will take that will show where we stand on this great question of our time.

What is the great question of our time? The great question of our time, as it relates to those of us in this country and around the world, is this: Are we going to allow the United States of America, the country that I love—no one sings “The Star-Spangled Banner” louder than I do, maybe not in a perfect key. No one recites the pledge with greater enthusiasm than I do. No one believes in the words told in the Pledge of Allegiance, liberty and justice, more than I do. No one believes in the words in the Declaration of Independence, “All persons being created equal, endowed by their Creator with certain inalienable rights”—no one believes these things more than I. I love my country.

So the question is, this country, the leader of the free world—people around the world depend on us for leadership and guidance on the great issues impacting the world; whether they be political or moral, people in this world depend on the United States. People want to know: Where is the United States of America when it comes to a crisis? Regardless of the magnitude of the crisis, where are the Americans, the leaders of the free world?

So, Mr. Speaker, the question is: Will we allow our preeminence in the world to be diminished by a perception that we condone and accept, in fact, will tolerate, bigotry? Will we tolerate bigotry? Will we allow the bigotry emanating in this country from the highest office to become the image of the United States of America? Will we allow people around the world to think that we condone this? I think not,

which is why I will bring the Articles of Impeachment tomorrow.

It is my opinion that I—personal pronoun—will not and should not tolerate bigotry. I lived too long, Mr. Speaker, and I fought too hard. I have suffered too many indignations associated with segregation. I had the Klan burn a cross in my yard. I know what bigotry looks like, I know what it smells like, I know what it sounds like, and I know what it feels like.

So I have been involved and engaged in this struggle too long to tolerate it. I refuse to tolerate bigotry. The truth is, that which you will tolerate, you are not likely to change. If you will tolerate it, you are not likely to change it.

So my vote tomorrow will be one indicative of a person who will not tolerate bigotry. My vote tomorrow will be one that I trust young children in years to come will be proud to say: One American stood against bigotry.

We in this House have had years, in fact, centuries, to eradicate and eliminate the hatred associated with bigotry and invidious discrimination. We went through slavery.

□ 2130

We fought back. We went through segregation. We changed the laws. But we cannot allow ourselves to be put in a position such that it will be perceived that we are amenable to allowing the clock, the hands of time, to be rolled back to a time that none of us would like to return to. Surely, I would not, given what I know about how bigotry impacts the lives and the psyches of human beings.

We are confronting the great question of: What will the United States look like to the rest of the world? How will we be perceived?

But more important than this, Mr. Speaker, the question is really: Will we stand by silently when we can plainly and clearly see that wrong is being perpetrated and that people are being harmed?

Bigotry may not impact me the same way it impacts people who are working every day and who don't have the benefit of Congress to come to and to work in the facilities that I work in.

There are people who are hard-working Americans who are impacted by bigotry in ways that are harmful and that I and many others will not experience. There are people of color who will go in to apply for a loan and have their loans denied because of how they look. We have empirical evidence to support it. It happens. It still happens to people of color.

There are people who will be impacted by bigotry simply because of who they happen to associate with in their intimate personal lives. There is still bigotry associated with the LGBTQ community. You can be fired because of who they happen to be, the person that God created. They can be fired for being that person.

There are people who suffer from bigotry because of their religious beliefs.

If you are Jewish, you may find yourself at some point suffering from bigotry perpetrated because of your belief in your God.

If you are Muslim, you may find yourself suffering from the horrors associated with bigotry and being banned from a country because of your religious beliefs and because you are of the Islamic faith.

Mr. Speaker, the list goes on and on. These are everyday, hardworking people who suffer. Those of us who are here in Congress may not suffer all of these indignations, but there are times when some of us, too, will befall to the ugliness of bigotry.

Mr. Speaker, the question is: Will we allow people who we know we can help be assisted by virtue of the position that we take?

I say to you, Mr. Speaker, tomorrow, sometime after we start our legislative day, I will come to the well and I will present Articles of Impeachment that will differ from the prior Articles of Impeachment. These articles will associate commentary made in the highest office in the land with policies that are produced.

When you are in the White House and you say ugly comments about a continent, the countries within that continent, about other countries, and you are talking about immigration policy, surely it is reasonable to conclude that your commentary can be converted into your policy, that it can become part of your policy, and that if you conclude and if you, by your commentary, would have us know that you may have concluded that people from a predominantly White country are more welcome than people from countries of color, it is not unreasonable for one to conclude that your immigration policy may be one that is race-based masquerading as one that is merit-based. It is not unreasonable, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, as I close, I want to apologize to people who I may have offended with my message, because the intent is not to offend. The intent is to speak the truth.

Mr. Speaker, I take no great solace in having to bring this truth before the Congress of the United States of America. This is not something that I came to Congress to do. It is not something that I take great pleasure in doing. People say ugly things about me and to me. Just today, we had a call to our office, a threat that involved the taking of life.

So this is nothing that I do with any degree of pleasure. I do it because it is right. And to all of the people who I may have offended, to colleagues that may somehow think ill of what I do, you have my apologies. It is really not about you. It is about democracy. It is about government of the people, by the people, and whether we will maintain government of the people, by the people. It is about the Republic and whether we will do as Franklin indicated, keep the Republic that we have.

It really is not about any individual. It is not about any political party. It is about the greatest country in the world and whether we, who have the ability, the responsibility, if you will, to take on these challenges, will do so in such a way as to protect the institutions that we love.

I am giving you my position. I give no one else's position. I am a caucus of one. It is called the liberated democratic caucus. That is who I am, a liberated Democrat. That means that I cannot only speak truth to power, I can speak truth about power.

Tonight, the truth is that we have a country in crisis. The stock market is up, yes. Jobs, yes, people are employed. There is something to be said about the types of jobs at minimum wage, but for this soliloquy, let's just say people are employed.

But these things are not what make a country great. The greatness of a country is not measured by how we treat people who live in the sweets of life. The greatness of a country is measured by how you treat people who live in the streets of life. Those who live in the streets of life are the ones who have to cope with bigotry that many of us never see and many don't understand.

So, Mr. Speaker, I am grateful to have had this moment to talk about the time that we will share tomorrow. It will take place. I do look forward to having the opportunity to stand in the well again of the Congress of America. It is a preeminent privilege, a superlative pleasure, and a splendiferous honor.

Mr. ESPAILLAT. Mr. Speaker, I want to take this opportunity to thank the Congressional Progressive Caucus for allowing and facilitating this Special Order hour on DREAMers and DACA.

On my previous intervention, I highlighted how we contemplated tonight, as this House passed a continuing resolution to fund government, and how for many months we contemplated three pieces of legislation to address the issues of DACA recipients and DREAMers that were drafted in a bipartisan way.

As I mentioned earlier, the first one is the clean Dream Act. The second one, put together by the Problem Solvers Caucus, is the USA Act.

The other Chamber, which is convening right now as I speak to debate whether or not the government should continue to be funded and to take up the continuing resolution that we sent over to the other House, as they debate that, they will realize that none of the three proposals that I highlighted earlier—the Dream Act, the USA Act, and also the immigration framework that came over from bipartisan Senators—is included in that continuing resolution, leaving the DREAMers and DACA recipients out in the cold, propelling me to once again vote against the continuing resolution, as I did over 3 weeks ago.

This particular issue impacts 800,000 DREAMers across the Nation, a population bigger than any one of our congressional districts.

Mr. Speaker, they will have a profound impact on the economy if they are left out in the cold. According to the Center for American Progress, my district, the 13th Congressional District in New York which I represent, will lose more than \$155 million in their own local GDP. My home State, New York, will lose \$2.6 billion. This is not chump change. This is what the numbers show that we will lose.

So this is not a matter to be taken lightly. These young people are not just a group of folks who will have an important impact on our economy. They are also having an impact on our healthcare. Many of them are working to serve our senior population. Many of them continue to be providing services impacting patients across our Nation's healthcare system.

According to a 2016 survey by groups, including the National Immigration Law Center and the Center for American Progress, more than one in five DREAMers also works in the healthcare and educational industries.

So these young people who are being left out in the cold by this continuing resolution that is being debated in the Senate right now work in our hospitals, in our clinics, in our community-based clinics. They take care of our seniors, our children, those who are perhaps ill with a catastrophic disease. They also work in our educational system. So they are productive members of our society.

Let me just say that they are also working very hard to distinguish themselves in higher education. Every year, an estimated 65,000 undocumented students graduate from high school. About 10,000 undocumented students graduate from college every single year.

Before President Obama announced DACA, these young people faced great barriers when it came to higher education. We are nowhere close to where we need to be if 55,000 high school graduates are not pursuing a higher education.

Let's not forget these students. Let's not forget these DREAMers. Let's not forget these DACA recipients. We have made a full effort in the House and in the Senate to have a bipartisan approach to solving this issue, but yet, once again, the continuing resolution which is currently, right now, being debated in the Senate chose to leave the DREAMers out in the cold.

Mr. Speaker, we will continue this fight. I ask the DREAMers not to be afraid. I ask them not to be deterred, not to be discouraged, not to dismay. We will continue this fight until they are allowed to stay here with their families and they can continue to make America a stronger nation.

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

SENATE ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to enrolled bills of the Senate of the following titles:

S. 117. An act to designate a mountain peak in the State of Montana as "Alex Diekmann Peak".

S. 139. An act to amend the Foreign Intelligence Surveillance Act of 1978 to improve foreign intelligence collection and the safeguards, accountability, and oversight of acquisitions of foreign intelligence, to extend title VII of such Act, and for other purposes.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 45 minutes p.m.), the House adjourned until tomorrow, Friday, January 19, 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:

3788. A letter from the Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Lieutenant General Alan R. Lynn, United States Army, and his advancement to the grade of lieutenant general on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

3789. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's final rule — National Priorities List [EPA-HQ-OLEM-2017-0073, 0074, 0075 and 0076; FRL-9973-00-OLEM] received January 12, 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.

3790. A letter from the Director, Regulatory Management Division, Environmental Protection Agency, transmitting the Agency's direct final rule — National Emission Standards for Hazardous Air Pollutants; Delegation of Authority to Texas [EPA-R06-OAR-2017-0061; FRL-9972-28-Region 6] received January 12, 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.

3791. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Advanced Methods to Target and Eliminate Unlawful Robocalls [CG Docket No.: 17-59] received January 12, 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.

3792. A letter from the Deputy Chief, Consumer and Governmental Affairs Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Modification of Subpart G, Section 0.701 of the Commission's Rules received January 12, 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.

3793. A letter from the Deputy Bureau Chief, Public Safety and Homeland Security Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Part 11 of the Commis-

sion's Rules Regarding Emergency Alert System [PS Docket No.: 15-94] received January 12, 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.

3794. A letter from the Assistant Secretary for Export Administration, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions, Clarifications, and Technical Corrections to the Export Administration Regulations [170207157-7157-01] (RIN: 0694-AH31) received January 4, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

3795. A letter from the Acting General Counsel, General Services Administration, transmitting a notification of an action on nomination, change in previously submitted reported information, and 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.

3796. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments received January 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3797. A letter from the Acting Director and General Counsel, General Counsel and Legal Policy Division, Office of Government Ethics, transmitting the Office's final rule — Civil Monetary Penalties Inflation Adjustments for Ethics in Government Act Violations (RIN: 3209-AA38) received January 12, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. FORTENBERRY (for himself, Mr. ROYCE of California, Ms. MCCOLLUM, Mr. CUELLAR, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. ROS-LEHTINEN, Ms. KELLY of Illinois, Mrs. LAWRENCE, and Ms. BASS):

H.R. 4819. A bill to promote inclusive economic growth through conservation and biodiversity programs that facilitate transboundary cooperation, improve natural resource management, and build local capacity to protect and preserve threatened wildlife species in the greater Okavango River Basin of southern Africa; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. MCEACHIN (for himself, Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD, Mr. CLAY, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. DEUTCH, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. POCAN, Mr. LANGEVIN, Mr. RICHMOND, Mr. HUFFMAN, Mr. SCHRADER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. MCNERNEY, Mr. GRIJALVA, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Mr. CARSON of Indiana, Mr. SABLAN, Ms. BONAMICI, Mr. LARSON of Connecticut, Ms. JUDY CHU of California, Ms. DELBENE, Ms. NORTON, Mr. SCOTT of Virginia, Mr. COHEN, Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York, Ms. BARRAGAN, Ms. MATSUI, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SOTO, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. KEATING, Mr. AL GREEN of Texas, Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. HANABUSA, Ms. CASTOR of Florida, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Mr. GOMEZ, Mr. LOEBACK, Ms.