

and equality. But most importantly, as Ron said, we must secure the future for generations yet unborn. That is what this blue baton reminds me of.

I thank all of those who have been here tonight to share the memory and celebrate the life and mourn the loss of my friend, my former boss, the great Congressman Ronald Dellums.

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

Mr. HOYER. Mr. Speaker, I want to thank my friend Rep. Lee and my other colleagues tonight who have gathered to pay tribute to our former colleague Rep. Ron Dellums, who passed away on July 30. I rise to join them in remembering Ron, who was my friend and with whom I served in this House for many years.

Ron Dellums's entire career was spent in service—to his community, his city, and his country. As a U.S. Marine, he proudly wore the uniform of our nation at a time when the peace of the world was threatened by cold war. As a city councilman in Berkeley, he drew on his family history of labor activism to fight for better conditions for working families. As a Congressman, he led the fight for sanctions against apartheid South Africa and chaired the Armed Services Committee as our military challenges were changing from a Cold War to a post-Cold War environment. He was a founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, which today is the conscience of the Congress. Later, as Mayor of Oakland, Ron worked hard to make neighborhoods safer, improve local schools, and bring new infrastructure funding to the city.

Ron fought with tenacity for the causes he believed in. One of those was human rights and the equal dignity of all people. When a presidential veto threatened to block his anti-apartheid legislation, he rallied support to override it. As Chairman of the Armed Services Committee, he earned the respect of his Committee colleagues and military leaders, and he worked diligently to transition our military to meet the threats of the twenty-first century. It came as no surprise to those of us who served with him that when he retired in 1998, praise for his service and leadership came from both sides of the aisle.

I was deeply saddened to learn of Ron's passing. Our nation lost a faithful public servant and a champion for working families and those working hard to make it in America. I mourn with the people of California and my colleagues in this House who served with Ron. I mourn with his wife Cynthia and the Dellums family. I mourn the loss of a man who gave service his all and contributed so much to the nation he loved and this institution he so faithfully served.

Ms. MAXINE WATERS of California. I would like to thank Congresswoman BARBARA LEE and Congressman JAMIE RASKIN for organizing a Special Order Hour to honor the memory of our dear friend and former colleague, Congressman Ron Dellums.

Ron Dellums was an unabashed, progressive icon, and a strong and outspoken advocate for his constituents, veterans, people of color, and other vulnerable communities during his 13-term tenure in the U.S. Congress.

Understanding the unique problems facing the African American community, Ron Dellums joined with 12 fellow civil rights giants, including Louis Stokes, Bill Clay, Sr., and Shirley

Chisholm, to create the Congressional Black Caucus in 1971. True to its creed, the CBC remains the 'Conscience of the Congress' today, and has grown to a historic 48 members.

As a former U.S. Marine, Ron Dellums was one of the most outspoken opponents of the Vietnam War. In Congress, he led an effort to educate the American public of war crimes that were committed during the Vietnam War. In 1993, he also made history as the first African American Chair of the House Armed Services Committee.

However, one of Ron Dellums's greatest achievements is one that is also dear to my heart: ending apartheid in South Africa. As a member of the California State Assembly and a national board member of TransAfrica, I had the privilege of working with Ron Dellums to pass legislation at the state and federal level that forced the United States to divest from the apartheid regime in South Africa.

While I authored, and fought to enact California Assembly Bill 134, which passed in August 1986 and made California the first state to divest its \$12 billion in state pension funds tied to the apartheid regime in South Africa, Ron Dellums was simultaneously championing similar legislation in the U.S. Congress. His historic bill, the Comprehensive Anti-Apartheid Act of 1986, gained enough support to not only pass in both chambers of Congress, but to also override President Ronald Reagan's veto in 1986.

Though he retired from Congress after 27 years of service, Ron Dellums maintained his dedication to his community and was elected mayor of his hometown, Oakland, California, in 2007.

The incomparable Ron Dellums—a passionate drum major for peace, inspiring community leader, effective politician, and lifelong public servant—left an indelible mark on the City of Oakland and in the hearts of so many people across this country who also love him.

Though our hearts are heavy, I join the Congressional Black Caucus and the entire U.S. Congress in celebrating his service to our nation.

Mr. BISHOP of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a man who I was honored to call a mentor, colleague, and dear friend, former Representative Ron Dellums.

Ron was an extraordinary man who wore many hats. He was a determined public servant who was dedicated to improving the conditions of humankind. He was also a marine, a social worker, a titan for civil rights here and across the world, a chairman of the House Armed Services Committee, and a founding member and past chair of the Congressional Black Caucus. Representative Dellums was a true advocate for fairness, human rights, and justice.

Congressman Ron Dellums was an icon. I served with him early during my career in Congress. He demonstrated courage, compassion, fairness, character, and dignity as a Member of Congress and as a man. He was a great role model for people of conscience to emulate. I will be forever grateful for his wise counsel, friendship, and his legacy of service to humankind.

Ms. EDDIE BERNICE JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute and to honor the legacy of my dear colleague, the Honorable Ronald V. Dellums. Although it saddens my heart to see that we have lost an-

other great trailblazer, I would be remiss if I didn't take the time to honor his life and the change he brought to this great country.

Dellums was not only a patriarch for the Congressional Black Caucus, but he was trailblazer for change all around the world. With a political career of over forty years, he was determined to help those around him and provide hope for his community. As a former member of the Berkeley City Council, United States House of Representatives, and mayor of Oakland, Dellums always inspired to pave the way for the next generation to be advocates and a voice.

During his 14 years in the U.S. House of Representatives he became the first African American to chair the Armed Services Committee. Dellums used this platform not for his own benefit, but to create an agenda to ensure civil rights and programs for people ahead of weapons systems and warfare. He was also the antiwar activist to hold that post. As a Congresswoman who proudly stands in the gap for my constituents, I always admired how Congressman Dellums fought hard and served his constituents with distinction and treated his colleagues with the utmost respect. He was determined to share his light with the world.

As a dedicated leader in human rights and civil rights in America and around the world, Congressman Dellums worked tirelessly to pass anti-apartheid legislation against South Africa. After a 14-year campaign against apartheid in South Africa, he wrote the 1986 legislation that mandated trade embargoes and divestment by American companies and citizens of holdings in South Africa.

Congressman Dellums was not only a leader; he was a person of incredible intellect who possessed the ability to build alliances with people and groups from diverse backgrounds and varying interests. He was a co-founder of the Congressional Black Caucus, which he chaired from 1989–1991, and a co-founder of the Congressional Progressive Caucus in 1991. After retiring from Congress he remained involved and determined to be a light for his people. He worked in the private sector on global aids, healthcare and transportation. He returned then to his native Oakland, in 2006, and was elected Mayor, serving one term and retiring from elective office in 2011.

I ask my colleagues to join me in paying tribute to Congressman Dellums for his outstanding and dedicated service.

#### TERM LIMITS

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ARRINGTON. 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 materials on the topic of this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, George Mason, the patriot, said:

"Nothing so strongly impels a man to regard the interest of his constituents as the certainty of returning to the general mass of the people, from whence he was taken, where he must participate in their burdens."

Translation: The Founding Fathers wanted us to come here and do the people's business and then go home, back to the "farm," and live under the rules we passed. They want us to come up here and represent the people, their interests, and no other; the public's interests, no other; America's interests, no other.

They wanted us to come here with a singular purpose and that is to do what is right and good for the American people and to have the courage to step up to the plate, because every generation is called to do so, and to make the sacrifices and to make the tough calls and take on the tough issues of the day and solve them, even if that causes you to have a shorter political career than you anticipated. That is the theme of this Special Order, Mr. Speaker. It is term limits.

We the Members who gather today to talk about it might be taken off some of the Christmas card lists of some of our friends and colleagues. But this does not in any way disparage Members who served here for many years and many terms. I think you have folks here—and I think in fact I can name some—who have done a good job, who have served well. But I don't think it is healthy.

Just because you can do it doesn't mean we shouldn't create an environment and have the right incentives for the right behavior. I think there are just too many forces that pull us as Members in directions other than doing what is best and right for this country and for the people we came here to represent.

So I think there is an ideal way. And I think we are off the mark from that ideal, from the spirit and the intent of what George Mason said in that quote, and what our Founding Fathers believed from the very outset.

Mr. Speaker, like my colleagues who will speak here in a moment, we didn't run just to rearrange the furniture in the people's House. We ran to make a real difference, to advance real reform, so that this country and its leaders could govern and solve problems and move this Nation forward.

So my greatest calling, I believe, isn't just to advance reforms to education or to healthcare or to the Tax Code. I think this is a season for reforming this institution, first and foremost. I think that we are long overdue, but I think the time is right for structural, fundamental, systemic reforms to the United States Congress.

As a new Member and as a new generation of Members, I cannot tell you how excited I am to stand with my colleagues today, Republican and Democratic, and talk about one of those structural reforms that I think will strike at the heart of some of the prob-

lems with Washington and the culture of Washington.

Woe to me and any Member who comes up here just to change the course, the policy course of this country, and not do anything to affect the broken culture of this body. I think it is incumbent upon us to do that and to change this broken culture.

I think if we take anything away from this last Presidential election on either side of the aisle and whatever party you claim, we can all agree that the American people are fed up with the status quo. They don't want business as usual. I think there is a crisis in confidence in this institution.

When I ran, I ran railing against the culture of Washington and the fundamental changes and the brokenness of this institution. Now I am a Member. Now it is time to act on the things that I so boldly proclaimed that we needed to do.

I think that for this reason Republican and Democrats alike have come together to support a constitutional amendment that would limit the number of terms an individual may serve in the United States Congress.

There are different ways to organize it, structure it, but I think the intent and the heart of all these reform initiatives around term limit are getting after, I think, the same desired outcome. We believe that, above and beyond Tax Code reform, bettering the healthcare system, limiting regulatory burden, and so on and so forth, we have got to change this institution.

We have a great chance. I do think the timing is right. Our Founders never intended these public servants to be professional career politicians. They didn't want a permanent political class to rule the land from Washington. Instead, they envisioned this sort of citizen-legislator way of leading and serving, and then living back among our brothers and sisters.

People say this is tilting at windmills and this is an unproductive quest. But all you have to do is look at George Washington and the example he set by custom, by tradition. When asked to serve more than two terms as President, he said: We got rid of a King George. We don't need a King George. I wanted to serve my people as President. It is time for me to go back to the farm.

For 100 years, that custom was honored. And then, FDR ran for a third and fourth term. The people reacted, and we had the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution and we have term limits on our Presidents.

I think that if it can happen for Presidents, where the people say, We don't want kings, I believe—and especially today, in these times—that the people are speaking, if we will just listen and respond. They don't want career politicians either. Neither are healthy for this great country.

There was a recent survey, as recent as February of this year, where over 80 percent of the American people—Demo-

cratic, Republican, Independent—say that this initiative of term limits being effectuated in an amendment to the Constitution would make this institution run better and would change the culture for the better. They support it. I am old-fashioned enough to believe if 80 percent of the people want something, they ought to get their chance to at least debate it and vote on it. I am grateful for this time that we have to talk about it.

I am looking at my colleagues here in the Chamber and I see RO KHANNA, my friend from California. We have very different backgrounds. We come from different places and different ideological places. We have different thoughts about policy reforms on various issues.

But when we met during orientation as two new Members—a former member of the George W. Bush administration and a former member of the Obama administration—you couldn't have two more different people. But we had a great conversation, we struck up a friendship, and our families love each other, care about each other, and I want him to be successful, I want his family to be successful. We came together on one thing in particular and it was this notion of term limits.

We introduced what I think is still the only bipartisan, Democratic and Republican-introduced legislation to limit Members of Congress' terms. I am grateful for his friendship and I am glad he is here.

I think I am going to stop talking, Mr. Speaker, and ask my colleagues to share their thoughts. I am going to start with a dear friend, Representative BRIAN FITZPATRICK from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, District Eight.

Brian is the heart and soul of this initiative. We went to see the President of the United States on this, Republicans and Democrats, and he said: This is the most energized group I have met with. It is because we believe that we can actually make real change with real reforms like term limits.

Brian has been the heart and soul of this. He, like myself, is very passionate about this. He has dedicated a lot of his time and effort introducing congressional reform and anticorruption legislation to fix Washington's broken system. These measures include his own term limit legislation, a constitutional amendment that would prevent Members of Congress from being paid unless a budget is passed, and a balanced budget amendment that would force Congress to stop kicking the can down the road and address our national debt now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. FITZPATRICK).

Mr. FITZPATRICK. Mr. Speaker, I am doing something a little bit unconventional here. I am actually speaking from the left side of the aisle in a sign of solidarity with our good friend and colleague, RO KHANNA, on an issue that, as JODEY ARRINGTON pointed out,

doesn't just unite Americans, it unites 80 percent of Americans. Eighty percent. How many issues are out there that enjoy the support of 80 percent of the American people?

A lot of our colleagues here, when you are dealing with the rigors of this job, say one thing, give you one piece of advice: Never forget why you ran. Just remember that theme that caused you to make that difficult decision.

I think that the reason we all ran was this: term limits to fix a broken system. The genesis of that desire, the genesis of that belief may vary amongst many of us. I can tell you where it came from with me, Mr. Speaker, and that was my time running the political corruption unit at FBI headquarters right down this road here, where you are responsible for a lot of cases.

Like many jobs, when you go home at night, sometimes you take a step back and you think: Well, if I were ever given the opportunity to have a policy-making role to change this brokenness, what would I do?

At the top of that list, Mr. Speaker, was legislative term limits.

You heard my friend and colleague, JODEY ARRINGTON, talk about George Washington, my favorite President ever, for this very reason: he set this tradition in motion. He said he only wanted to serve one term, go back to his farm in Mount Vernon, live under the laws he helped pass, make way for a new generation of leadership. That is the most organic way to serve a democracy. It is the healthiest form of democracy.

They talked him into a second term. He said: No more. It was a tradition that every single President honored, up until FDR served four terms, at which point Congress passed the 22nd Amendment to the Constitution. But true to form, they applied it to the executive. They did not apply it to themselves.

□ 1745

We need a constitutional amendment for term limits in this country.

Is there anybody in this Chamber who does not agree with this very basic principle, this very basic premise, that more organic change in this organization, in this body, is a good thing?

Mr. Speaker, in the FBI, we had term limits in the Bureau. If you were a supervisor, you had to serve up to 7 years—no more, not a day longer than 7 years.

Do you lose some good people? Of course you do.

Overall, did it benefit the institution? You bet you it did. You bet you it did. It brought people in from different places, different perspectives, different educational backgrounds. They had an opportunity to serve and lend their area of expertise.

That is a good thing for this institution. It is a good thing for our country. It is not just from the corruption standpoint; it is from the getting along standpoint.

I can tell you how proud I am of this freshman class—so proud. I am particularly proud of RO KHANNA, mostly because he is from Bucks County—the most special place in America, I might add—and now representing Silicon Valley.

Here you have an issue. Ro and I come from different parties. We checked different boxes on our voter registration form when we were 18 years old. We grew up in the same community; we care about the same things; and we have an issue here that unites us.

JODEY ARRINGTON, a very wise man, identified this—and I couldn't agree more—as a root issue. So much of what we deal with in this House, so much of what we deal with in this country are symptoms. It is symptomatic of what the root issues are. The root issues get to the functionality of this body.

The Problem Solvers Caucus introduced a Break the Gridlock package essential to changing the way things operate here. The government reform, anticorruption legislation that several Members have introduced, myself included, on term limits, on dealing with things like no budget, no pay, these are important things that will fundamentally change the way this body works. And when we do that, we will win back the trust and support of the American people, too many of whom have lost faith in this institution—and for good reason.

We can make those changes. This is Exhibit A of what we need to do to fix a broken system, to restore that trust. Mr. Speaker, it is an 80 percent issue.

How dare we not address, on the floor of this House, an issue that addresses the root cause of our problems that is supported by 80 percent of the American people. We have to get this done.

I want to thank my colleague, JODEY. This is an issue that fires both of us up. We talk about it every single day we are on the floor of the House of Representatives: my friend MIKE GALLAGHER from Wisconsin, who did the first Special Order on term limits shortly after we got sworn in, and my friend RO KHANNA, who has shown incredible courage. This is a man who could serve here for a long, long time, but he is making a courageous decision to stand for what is right, what is good for this institution, what is good for this country. God bless Mr. KHANNA for doing that.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I think anybody who heard the remarks from my friend BRIAN FITZPATRICK is, without a doubt, inspired by the new blood and the new fire in the belly of this new membership of this institution that, again, wants to make real change.

I love what he said to me—and he may be mad when I quote him, but he said: If we could get a vote, if we could just get a vote. And if we got a vote, I believe it would pass because I think the American people would put too much pressure on our colleagues, which

is a good thing. That is how it works. And we would pass this, and we would be able to have this new dynamic which would get at that root cause and change the behavior of this institution and the culture.

He said: If I could get that, I would be willing to leave tomorrow, if that is what it took. If I knew I could leave knowing that that would happen, I would leave tomorrow.

Thank God for people like BRIAN FITZPATRICK. I am so proud to serve with the gentleman, and I appreciate his leadership on this issue. He really is the heart of this movement in our class. And I know that it extends beyond our class, but I think there is a sense of urgency to do something real in this class.

This isn't the silver bullet. This isn't the panacea. There is a list of things that are root causes and fundamental structural reforms, but I think this one should be the easiest to pass this House. And the people want it, as the gentleman said.

Mr. Speaker, now I am going to introduce another member of this new class of Representatives, from the great State of Wisconsin, another dear friend, MIKE GALLAGHER.

During his first 100 days in office, MIKE introduced a number of bills to drain the swamp, including his own term limit legislation, a 5-year lobbying ban for retiring Members, reforms to the congressional pension, and the Do Your Job Act, which would prevent Congress from leaving for recess until it passed all its appropriations bills.

This is a guy who wants to make a real difference, and he is willing to stick his neck out and do it. Probably, none of these are very popular here, but I guarantee you they would be powerful in implementation and the change—the good change—that they would make.

Since taking office last year, he has made decreasing the size and influence of the Federal Government, restoring power back to the people, a top priority; and he is an original cosponsor of RO KHANNA and my term limit legislation and led the first Special Order to discuss term limits in this Chamber. I thank Mr. GALLAGHER for his leadership.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin (Mr. GALLAGHER).

Mr. GALLAGHER. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to stand with my colleagues here: Mr. ARRINGTON from Texas, Mr. FITZPATRICK, and Mr. KHANNA.

I want to say, since we started on this journey a year and a half ago, I have been blown away by the response that I have gotten from constituents in my district.

RO KHANNA and I wrote an op-ed together very early on in Congress where we laid out three priorities for draining the swamp, one of which was term limits; and to this day, I still have people coming up to me on the street saying: I love that. I just love the fact that you

were willing to write an op-ed with a Democrat.

I just think it gets to what my colleagues have laid out, which is that issues like this cross party lines. They have the overwhelming support of 80 percent of the American people.

We have to ask ourselves the serious question as to whether we are willing to disregard the wisdom, the common sense of 80 percent of the American people. I think we do so at our own peril.

I recognize that there are principled and serious objections to the idea of term limits, and I would like to address what I think are the three most salient, albeit briefly.

The one thing I hear a lot from opponents of term limits is that, well, we already have term limits built into the system. We have term limits every 2 years in the House and every 6 years in the Senate in the form of elections.

I understand the logic there, but anyone who is taking a serious look at how elections work in this country cannot conclude that there is an honest chance for newcomers to overcome the serious hurdles that we have placed to them running for office and to overcome the serious advantages that we have given incumbents.

I think my friend, Mr. KHANNA, is the one pointing out that, in many cases, the turnover rates among Members of Congress is actually lower than in certain European monarchies, which goes to the fact that incumbency comes with enormous advantage.

Think of how many good people, good citizens who love this country aren't even willing to run because they see it as such an insurmountable task. That shows how far we have gotten away from the model of the citizen legislator.

I won't even get into the issue of PAC money that is available to incumbents, as well as the way in which incumbents are able to use their official budget to contact voters in a way that people trying to challenge incumbents are not. So I don't think that argument stands up to serious scrutiny.

The second thing I have heard, which I take seriously, is that term limits have been tried at the State level, and there have been mixed results. In some cases, there are arguments that they have actually had a negative effect. I would say that, most basically, that experiment has not been run enough times to be significant in a meaningful, statistical sense.

Contrarily, we have actually run this experiment here over and over again, and we have seen the results of careerism and the use of congressional office as a stepping stone and as a means to enrichment.

But I would also say you have to make a fundamental distinction between service at the Federal level and service at the State and local level. And it is my belief that the Founders intended service at the Federal level to be, as my colleague JODEY ARRINGTON

more eloquently pointed out, a season of service.

You want expertise and authority concentrated at the lowest possible level that is responsible, where it can be more responsive to the needs of the people and, also, more accountable. So I bring that up to say you have to make a distinction between service at the State level and service at the Federal level.

The final thing I hear, and I think it is actually the most serious objection, is that, if you term-limit Members of Congress, you will only empower the staff; you will further empower a staff that, by the way, is already over-empowered and already running this place because Members do not take an interest in the serious work of legislation and, instead, are only interested in perpetuating the Kabuki theater that dominates what we do in this place.

I am a former staffer. I worked in the Senate. I was paid to advise Members of the Senate on how they should make decisions. I can tell you that staff power is inversely proportional to Member interest. In other words, if Members are not interested in doing the hard work of showing up to their committee hearings, legislating, then staff is going to run the place.

If you create a dynamic where Members feel they have a limited period of time to make an impact via term limits, then it is my firm belief that you will actually have the opposite effect, that you will have Members taking ownership of the legislative process rather than outsourcing it to not only unelected congressional staff, but unelected members of the executive branch and the judicial branch whom the American people did not hire to make laws.

They hired us to make laws, but we are failing in that fundamental duty. We have placed most of the Federal Government on autopilot, and we are more than happy to outsource consequential decisions that we should be making constitutionally to Article II and Article III.

The final thing I will say, though: Put aside all the philosophical arguments for or against term limits. Given what my colleagues have laid out, given the historically low levels of approval that this body faces right now, the shared sense among all of us that Congress, as an institution, is fundamentally broken, that it is in need of some serious reform, we need to do something different.

I cannot promise you that term limits will solve all of our problems, but I believe firmly that, if nothing else—if nothing else—it will send a signal to the American people that we are interested in changing the status quo and the fundamental dynamic here in Washington, D.C., because the American people have made their opinion clear over and over again, and that is that they are not satisfied with the status quo.

To continue business as usual, to continue making the same mistakes over and over again, would satisfy the literal definition of insanity; and I would hope that we could avoid that, at the very least. What my colleague Mr. FITZPATRICK said and my colleague JODEY ARRINGTON echoed, that we should demand a vote, is absolutely right.

We are going to have a Speaker's race no matter who wins the election. This should be a key part of that debate. Getting a vote on the House floor is something that we should demand, and this is an idea whose time has finally come.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, that is the courage of a captain in the Marine Corps. I am grateful for his service to this country in the armed services. I am blessed to call him my friend. And again, the fire in the belly to come up here and make lasting reforms for our children and grandchildren—and game-changing reforms.

So I am grateful to Mr. GALLAGHER, and I thank the gentleman for being a leader on this issue.

Mr. Speaker, I am now going to introduce a dear friend whom I mentioned earlier, RO KHANNA, a Democrat from California.

I want to just also note before Representative GALLAGHER may have to leave, but he is speaking from the traditionally Democratic podium. I don't know. There is not a law. I don't think there is even a House rule that says you have to speak on the right side or the left side. But he speaks over there, and our Republican colleague BRIAN FITZPATRICK also stood over there, not just in solidarity on this issue, but with the spirit of friendship and the notion of restoring civility in this body.

When I look at you guys across the aisle and I see a Republican and Democrat on the Democratic side, traditionally, I am reminded of our class signing the civility agreement and sitting in the middle of this Chamber as a message to others and as an affirmation to each other that part of the culture change that we are talking about—in this respect, it is term limits, but it is more than that. It is some of the things that Mr. GALLAGHER is pushing through legislation, but it is also the softer issues, the intangible cultural issues like civility.

With that, I want to say that I thank Mr. KHANNA for his leadership. His folks are well represented by him. He knows what he believes. He fights hard for his beliefs and his constituents, but he remains independent to those beliefs and to those interests. I am proud to call RO KHANNA my friend.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. KHANNA).

□ 1800

Mr. KHANNA. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative ARRINGTON for his friendship. One of the things I get asked all the time as a freshman is: What is it like in Congress? Do you actually know people on the other side?

I always say that, actually, one of my closest friends in Congress is JOEY ARRINGTON. I really value the friendship we have formed, that our families have formed, much at his initiative. I mean, he struck up a conversation with my wife, and he has been so gracious as we have had our own family.

It is one of the things I have enjoyed most about our class, to have relationships that transcend the rancor and the partisanship. You get to know people and know that everyone, in their own way, cares about the country, and there are things that we can do in common.

I so admire Mr. ARRINGTON's leadership from day one on term limits and trying to find common ground on making sure that this is an issue that isn't partisan, that you can be a Democrat, a Libertarian, a Republican, and still have a belief in what Thomas Jefferson said, that we should live under the laws that we make.

I still have a belief that these jobs weren't supposed to be a career. They were supposed to be ones that were inspired out of answering the Nation's call to service and then returning home to your community.

I also want to recognize my friend MIKE GALLAGHER, recognize, of course, his extraordinary service to our Nation as a marine, but also his desire to cross the aisle. I was honored to host him in Stanford, where he had great ideas on cybersecurity. I know Mr. GALLAGHER has been championing political reform, term limits, and is sincere about wanting to see progress.

BRIAN FITZPATRICK left, but I have a soft spot for BRIAN because we are both Bucks County kids. We grew up in Bucks County, and BRIAN is relentless, as JOEY ARRINGTON has pointed out. We had that meeting with the President, and BRIAN would chime in and challenge the President whenever he wanted to push further for term limits, in a respectful way, but wanting to really advocate for this issue as the most important issue.

So I am really honored to work with Representative ARRINGTON, Representative FITZPATRICK, and Representative GALLAGHER on this. They have made most of the points. I will just add a few more.

Representative GALLAGHER referenced the Economist article, which I was shocked to see, where they had the turnover rate of European monarchies. They showed that the turnover rate of the United States Congress was less than European monarchies. I thought that is why we fought a revolution, that we didn't believe in dynastic rule. We didn't believe that people should just be in power for decade after decade.

Yet, the incumbent reelection rate remains at 95 or 98 percent. And you wonder, you say, how is it possible that our approval ratings are at 10 percent as a body, and yet 95 or 98 percent are getting reelected?

Sometimes, when I talk to friends, I say, it is as if there is a company that

is going bankrupt and all the presidents and vice presidents are fighting over who gets to be CEO.

Sometimes I think that is what the American people think. We are here fighting about who gets control, who gets to chair a committee, and the institution isn't working.

They are saying: Why don't the men and women fix the institution first? That is what term limits will do. I have seen it in my own class. I have seen how people of both sides of the aisle—and let's not be Pollyannaish about it. We probably vote differently on 95 percent of the issues. But I have seen that people in this class have come here with a sense of wanting to restore our democracy, of trying to fix something and make it functional, because we all heard that out on the campaign trail.

I get the loudest applause in one of the most liberal districts when I talk about working on legislation with a Republican like we did on the VALOR Act or writing an op-ed together and reaching across the aisle. That is what people are hungry for.

I believe that, if you have term limits and if you take the careerism out of it and if people know they are going to have about a decade to have an impact, you are going to encourage more efforts to find that common ground, more efforts to be willing to compromise when it makes sense for the Nation to look for some overlap in issues.

So I am committed to this. I really respect JOEY, again, in his leadership in pursuing this. It is not easy to make change, and a lot of times, after we do one of these things, it is easy to say: Okay. It is out in the press. We have had a meeting. We made the point.

But Mr. ARRINGTON has been so persistent about getting us back together, continuing to fight for this, and I echo the call that we should have a vote on the House floor, whoever the Speaker is, to make sure that the American people have their voices heard, and we can get a vote on term limits.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank Representative KHANNA. I think we would do a lot for the confidence of the American people if we could get a vote on it. I think they would believe that this body is actually responding to them, instead of just talking to each other in this bubble up here in Washington.

Again, there are good people, but there is a bad dynamic. You put good people in a bad dynamic and a history that creates a bad culture and you get bad outcomes.

So this isn't to disparage anybody on either side. It is to align the incentives so that we can be most responsive and do what was expected when the folks hired us to do this job, and that is to focus on their interests, the interests of our country, do the right thing, and put America first.

I am reminded from the comments of Mr. KHANNA that, when we had the meeting with the President—and I

want to say that Mr. MARK MEADOWS, the Representative from North Carolina, helped us a great deal to get that audience with the President. I think everybody here is grateful for his efforts to do that. We knew that, from the outset—Mr. KHANNA and I talked about this—that if we were going to have a path to success and not just make this part of the sort of rhetoric or some political box-checking exercise, but if we were going to really try to get this across the goal line with many others who have other pieces of legislation similar to our term limits legislation: A, it needed to be bipartisan; and, B, we needed buy-in from the drainer of the swamp in chief.

If there is anything that the man in the Oval Office, Donald J. Trump, represents, it is shaking up this culture. Whether you like the way he is shaking it up or not, that was the message, that they wanted change. They didn't want business as usual.

This is a proud moment for me because of my colleagues' response to the President when he said: Do you really think we are going to get a vote on this? Do you really think that you are actually going to get a vote whereby your fellow Members, who have been there longer than you all, would actually term limit themselves?

That is when my new friends and colleagues, Republican and Democrat, said: Mr. President, grandfather them in. Term limit us. Start with our class and every class that follows. Don't worry about the ones who are there. They may want a term limit, they may not. But we are not going to get into that. We don't want to slow this down. We want to be successful.

I really appreciate that response. I believe in it wholeheartedly. I am all in, and I am a true believer in what we are doing. So I thank Mr. KHANNA.

Now, Mr. TOM MARINO, the United States Representative from the great Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, the 10th District, he has been working on this before probably my freshmen colleagues had thought to even run for this in their respective offices. He introduced term limit legislation to help "return our government" to one that truly is for the people and by the people.

He believes, like I do, and the gentleman you heard speak earlier, that it is well past time to get Washington back to work for the American people.

So may God bless my friend TOM MARINO, as I yield to him to speak about this term limit effort.

Mr. Speaker, may I ask how much time I have left?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Texas has 22 minutes remaining.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. MARINO.)

Mr. MARINO. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman ARRINGTON for providing this opportunity to talk about term limits, and I thank my colleagues who were here to comment on it.

First of all, I would like to take a moment to pay tribute and thank our veterans, our law enforcement, our emergency service people, and their families for how they protect us. If it weren't for them, we would not be able to be in this Chamber doing what we are doing tonight.

Now, I am probably, in years, age, the oldest Member here who is talking about term limits. I am in my eighth year, so it is my fourth term. When I first ran for Congress in 2010, I advocated for term limits, and I have introduced legislation in the past three election cycles for term limits.

President Trump ran on draining the swamp, and I believe that term limits are the exact way to ensure that we drain the swamp and effectively serve the American people. I can remember when I was on the campaign trail many, many months with the President, and one of the things he asked me, he said: What would you do to change Congress?

I said: Term limits.

He said to me: You would be putting yourself out of a job.

I said: It wasn't designed to be a lifetime career.

When he went out and spoke to the people, he raised that issue of term limits.

Now, I am not criticizing my colleagues who have been here longer than 12 years, because my term limit legislation is 12 years. But times have changed, and we have to change with the times to improve the quality of life for people.

As I said, my legislation would limit any Senator or any House Member to 12 years in office. Now, let me explain something on this concept. First of all, we use the word "Congress"; we use the word "House Member"; we use the word "Senator." Most of my colleagues know this, and most of the people know it, but Congress represents the House and the Senate.

The Members of the Senate are Members of Congress. The Members of the House are Members of Congress. For some reason, the Senate goes by "Senate," and we go by "Congress" or "House Members."

But I don't mean 12 years serving in the House and then 12 years in the Senate or vice versa. I mean 12 years and you are out. That would be six terms for Congressmen and two terms for a Senator, or vice versa, however they wanted to do it.

I was once told by a reporter who asked a Member, and I won't mention that Member's name in Congress, and you don't know if it is in the House or in the Senate: What do you think of MARINO's term limit legislation of 12 years?

The reporter told me that the elected official responded by saying: Well, we are only beginning to learn what is going on here and how it works in 12 years.

So my term limit legislation would hinder Congress' ability to get things

done. How's that been going? I completely disagree.

Opponents say we will not have the experience. Wrong, and that is a lame excuse.

They say that staff members will be making the decisions. Well, if there is a Member in the House or the Senate who is letting their staff members make the decisions, that elected official shouldn't be here.

Part of my background is that I worked in a factory until I was 30, started sweeping floors and worked my way up. I started college 2 weeks after my 30th birthday and then went on to law school. Having a background in the private sector, I can tell you that if a person in the private sector or who worked for someone in business were to argue that I need 12 years to start being successful or doing my job correctly, they would be fired in the first week.

□ 1815

The President is limited to two terms, 8 years. Many governors are limited to two terms. State House and Senate elected officials in some States are limited in their terms.

Why not Congress? It is not a lifetime career.

I am only advocating for term limits at the Federal level, not at the State level. It is completely ridiculous for a lawmaker to state that they are unable to serve their constituents unless they are here for longer than 12 years. Knowing that one is limited to 12 years, or a variation of that, then the elected official knows what they have to do to get the job done, what they promised.

We need to change the culture here in Congress, and term limits is the only way to accomplish this.

According to the most recent clear politics polling average, 18.4 percent of the American public approves of the job that Congress is doing. What does that tell us?

This certainly seems like a good argument for why we need turnover in Congress and new ideas consistently coming through the doors.

CEOs, chief executive officers, presidents of companies, chairmen and women of corporations leave or are asked to leave their position after 8 to 10 years, on average. And why is that? That is because the company wants fresh ideas. That is because that person who is in that position feels that they have accomplished all that they can and they move on to their next goal.

Serving in Congress was originally never viewed as a career or a lifetime appointment. We need new ideas from new Members, women and men, young and not so young.

There is a great deal of talent here in Congress and, with term limits, newer Members will have the ability to chair committees, instead of waiting for 15 or 20 years to be a chairman or a chairwoman.

We have, in the House, a person can serve 6 years on one committee as the

chair, and then move to another committee for 6 years. That is 12 years. I understand that that is the Republican side. I understand, and someone correct me if I am wrong, on the other side of the aisle it is lifetime in situations.

That doesn't give the talent, the new talent, the ability to move up and have a say of how things are run. It gives the new talent ability to get into leadership without having to be here 20 years.

The framers of the Constitution were not full-time legislators. They were businessmen, they were entrepreneurs, they were farmers, they were inventors, et cetera. They spent very little time actually in Philadelphia and in New York. They went back home with their constituents, and back home to their jobs.

See, there was a difference there between representing the people, putting together a Constitution, and then going back to your job.

There was also never supposed to be a permanent class that would rule over the citizens and without term limits that is what we have.

In 2016, 97 percent of all House Members who were seeking reelection won their races. We also must change, in Congress, the rules. They are outdated; they are old; they are inefficient, in both Chambers, in the House and in the Senate. But to do this, we need term limits.

As I said, I have brought up term limits the last three elections. I can't even get a hearing on it.

It is not healthy for our republic or for our constituents who deserve better.

I ask my constituents every time I am out in my district, and when I am speaking around the State, and in other States: Do you support my term limit of 12 years? And overwhelmingly, overwhelmingly, it is a resounding yes. I have had people say to me, I never used to support term limits, but now I do.

I want to, again, thank Congressman ARRINGTON and the other Members that were here for holding this Special Order Hour to discuss this very important issue. I would encourage all of my colleagues to join us in supporting term limits to help drain the swamp and maintain a healthy legislative branch, or at least get it to a debate. This is a game-changer, term limits, and will improve the quality of life for Americans.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and his passion and his focus on the things that will really move the needle and really change the culture and really make a difference for his kids and grandkids. And I am thankful that he came and expressed his sentiments and the history behind his leadership and experience long before I showed up; and he has plowed some good ground for the new Members who spoke today, and we greatly appreciate that.



Mr. Speaker, I say to the gentleman, I think we can be successful, I really do, and here is why. I think we have the precedents of the 22nd Amendment, which was done in the shadow that was cast by one of our greatest leaders, George Washington, and the custom and tradition of the 2 terms for President.

But the people, with angst and vehement opposition to more than two terms as President, spoke, and there was enough critical mass where we had the 22nd Amendment. We passed a constitutional amendment. It has already happened and it can happen again. I believe that we are embarking on such a time and a season in the life of this country.

And the public frustration, we have talked about the approval rating, popular reform. We talked about the polls. Over 80 percent of the American people want this. And then we talked about the man in the Oval Office who ran on draining the swamp. And this is a definitive measurable way to do that. It is not the only way; it is not the panacea for all of the ills culturally in this institution, but it would certainly be a big start.

So, Mr. Speaker, I say thank you to my colleagues for the support and for their eloquent and passionate remarks to advance this.

And I want to say a special thanks to the President for tweeting out on this after our meeting, for endorsing our efforts, and I encourage him. There are two things we need. We need the President to continue to make this a priority, and we need him to continue to talk about it; and we need the next leadership of this body, whatever that looks like and however that sorts out, we need the leadership to bring this to a vote.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from North Carolina (Ms. FOXX). It is not on the issue of term limits. It is on another very important issue.

#### RECOGNIZING ELI HERMAN

Ms. FOXX. Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleague from Texas, Mr. ARRINGTON, for leading this Special Order and yielding me some time.

Mr. Speaker, I rise to share the story of a young American entrepreneur, Eli Herman, who lives with his parents, Teresa and Ritchie Herman, on their farm in Alexander County.

I met Eli and his parents at the Alexander County Draft Horse Pulling Contest recently, where he opened the contest by riding into the arena with his ponies and the American flag.

It was clear from the beginning of our meeting that Eli is not a typical 11-year old boy. This young man truly embodies the American entrepreneurial spirit and exudes patriotism.

At his young age, Eli has big dreams and the self-motivation he needs to accomplish them. Starting at a very young age, Eli raised his own calves and was able to earn some money from that endeavor. He made the decision to

use that money to purchase ponies and a wagon.

Now Eli owns 11 ponies, which he shows. He participates in events to promote American values, and will be participating in the North Carolina State Fair in October, where I know he will be a big hit.

Eli's long-term dream is, one day, to follow in the footsteps of his hero, Randy Derrer, the driver of the Wells Fargo stagecoach. He has my best wishes to achieve that dream, and it is my good fortune to have met him and his parents and know that they are among the many wonderful people in the Fifth District of North Carolina that it is my privilege to represent.

Mr. ARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentlewoman from North Carolina. And I just say, in conclusion, before I yield the balance of my time back, Mr. Speaker, that, and I was remiss to not mention that this would be the appropriate way to conclude.

I want to thank the majority leader, KEVIN MCCARTHY, for allowing my colleagues and I to speak on this issue on the floor of the House, of the people's House, and being open to allow Members to bring their ideas and the things that they ran on, the things that they are passionate about, that they believe will make the biggest difference for the future of this country.

To me, that is a big part of leadership, being big enough to allow people to take the microphone and speak on these issues, whether he believes in it, supports it or not, I don't know. But I know that he is a good leader for allowing us to speak about it, and I am grateful for that.

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

#### HONORING THE LIFE AND LEGACY OF SENATOR JOHN MCCAIN

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

#### GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. HILL. 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 this Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. HILL. Mr. Speaker, tonight, in this hallowed Chamber of the House, in the U.S. Capitol, we pay tribute to a good friend, a patriot, a loyal Member of this House of Representatives, and the Senate, and that is John McCain, who we lost last week, after a long and productive life.

It seems fitting that we are here in the House Chamber with the portraits of George Washington and the Marquis de Lafayette, two generals in the army of the liberation in our American Revo-

lution, two comrades at arms, two people who set the standard for high, ethical standards of leadership, and leading us in what we treasure today, our United States of America. And really John McCain epitomized that.

Mr. Speaker, it may be unusual that a Member from Arkansas would lead a tribute in honor of our distinguished former colleague, but there is a connection, because when I started, one of my earliest jobs was serving Senator John Tower of Texas, on his personal staff and on the staff of the Senate banking committee.

You couldn't work for John Tower and not be a friend to John McCain, because John McCain was, as a young captain, the liaison to the Senate between 1977 and 1981, and then he ran for office in 1982 in his home State of Arizona.

He said it was hard to decide to run. He didn't really have a home. The longest place he had lived before he ran for Congress from Arizona was in the Hanoi Hilton, Mr. Speaker.

□ 1830

And John Tower broke his promise to not campaign and mess around in a Republican primary by traveling Arizona and Texas helping John McCain win his election in 1982.

They were, like Lafayette and Washington, comrades in arms, both Navy men: Tower, the seniormost enlisted man elected to the Senate, and John McCain, a captain, son and grandson of admirals.

Tower's favorite story about John was when they went to Oman, and Captain McCain was his escort officer on a codel, and they were with the Sultan of Oman out in the desert in a tent, arrayed on beautiful carpets.

As you know, it is bad protocol to show one's soles of the feet in the Arab culture, and John McCain, Mr. Speaker, could not bend his legs from his beatings in the Hanoi Hilton. And so there he was, cross-legged—or tried to be cross-legged—in that tent in Oman with the soles of his feet pointing directly at the sultan.

It was Tower who said: Your Majesty, please understand that Captain McCain can't properly cross his legs, as he was a POW in Vietnam and is crippled from that horrible ordeal.

And the Sultan of Oman said: My dear Senator, I am a graduate of Sandhurst and a former captain in the British Army of the Rhine. I understand. And it is a pleasure to have Captain McCain at our table.

Years later, it was John McCain who worked his tail off to try to have John Tower confirmed as Secretary of Defense in 1989 for my old boss, President Bush, to no avail. But in the minutes before that failed vote in the Senate, McCain turned to Tower and said: God bless you, John Tower. You are a damn fine sailor.

So tonight, Mr. Speaker, I pay tribute to John McCain, his comradeship, his friendship with John Tower, his