

(Mr. RYAN) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. RYAN of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, I rise today as the Congressman from the General Motors Lordstown plant. We had some bad news this week that we are going to lose 1,600 jobs in Lordstown. When you factor in the supply chain, four, five, six times the amount of that in our community—seat manufacturer, logistics company, trucking, and all the rest. Many communities in the last week have been dealt a pretty bad hand. I think this speaks, Mr. Speaker, to the broken economic system that we have in the United States.

This company, many years ago, got a rescue package from the taxpayers in the United States. When many years later, last year, they got \$157 million in a tax cut that we were told was going to be spent for workers, factories, and jobs in the heartland, and turned around and cut 14,000 jobs and their stock price goes up 6 percent, that is a broken economic system that we have in the United States of America.

We need an industrial policy in this country where the government, the agencies, the departments, the Tax Code, and the investments in infrastructure and education are all moving in the same direction that will create manufacturing jobs here in the United States. We have to have policies that move venture capital out of the three main States, California, New York, and Massachusetts, which is 80 percent of all venture capital.

I am not sure, Mr. Speaker, that the people on Wall Street or the people in the high-tech centers of our country fully appreciate what is happening in communities all over the United States of America. They are being hollowed out and disinvested in.

We need this government to begin to modernize itself and to look at the world as it is, and to recognize that globalization may yield great benefits and great wealth but that those benefits aren't shared everywhere in the United States of America.

They are not shared in the industrial Midwest. Wages have been stagnant for 30 years. People work hard, play by the rules, and still get to their retirement, and they lose their pension or their pension is cut in half.

This is not working. This is not working, Mr. Speaker, and the American people are fed up.

How much can the worker take? How much can their families take?

Year in and year out for 40 years, this has been going on in this country. People who have money continue to make money. The top 1 percent continues to do well. I don't hate anybody because they are rich. But my goodness gracious, when everyone else is suffering, when communities in Ohio, Michigan, Indiana, western Pennsylvania, Kentucky, and Minnesota that have done so much for so long, whether there is a war or manufacturing, it has been these communities who have re-

sponded. Now they have been cut loose, and the stock price goes up.

It is time for us to reclaim the American Dream for these communities and these workers who have done nothing wrong. They have done everything right. They support their church; they support the Little League; they sit on the boards of the booster clubs; and they coach football. They have done everything right. Everything our society would ask of them, they have done, and they get cut loose. Now we live in communities that have blight; they don't have broadband; and they don't have investment.

Some people will say: Just cut taxes for the wealthiest people, and all that wealth will trickle right down to the Lordstowns, the Youngstowns, and the Gary, Indianas of the world.

Do you know what, Mr. Speaker? We have been trying this for 40 years. Since 1980, the supply-side economic policy has been pushed in this country. If it is so damn good, then why isn't it working for working class people? That is what I want to know.

If this economic philosophy is so great, why does the worker in Lordstown get screwed and the stock price for the company goes up 6 percent?

Why do the CEOs of these companies get 350 times the amount of money that the worker on the factory floor gets? Does that seem fair to anybody?

These people work hard and play by the rules. They can't get healthcare. People out working hard, pension gets squeezed, kid gets sick, can't afford it, got to go to the emergency room, opiate epidemic. Try to work hard and go to college, end up \$30,000 in debt, \$40,000 in debt, have to move out of your own community.

The systems are broken in the United States, Mr. Speaker, and it is our job here in Washington, D.C., to remember these families who have done everything right.

That is our commitment. Our responsibility is to fix this broken system. There have been a lot of promises made over the last few years for these communities. Things are moving in the wrong direction, and it is our obligation to fix it.

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

CAMPAIGN CONTRIBUTION REFORM

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was hoping we would be able to get more accomplished this week that would help the American workers. It is amazing a party that calls itself the friend of the working class in America has spent much of the last 10, 12 years doing everything they can to encourage people to come into the United

States illegally so that they can take the jobs from those hardworking Americans and those who wanted to work. It has clearly driven down wages for many years now.

I think that had a lot to do with President Trump's getting a higher percentage of African Americans and Hispanics than was ever predicted or that other Republicans have done. I have African American friends in different places who say that it is pretty clear the party that counts on getting 90 percent of our vote or so, most places, they haven't done us any good.

Under 8 years of the Obama administration, especially after the early part of the administration when the Democrats had the House, the Senate, and the White House, they got anything they wanted done.

Did they want to fix immigration or the border? No. It was not a priority at all.

They are more interested in driving us into socialized medicine, which has made record profits for the big pharmaceuticals, made record profits for the big insurance companies, and driven the little guys out of the market.

So we also know, and we have seen in this last election, the part that the multimillionaires, the megamillionaires, and the billionaires have played as they poured hundreds of millions of dollars into the election to try to drive into office people who call themselves Socialists, Communists, and progressives.

It doesn't take a lot of research to figure out why they would do that. We saw the policies of the Obama administration and the Democratic Party have a profound effect on the economy. President Obama himself—you can find it on video—he finally had to admit that, for the first time in American history—it was on his watch; it was under his policies—95 percent of all the income made in America went to the top 1 percent.

So we can talk about the party that cares deeply about the working class, but let's look at whom they pandered to in order to get hundreds of millions of dollars to help in races where we had Republican Members of Congress who were outspent 10-to-1, 20-to-1, and 30-to-1. It was dramatic.

Talking to TED CRUZ, he said that they had 18 full-time employees, which is understandable you would have a lot, because it is the big State of Texas. You need more than two or three. He had 18 full-time employees at the time of the election. He said that then he learned that his opponent, Robert Francis O'Rourke, had over 800 full-time employees.

What you normally use full-time employees in your campaign for, you don't have them necessarily go out and do the door knocking and do the calls, but usually it is your full-time employees who contact others and solicit volunteers who then go do the block walking, the phone calls, and all that kind of thing.

So to have outraised and outspent TED CRUZ so dramatically that you can have not just 18 employees but really a whole army—platoons and platoons, 20 platoons or so of full-time employees—it tells you that that money was not coming from the country's poor in order to drive up the contributions.

One of the things that I feel really needs to be done—and I haven't heard anybody mention it in the Democratic Party, and there is probably a good reason—but one of the things we saw in 2008 when President Obama, then-candidate Senator Obama ran—we saw little glimpses of it in the Clinton election years, but we saw it with Robert Francis O'Rourke—that is contributions that came in under the amount that required the filing of the name and information about the contributor.

So it is a loophole. Obviously, if you have a loophole, somebody is going to come along and take advantage. But when you have millions and millions of dollars contributed in \$40, \$50 amounts so that you just list the amount, you don't have to list who the credit card holder was, so we don't know if there was one credit card that paid for millions of dollars of \$50 contributions. We don't know where that money came from. We don't even know if it came from the United States or Iran.

When you have that kind of a loophole, heck, you could even have—and I am just saying it is possible. When you don't have to report where the money came from, you can say, hypothetically, that we will send \$150 billion to you and your country if you will be sure and send me millions back for the campaigns I want to help.

□ 1130

I am not saying that happened. I am just saying that is the kind of thing that is possible, and that loophole needs to be closed. It is inconvenient to have to report every contributor, but because it is a loophole that can allow violations of the law without allowing a proper audit and determination whether the law was violated, that loophole needs to be closed.

We need to stick in a provision before we leave the majority that requires the contributor of every dollar to be listed meeting the Federal requirements: who they are, where they are, and that information. It needs to be filed.

For heaven's sake, if somebody is doing it with a credit card, it isn't hard to do that filing. You can get a program that will just do it on automatic pilot for you.

But in the same way, we know that the Democratic Party has battled tooth and nail. We have courts, I would say all over the country, but they are very careful where they file so they can have the most liberal judges, even though this is an area of complete ignorance of Chief Justice Roberts, who said there is no such thing as an Obama judge, a Bush judge. Well, he is right about that.

Really, to say somebody is a Bush judge, that is really not to define who

they are. We have seen appointments under H.W. Bush. I understand President George H.W. Bush has acknowledged nominating David Souter for the Supreme Court. I understood that it had come down to Edith Jones, who is a wonderful, America-loving, brilliant jurist, former chief judge of the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals in New Orleans, but it came down to Edith Jones and David Souter.

I was told by one of Edith's close friends that she was asked to fly to Washington and actually was at the White House with David Souter while President George H.W. Bush was trying to make up his mind. Edith and Souter were both waiting to find out who was going to be tapped to go out into the Rose Garden, wherever they did it, to make the announcement of who was going to be the nominee.

Supposedly—I was told, but haven't confirmed—it apparently was John Sununu who said: I am sure Judge Jones is a great jurist, would be a great jurist. I don't really know her. But I know David Souter would be a terrific Supreme Court Justice.

So they said: Go get Souter. And he comes out.

To say that Souter was a Bush appointment doesn't define who he is. It doesn't tell you anything about who he is.

On the other hand, we have Justice Roberts. And it is nothing against him from an intentional point. It is simply that he is totally ignorant, apparently, of the fact that, when someone says this judge or justice was an Obama justice or judge, then it does define who they are. They are rock-ribbed liberal. They don't care what the Constitution says. They fit in nicely at the Ninth Circuit, where one justice said something years back about: Well, we don't care what the Constitution says. We figure if we come out with enough opinions, the Supreme Court can't reverse them all.

To me, it is a bit treasonous. It is unconstitutional. It should be a basis for impeaching any such judge. But we haven't done that. I was hoping that our Judiciary Committee would begin to bring in justices who had shown contempt for the Constitution in violation of their oath. But because of what I believe was the lack of keeping our promises, we didn't get enough people out in the last election, and we lost the majority in the House.

I know we had House Republican leaders whose mantra was, "When there is no drama, we win," but it seemed very clear. The Senate won. They picked up a couple of seats because they fought and there was drama, and they stood up against the outrageous attacks on an honorable man named Kavanaugh, kind of like Judge Bork. There probably was nobody more qualified like Judge Bork when he was nominated, but he was a bit arrogant, so they got the folks to bring him down.

You had Senator Ted Kennedy, who did an amazing job of character assassina-

tion. He was effective in the lies he made up about Bork, and that kept him from being confirmed. Of course, there was a big celebration not for the truth, but for the fact that, regardless of the truth, they were able to block Judge Bork.

The term "Obama judge" or "Obama justice" is quite definitive. He was very careful not to appoint anyone who believed in following the strict language of the Constitution. These are people who had no problem in doing what I left the bench to do, and that is to legislate. They have no problem with taking over legislative duties.

Now we have seen we have Obama judges who have no problem taking over the executive function. Can any judge say that a President cannot put restrictions and even prevent a reporter from coming and asking questions when they violate what has been instructed and when the person in charge, the President, says, "I have answered your questions," and he doesn't allow a filibuster and the reporter still will not be obedient? The President needs to be able to say: "You are not going to come back and ask any more questions. That is the way it is."

It seems to me to be perfectly equivalent, if the President were to issue an order saying that no Federal judge could go back—or could limit oral argument, that it is a violation of an attorney's freedom of speech, but to put a time limit on oral argument.

In the early days of this country, there were no time limits on arguments before the Supreme Court. I understand Daniel Webster argued one case for about 3 days. In the Amistad case, John Quincy Adams, one of my heroes, even though he was a very ineffective President—some say the best educated, perhaps the most intelligent—but he was determined to bring an end to slavery.

He was talked into handling the oral argument in the Amistad case before the Supreme Court when they were meeting downstairs. His argument spilled into a third day. Since it was multiple days, one of the nine Justices even died during that time.

That kind of crimps your argument a little bit if you lose a Justice.

They didn't have time limits. You could argue the case as long as you wanted. In fact, if you go down to the Old Supreme Court Chamber downstairs, they have two red couches. They are called fainting couches because lawyers could argue a case as long as they felt like they should, and sometimes they might grow faint. They had a place to land if they argued too long and became faint.

If the courts are going to say the President cannot have any restrictions and put any restrictions on reporters who want to filibuster a press conference and they can't limit their questions as long as the reporter wants to talk, then maybe the President should issue an executive order that no Federal judge can limit the time of oral argument of any lawyer before the court.

Now, if that had been the law, that I could not limit oral argument in a case either during my time as a trial judge, my time as a court of appeals chief justice, I could not have survived on the bench. You have got to be able to put a limit on how long argument is going to go on.

But if the courts are going to say the President can't limit a reporter, it violates his freedom of speech, it sure seems like it is a violation of a lawyer's freedom of speech for a justice to say: I am putting a limit of 10 minutes, an hour, 40 minutes, whatever they do. It seems like that would be a violation as well.

It is just really outrageous, and you would expect either an Obama or Clinton judge to be the one who would issue such a ridiculous ruling. Certainly, reporters have freedom of speech, but they do not have a right to be anywhere they want to be to utilize that speech.

The President can restrict all kinds of areas. As we know, President Obama did. He shut down tours of the White House for a prolonged period of time. We had a harder time allowing constituents—I am talking about Democratic constituents, because we don't care what party anybody is affiliated with. No party, some party, if they want our help to get a ticket to tour the White House, we help them. We don't ask them what party they are a part of.

Apparently, party meant a great deal during the Obama years, and they had no problems with doing things like violating the law that says you can't spend more to shut down a Federal site during a government shutdown than it takes to leave it open.

They spent a lot of money shutting down facilities that didn't require any money to keep them open. They wanted to make the veterans suffer and keep them out of their memorials. For some of them, it was their only chance to see the memorials in their whole life.

The Obama administration didn't care. They shut them down and then said it is all the Republicans' fault. Even though we passed four bills, doing everything we could to prevent a government shutdown, the Senate was hell-bent on having a shutdown, and with the help of John Boehner saying Republicans did it, it was ridiculous. Maybe he had had too much to drink that night. I don't know.

We passed four bills in those preceding days, even up until 1 a.m. The last one was appointing conferees. They didn't include me. They were people who were ready to get an agreement struck within the hour, and the Senate would not appoint conferees because they wanted a shutdown.

I was just heartbroken. I was the one who cut the tape. I hollered at STEVE PALAZZO from Mississippi. He had three busloads of veterans out there. The majority, I think, were in wheelchairs. They couldn't get in. I came with scis-

sors, cut the tape. I called STEVE over. There were two big barricades. I said: STEVE, when I cut the tape, don't hesitate. You open the left side, I will open the right side, and we will get this open for our veterans.

I had asked STEVE KING before we did that to go over and tell the Park Police closest to us which ones were Members of Congress so they didn't arrest us and then later say: Oh, we didn't know they were Members of Congress. We had a right to be there, and we had a right to inspect the facilities. So, STEVE took care of that detail for us.

Once he had done that, then I cut the ribbon. And he opened the left one; I opened the right one. I didn't even notice there was a bagpipe player who had worked his way up right behind me and STEVE. So when we opened those barricades, the first guy through behind us was the bagpipe player. It was awesome to see all those veterans rolling in in wheelchairs right behind the bagpipe player. It was a beautiful sight. But it was tragic to see the way the Obama administration wanted to punish our veterans.

After I left there to go try to help open the Iwo Jima Monument access, I came by and could see the Martin Luther King Jr. Memorial. I couldn't believe they had barricaded that. It is a walk-through memorial.

□ 1145

Yes, they wanted to blame Republicans, but they spent a lot of money to blockade a facility that you walk through. It is a moving memorial to most of us, but they blocked people out of that.

So when you couple that kind of callousness toward the middle-class patriots of this country who risked life and limb—some of them lost limbs—and you want to punish them to make a political point, it was outrageous.

Then, when you see that the economic policies of an administration, the Obama administration, which claimed to be looking out for the little guy, where basically they kept holding out—luring people into the United States illegally by their failure and refusal to protect our borders.

It is clear they drove down wages. People had not had a wage increase, when adjusted for inflation, for a very long time.

When anybody really studies socialism—and I am not talking about the games that are played in so many universities now about this glorious thing called socialism, progressivism, communism.

When you really look historically at what that means, in socialism there is no middle class. You have the ruling class, and you have the ruled class. Now, someday in heaven, then everybody will share and share alike and do so joyfully. But in this world, where no human being is perfect, there is always going to be jealousy.

You are always going to have circumstances like I found as an exchange

student in the Soviet Union when I asked a bunch of farmers sitting in the shade in the middle of the morning: When do you work out in the fields?

They looked terrible. You couldn't even tell what they had cultivated and what they hadn't. And they laughed, and I thought I had said something wrong in Russian.

One of them responded: I make the same number of rubles if I am out there in the sun as I do here in the shade, so I am here in the shade.

That explains why socialism, communism, it never, ever works in this world. It never, ever will. You are left with a ruling class that gets all kinds of privilege—that doesn't have to worry about money, they get everything they want—and then the ruled class.

And their healthcare stinks. Being over in the Soviet Union for that summer and being exposed to their socialized medicine, I literally thanked God that I was American and never had to worry about socialized medicine. It just seemed like they were 20, 30 years behind where we were. And I lived in the small town of Mount Pleasant. We had a lot better healthcare than they had over there at some of the larger cities. It was amazing.

But, if you are going to use socialism and you are going to pay a physician the same amount of money whether they see 5 people or 100 people, then the physicians have no incentive to take care of as many people as they physically can. They have an incentive to see as few as they can. And, in a socialized medicine situation, the physicians don't get paid all that much.

Now, the big pharmaceuticals, Big Pharma, the big insurance companies—not the little ones, the big ones—and pharmaceuticals that signed on to support ObamaCare, they could tell, and I could tell from reading the bill, that they were going to make billions and billions more than they have ever made in their history.

As I told some of their lobbyists, you guys signed your own death warrant. Yeah, you are going to make billions and billions more, maybe 15 years; but then, eventually, you are going to be capped. And you are not going to be able to collect for research and development. You are going to be unable to keep creating lifesaving, life-enhancing medications, and you are going to be like a Third World pharmaceutical.

They didn't care, because these guys had golden parachutes. They knew they would make billions more because of what Obama did for them. And they did, and they have, and they still are.

Yes, we have lost a lot of insurance companies, but the big companies, they are doing great. They are doing real well. In fact, I was shocked; I missed it when I read the bill, but these biggest insurance companies could even get bailouts in years they made record profits.

We were able to stop some of that while we had the majority, but I guess

those kind of things won't be stopped next year. The Democrats that passed ObamaCare are probably not going to be restricting the big money coming to the big insurance companies because I am sure a lot of that will come back in the way of political contributions.

So, there is a lot that needs to be done. We have not been faithful, as a party, to keep our promises. The number one issue, I think, that got President Trump elected was that he was going to secure the border: We are going to get a wall built where we need it.

And I really do believe what he said, that if he had the cooperation of Congress, he was going to be able to make Mexico pay for it. And I felt like he eventually would.

But if there is no wall built—not in all places do we need it. We don't need 2,000 miles of it, but there are some places where we definitely need it. But these invasions—whether you want to call them caravans, they are really invasions. Even though the alt-left media like CNN and MSNBC were saying it is all big lies about these caravans, there are no invasions, there are no caravans, it is all a political hoax—well, it was not a political hoax. They were either intentionally lying, or they were just ignorant. Either way, they were wrong.

Then we see yesterday information about at least a third of those who are wanting to crash into our country, invade our country, have serious healthcare issues. And they are going to make a lot of Americans sick if they come in.

Now, there is no country in the history of the world that has been more generous, more philanthropic, has done more good for other countries, other peoples all over the world. But, in order to maintain that, you have to have a vibrant economy. And, actually, to do that, to care for the environment, you have got to have a vibrant economy.

So we should be doing reconciliation, get the money for the President's wall, and do it now before we turn over the majority. Anything else is a betrayal of our promises.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. POE of Texas (at the request of Mr. MCCARTHY) for today on account of personal reasons.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED

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

H.R. 6651. An act to extend certain authorities relating to United States efforts to combat HIV/AIDS, tuberculosis, and malaria globally, and for other purposes.

H.R. 7187. An act to extend the National Flood Insurance Program until December 7, 2018.

SENATE ENROLLED BILL SIGNED

The Speaker announced his signature to an enrolled bill of the Senate of the following title:

S. 140. An act to authorize appropriations for the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT

Karen L. Haas, Clerk of the House, reported that on November 29, 2018, she presented to the President of the United States, for his approval, the following bills:

H.R. 4254. To amend the National Science Foundation Authorization Act of 2002 to strengthen the aerospace workforce pipeline by the promotion of Robert Noyce Teacher Scholarship Program and National Aeronautics and Space Administration internship and fellowship opportunities to women, and for other purposes.

H.R. 390. To provide relief for victims of genocide, crimes against humanity, and war crimes who are members of religious and ethnic minority groups in Iraq and Syria, for accountability for perpetrators of these crimes, and for other purposes.

H.R. 2422. To amend the Public Health Service Act to improve essential oral health care for low-income and other underserved individuals by breaking down barriers to care, and for other purposes.

H.R. 5317. To repeal section 2141 of the Revised Statutes to remove the prohibition on certain alcohol manufacturing on Indian lands.

H.R. 1074. To repeal the Act entitled "An Act to confer jurisdiction on the State of Iowa over offenses committed by or against Indians on the Sac and Fox Indian Reservation".

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 11 o'clock and 53 minutes a.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until Tuesday, December 4, 2018, at noon for morning-hour debate.

OATH FOR ACCESS TO CLASSIFIED INFORMATION

Under clause 13 of rule XXIII, the following Members executed the oath for access to classified information:

Brenda Jones
Susan Wild

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

7039. A letter from the Secretary of Defense, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter issuing a travel restriction for senior officials' travel to Yemen, effective Novem-

ber 1, 2018; ; to the Committee on Armed Services.

7040. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Standards for Business Practices of Interstate Natural Gas Pipelines [Docket No.: RM96-1-041; Order No.: 587-Y] November 26, 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.

7041. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the stabilization of Iraq that was declared in Executive Order 13303 of May 22, 2003, pursuant to 50 U.S.C. 1641(c); Public Law 94-412, Sec. 401(c); (90 Stat. 1257) and 50 U.S.C. 1703(c); Public Law 95-223, Sec. 204(c); (91 Stat. 1627); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

7042. A letter from the Administrator and Chief Executive Officer, Bonneville Power Administration, Department of Energy, transmitting the Bonneville Power Administration's 2018 Annual Report, pursuant to the Third Powerplant at Grand Coulee Dam Act, 16 U.S.C. 835j, and the Chief Financial Officers Act, Public Law 101-576, applicable to Government corporations; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7043. A letter from the Treasurer, National Gallery of Art, transmitting the Gallery's Performance and Accountability Report for the year ended September 30, 2018, pursuant to 31 U.S.C. 3515(a)(1); Public Law 101-576, Sec. 303(a)(1) (as amended by Public Law 107-289, Sec. 2(a)); (116 Stat. 2049); to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7044. A letter from the Administrator, U.S. Agency for International Development, transmitting the Agency's Semiannual Report to Congress for the period ending September 30, 2018; to the Committee on Oversight and Government Reform.

7045. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Atlantic Highly Migratory Species; Atlantic Bluefin Tuna Fisheries [Docket No.: 150121066-5717-02] (RIN: 0648-XG216) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7046. A letter from the Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery; 2018 Closure of the Northern Gulf of Maine Scallop Management Area [Docket No.: 180110025-8285-02] (RIN: 0648-XG202) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7047. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Northeast Multispecies Fishery; Gulf of Maine Cod Trimester Total Allowable Catch Area Closure for the Common Pool Fishery [Docket No.: 15121999-6343-02] (RIN: 0648-XG175) received November 26, 2018, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Natural Resources.

7048. A letter from the Acting Director, Office of Sustainable Fisheries, NMFS, National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, transmitting the Administration's temporary rule — Fisheries of the Northeastern United States; Atlantic Sea Scallop Fishery;