

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, on February 8, 2019, I missed two recorded votes. Had I been present, on rollcall No. 74, I would have voted no, and on rollcall No. 75, I would have voted yes.

AUTHORIZING THE CLERK TO MAKE CORRECTIONS IN EN- GROSSMENT OF H.R. 840, VET- ERANS' ACCESS TO CHILD CARE ACT

Mr. TAKANO. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that, in the engrossment of H.R. 840, the Clerk be authorized to correct section numbers, punctuation, spelling, and cross-references, and to make such other technical and conforming changes as may be necessary to reflect the actions of the House in amending the bill, including the changes now at the desk.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Clerk will report the changes.

The Clerk read as follows:

In the amendment offered by Mrs. Radewagen of American Samoa, modify the first amendatory instruction to read “Page 1, line 15”; modify the second amendatory instruction to read “Page 2, after line 24”; and modify the third amendatory instruction to read “Page 2, line 25”.

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

There was no objection.

REQUEST TO CONSIDER H.R. 962, BORN-ALIVE ABORTION SURVIVORS PROTECTION ACT

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Judiciary be discharged from further consideration of my bill, H.R. 962, the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, and ask for its immediate consideration in the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is advised that, under guidelines consistently issued by successive Speakers, as recorded in section 956 of the House Rules and Manual, the Chair is constrained not to entertain the request unless it has been cleared by the bipartisan floor and committee leaderships.

PARLIAMENTARY INQUIRIES

Mrs. WAGNER. A parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I understand the guidelines the Chair just cited. However, seeing no objection from leadership or committee members on either side of the aisle, does that constitute clearance and allow the Chair to entertain my motion under the rules of the House?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. As previously stated, the request cannot be entertained absent appropriate clearance.

Mrs. WAGNER. Further parliamentary inquiry, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will state her parliamentary inquiry.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, again, seeing no objection on either side of the aisle, can the Chair advise what is required pursuant to section 956 of the House rules to allow my motion for discharge of the Born-Alive Act to be considered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is advised that a unanimous consent request for the consideration of that measure would have to receive clearance from the majority and the minority floor and committee leaderships.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, can the ruling of the Chair be challenged?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has not issued a ruling.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask the Chair to rule on the motion of unanimous consent.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman has sought unanimous consent and has not been recognized for that purpose.

Mrs. WAGNER. Mr. Speaker, if this unanimous consent request cannot be entertained, I urge the Speaker and the majority leader to schedule the Born-Alive Act on the floor immediately so we can stand up and defend the sanctity of life.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman is engaging in debate and has not been recognized for debate.

Mrs. WAGNER. This bill, Mr. Speaker, does not impose any restrictions.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentlewoman will suspend. The gentlewoman is engaging in debate.

ELECTING MEMBERS TO A CERTAIN STANDING COMMITTEE OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Ms. CHENEY. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the House Republican Conference, I send to the desk a privileged resolution and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

H. RES. 113

Resolved, That the following named Members be, and are hereby, elected to the following standing committee of the House of Representatives:

COMMITTEE ON ETHICS: Mr. Ratcliffe, Mr. Holding, Mrs. Walorski, Mr. Guest.

Ms. CHENEY (during the reading). Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be considered as read.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Wyoming?

There was no objection.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEGISLATIVE PROGRAM

(Mr. SCALISE asked and was given permission to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I rise for the purpose of inquiring of the majority leader the schedule for the week to come.

Madam Speaker, before I yield to the gentleman from Maryland, I want to share and join in with him in the tribute that has been paid to our former colleague John Dingell.

I served proudly on the House Energy and Commerce Committee with Chairman Dingell, and what a giant, what a true institutionalist of this House, the longest serving Member, a colleague of whom we will have fond memories and will share those fond memories, I am sure, in the days and weeks to come.

I know, Madam Speaker, and to my colleague from Maryland as well, every time we go into that room, the committee room for the Energy and Commerce Committee, we always get to look up now and know that it is named after our colleague John Dingell and always remember his wit—because he was tough, but he had a great wit to share along with the combat that you would always get to engage in with him.

I will always remember, when the vote was finally called, he always had his own unique way. As the clerk would be calling the roll of the committee and they would call a member and the member would say “aye” or “nay,” he would always say: “Dingell votes aye.”

He would have his unique way of addressing the issue of the day, and we will always remember him. To his wife, DEBBIE, and his family, we keep him in our prayers.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Maryland (Mr. HOYER).

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank my friend Mr. SCALISE, the Republican whip, for his comments. It is a testimony to the love and respect that John Dingell enjoyed in this House from both sides of the aisle.

As I said earlier, Madam Speaker, there is no one in this House who doesn’t have a particular story about John Dingell. So, before we begin this colloquy, I want to again express my gratitude for the life and service of my friend John Dingell.

Madam Speaker, I was with him Wednesday. He died yesterday. I was with him the day before he died. We sat together for 2½ hours and talked. As I left, I leaned down and I kissed him on the forehead, and I said: “I love you, John.”

I think I was speaking for, literally, scores of Members who worked with him on the committee, who worked with him on the floor, and who saw him in various different venues as a colleague.

□ 1145

They loved him as well for his integrity and for his fairness. And, yes, as the gentleman from Louisiana said, he could be tough, and he could be rough, but he also could be gentle and accepting and open.

All of us in this country were blessed by his time on this Earth, so much of

which he gave back to the rest of us in the form of service in the Armed Forces and in this House and in his community.

History will remember him as its longest serving Member of the House of Representatives, but we who knew him well remember John Dingell as a man of extraordinary character, intellect, courage, and purpose.

From healthcare to the environment, from workers' rights to veterans' care, John worked tirelessly over six decades in the House to make sure Congress was doing right by the people who the House represents. His legislative record of achievement speaks volumes about who it was he believed he was fighting for every day in office.

Medicare, Civil Rights Act, Voting Rights Act, Clean Air Act, Safe Drinking Water Act, Endangered Species Act, all of these bore his imprint. What an extraordinary record of service and accomplishment. And that is because he was a champion of affordable healthcare, equality under the law, the right to vote, economic opportunity, and a healthy future for our children and grandchildren.

To his beloved Michigan, he was an indefatigable defender of autoworkers and their role in the American economy.

John was steadfast in his belief that the best way to serve them and all his constituents was to work, whenever possible, in concert with those across the aisle and not against them.

We are, after all, all Americans. We serve Americans. We serve a great country. He believed in Congress, and, oh, how he believed in his country. He believed in sitting down together and working through our differences in a way that was respectful and civil.

Madam Speaker, I hope that spirit and his example will imbue in us a resolve to find compromise in these challenging times. John, as everybody knows, followed his father into service—22 years of service.

In 1955, in December, his father passed away, and John was sent by the voters to continue the service of the Dingell family. John Dingell, Sr., was a major proponent of New Deal legislation in this House, serving from 1933 to 1955.

John was followed in service here by the “lovely DEBORAH,” as he so affectionately and lovingly called her. His wife is an extraordinary Member of Congress herself, and we are blessed to have her. DEBBIE is an extraordinary woman, an outstanding Member of the Congress of the United States.

We stood in a moment of silence just a few minutes ago. I hope that we will adjourn in his honor today.

DEBBIE has been carrying on the Dingell legacy of seeking bipartisan results while remaining steadfast to the progressive values that brought her into public service.

I offer, Madam Speaker, my condolences, as I do to John’s children and grandchildren and to their entire extended family.

I thank the minority whip for his comments and expression, which demonstrates what we have all said. John Dingell was, of course, a Democrat, but John Dingell was more than that, by far. He was an American and a fierce promoter of the people’s House and the work that was done by all the Members of the people’s House, so I thank my friend.

Madam Speaker, on Monday, the House will meet at 12 p.m. for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business, with votes postponed until 6:30 p.m.

On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday, the House will meet at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate and 12 p.m. for legislative business.

On Friday, the House will meet at 9 a.m. for legislative business, with last votes expected no later than 3 p.m.

We will consider several bills under suspension of the rules. A complete list of suspensions will be available by the close of business today.

The House will also consider H.J. Res. 37, a war powers resolution on U.S. involvement in Yemen. This legislation will force a much-needed conversation about how to bring to an end the violence and the humanitarian crisis that we see in Yemen.

In addition, Madam Speaker, the House is expected to consider the conference report that finishes fiscal year 2019 appropriations. I understand that progress is being made, and I am hopeful—I am hopeful—and optimistic that we can have a deal that comes together early next week. Members are advised that additional legislative items are possible.

Let me simply say that Members ought to know that there is a possibility as well, given the death of our colleague, John Dingell, and the desire of so many to attend his funeral, that the schedule may be modified to accommodate that effort and that travel to Michigan.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for going through the schedule, and I would share that assessment as well, that if those arrangements are made early next week, I would expect a large contingent of our colleagues to want to be there. We will all be there in spirit with John and his memory, as well as our wishes to his family.

As he and I may have disagreed on some issues, he was a strong supporter of the Second Amendment, and we would talk about that. Mostly, when I had those conversations with Chairman Dingell, it was about this great institution, this people’s House that we both have the honor to serve in, and his appreciation for what this institution means to our great Nation. Those will be memories I will always cherish.

As we look to the schedule, I know the gentleman alluded to the conference committee that is meeting. I am encouraged, as I talk to different conferees, by the conversations, the issues that they are tackling. Clearly,

the issue that has been at the front and center of the differences that we are trying to work through deals with border security.

As we look to resolve the differences, ultimately, it is my hope that we find a way to properly fund the tools that are needed to actually secure the border, as our experts, our men and women who risk their lives to keep our border safe, have laid out in detail: obviously, technology to help them do their jobs better, the need to increase security at ports of entry and to have more of the drug-testing equipment that can do a better job of keeping drugs out of our country.

Clearly, part of that solution has to be some form of physical barriers—whatever you want to call them, wall, physical barrier—along areas where we have the worst problems.

If I can bring to the gentleman’s attention, there was a story yesterday in the Washington Examiner titled, “Border agents just apprehended convicted child molesters and an MS-13 member at the Texas border where there’s no barrier.” This is a Washington Examiner article from yesterday, and I include it in the RECORD.

[From the Washington Examiner, Feb. 7, 2019]

BORDER AGENTS JUST APPREHENDED CONVICTED CHILD MOLESTERS AND AN MS-13 MEMBER AT THE TEXAS BORDER WHERE THERE’S NO BARRIER

(By Eddie Scarry)

U.S. Border Patrol agents said Thursday that they apprehended several illegal immigrants at the southern border in Texas, in places where there are no physical barrier walls to deter illegal crossings.

Among those caught crossing into the U.S. were a Mexican man with a previous conviction in Georgia for child molestation, a Honduran man with a record in North Carolina showing a conviction for “Indecent Liberties with Child,” and another Honduran male with a Florida record that identified him as a member of the violent M-13 gang.

The apprehensions occurred in the Rio Grande Valley sector of the southern border on Monday and Tuesday, according to a release by the Border Patrol.

I toured a portion of that sector in January, and agents said that areas that feature a 25-foot barrier of concrete and steel have proven critical in blocking illegal border crossers, forcing them to attempt their crossings in specific areas where they can be apprehended. They’ve asked for more of the same kind of border wall to fill in the long gaps that currently exist.

When President Trump said during his State of the Union address Tuesday that his proposal is for new barrier that “will be deployed in the areas identified by the border agents as having the greatest need,” this is what he meant.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, for my friend, the majority leader, I want to read this comment and ask a question about this.

Among the other things that they were able to identify as they were able to stop, just earlier this week, some of these people coming in, a person with “a previous conviction in Georgia for child molestation, a Honduran man with a record in North Carolina showing a conviction for ‘indecent liberties

with a child,’ and another Honduran male with a Florida record that identified him as a member of the violent MS-13 gang.”

This is just one more example, earlier this week, of people who are coming across our border illegally in areas—and the article notes that this happened in the Rio Grande Valley sector of the southern border on Monday and Tuesday, according to our Border Patrol agents, in areas where there is no physical barrier.

So as the gentleman himself has said just a few days ago, and I quote, “physical barriers are part of the solution” to improve border security, I would ask the gentleman, when we get this conference report hopefully wrapped up this weekend, can the gentleman give an assurance that there will be money to properly not only secure the border but to include the physical barriers that are not there in those areas where we have child molesters and gang members coming across our southern border?

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his question. I am not a member of the conference committee.

He quoted me in what I said. We are for border security. I am hopeful that the conference committee reports out a bill that all sides can support that does, in fact, try to make our borders more secure. I look forward to having that bill, hopefully, on the floor next week prior to the 15th or on the 15th, so we can: A, ensure that the government is not shut down; and, B, ensure that we have a bipartisan agreement on how we can make our borders more secure.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman, and I think we are all going to be encouraging those members of the conference committee to continue the work that they are doing. That headway seems to be going in the right direction.

Hopefully, we come up with a bill by early next week that we can vote on next week before we get to the deadline on the 15th to continue to properly fund those other areas of the government that haven’t been funded. That includes the border security that is necessary, including physical barriers.

Shifting gears, I would ask the gentleman about a piece of legislation that we filed that we have been trying to get unanimous consent to bring up, and this is H.R. 962, a bill by my colleague, ANN WAGNER from Missouri.

As we saw earlier, in these last few days, you had the Governor of New York signing legislation that, among other things, would allow for a baby that comes out of the womb alive, whether it is from an abortion that wasn’t successful—whatever the case, if a baby comes out of the womb alive, the fact that in the State of New York, and now we saw the Governor of Virginia talking on a radio show about

how that process and procedure would be carried out where the baby, after it is born alive, can be killed legally in those States.

As we talk about the sanctity of innocent life, clearly, there are many different divisions amongst the parties on the issue of abortion. But to many, this issue transcends abortion. This isn’t related to abortion anymore. If a baby comes out of the womb and is alive, the fact that in only 26 States there are protections that that baby can’t be killed, that means in nearly half of the States in this country, that baby still can be killed legally.

I still don’t completely grasp how that is legal in America, that someone who is born alive can still be killed and have that be legal in certain States.

So we have a bill called the Born-Alive Protection Act that would ensure that, regardless of how you feel about abortion—pro-life, pro-choice—after the baby comes out of the womb alive, it shouldn’t be able to be killed. H.R. 962 gives that protection that it can’t be killed. I would ask the gentleman if he would allow that bill to come to the House floor for a vote.

Madam Speaker, I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the question. As the gentleman knows, this bill was introduced in the last Congress in which the Republicans, his party, were in charge of the House and the Senate and the Presidency, and it did not pass the Congress and go to the President.

We will pursue the regular order. This bill, like every other bill, will be referred to committee, and the committee will handle its consideration as the committee sees fit.

The gentleman has talked about, or there has been discussion about, a discharge petition that is obviously available. We were trying very hard to have people we call Dreamers allowed to stay in the only country they know. Unfortunately, the leadership was against that discharge petition, and it never got to the floor.

For many bills that either side may want, some come to the floor, some don’t. But this will go through the regular process, and it is going to be referred to the committee of jurisdiction. We will see how that proceeds.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I would remind the gentleman that when we did bring that piece of legislation last year, the Born-Alive Protection Act, it did pass the House, 241–183, in a bipartisan way, with six Democrats voting with us to pass that bill to the Senate. It did not get passed in the Senate.

□ 1200

However, as you look now, there have been a number of alarming developments that have raised the profile of this issue.

When the Governor of New York signed into law his legislation and celebrated the fact that, in his State, you

can kill a baby after it has been born, and you saw applause in the legislature over that, it shocked people across the country. It horrified and angered people across the country.

When the Governor of Virginia, just a few days ago, went to a radio station and described, in detail, how a baby born alive can still be killed, can be killed after it is born alive, and it is legal in that State, it is legal, and not protected in nearly a majority of our States, this issue has come to the forefront of Americans.

Again, pro-life, pro-choice, wherever you are on this issue, the vast majority of Americans feel strongly that you should not be able to kill the baby after it is born alive.

So we can talk about a long, drawn-out legislative process, but now there is more interest and more anger to confront this violent act of murder. How can it be anything other than murder to kill a child after it comes out of the womb? So I know we can talk about a long, drawn-out procedure.

I have made it very clear I will be filing a discharge petition if we can’t get to the point where we get this bill brought to the floor in a quicker way. There is a quicker way to do this and address this problem.

Again, if you ask most pro-choice people in America, they don’t think it is right that you can kill the baby after it comes out of the womb. And so, as the gentleman can talk about a regular order procedure, this bill has passed the House before, and now there is more interest in the Senate to confront this issue. We have the ability to give them that opportunity.

I would just ask if the gentleman would reconsider, to move this in a quicker way and allow the unanimous consent motion to go through. If no one objects, we can bring that bill to the floor. And so far, as we have been making the motion for unanimous consent, there has been no opposition expressed. They have just not allowed the motion to go forward and be recognized.

So I would just ask the gentleman to reconsider and allow us to, at least, have that opportunity to try to bring this bill to the floor in the quickest way possible, to stop this barbaric process from being allowed anywhere in America.

Mr. HOYER. My answer, however, is the same to the gentleman, Madam Speaker. We have a process. The bill has just been introduced. It will be referred to committee, and the committee will have it under regular order to consider. I cannot predict what the committee will do with that bill, but I understand the gentleman’s strong feelings. I respect those; and I respect the fact that this is an issue that is current.

But, again, my answer to the distinguished Republican Whip is that we will be considering that in the regular order and, at that point in time, I am sure that he will be able to testify before the committee, if and when there

is a hearing, and that others will as well, including the sponsor. But we are going to pursue the regular order on this bill and other bills as well.

Mr. SCALISE. Madam Speaker, I thank the gentleman for those comments. I would just ask if the gentleman would urge the chairman of the Judiciary Committee to move swiftly to bring this bill up for a vote as we continue to use every legislative tool we have available to, hopefully, try to get a unanimous consent agreement to bring the bill to the floor. But ultimately, if that is not allowed, and if the committee process doesn't work and actually take attention to this in a quick way, then we will go a different route and use the discharge petition route.

So we have continued to try to make the point that this issue needs to be addressed by this Congress. The President, in his State of the Union Tuesday night, was very clear that Congress ought to address this issue. And the President, in his speech—and I thought it was an incredibly eloquent speech, confronting the challenges we face, but also talking about the greatness of this country and highlighting some of the people who achieved greatness, the three men who stormed the beaches of Normandy, and the challenges they faced to liberate Europe, to keep America free.

Ultimately, one of those gentlemen actually went on to help liberate Dachau; and to see the Holocaust survivor who was at Dachau, and liberated by that very gentleman, to both be on the same row of the gallery, was a special moment, a special moment that reminds us of the greatness of this country.

And as the President talked about that at the end, he challenged us, he challenged Congress to reach for greatness, not gridlock, but for that same greatness as we confront the challenges that this great Nation faces today.

This action, the fact that, in many States of this Nation, it is allowed to kill a baby after it has been born, is a moral wrong that we need to fix. That is another act of greatness that we need to rise up to; and I hope we do in the quickest way possible.

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

ADJOURNMENT TO MONDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 2019

Mr. HOYER. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns today, it adjourn to meet on Monday next, when it shall convene at noon for morning-hour debate and 2 p.m. for legislative business.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Ms. FINKENAUER). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

HONORING THE LIFE OF THE HONORABLE JOHN DAVID DINGELL, JR.

(Ms. SHALALA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend her remarks.)

Ms. SHALALA. Madam Speaker, my first friend and mentor in Washington was Chairman Dingell. Big John guided me during all of my years as HHS Secretary. He was a towering figure in the House, passionate about healthcare, and tough on unethical behavior by those who benefited from the generosity of taxpayers.

He was, for all of us who knew and loved him, gentle and kind, and generous with his time and advice. He was a gentleman legislator, brilliant, tough, strategic, and extraordinarily effective. He was a patriot.

My heart goes out to my good friend, his wife, DEBBIE, and his family.

HONORING THE LIFE OF OSSIE MILLS

(Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. KEVIN HERN of Oklahoma. Madam Speaker, I rise today to honor the life of Ossie Mills from Tulsa, Oklahoma. Those who knew Mr. Mills best say that he was a loyal friend, a hard worker, a devoted husband and father, and a servant of God. Mr. Mills encouraged and challenged others to live out their full potential.

Mr. Mills served as an executive vice president at Oral Roberts University from 2011 to 2018, where he served as executive director and global council member of Empowered21. He also served on the Board of Directors for Convoy of Hope, a worldwide, faith-based organization aimed at empowering others to live lives free of poverty, disease, and hunger.

Most recently, Mr. Mills was the president and CEO of tvChaz, a faith-based streaming platform aimed at helping people discover God's vision for life.

While Ossie Mills' time on Earth has come to an end, the impact of his work will last for years to come.

Mr. Mills is survived by his loving wife, Bonnie, and his three children, Nick, Olivia, and Alex.

THE NATIONAL PRAYER BREAKFAST

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

Mr. MARSHALL. Madam Speaker, Kansas has deep roots in the creation of the National Prayer Breakfast. President Eisenhower, who grew up near my hometown, in Abilene, Kansas, was the first President to join Members in their informal prayer event in 1953. Since that year, it has been honored as

a nationally recognized event and, to this day, every President since Ike has attended.

This week, I had the great honor to attend the 67th Annual National Prayer Breakfast, where we gathered to ask God for wisdom, discernment, and strength, as well as how to lead this great Nation.

This country has always looked to God in times of need and will continue to do so. And now, more than ever, it is important to pray for a united Nation.

I was reminded this week of the scripture from 1 Timothy that requires us to all pray for our kings and those in authority. But what I had forgotten was that there was a promise that came along with that request; that we live peaceful and quiet lives in all Godliness and holiness.

END INFANTICIDE

(Mr. GREEN of Tennessee asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. GREEN of Tennessee. Madam Speaker, like many Americans, chills ran through my spine when I heard Governor Northam casually endorse killing a baby after it was born. It has been over a week since those comments, and I ask, Why are our Democrat colleagues still silent?

Killing a baby, once born, is infanticide, pure and simple.

It is 2019, and we live in the most advanced country in the world. Surely, every Member of this body can agree that, at the very least, babies, once born, should be protected.

That is why I come to the floor today to urge Speaker PELOSI to allow a vote on the Born-Alive Abortion Survivors Protection Act, a bill that would require medical care for infants born alive during an abortion procedure.

I urge my colleagues across the aisle to join us to end infanticide.

HONORING THE LIFE OF DICK AMES

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

Mr. EMMER. Madam Speaker, I rise today to remember the life of Dick Ames, a great friend who recently passed. Dick's contributions to the great State of Minnesota are countless. His impact on our progress and the future of our great State is unending. I was lucky to know Dick and the generous heart he had for others, for everyone in our community.

Over the course of his life, he helped shape everything he touched. Through his business, Ames Construction, or his farm, or even his contributions to the athletic department at his beloved University of Minnesota, Dick made a difference for our great State.

His hard work, honesty, and integrity were an example for us all, to strive for greatness and serve those around you