

Currently, there is over \$9 billion sitting in the harbor maintenance trust fund. This money has come from the users of those assets. They have put that money in for the express purpose of thinking that it was going to be used to improve the ports that they used.

Over the next decade, there is going to be an additional \$24.5 billion in revenue that will be collected by the harbor maintenance tax. This bill provides for the investment of approximately \$34 billion for our Nation's coastal and inland harbors over the next decade without raising one dime in taxes for our hardworking American taxpayers. This money will provide for dredging of all Federal harbors to their constructed widths and depths.

Because of developments like the opening of the expanded Panama Canal in 2016, larger container ships will increasingly call upon our Nation's ports, and dredging is necessary if they are allowed to have access to these ports. Our goal is to guarantee that our Nation is competitive in the global economy of the 21st century.

Also with EARL BLUMENAUER, I introduced the Public Buildings Renewal Act. This bipartisan legislation will spur private investment in public building infrastructure throughout the United States by creating \$5 billion in private activity bonds for the improvement of government-owned public buildings.

In every small town or city in America, the conditions of our public schools, our public hospitals, our universities, and our police and fire stations are deteriorating because of delayed maintenance. We just haven't been able to afford to do it.

With State and local budgets becoming increasingly tight, capital investments in public buildings have fallen by the wayside. For example, the average public school building is at least 40 years old, and the current backlog of maintenance and repair projects adds up to more than \$45 billion, annually, in unmet funding needs.

□ 2015

The Public Building Renewal Act aims to unlock private sector capital for the public sector's benefit. The public buildings that house vital services for Americans must be maintained and improved.

We have also dropped the Building Rail Access for Customers and the Economy Act. Representative BLUMENAUER and I introduced this bill just recently.

The short line rail industry operates on nearly 50,000 miles of railroad track in 49 states. And is part of the origination or the termination of one out of every five cars, railroad cars, on the national railroad system.

Short line railroads serve the most vulnerable part of the rail network. Small towns and small businesses who would have otherwise been cut off from the national network, are now served by the short lines.

Unfortunately, though, as the freight rail industry has evolved, many short line railroads and smaller communities have been abandoned.

This removes a critical first- and last-mile link between producers, consumers, and export opportunities in large and small communities across America.

Since it was first enacted in 2005, the 1- or 2-year increment extensions of the Short Line Railroad Maintenance Credit provided limited certainty for short line railroads to make investments in their infrastructure.

Our legislation delivers confidence by making the short line railroad maintenance credit permanent while also applying it retroactively to tax year 2018.

The short line railroad maintenance tax credit is responsible for more than \$4 billion of investment in privately held short line railroads across America.

The tax credit requires the short line railroad to invest \$1 dollar for every 50 cents in credit up to a credit cap of \$3,500 per track mile.

In 2015 alone, 2,140 rail miles were improved.

5.27 million railroad ties were replaced; and the short line industry invested nearly 25 percent of their revenue on infrastructure improvements.

These investments ensure that more than 10,000 rail companies can rely on safe, efficiently and economically competitive transportation for their products.

Also, I would like to talk just a little bit about the GAIIN Act.

During the last Congress, I introduced a bipartisan bill with a broad coalition from the Republican Study Committee, the Congressional Black Caucus, the Congressional Hispanic Caucus, and the House Freedom Caucus.

This legislation has the potential to help fund critical infrastructure projects in the Nation's poorest communities while simultaneously paying down on our national debt.

The poorest areas in our country have been routinely overlooked or are in dire need of infrastructure improvements that will facilitate economic growth and self-sustainability.

Reviving these forgotten cities and breathing life back into these towns throughout America is both a moral and economic imperative that uniquely unites all lawmakers on both sides of the aisle.

Selling some of the \$2 trillion of non-performing debt and lease assets held by Federal agencies on the open market would be a good strategy for a down payment on infrastructure improvements.

The GAIIN Act will do that and reduce our debt without asking taxpayers for one more penny of their money.

Half the proceeds from these sales will be put into projects and communities below the poverty line and directly lead to jobs and economic growth where it is most needed.

Also, the contractors doing this work in these communities would be required to hire people who actually live there, to help build these products and projects.

Imagine the generational pride that will be created when fathers and mothers and grandfathers and grandmothers tell their children and grandchildren, "We rebuilt this community for you." It lasts for generations, and it is a pride that you can't just stop thinking about how good it is for our country.

Now, the other half of the revenue we collect would go to debt reduction. And this is a private-sector solution to a public-sector problem, and another huge win for America.

It is time for us to come together as a Nation to keep America on its path of greatness.

This is not a red State or blue State issue. This is not a Republican or Democrat issue. This is a red, white, and blue American issue.

We must make sure American infrastructure allows our people to compete in the global economy now and in the future. In an economy that we not only participate in, but that we dominate, that America takes its rightful place in the world when it comes to what we are able to do.

The Tax Cuts and Jobs Act and the President's rescission of the onerous regulations unleashed our economy, and we are seeing the best job numbers that we have seen in over half a century.

Now, in order for that success to be sustained and long-term, it is incumbent that we upgrade our infrastructure.

So I call on all my colleagues to work together and come up with creative solutions to pay for these very necessary improvements and to support the bills I have outlined today.

America's best times lie in front of her, not behind her. And once again, it is Yankee ingenuity that will lead us to the top again and we will become that country that others long to belong to and become a part of.

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

ISSUES OF THE DAY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the majority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, one of the things that occasionally happens here on the floor of the House late at night, when most everybody is doing something else, is an opportunity to hear what our Republican colleagues want to talk about, and I must commend them.

I actually sat through a very fascinating discussion on the American economy by Mr. SCHWEIKERT about jobs, about the development of the workforce and the way it relates to Social Security.

Very, very interesting. And I just wish there were 433 or 434 others that could have listened to what he had to say. And he very well described a fascinating part of the American economy and how it might relate to our future.

I am going to go into it in a few moments.

I had no idea that our colleague was going to pick up the short line railroad issue, which is a big deal in my district. I have a very large agriculture district in California, and the short line railroads are critically important. And as we talk about infrastructure—yeah—we really ought to be considering the first and the last mile. In other words, the short line railroads and how they fit into this transportation system that is so critically important to the American economy.

Fascinating. I want to commend my Republican colleagues for bringing all of that to the floor, and I am going to make a few comments about it.

Let's start with Mr. SCHWEIKERT on the issue of Social Security and growing the jobs.

He is absolutely correct. If we have a robust economy, if the men and women of America are working, they will be paying into Social Security insurance systems and the life, the viability, and the financial integrity of the Social Security system will be improved.

One of the facts that Mr. SCHWEIKERT, my friend from Arizona, pointed out is that, already with the economy as it is, we have extended, by 1 year, the financial viability of Social Security.

Now, think for a few moments. And my colleague didn't bring this up, but if the minimum wage, either legally in law or in competition for quality workers, were to increase, say, across the Nation to \$15 an hour, then that much more revenue would flow into the Social Security system.

So as we think about these things and as he correctly pointed out, high employment, very low unemployment, is a benefit to the viability of Social Security, to say nothing of the viability of the individual that is able to earn a living, to participate in whichever way they may desire to engage in the economic activities of this Nation.

All very, very good points, and I really want to commend them for that.

One issue that was discussed, but I don't think was fully explained, is how do you prepare people.

Years and years ago in California, in the 1980s, I led a committee on the future of the California economy. And we studied the California economy, we studied the world economy, the history of the growth of the California economy, which today remains the largest economy—I guess, it is fifth largest economy in the world—and one of the most rapid-growing and one of the most advanced.

We said then that if a government—really, the people—of a society, were to invest in education, and if you had the best educated workforce in the world, you would have the best economy.

Now, California does not have the best education system at K through 12. Community college and the university systems, public and private, are extraordinary, literally, the best in the world.

Now, if we were to add that same principle to the American economy, then those men and women that are ill-prepared to enter a modern workforce, could—in the K through 12 system, high school—begin their preparation to enter into the workforce at a skilled level.

Maybe that skill is computer science, and all of that, or maybe it is welding, or in the construction trades. Whatever it is, they would be prepared.

And so as we look at the options that were discussed first by Mr. SCHWEIKERT as he talked about the workforce, I would suggest that he look at this issue of education. I know he mentioned it, but how do we then fund it. And here is where we ought to have an interesting debate.

In December of 2017, my Republican colleagues and the President decided that the way to grow the economy was to massively cut taxes, and they did. Probably a trillion and a half dollars over the next 10 years—a massive, massive tax cut—that significantly reduced the revenue to the Federal Government.

Choices were made in that process.

The choice that was made was to reduce taxes a little bit across the board. Working men and women and families did receive a tax reduction.

In my view, it was very small, and certainly statistically—and by the numbers—very, very small compared to the top 10 percent, the top 1 percent that received a massive tax cut. And American corporations saw their tax rate fall from 35 percent down to 20 percent.

Now, that was supposed to create massive economic growth, and it could be argued that we have had a good economy for the last year or so. And my colleagues did put up some charts to support that argument; however, we need to consider some of the underlying implications of that.

First of all, who got the great bulk? 90 percent—I guess, about 80 percent—of that great tax reduction went to the superwealthy and the corporations.

□ 2030

What did they do with it? Did they invest in the elements of economic growth, education, research, capital outlay in businesses, and transportation and infrastructure? Was that where the tax reductions were invested? Well, no.

The corporations used the clear majority, in the 60 to 70 percent range, of their reduced tax for stock buyback, which had the wonderful effect of driving up the price of stock.

Who benefited from that? Was it the working men and women in the shipyards or on the short-line railroads, or the teachers in education? No. It was

the top 10 percent who owned the stock.

Let's think this through. Now, nonetheless, the economy has grown, and I would posit that one of the reasons the economy has grown is the Keynesian economic theory. The Keynesian economic theory, developed in the 1930s with the Great Depression, was that when the economy is slow or depressed, government steps in with deficit spending. Government supports the economy with deficit spending.

Guess what is happening today: massive deficit spending by the government, tax reductions, \$1.5 trillion gone this year, a \$1 trillion deficit for the Federal Government. By the facts, massive deficit spending by the government, not in education, not in infrastructure, but, rather, in the military and, interestingly enough, through the tax policy so that the great benefit went to the top 10 percent. Nonetheless, we have seen a stimulated economy, as Keynes suggested would happen with deficit spending.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT correctly points out that we have not seen the inflation, thankfully, and interest rates have remained low. I would posit the reason for that is that we are still importing cheap products from around the world, and despite the chaos here in Washington, D.C., the safest bet in the world is America. People are continuing to buy American bonds and invest in America, bonds and debt, all of which has kept the interest rates low.

Here is what I would suggest we look at, and there is a lot of opportunity that exists. I was really enthusiastically listening to Mr. SCHWEIKERT as he laid out his proposals and his description of the economy and the labor force. I would suggest that we continue this debate.

I spoke to the gentleman a few moments ago. I said: Let's get in a colloquy back here. You can open with your discussion, and I will come back with my side of it. I think we have some opportunity here to really develop some decent policy.

Let's take investing. There is a lot of talk about infrastructure investing. We are going to have to find the money for that. Can we do it all on debt with deficit financing? I don't think so. I think there is going to be some limit to that, so we need to talk about tax revenue. We might want to go back and revisit the 2017 tax cut and who benefited and what the opportunities might be to rearrange that equation.

What would we invest in? Infrastructure. Now, if we are going to invest in infrastructure, we already know we are short of skilled labor. That brings us to education and labor force preparation. Is there a role for the Federal Government here, together with the State governments and businesses, to develop the workforce, to train the workforce? The answer is absolutely yes.

We know how to do this. This has been done before during World War II. As Mr. SCHWEIKERT pointed out correctly, the millennial women joining

the labor force—guess who the millennial women were in 1942 and 1943? Yes, they were Rosie the Riveter. Who trained them in the government contracts to the shipbuilders, to the tank builders, to the truck builders? There was money in those contracts to train the workforce. The government, together with the private sector, trained the workforce. The models are there.

We do have community colleges. We do have apprenticeship programs with labor unions, labor-management apprenticeship programs. All of those are there.

If we need a well-trained workforce, we don't need to reinvent it. It is already available to us: labor-management apprenticeship programs and the Federal Government providing incentives in the contracts for shipbuilding.

I was talking to one of my Democratic colleagues about a shipyard that was unable to have trained workers: welders, shipbuilders, plumbers, pipefitters, and the like. The company was not investing in the workforce, in the apprenticeship programs. That can be solved.

If we need to subsidize that through the contracts, do it. Set it aside, make it a special part of it. Yes, you are going to build naval ships, but, yes, you are also going to train workers. Here is how it will be done. Here is the money to do it. We can do these things.

Education, research, fundamental investments, we need to pay attention to making it in America. I have spent days and days here on the floor in these Special Order hours talking about how we can do that. I want to give you an example.

America today is exporting oil and natural gas. Ten years ago, we used to be net importers. Now we are net exporters. That strategic natural resource is going out to the world, largely to China, on ships. Whose ships? This strategic national asset needs to be coupled with another strategic national asset, which is the American maritime industry.

Consider for a moment, if we were to require that a small percentage of that oil and natural gas be on American-built ships with American crews, American mariners, what would happen. One, 2, 3, percent, up to 5, 6, 7, 8 percent over the next decade, we would build 50 ships. In the shipyards across America, we would employ American workers to build those ships.

Is it possible? Absolutely, it is possible. Do you know what it takes? It takes a very simple law requiring that, for the necessity of America's national security, we be able to maintain our maritime industry so that, should something happen, we will be able to transport across the oceans of the world our military as needed, that we in our shipyards maintain the workforce and the viability of the shipyards so that they can build the necessary naval vessels.

Is it possible? All it takes is a law.

I recommend that we pay attention. I introduced this legislation last year

with my good friend, Senator WICKER from the Senate side, and we are going to reintroduce it here in the next few days.

The Energizing American Shipbuilding Act will soon be on the floor of the House and the Senate. I draw our attention to that because it combines a necessary national security issue with the jobs.

However, what I said a moment ago is critical. That is that, along the way in this process, we must train workers starting in high school, starting with the apprenticeship programs, making sure that the shipyard businesses are in the business of training workers together with community colleges and other apprenticeship programs. If we do this, even if we need to subsidize that process, we will grow this economy, and we will have high-paid, high-skilled workers.

Similarly, as we rebuild the American bridges, as we rebuild the short-line railroads, as we rebuild the infrastructure of America, whether it is in high-speed internet communications systems or in highway transportation, river transportation, all the rest, we need to keep in mind the training of the workforce.

I thank Mr. SCHWEIKERT for bringing to the attention of the floor tonight this critical issue. There are so many things we can do together. There are different ways of approaching this. But I know that if we are willing to engage in a debate, an honest debate about growing the American economy, about making sure that our task is for the people, not the special interests but for the fundamental American working men and women, we will be successful.

Again, we can do it through education, job training, research, make it in America, and paying attention to our infrastructure.

If we are short 350,000 workers to fill the 350,000 jobs that are open today, then it is incumbent upon this Congress to get at it.

I want to do one final thing. There is an infrastructure project in California. It is an infrastructure project that has been discussed for the last 30 years, and it is an infrastructure project that is extraordinarily damaging.

California water is extremely complex. Basically, water flows from northern California rivers into the great Sacramento-San Joaquin River Delta, the largest inland estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere, an extraordinary place, a place that I represent and a place where I have lived for the last 40-some years.

It is an extraordinary part of America. It is now a national heritage area.

It has been suggested over the last three decades that the water systems of California need to circumvent the natural flow of water into this estuary. Over this period of time, I have had the obligation to fight those proposals.

First, it was the Peripheral Canal to take the water around the delta. Then in the last decade, it has been the Twin

Tunnels, two massive tunnels that literally had the capacity to drain the Sacramento River, to drain it dry. The river runs some 12,000 to 16,000 cubic feet per second 6 months of the year. The tunnels were sized at 16,000 cubic feet per second and, therefore, capable of literally drying the delta and destroying the incredible ecosystem of the delta.

We fought. We fought the battle, and I commend our new Governor, Governor Newsom, for stepping back and taking the time to rethink this proposal called the California WaterFix, to rethink its impact on the ecology and the environment of the delta. I thank him for taking WaterFix and pushing it aside.

He said no, we are not going to pursue that. We are going to go back and do the environmental analysis, not on two tunnels capable of drying out the delta or drying out the Sacramento River, but, rather, look at how this water problem in California can be solved without ecological damage.

We will pursue this once again, and I know that it can be done. Nearly 8 years ago, I proposed what I called a Water Plan for All California. It laid out solutions, not that I developed, but that had been developed by Californians in the water industry, in the agricultural industry, in the urban as well as the agricultural water systems.

Those proposals have been out there. We simply compiled them into a program: conservation, storage, paying attention to the aquifers, paying attention to the ecology of the fish and the environment, and providing in the delta a solution built upon improving the transport of water through the natural levees and through the natural sluices and rivers while keeping in mind that water should not be exported when it would damage the fish. All of that is possible. That law is now in place; it is called the WIN legislation, water infrastructure.

Now, we can move forward with a new opportunity as we revisit a solution that is both good for the environment, good for the delivery of water to all Californians, and done in a way that does not set up an existential danger, an existential system that could damage forever the largest estuary on the West Coast of the Western Hemisphere.

We can do it. Just as the optimism that I heard from my Republican colleagues in the first order hour here, I present an optimistic opportunity. I am not yet joyful, but I am optimistic because I know these solutions are there if we work together and if we keep our eye on the prize for the people, for the American people, not just the superwealthy, not just the major American corporations, but for mom and pop, for Wall Street, for the men and women who are working in the shipyards, working on the rails, and for those millennial women who are entering the workforce and the millennial men who will be following along.

I am optimistic, and I hope to be joyful.

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

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. JACKSON LEE (at the request of Mr. HOYER) for today on account of travel delay.

SENATE BILL REFERRED

A bill of the Senate of the following title was taken from the Speaker's table and, under the rule, referred as follows:

S. 693. An act to amend title 36, United States Code, to require that the POW/MIA flag be displayed on all days that the flag of the United States is displayed on certain Federal property; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 8 o'clock and 46 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, May 8, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

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

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

895. A letter from the Under Secretary, Research and Engineering, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's Calendar Year 2018 List and Description of Activities at the Science and Technology Re-invention Laboratory Personnel Demonstration Projects, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 2358 note; Public Law 110-181, Sec. 1107(d); (122 Stat. 358) and 5 U.S.C. 4703(b)(4)(B); Public Law 95-454, Sec. 601(a); (92 Stat. 1186); to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

897. A letter from the Acting Secretary, Department of Defense, transmitting a letter on the approved retirement of Vice Admiral Walter E. Carter, Jr., United States Navy, and his advancement to the grade of vice admiral on the retired list, pursuant to 10 U.S.C. 1370(c)(1); Public Law 96-513, Sec. 112 (as amended by Public Law 104-106, Sec. 502(b)); (110 Stat. 293); to the Committee on Armed Services.

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

899. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Contract Closeout Authority (DFARS Case 2018-D012) [Docket: DARS-2018-0029] (RIN: 0750-AJ76) received April 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

900. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Small Business Set-Asides for Architect-Engineer and Construction Design Contracts (DFARS Case 2018-D057) [Docket: DARS-2018-0056] (RIN: 0750-AK18) received April 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

901. A letter from the Acting Principal Deputy, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Restriction on the Acquisition of Certain Magnets and Tungsten (DFARS Case 2018-D054) [Docket: DARS-2019-0016] (RIN: 0750-AK15) received April 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

902. A letter from the Chief Counsel, FEMA, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's final rule — Suspension of Community Eligibility; West Virginia: Fairmont, City of, Marion County [Docket ID: FEMA-2019-0003; Internal Agency Docket No.: FEMA-8573] received April 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Financial Services.

903. A letter from the Chief of Staff, Media Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Amendment of Section 73.622(i) Post-Transition Table of DTV Allotments (Bridgeport and Stamford, Connecticut) [MB Docket No.: 18-126] (RM-11800) received April 30, 2019, 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.

904. A letter from the Associate Bureau Chief, Wireline Competition Bureau, Federal Communications Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Connect America Fund [WC Docket No.: 10-90] received April 30, 2019, 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.

905. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to the situation in or in relation to the Democratic Republic of the Congo that was declared in Executive Order 13413 of October 27, 2006, 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.

906. A letter from the Secretary, Department of the Treasury, transmitting a six-month periodic report on the national emergency with respect to significant narcotics traffickers centered in Colombia declared in Executive Order 12978 of October 21, 1995, 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.

907. A letter from the Assistant Secretary, Bureau of Industry and Security, Department of Commerce, transmitting the Department's final rule — Revisions to the Unverified List (UVL) [Docket No.: 190130021-9021-01] (RIN: 0694-AH73) received April 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

908. A letter from the Acting Principal Director, Department of Defense, transmitting the Department's final rule — Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement: Use of the Government Property Clause (DFARS Case 2015-D035) [Docket: DARS-2016-0035] (RIN: 0750-AJ11) received April 30, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Armed Services.

909. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Security Zone; Cumberland River, Nashville, TN [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0152] [RIN: 1625-AA87] received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

910. A letter from the Attorney — Advisor, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Safety Zone; Sabine River, Orange, TX [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0160] (RIN: 1625-AA00) received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

911. A letter from the Attorney-Advisor, Office of Regulations and Administrative Law, U.S. Coast Guard, Department of Homeland Security, transmitting the Department's temporary final rule — Special Local Regulation; Bush River and Otter Point Creek, Harford County, MD [Docket Number: USCG-2019-0083] (RIN: 1625-AA08) received April 26, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

912. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment of the Prohibition Against Certain Flights in the Tripoli Flight Information Region (FIR) (HLLL) [Docket No.: FAA-2011-0246; Amdt. No.: 91-321D] (RIN: 2120-AL40) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

913. A letter from the Management and Program Analyst, FAA, Department of Transportation, transmitting the Department's final rule — Amendment and Establishment of Multiple Air Traffic Service (ATS) Routes; Western United States [Docket No.: FAA-2018-0232; Airspace Docket No.: 17-ANM-33] (RIN: 2120-AA66) received April 25, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.