

I am enclosing a copy of the Executive Order I have issued.

DONALD J. TRUMP,
THE WHITE HOUSE, May 15, 2019.

□ 1800

WOMEN IN THE ARMED FORCES

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from Pennsylvania (Ms. HOULAHAN) for 30 minutes.

GENERAL LEAVE

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks on the subject of my Special Order.

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

There was no objection.

Ms. HOULAHAN. Madam Speaker, there are over a dozen caucuses in Congress today that address issues facing servicemembers and/or veterans, but none of these are geared towards addressing the issues faced by the fastest growing cohort in our Nation's military: women.

Today, that changes.

My name is CHRISSY HOULAHAN, and I represent Pennsylvania's Sixth Congressional District. Today I am announcing the launch of the first ever Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus.

When the draft ended in 1973, women represented just 2 percent of the enlisted force and 8 percent of the officer corps. Today, those numbers have grown to 16 percent and 18 percent, respectively. Currently, there are 2 million living women veterans in the United States, and in the next 25 years, women veterans are projected to nearly double their population and will account for one in five living veterans.

We cannot afford to wait, and the time to act is now.

Twenty-seven years ago, I gave birth to my first child, my daughter Molly. I was Active Duty at the time, and I was given 6 weeks of maternity leave. When I returned, I intended to enroll my daughter in the on-base childcare but discovered that there was a 6-month-long waiting list. I looked for private care in Boston where I was serving, but the cost was too high. In fact, my entire paycheck would have gone to childcare.

I was a lieutenant in the Air Force, stationed at Hanscom Air Force Base at the time, and my assignment, my job, was to determine what kind of information people needed and in what order and in what visual display when ballistic missiles were raining down on them and the end of the world was coming.

I am a very well-educated engineer. I became an engineer in the Air Force, and yet I couldn't, with my skills and my education, figure out how I was

supposed to make ends meet and make childcare work to fulfill my military responsibilities and serve our country.

I was going against the system in many ways, a new mother serving in the military with a working civilian husband. That is not what most people picture when they picture a traditional military family. It wasn't even what I saw as a young girl when I was growing up.

I was the daughter and granddaughter of career Naval officers and career Navy wives, and I watched as my mother and my grandmother moved us all around the country and cared for us while my father and my grandfather served. My mother's job was to create a sense of home in every new place that we moved. Her job was my brother and I.

So there I was with a new baby of my own and a mission to deal with ballistic missile defense, no viable options for childcare, and working within a system that had not yet caught up with me and my career. So I decided to make a very difficult choice, and I separated from the Air Force.

You see, at that time, I didn't really have any role models, anyone that I knew or could look up to who had walked in my boots, so to speak, and had navigated being a new mother while simultaneously serving our country. So few women were really high up in the Air Force's ranks at the time, so there were very few I knew who could show me what Active Duty looked like as a mother.

But that is changing. In 2019, women represent the fastest growing cohort in America's military. More and more women are hearing that same call that I and my friends here heard—the call to serve.

What is upsetting, though, is 27 years later, despite women's increased presence across all branches of the military, we all still struggle with many of the same issues, including access to quality and affordable childcare, and I find this unacceptable.

In this 116th Congress, we set a record. For the first time in history, there are more than two women veterans serving in the House of Representatives. There are now four. It was the realization that I was surrounded by three other women who served our country that inspired me to start this caucus.

Now is the time to address these issues that have been plaguing our servicewomen and women veterans for years, and that is what today is about. That is what the Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus is about.

We four women are here to enact change to better support the brave women who have also answered the call to serve. We four are here as four women veterans who will lead this caucus with our lived experiences in the Armed Forces and who will evaluate the unique issues that our women face and who will work towards enacting

legislation that better serves them and better serves their families.

This is not a Democratic issue nor is it a Republican issue. It is neither a man's issue nor a woman's issue. It is an intrinsically American and human issue, and that is why this caucus has members from both sides of the aisle, and that is why we have veterans and nonveterans as participants, men and women.

This caucus is comprised of people who are held together by a shared understanding that, when Congress neglects its duty to support the men and women who serve, it hasn't done its job. It undermines our country's national security and our military's readiness.

I remember thinking to myself when I got here that I was just one person. Then when I got here, I met Representative TULSI GABBARD, Representative ELAINE LURIA, Representative MIKIE SHERRILL, and the one became four. And now, today, I am launching that Servicewomen and Women Veterans Congressional Caucus, the very first caucus in our country's history to specifically address the issues facing servicewomen and women veterans.

We are more than 50 strong in number now; 1 became 4, and 4 became more than 50. We have a mission. We have our marching orders. And speaking as an Air Force veteran, I can promise I won't stop fighting until our mission has been accomplished.

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

MAKING THE MATH WORK

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2019, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arizona (Mr. SCHWEIKERT) for 30 minutes.

Mr. SCHWEIKERT. Madam Speaker, this is actually something we try to do about once a week, come in here and actually sort of talk about our unified theory in our office: What do we do to, basically, keep our promises?

Here is a thought experiment.

Social Security and Medicare are two of the greatest fragilities we have in our society because we are getting older very fast. Remember, we have talked about this over and over and over. In about 8½ years, 50 percent of the spending in this body, less interest, will be to those 65 and up.

How do you make the math work? And in an intellectual, lazier time, you would get some that would say: Well, we could raise taxes here or we can do entitlement reform here.

Well, it turns out that math really actually doesn't work anymore. Now, we actually have to do everything to make the math work. So we have been trying to actually sell this concept that it is economic growth, and within economic growth it is how we design our tax system, how we design trade, how we design our regulatory environment, how we actually do population

stability—and this one actually gets complicated.

You saw the article in *The Wall Street Journal* today about what has happened to U.S. birth rates. How do you encourage family formation, but also how do you deal with the immigration system that maximizes a talent-based immigration system to maximize that economic velocity?

Remember, this is about us having a vibrant enough economy so we can keep our promises, but within that, we also have some other issues. How do you do what we call labor force participation?

Countries like Japan and some in Western Europe are dealing with how they get those who are older, and if they are healthy and want to, how they create incentives to actually say: Are you willing to stay in or come back into the labor force?

We actually have this quirky math here in our country of millennial males. In December, we started to see this breakthrough of millennial females entering the workforce. We still actually have a whole bunch of millennial males who are missing in the workforce who should be there. How do we build a society that encourages participation in that labor force?

It turns out, if you actually look at a lot of our economic data, from the Joint Economic Committee to the Joint Committee on Taxation, when they talk about what are the barriers for us to be able to keep growing and continue this actually incredibly robust cycle we are having right now, it is capital stock.

Well, actually, the numbers since tax reform have been dramatically healthier than we modeled for, with folks having savings, and that savings actually becoming lendable capital. You actually can see that in just nationwide interest rates.

The second fragility that was being written about was labor force participation, and we now live in a society where we have hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of thousands of jobs and no workers. So who would have ever thought a couple years ago you would live in a society with more job openings than available workers?

This is a wonderful problem, but it actually does genuinely become a barrier to economic growth, and it is something we have to find a way to deal with.

Part of this is actually really optimistic, though, as we started to see in the data over the last several months the number of business organizations and others who are taking a chance on people, hiring right out of correctional facilities, making accommodations for our brothers and sisters who may have a personal impairment, a personal handicap; and we actually see that in some of the Social Security disability numbers of individuals actually moving into the labor force.

So, look, this is just our unified theory.

Today, we are actually going to start to talk about technology, which is one of our five pillars, and how aggressive I believe the adoption of technology has to be to keep the economic growth going.

We have done lots of floor time over the last couple months on the healthcare technology, the revolution that I believe, our office believes, some of the people we work with believe, that is about to happen and the ability for you to take care of yourself, the wearables—the kazoo you blow into that instantly tells you if you have the flu, to the other side of the spectrum, the single shot cure for hemophilia—and how do we finance those types of disruptions.

Wouldn't it be amazing if this body were no longer having the, actually, in some ways, insane debate we have had for decades about who gets subsidized, who gets to pay in healthcare, and started actually talking about what we pay and how we are going to cure our brothers and sisters who have chronic conditions? We all know, the 5 percent of Americans with those chronic conditions are well over half of our healthcare spending.

So what happens when we actually bring cures to market? And then our obligation: How do we finance them so we roll them out as fast as possible?

But today, we are going to talk about another fixation of mine, and that is environment issues.

I wish I had a more delicate way to talk about this. Often, the discussion around here is almost Malthusian, saying the pie is only so big. If you care about global warming, if you care about greenhouse gases, we must shrink the economy; we must get individuals to drive less; we must generate less power; we must do these types of things.

And a decade or so ago, maybe that was a legitimate view, but they have missed an entire technology revolution that is going on around us, and there should be optimism in this body that, if you are someone who cares about greenhouse gases in our national and world environment, the revolution is here, and it is a technology one.

□ 1815

How does this body start to remove the barriers that have slowed down the adoption of this clean generation, these alternative generations that are in our marketplace? A simple thought: solar generation.

I hope I get this story, which is coming out of New Mexico, correct. They wanted to run a power line to Arizona. They have been working on the power transmission lines for a dozen years.

We have seen the discussion in the upper Midwest. I believe it is Iowa, with wind generation, finally figuring it out and saying maybe we can run the power lines in the railroad right-of-way because we want this power to make it to Illinois. That is where the demand is, and over here is where the clean generation is.

These are things we often don't think about. It is not enough to have the technology. How do you get the power to where it needs to be consumed? We have never fixed the bureaucratic barriers to moving that power.

It is like some of the discussions we have had in our office. A couple of years ago, we did a math experiment. A pipeline in west Texas, a pipeline loop that would capture methane so you didn't have to flare it off, had a really impressive calculation in U.S. greenhouse gas emissions, but it requires permitting a pipeline.

I need us to remove some of our ideological blinders and think of pro-growth, pro-environment, pro-effectiveness. We have to be willing to change the permitting system and so much of the litigation and bureaucracy that slows these things down.

We are going to walk through a couple of these boards, just because I think there is incredible optimism out there.

This one I am sort of thrilled with. This is a chart that talks about battery efficiency. For those of you that geek out on this stuff with me, you probably all saw the article—I think it was April 1—on some new solid-state battery technology. It looks like they finally have a major breakthrough on what we call power density.

This chart here, do you see that coming down? That is the cost of battery storage. It is a remarkable reduction.

In Arizona, we have our largest and best utility, Arizona Public Service. When you read some of the articles that are going on right now with them, the amount of solar that is now in their portfolio, they have baseline nuclear and now the holy grail. What happens when you live in the desert Southwest as I do? I am blessed to live in the Phoenix-Scottsdale area. We produce lots of solar.

Into the peak of the afternoon, California now produces so much alternative solar generation that they can't use it all. On some days, they paid Arizona to buy it off them.

What happens when a company like APS gets really creative and says: How do we have solar power at night when, if you live in the Phoenix area, you are still running your air-conditioner into the evening? It turns out the battery investment is about to bring solar generation into the hours it is dark because they will store it. If you design that type of battery storage that holds for about 4 hours, you get us through the peak.

It is referred to as the duck curve. If you see the back of a duck, we have all this production, and then it collapses. Yet, we still have all this demand. How do you cover that gap?

In the past, we used peaking power plants, fire them up to cover those few hours. Now, with what is happening with battery storage, it is here.

Our privately owned utility in Arizona, APS, recently did an RFP or RFQ. The numbers that came back

were remarkably competitive. It is happening.

When on this floor we discuss global warming, greenhouse gases, and what we are going to do in alternative generation, it is here. We just need to understand what is happening right around us.

How do you keep curves like this line continuing? When we are reading that there is a breakthrough in battery technology, how do we remove barriers so that technology rolls out and becomes part of what we do here in the United States and around the world?

Here is something else. I am blessed to be on the Ways and Means Committee. Last year, we updated a tax credit mechanism for carbon sequestration. It turns out that we have multiple facilities now that were an experiment, but they are growing. They are about to go to large-scale commercial where they capture all the carbon.

This first one, I believe this is the NET Power facility outside Houston. It is a natural gas-fired facility, so they are using a hydrocarbon and they have no smokestack. They capture not only the manmade CO₂, but they even capture any other gas throw-off.

The remarkable design is that they throw a little oxygen. They heat it up, and heat it really, really hot. They use that to spin the turbines. Then they cool it down and pull out the CO₂ and then use that to sell for other purposes. They don't have a smokestack.

This technology is up and running today. The proof of concept is done. Now we are heading toward, I believe, a fairly substantial expansion in the scale of the facility.

This was research that has been going on for years. Those of us here in this body, a year ago, we updated the carbon sequestration tax credits. It is paying off.

The next one is another facility that is also in Texas. This one was really an interesting experiment because, in many ways, it broke through a bit of folklore.

It sits right next to an existing coal-fired generation facility. It is a coal-fired carbon capture plant. They are spinning the turbines, burning coal, and they capture the carbon.

It was only 2 or 3 years ago when we had witnesses around here saying this sort of technology would not work. It is up and running today.

There should be joy and optimism around this place because the ability to basically say, for the hydrocarbons we have, what happens if we can use them to help us through this transition of time and we are capturing the CO₂? This is wonderful.

Let's go even further. If we are going to continue the thought experiment, you have already seen the United States do some pretty remarkable reductions. Most of it has come from natural gas, but there have been some pretty remarkable reductions in our CO₂ production.

A lot of the rest of the world hasn't even come close. For the number of

new coal-fired plants moving in Southeast Asia, part of the Chinese Belt and Road Initiative, they are not going to have the types of capture technology we have here in the United States.

We have to have a worldwide strategy. I am one of those who has been really excited because I have been following a facility that is going up in Canada. It looks like they have succeeded in the breakthrough of mining the air to pull CO₂ out of it. Mathematically, we had lots of smart people saying this is absurd, that you are not going to be able to do it.

We had a very smart professor in Arizona at Arizona State University who had been working on sort of a carbon capture artificial tree. This technology is rolling out. It is under production right now, and they are moving up to industrial scale. The amazing thing is, they think they can do it for about \$100 a ton, which is remarkable if you have actually played the math game. This is for the new facility.

What happens if they start to break that curve? If you understand that carbon that has been captured, to have the ability to refine it and do other things, even make another fuel source out of it?

The other thing is, think about the article we hopefully all saw last week about what the Dutch are doing. The Dutch are basically about to take a depleted oil field and take carbon that they have captured and shove it back in the ground and sequester it.

All of a sudden, it is a negative calculation. In this place, in a lot of the debate, for a lot of the witnesses we have had in previous years, the concept of mining and having negative emissions was considered absurd. It is here. The technology is here.

This is a facility that has, apparently, really smart, really wealthy people investing in it because they are so excited about the technology. We need to understand that there is optimism out here.

How do we get ourselves up to date on the cutting-edge technology? How do we move it forward and promote it?

We also need to understand that the theater that we engage in here often is not good math. I wish I had a more recent date, but the latest we could find is 2015 on this.

Do you see the yellow bar on the side? That is all the photovoltaic solar that rolled out in 2015. It was an impressive year. There were fairly aggressive subsidies, State, local, and Federal.

Do you see the other bar chart next to it? That was all the nuclear that went offline that year.

The reality of it is, in 2015, if you were thinking about power generation in the United States that did not produce CO₂ and you were joyful that this much solar hit the grid, understand that almost the equal amount of nuclear came off the grid. We were peddling in place.

We need to be honest about the math, and we need to be honest about that

baseload nuclear being really, really important if you care about this issue.

There are a couple of quirky things I wanted to throw out here. This one is just fun. It is sort of an odd thought experiment.

In the desert Southwest and mountain Southwest, uranium mining has always been a dodgy issue. We need it. We know we need it. We need it for everything from our X-rays to refining and refining for a nuclear power plant.

In previous decades, we have been able to take very high grades and step it down, but that was some of the excess that was out there after the Cold War. That stock has been substantially used up. So what are we going to do?

There is a technology breakthrough of mining seawater for uranium. We should be joyful and pushing these technologies. They solve some of the moving problem of wanting nuclear generation but where are we going to get the uranium? How are we going to step it up? It turns out, even on that, the technology has moved forward.

Look at other little thought experiments. How many of us in high school with Popular Science magazine used to get excited about how you generate power from ocean waves? It turns out that a new design is rolling out. It is sort of a bobbing power generation. It exists now, and it works. It is much more robust than anything that has ever been designed.

We should be joyful and trying to promote more of this type of technology, but we have to deal with how you bring the power in from the shore. All of a sudden, you have a whole other layer of regs, rules, and permitting.

You want clean power. We all want it, but we have to deal with the bureaucratic malaise, mess, and blocks that stop us from being able to pull this type of new power generation into our communities and our country.

What is exciting about that is that is a type of power generation that, if we make it work, it can be all over the world. Being someone who, as a younger man, trekked Indonesia, Vietnam, lots of India, and Sri Lanka, think about most of the world's population living near coastal communities. Wouldn't that be exciting?

Why aren't we promoting these types of technologies? We need to get rid of this Malthusian mindset that the pie is only so big, that we can cut it only so many ways, that once you cut it those ways, there is never an opportunity for it to grow.

There are still people who believe that the 1968 book "The Population Bomb" was real. The only thing they got accurate was the author's name.

□ 1830

We need to understand there is a technology breakthrough happening around us, in particularly power generation. But if you want to have a revolution—and I am sort of banking on being one of the first people to talk

about this because this one is really disruptive, but it is worth the thought experiment.

For anyone who might be watching or having an interest in this Google, “photosynthesis 40 percent”. Read the complete articles that have been written.

Madam Speaker, you remember your high school biology class talking about plants and plant cells having a certain inherent inefficiency, where there is a flaw that has been there for millions and millions of years where it reaches out and grabs the oxygen molecule when it should have grabbed the carbon molecule.

Through some synthetic biology they fixed the inefficiency. It now will reach over and grab the carbon molecule every time. All of a sudden it means a 40 percent efficiency in growth.

So, what happens tomorrow when crops require 40 percent less water, 40 percent less land, and 40 percent less fuel?

What does it mean to the world?

Thought experiment: I need you to take it a step further. World agriculture represents 2.2 times the total greenhouse gases of every automobile on Earth. Just adopting this plant technology in our agriculture equals removing every car off the face of the Earth.

As this rolls out, how fast would it take to change the seed stock around the world?

There are solutions, and they are not always a linear thought. They sometimes require some creativity. Let’s face it. We work in a math-free zone that also lacks creativity. This exists. This is rolling out. It is a revolution.

Yes, it is going to be incredibly disruptive to agriculture around the world. It is going to be incredibly disruptive.

At the same time, what happens when you want to plant trees and you can grow them 40 percent more efficiently, and they are just little carbon capture machines?

This is here. We should be excited about it.

The last one is just more of the thought experiment of trying to say, if we really care, we need to stop the theater that seems to be what happens behind these microphones and actually understand the problem, understand the math, and then focus on that solution. Because often around here I believe a solution is a problem for us because the very thing that we got elected on, that we love coming and complaining about, oh, dear heaven, what happens if we solve it?

So let’s actually talk about something that is part of our pop culture right now, but it is a real issue. For someone like myself, I grew up scuba diving. I love scuba diving, and I have been blessed to do it in a lot of really neat places. Ninety percent of the plastic in the world’s oceans come from 10 rivers. Eight of these rivers are in Asia, and two of those rivers are in Africa.

Ninety percent of the plastic in the ocean comes from 10 rivers. If you give a darn about plastic in the ocean, banning straws in your community is theater. It is absurd math. It may make you feel better and get you in the local newspaper, but you didn’t do anything.

This body here immediately should figure out what aid programs we have, what research, what we can do to go to those 10 rivers that are 90 percent of the plastic in the ocean and help, instead of complaining about it and instead of doing a nice video of going out and saying, I am going to pick up plastic off a beach.

No. If you care, it is 10 rivers, we know where the problem is. If you really want to have an impact, go where it is coming from. This is a simple example of we talk, talk, talk, talk, and talk around this place, but if we solve it, then we don’t get to actually talk about it. But solving is the most ethical thing we can do as a body.

Policy that is made with math and policy that is made with facts can do amazing things for our country, my 3-year-old little girl, and for this world. Policy around here that is done by folklore, by an anecdote, and by feelings, time and time again, when we look back, it may have been well-intended, but ultimately it hurts people.

If we get our math right, if we actually understand the underlying basis of a problem, figure out an honest solution that continues to grow our economy and continues to provide opportunities instead of this sort of constant Malthusian echo around here that says that we can’t grow anymore, we can’t do this—they are wrong, and the folks who embrace that philosophy have been wrong for centuries now.

There are technology breakthroughs happening all around us. You actually saw the latest one on this. Finally, we have broken the code on a plastic that truly breaks down. Let’s incentivize that. There are solutions. This body is an honorable body, but it needs to become one about solutions instead of theatrics.

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

PUBLICATION OF BUDGETARY MATERIAL

REVISION TO THE AGGREGATES, ALLOCATIONS, AND OTHER BUDGETARY LEVELS FOR FISCAL YEAR 2020

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON THE BUDGET,
Washington, DC, May 15, 2019.

MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the Congressional Budget Act of 1974 (CBA), the Balanced Budget and Emergency Deficit Control Act of 1985 (BBEDCA), and H. Res. 293 (116th Congress), I hereby submit for printing in the Congressional Record a revision to the aggregates and allocations set forth in the Statement of Aggregates, Allocations, and Other Budgetary Levels for Fiscal Year 2020 published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

This revision is for allowable adjustments for amounts for program integrity initiatives and Overseas Contingency Operations

pursuant to section 251(b) of BBEDCA. These amounts are contained respectively in the text of H.R. 2740, the Departments of Labor, Health and Human Services, and Education, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020, and of H.R. 2745, the Military Construction, Veterans Affairs, and Related Agencies Appropriations Act, 2020, as reported by the Committee on Appropriations.

Accordingly, I am revising aggregate spending levels for fiscal year 2020 and the allocation for the House Committee on Appropriations for fiscal year 2020. For purposes of enforcing titles III and IV of the CBA and other budgetary enforcement provisions, the revised aggregates and allocation are to be considered as aggregates and allocations included in the budget resolution, pursuant to the Statement published in the Congressional Record on May 3, 2019.

Questions may be directed to Jennifer Wheelock or Raquel Spencer of the Budget Committee staff.

JOHN YARMUTH.

TABLE 1.—REVISION TO ON-BUDGET AGGREGATES

(On-budget amounts, in millions of dollars)

	2020	2020–2029
Current Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,709,585	n.a.
Outlays	3,676,452	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 2740):		
Budget Authority	1,842	n.a.
Outlays	1,481	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 2745):		
Budget Authority	921	n.a.
Outlays	7	n.a.
Revenues	---	---
Revised Aggregates:		
Budget Authority	3,712,348	n.a.
Outlays	3,677,940	n.a.
Revenues	2,740,533	34,847,515

n.a. = Not applicable because annual appropriations for fiscal years 2021 through 2029 will not be considered until future sessions of Congress.

TABLE 2.—REVISED ALLOCATION OF SPENDING AUTHORITY TO THE HOUSE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS

(In millions of dollars)

	2020
Base Discretionary Action:	
BA	1,295,018
OT	1,360,935
Revision for Program Integrity (H.R. 2740):	
BA	1,842
OT	1,481
Revision for Overseas Contingency Operations (H.R. 2745):	
BA	921
OT	7
Revised Allocation:	
BA	1,297,781
OT	1,362,423
Current Law Mandatory:	
BA	1,075,820
OT	1,067,358

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o’clock and 35 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House adjourned until tomorrow, Thursday, May 16, 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:

1026. A letter from the Deputy Under Secretary, Comptroller, Department of Defense, transmitting a semi-annual report titled,