



United States
of America

Congressional Record

PROCEEDINGS AND DEBATES OF THE 116th CONGRESS, FIRST SESSION

Vol. 165

WASHINGTON, TUESDAY, JANUARY 22, 2019

No. 13

House of Representatives

The House met at noon and was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. BEYER).

DESIGNATION OF SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Speaker:

WASHINGTON, DC,
January 22, 2019.

I hereby appoint the Honorable DONALD S. BEYER, Jr. to act as Speaker pro tempore on this day.

NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives.

MORNING-HOUR DEBATE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the order of the House of January 3, 2019, the Chair will now recognize Members from lists submitted by the majority and minority leaders for morning-hour debate.

The Chair will alternate recognition between the parties. All time shall be equally allocated between the parties, and in no event shall debate continue beyond 1:50 p.m. Each Member, other than the majority and minority leaders and the minority whip, shall be limited to 5 minutes.

NORTH LITTLE ROCK CHOIR TO DUBLIN CHORAL FESTIVAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL) for 5 minutes.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the choir from Immaculate Conception Church and School in North Little Rock, Arkansas, for being invited to represent our State at the inaugural Dublin Choral Festival in Ireland later this year.

More than 240 voices from around the United States will sing together at the festival, and Immaculate Conception is

the only group from our State of Arkansas.

The group of 48 parishioners, ranging in age from 10 to 87, is led by Music Director Steve Guilmet.

While there, the choir will travel to Belfast, Northern Ireland, where they will attend mass and perform during the service. Along with their performances, the parishioners will be raising money to support local hunger and poverty programs, and the parish there will host them.

I congratulate those parishioners on their hard work, and I join all Arkansans in wishing them the very best as they represent our State in Ireland.

ARKANSAS CANOE CLUB TRASH REMOVAL TEAM

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the achievements of Cowper Chadbourn and the Arkansas Canoe Club Black Ops Advanced Trash Removal team.

Cowper founded the black ops team in 2014 to promote water quality and clean up trash in the watersheds throughout Arkansas.

Since the formation of the group, they have retrieved two giant dumpsters, portable toilets, refrigerators, washers, stoves, and countless tires out of our State's streams. In total, over the past 2 years, they have hauled out more than 2,400 tires and 124,000 pounds from Arkansas waterways.

Mr. Speaker, I extend a hand of gratitude to Mr. Chadbourn and the entire Arkansas Canoe Club Black Ops Advanced Trash Removal team for their worthwhile commitment to our environment and our natural resources.

ASH HOSPITAL OF THE YEAR

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize North Little Rock's Arkansas Surgical Hospital for being awarded the Physician Hospital of the Year by the Physician Hospitals of America.

This award recognizes a hospital with a long and exceptional record of high-

quality community service and leadership.

Arkansas Surgical Hospital was one of only 19 hospitals in the United States, and the only one in Arkansas, to receive double five-star status from the Centers for Medicaid and Medicare Services, CMS, and obtained the highest rankings for both overall quality and patient satisfaction.

The hospital opened in 2005 with 16 beds and 5 operating rooms, but quickly outgrew its space. To meet increasing demand for patient care, in 2006, the hospital broke ground on expansion that brought the facility to 51 beds and 9 operating rooms.

The facility continues to grow and helps 15,000 patients on an annual basis.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the dedicated workers at the Arkansas Surgical Hospital for their service and leadership in patient-centered care in central Arkansas.

ARKANSAS CHILDREN'S BEACON AWARD

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize the Pediatric Intensive Care Unit at Little Rock's Arkansas Children's Hospital. They have received the silver-level Beacon Award for Excellence by the American Association of Critical-Care Nurses.

The Beacon Award for Excellence recognizes unit caregivers who successfully improve patient outcomes and demonstrate effective leadership and communication. Arkansas Children's Hospital is the only hospital and unit in the State to earn this recognition and one of only 497 hospitals that currently hold the award.

Its history of excellence in patient care dates back to its founding in 1912.

As a former director and supporter of Arkansas Children's Hospital, I congratulate them on their 106-year legacy of leadership in patient-centered care; this recognition of the Beacon award; and their unqualified, wonderful service to the kids of Arkansas.

This symbol represents the time of day during the House proceedings, e.g., 1407 is 2:07 p.m.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.



Printed on recycled paper.

H963

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until 2 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 12 o'clock and 5 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1400

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 2 p.m.

PRAYER

The Chaplain, the Reverend Patrick J. Conroy, offered the following prayer: Thank You, O Lord, for giving us another day.

In Scripture, we read:

"You shall not oppress a hired servant who is poor and needy . . . You shall give him his wages . . . lest he cry against you to the Lord. . . ." And then, "now to the one who works, his wages are not counted as a gift, but as his due."

May Your spirit, O Lord, impel those who are empowered to do so, to bring resolution to the current shutdown.

In such a contentious time, may humility be manifest in the exchange of opposing positions, that all might find relief, and those charged with serving to secure our safe travel, and our borders, can be properly compensated in a timely fashion.

Lord, have mercy on us.

May everything we do be for Your greater honor and glory.

Amen.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair has examined the Journal of the last day's proceedings and announces to the House his approval thereof.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, pursuant to clause 1, rule I, I demand a vote on agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

The question was taken; and the Speaker pro tempore announced that the ayes appeared to have it.

Mr. MCCARTHY. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present and make the point of order that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8, rule XX, further proceedings on this question will be postponed.

The point of no quorum is considered withdrawn.

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Will the gentleman from California (Mr.

MCCARTHY) come forward and lead the House in the Pledge of Allegiance.

Mr. MCCARTHY led the Pledge of Allegiance as follows:

I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United States of America, and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 18, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 18, 2019, at 12:59 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 259.

That the Senate agreed to Relative to the death of Richard Arvin Overton S. Res. 10.

With best wishes, I am

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 4 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 2 o'clock and 3 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1600

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 4 p.m.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE CLERK OF THE HOUSE

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following communication from the Clerk of the House of Representatives:

OFFICE OF THE CLERK,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 22, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
The Speaker, House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MADAM SPEAKER: Pursuant to the permission granted in Clause 2(h) of Rule II of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives, the Clerk received the following message from the Secretary of the Senate on January 22, 2019, at 2:23 p.m.:

That the Senate passed without amendment H.R. 430.

With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely,

KAREN L. HAAS.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the Chair

will postpone further proceedings today on motions to suspend the rules on which a recorded vote or the yeas and nays are ordered, or votes objected to under clause 6 of rule XX.

The House will resume proceedings on postponed questions at a later time.

NATIONAL FFA ORGANIZATION'S FEDERAL CHARTER AMENDMENTS ACT

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 439) to amend the charter of the Future Farmers of America, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 439

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act".

SEC. 2. ORGANIZATION.

Section 70901 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking "corporation" and inserting "FFA"; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking "corporation" and inserting "FFA".

SEC. 3. PURPOSES OF THE CORPORATION.

Section 70902 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking "corporation" and inserting "FFA";

(2) by redesignating paragraphs (1) and (2) as paragraphs (7) and (8), respectively;

(3) by striking paragraphs (3), (4), (6), and (7);

(4) by redesignating paragraph (5) as paragraph (11);

(5) by redesignating paragraphs (8) and (9) as paragraphs (12) and (13), respectively;

(6) by inserting before paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

"(1) to be an integral component of instruction in agricultural education, including instruction relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources;

"(2) to advance comprehensive agricultural education in the United States, including in public schools, by supporting contextual classroom and laboratory instruction and work-based experiential learning;

"(3) to prepare students for successful entry into productive careers in fields relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources, including by connecting students to relevant postsecondary educational pathways and focusing on the complete delivery of classroom and laboratory instruction, work-based experiential learning, and leadership development;

"(4) to be a resource and support organization that does not select, control, or supervise State association, local chapter, or individual member activities;

"(5) to develop educational materials, programs, services, and events as a service to State and local agricultural education agencies;

"(6) to seek and promote inclusion and diversity in its membership, leadership, and staff to reflect the belief of the FFA in the value of all human beings;"

(7) in paragraph (7), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking "composed of students and former students of vocational agriculture in

public schools qualifying for Federal reimbursement under the Smith-Hughes Vocational Education Act (20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28); and

(B) by inserting “as such chapters and associations carry out agricultural education programs that are approved by States, territories, or possessions” after “United States”;

(8) in paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2)—

(A) by striking “to develop” and inserting “to build”;

(B) by striking “train for useful citizenship, and foster patriotism, and thereby” and inserting “and”;

(C) by striking “aggressive rural and” and inserting “assertive”;

(9) by inserting after paragraph (8), as redesignated by paragraph (2), the following:

“(9) to increase awareness of the global and technological importance of agriculture, food, and natural resources, and the way agriculture contributes to our well-being;

“(10) to promote the intelligent choice and establishment of a career in fields relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources;”;

(10) in paragraph (11), as redesignated by paragraph (4)—

(A) by striking “to procure for and distribute to State” and inserting “to make available to State”;

(B) by inserting “, programs, services,” before “and equipment”;

(C) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(11) in paragraph (12), as redesignated by paragraph (5), by striking “State boards for vocational” and inserting “State boards and officials for career and technical”;

(12) in paragraph (13), as redesignated by paragraph (5), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 4. MEMBERSHIP.

Section 70903(a) of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(2) by striking “as provided in the bylaws” and inserting “as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA”.

SEC. 5. GOVERNING BODY.

Section 70904 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) in paragraph (1), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears;

(B) by striking paragraphs (2) and (3) and inserting the following:

“(2) The board—

“(A) shall consist of—

“(i) the Secretary of Education, or the Secretary of Education’s designee who has experience in agricultural education, the FFA, or career and technical education; and

“(ii) other individuals—

“(I) representing the fields of education, agriculture, food, and natural resources; or

“(II) with experience working closely with the FFA; and

“(B) shall not include any individual who is a current employee of the National FFA Organization.

“(3) The number of directors, terms of office of the directors, and the method of selecting the directors, are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA.”;

(C) in paragraph (4)—

(i) in the first sentence, by striking “bylaws” and inserting “constitution or bylaws of the FFA”;

(ii) in the third sentence, by striking “chairman” and inserting “chair”;

(2) by striking subsection (b); and

(3) by inserting after subsection (a) the following:

“(b) OFFICERS.—The officers of the FFA, the terms of officers, and the election of officers, are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA, except that such officers shall include—

“(1) a national advisor;

“(2) an executive secretary; and

“(3) a treasurer.

“(c) GOVERNING COMMITTEE.—

“(1) The board may designate a governing committee. The terms and method of selecting the governing committee members are as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA, except that all members of the governing committee shall be members of the board of directors and at all times the governing committee shall be comprised of not less than 3 individuals.

“(2) When the board is not in session, the governing committee has the powers of the board subject to the board’s direction and may authorize the seal of the FFA to be affixed to all papers that require it.

“(3) The board shall designate to such committee—

“(A) the chair of the board;

“(B) the executive secretary of the board; and

“(C) the treasurer of the board.”.

SEC. 6. NATIONAL STUDENT OFFICERS.

Section 70905 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by amending subsection (a) to read as follows:

“(a) COMPOSITION.—There shall be not less than 6 national student officers of the FFA, including a student president, 4 student vice presidents (each representing regions as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the corporation), and a student secretary.”;

(2) by striking subsection (b);

(3) by redesignating subsections (c) and (d) as subsections (b) and (c), respectively; and

(4) in subsection (b), as so redesignated, by striking “, except that” and all that follows through “(20 U.S.C. 11-15, 16-28)”.

SEC. 7. POWERS.

Section 70906 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in the matter preceding paragraph (1), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(2) in paragraph (2), by striking “corporate”;

(3) in paragraph (4), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(4) in paragraph (6), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(5) by amending paragraph (8) to read as follows:

“(8) use FFA funds to give prizes, awards, loans, and grants to deserving members, local FFA chapters, and State FFA associations to carry out the purposes of the FFA;”;

(6) by amending paragraph (9) to read as follows:

“(9) produce publications, websites, and other media;”;

(7) in paragraph (10)—

(A) by striking “procure for and distribute to State” and inserting “make available to State”; and

(B) by striking “Future Farmers of America” and inserting “FFA”; and

(8) in paragraph (12), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 8. NAME, SEALS, EMBLEMS, AND BADGES.

Section 70907 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears;

(2) by striking “name” and inserting “names”;

(3) by striking “Future Farmers of America” and inserting “Future Farmers of America” and ‘National FFA Organization,’; and

(4) by inserting “education” before “membership”.

SEC. 9. RESTRICTIONS.

Section 70908 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”;

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “corporation or a director, officer, or member as such” and inserting “FFA or a director, officer, or member acting on behalf of the FFA”;

(3) in subsection (c), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears; and

(4) in subsection (d), in the first sentence, by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 10. RELATIONSHIP TO FEDERAL AGENCIES.

Section 70909 of title 36, United States Code, is amended to read as follows:

“SEC. 70909. RELATIONSHIP TO FEDERAL AGENCIES.

“(a) IN GENERAL.—On request of the board of directors, the FFA may collaborate with Federal agencies, including the Department of Education and the Department of Agriculture on matters of mutual interest and benefit.

“(b) AGENCY ASSISTANCE.—Those Federal agencies may make personnel, services, and facilities available to administer or assist in the administration of the activities of the FFA.

“(c) AGENCY COMPENSATION.—Personnel of the Federal agencies may not receive compensation from the FFA for their services, except that travel and other legitimate expenses as defined by the Federal agencies and approved by the board may be paid.

“(d) COOPERATION WITH STATE BOARDS.—The Federal agencies also may cooperate with State boards and other organizations for career and technical education to assist in the promotion of activities of the FFA.”.

SEC. 11. HEADQUARTERS AND PRINCIPAL OFFICE.

Section 70910 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “of the corporation shall be in the District of Columbia. However, the activities of the corporation are not confined to the District of Columbia but” and inserting “of the FFA shall be as provided in the constitution or bylaws of the FFA. The activities of the FFA”.

SEC. 12. RECORDS AND INSPECTION.

Section 70911 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(B) in paragraph (3), by striking “entitled to vote”; and

(2) in subsection (b), by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 13. SERVICE OF PROCESS.

Section 70912 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) in subsection (a)—

(A) by striking “DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA” and inserting “IN GENERAL”;

(B) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears;

(C) by striking “in the District of Columbia” before “to receive”; and

(D) by striking “Designation of the agent shall be filed in the office of the clerk of the United States District Court for the District of Columbia”; and

(2) in subsection (b)—

(A) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA” each place the term appears; and

(B) by inserting “of the FFA” after “association or chapter”.

SEC. 14. LIABILITY FOR ACTS OF OFFICERS OR AGENTS.

Section 70913 of title 36, United States Code, is amended by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”.

SEC. 15. DISTRIBUTION OF ASSETS IN DISSOLUTION OR FINAL LIQUIDATION.

Section 70914 of title 36, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking “corporation” and inserting “FFA”; and

(2) by striking “vocational agriculture” and inserting “agricultural education”.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 439, a bipartisan bill to update and modernize the Federal charter of the National FFA Organization.

The FFA, formally known as the Future Farmers of America, is a dynamic youth organization that uses agricultural education and leadership training to promote the personal growth and career successes of its members. With chapters in every State of the Union, its members are the country's future chemists, veterinarians, government officials, entrepreneurs, bankers, international business leaders, teachers, and other professionals across a wide array of career fields.

The bill simply updates the FFA's charter to make it more consistent with the modern organization and to provide additional flexibility as it looks toward the future.

Among other things, the bill recognizes changes to the organization's name. It modifies the organization's purpose to better reflect trends in education and leadership training. It allows the FFA to publish materials in electronic form rather than in printed form and provides flexibility as to the location of the FFA's headquarters.

These are important changes to the existing charter that will help the FFA better carry out its mission for years to come. I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for H.R. 439.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

I rise today in support of H.R. 439, the National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act.

The Future Farmers of America was founded in 1928 to advance agricultural education and improve the quality of life of farming families across the country.

At the first National FFA Convention in Kansas City, there were 33 dele-

gates from 18 States. At the convention in 1929, 33 States were represented, and FFA had swelled to over 30,000 members nationwide. By 1939, FFA had become so large, it required a national headquarters, so it purchased part of George Washington's estate in Alexandria, Virginia, and began construction.

During World War II, more than 138,000 FFA members were serving in the armed services. In 1949, the FFA introduced its first international exchange program with the Young Farmers Club of Great Britain.

In 1950, Harry Truman signed a bill to grant the FFA a Federal charter, directing that a Department of Education staff member be the national FFA adviser. In 1959, President Truman became the first of a long line of Presidents to speak at the FFA National Convention.

In 1969, the FFA created the Washington Leadership Conference to help students become more engaged citizens and to make a difference in their communities.

Following Hurricane Katrina, the National FFA launched Seeds of Hope to help rebuild the Gulf Coast agricultural programs. This effort, combined with the National FFA Foundation, raised over \$10 million for FFA's programs and services.

Since its creation, FFA has grown to include more than 600,000 members across the country. It has built relationships with agricultural organizations around the world.

Under FFA, students between the ages of 12 and 21 can be enrolled in a systematic course of instruction in agricultural education.

Beyond the FFA's rich national history, it has held a special place in my home State of Georgia for decades. Georgia has the third largest State association, with more than 42,000 members. There are more than 342 chapters and more than 475 agricultural education teachers in the State.

Georgia's FFA has also expanded its scholarship awards to help students access these agricultural education programs and reward the hard work of students. The Georgia FFA Association has worked to improve career opportunities of its members through partnership programs with businesses, educators, and legislators.

Today's legislation makes the necessary amendments to the National FFA Organization's charter to allow for student officer vice presidents, to reflect the regional diversity of the United States. It also provides flexibility for national officers to reduce delays caused by vacant seats on the national board.

These amendments will ensure the FFA's purpose matches the innovative and hands-on approach that many agriculture educations are implementing across the country.

I would like to thank Representative JAMES LANGEVIN and Representative GLENN THOMPSON for their work on this legislation and for their support of FFA and agricultural learning.

Mr. Speaker, I would also be remiss if I did not say that FFA is an organization that, when you see the blue jackets on, especially from my part of the world, it is something that also teaches young people leadership and vocal skills. It also is very special to my heart.

Mr. Sutton was the agricultural and FFA adviser in North Hall High School when my daughter attended. My daughter, as many of you know, has spina bifida, and many of her recreational activities and others were limited. She got into agriculture and joined the FFA. She got into their speaker's program, and she would actually participate in the extemporaneous speaker's program.

I watched this young lady take an FFA experience; I watched Mr. Sutton, a man of integrity and character who led the blue jackets in North Hall High School. When she would go, when they couldn't get access to a handicap bus, he would actually physically pick her wheelchair up and take her onto the bus himself.

As a dad and as a Congressman, the blue jackets mean a lot; and when you see them coming, you know that there is good work being done. I could not be more proud to stand here today to ask for support for this legislation, for this charter to be renewed, for when we see agriculture in our economy, which is the most dominant industry we have, we know FFA stands behind it.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, at this time, it is my privilege to yield as much time as he may consume to the gentleman from Pennsylvania (Mr. THOMPSON).

Mr. THOMPSON of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, I thank the chairman for yielding.

I share the chairman's passion for FFA and in the leadership that emerges from that experience for our youth. And I know that, being someone who represents a very rural district, we think of the FFA as a rural enterprise; but, Mr. Speaker, the largest FFA chapter we have in Pennsylvania—and we have a lot—it is a robust program in the city of Philadelphia. This is a program that has tremendous impact in rural America and has tremendous ability to impact in urban America today.

So I rise in support of H.R. 439, the National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act. I am honored to work with my good friend, Mr. LANGEVIN, on this piece of legislation.

This bipartisan bill makes updates to allow the national FFA to be a self-governing organization, while maintaining its long-held relationship with the U.S. Department of Education.

FFA, formally called the Future Farmers of America, was organized in

1928. Congress recognized the importance of FFA as an integral part of vocational agriculture, and in 1950 granted it a Federal charter.

This charter provides Federal authority to create an interagency working agreement that is focused on strengthening FFA and school-based agriculture education.

However, the role of education in securing a skilled, sustainable workforce in agriculture is underscored through the required involvement of the U.S. Department of Education on the National FFA board of directors.

It is important to note that only about 100 organizations have charters with Federal agencies. Only six organizations require the respective government agencies to select one member for their board of directors. FFA is the only organization that requires a majority of its board of directors be chosen by its partner government agency.

Mr. Speaker, while we can all appreciate the integrated relationship between the Department of Education and the FFA, it must be our prerogative to determine the best path forward for both this Federal charter and the students it serves.

FFA functions through a network of local chapters that may be chartered in any public school with an agricultural education program.

Local chapters are run with student leadership. Students are elected each year by the chapter's members, with the agriculture teacher serving as advisor for the chapter.

Local chapters then make up State FFA associations, which operate within the bounds of the National FFA Organization but have the ability to create other individual leadership arrangements, competitions, awards, and programs.

In Pennsylvania alone, our State FFA association includes over 12,900 members, 210 agriculture science teachers, and they have raised \$179,000 to support the future of agriculture education and student leader growth.

It is important to understand this bill will allow the Secretary of Education to continue to serve on the National FFA board of directors but would no longer have the Department of Education's employees constituting the majority of the board.

Additionally, this bill will also shift the organization's purpose towards providing comprehensive career and technical education to strengthen the Nation's agriculture workforce.

Mr. Speaker, this legislation brings FFA, a great cornerstone of rural America—and, quite frankly, having a tremendous impact, today, on urban America—into the 21st century.

Mr. Speaker, I encourage my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I support H.R. 439, and I would ask for favorable consideration.

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

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, in closing, I want to acknowledge

the leadership and commitment of my colleagues, JIM LANGEVIN of Rhode Island and GLENN THOMPSON of Pennsylvania, for working together on a bipartisan bill to fashion this bill.

I support H.R. 439 even more after listening to the comments of my fellow Georgian about his daughter and the assistance and care that this organization has rendered to her and probably countless others even in more need of their support.

So, Mr. Speaker, I support organizations such as FFA. I support this legislation, I ask my colleagues to support it too, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 439, the "National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act."

H.R. 439 updates the charter of the Future Farmers of America (FFA) to include the Department of Education on its board and governing committee in line with other Congressionally chartered organizations by changing the makeup of the board to consist of the Secretary of Education, or the Secretary of Education's designee who has experience in agricultural education, the FFA, or career and technical education and other individuals representing the fields of education, agriculture, food, and natural resources.

The changes will provide the National FFA Organization more autonomy while allowing it to collaborate with federal agencies on matters of mutual interest.

H.R. 439 also shifts the purpose of the FFA toward agriculture career and technical education, provides for online publications, and allows its headquarters to be located outside of Washington, D.C.

The shift in purpose of the FFA allows it to become an integral component of instruction in agricultural education, including instruction relating to agriculture, food, and natural resources, and helps prepare students for successful entry into productive careers in these fields.

This legislation helps to advance comprehensive agricultural education by supporting contextual classroom and laboratory instruction and work-based experiential learning.

With the changes promulgated by H.R. 439, the National FFA organization will be allowed to develop education materials, programs, services, and events as a service to State and local agricultural education agencies while being a resource and support organization that does not select, control, or supervise State association, local chapter, or individual member activities.

The FFA's mission, which remains the same, is to "make a positive difference in the lives of students by developing their potential for premier leadership, personal growth, and career success through agricultural education."

FFA has a strong and positive impact in the state I represent.

The Texas FFA was chartered in 1929, and boasts one of the largest state memberships with over 123,000 members of which more than a third are young women.

I am a strong supporter of educational organizations like the FFA.

For instance, each year the Texas FFA conducts career development events over topics

such as agricultural advocacy, food science and natural resources, entomology, land evaluation, and public relations.

In 2018, the Texas FFA awarded over \$2 million in scholarships to graduating seniors who are "the most capable and deserving FFA members" who will be pursuing a bachelor's degree from a Texas college or university.

The FFA gives its members the opportunity to discover their individual talents and values while discovering careers in agriculture and developing leadership skills.

Agriculture is the nation's largest employer, with more than 23 million jobs.

Updating the FFA's Federal Charter means that the 653,359 FFA members in all 50 states, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands will have a national organization that is in a better position to offer them the support and resources they need.

For these reason, I ask my colleagues to join me in supporting H.R. 439.

□ 1615

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 439.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLEAN UP THE CODE ACT OF 2019

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 498) to eliminate unused sections of the United States Code, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 498

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Clean Up the Code Act of 2019".

SEC. 2. REPEALS.

The following provisions of title 18, United States Code, are repealed:

- (1) Section 46 relating to transportation of water hyacinths.
- (2) Section 511A relating to unauthorized application of theft prevention decal or device.
- (3) Section 707 relating to 4-H club emblem fraudulently used.
- (4) Section 708 relating to Swiss Confederation coat of arms.
- (5) Section 711 relating to "Smokey Bear" character or name.
- (6) Section 711a relating to "Woodsy Owl" character, name, or slogan.
- (7) Section 715 relating to "The Golden Eagle Insignia".
- (8) Chapter 89—Professions and Occupations.
- (9) Section 1921 relating to receiving Federal employees' compensation after marriage.

SEC. 3. CLERICAL AMENDMENTS.

(a) TABLE OF CHAPTERS FOR PART I OF TITLE 18.—The table of chapters for part I of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to chapter 89.

(b) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 3.—The table of sections for chapter 3 of title 18,

United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 46.

(c) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 25.—The table of sections for chapter 25 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 511A.

(d) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 33.—The table of sections for chapter 33 of title 18, United States Code, is amended—

(1) by striking the item relating to section 707;

(2) by striking the item relating to section 708;

(3) by striking the item relating to section 711;

(4) by striking the item relating to section 711a; and

(5) by striking the item relating to section 715.

(e) TABLE OF SECTIONS FOR CHAPTER 93.—The table of sections for chapter 93 of title 18, United States Code, is amended by striking the item relating to section 1921.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) and the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. COLLINS) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON).

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on the bill under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of H.R. 498, the Clean Up the Code Act. I support this measure because it represents a small yet meaningful step toward addressing the problem of over-criminalization. H.R. 498 repeals several criminal penalties for violations that do not involve serious wrongdoing, at least not serious enough to warrant criminal prosecution or the consequences of a criminal record.

Specifically, the bill decriminalizes the transportation of water hyacinths, the unauthorized application of theft prevention decals or devices, and the unauthorized use of the 4-H Club emblem; the Swiss Confederation coat of arms; the “Smokey Bear” character or name; the “Woodsy Owl” character, name, or slogan; or the “Golden Eagle Insignia.”

The conduct that these laws are designed to deter or punish simply does not merit criminal sanctions. This bill repeals a number of these obscure and unnecessary criminal provisions. Criminal penalties should be reserved to deter offenses that jeopardize public safety or as punishment for serious moral transgressions. Such penalties should not be used to punish minor transgressions or to discourage behavior deemed unwanted but ultimately harmless to the greater public good. Therefore, while H.R. 498 is a modest step toward addressing the problem of

over-criminalization, I support its adoption by the House today.

Mr. Speaker, I would like to recognize the efforts of my colleague, Representative STEVE CHABOT, who is the author of this measure and who shepherded it to House passage last year with 385 votes in favor. I was the lead cosponsor of the bill last Congress, and I am pleased again to serve in that role for this bipartisan legislation.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in voting for it today, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of H.R. 498. This bill continues the House Judiciary Committee’s commitment to addressing over-criminalization and over-federalization in our Nation’s criminal code. Last Congress I was proud to work with my friend and colleague from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) to develop and enact the First Step Act, the most significant piece of criminal justice reform legislation in decades. Today’s bill, championed by Mr. CHABOT of Ohio, builds off that great victory and continues that process.

Part of the reasoning behind the First Step Act was that Congress, as our Nation’s lawmaking body, can and should from time to time make reasonable revisions to Federal law to ensure our laws work efficiently and fairly. Today our criminal code is bloated with nearly 5,000 separate crimes. The bill before us begins to address that problem by eliminating nine sections of the Federal criminal code. Those sections either criminalize conduct that should not, fundamentally, be a Federal crime, or have never been prosecuted, or both.

For instance, the unauthorized use of the Smokey Bear emblem, while problematic, should not land someone in a Federal penitentiary for 6 months, especially when there are civil statutes already on the books protecting this and other insignia.

Mr. Speaker, this bill continues the Judiciary Committee’s proven approach to criminal justice reform legislation, namely to take a scalpel, not a sledgehammer, to the criminal code. I would like to thank my colleague, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and also my colleague on the Republican side of the Judiciary Committee, Mr. CHABOT, for their work on this.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to support this legislation, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as she may consume to the gentlewoman from Houston, Texas (Ms. JACKSON LEE).

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia, and I congratulate him and Mr. CHABOT for this legislation. I am glad that this is one of the early bills that we are moving forward. It sets the tone for this Congress, and it sets the tone for

bipartisanship. It also sets the tone for the Democratic-led Congress on the idea of ensuring that justice is truly rendered.

This bill, H.R. 498, the Clean Up the Code Act of 2017, essentially repeals many unused statutes currently in the criminal code. Mr. Speaker, you have to pay a fine, but some of them even have jail time. It is right in line with the concept of ending mass incarceration just to incarcerate.

It is well-known that this Nation has the largest number of people incarcerated in Western civilization, some 2 million-plus, added to, of course, by a number of individuals who are being held in detention centers across the Nation. It is emblematic of what is terribly wrong with our criminal justice system and sheds light on why it is imperative to have an overhaul of our Federal Criminal Code while addressing the ripple effects it creates within our criminal justice system.

We had a task force entitled the Over-Criminalization Task Force in the Judiciary Committee which made an effective start on looking at Federal laws across the Nation to find out how we can best secure and safeguard the American people, bring justice to those who have done wrong, but also provide, if you will, a pathway of reasonableness as it relates to nonviolent crimes, crimes that don’t have a major impact such as the concept of utilizing the Smokey Bear theme, if you will.

We began our journey several Congresses ago to work in a bipartisan way to address the ills of our criminal justice system, as I have indicated, and I look forward to having the Over-Criminalization Task Force reestablished.

As this bill seeks to promote, we must take initiatives to clean up our Federal Criminal Code, which in large part criminalizes many acts that can easily be addressed in other forms such as smaller fines. When we over-criminalize, we place an undue burden on the taxpayers and create long-term human costs on families and other communities. What we do is we create a criminal offense and we create a criminal record.

We should penalize where necessary to ensure public safety and security and hold accountable those criminals who have done major damage and who would tend to offend, where appropriate. But we should also look for ways in which we could enhance our communities, human relations with civilians and law enforcement, and promote an entirely new approach to our criminal justice system.

For all of the foregoing reasons and as well to suggest that Smokey Bear and Woodsy Owl would prefer being left alone as opposed to being held up in a criminal court as a reason for that particular offender being held to a fine of a large amount or jail time, I think this is an important bill and an important step.

I congratulate the authors, both the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON)

and the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT). I look forward to supporting this legislation, and I ask my colleagues to support the legislation.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support H.R. 498, the "Clean Up the Code Act of 2019."

This legislation essentially repeals many unused statutes currently in the criminal code.

It is emblematic of what is terribly wrong with our criminal justice system and sheds light on why it is imperative to have an overhaul of our federal criminal code, while addressing the ripple effects it creates within our criminal justice system.

We began our journey several Congresses ago to work in a bipartisan way to address the ills of our criminal justice system through our Over-criminalization Task Force, which I intend to re-establish in this Congress.

As this bill seeks to promote, we must take initiatives to clean up our federal criminal code, which in large part, criminalizes many acts that can easily be addressed in other forums.

When we over-criminalize we place an undue burden on the taxpayers and create long term human costs on families and on our communities.

We should penalize where necessary to ensure public safety and hold accountable criminals where appropriate.

We should also look for ways in which we could enhance our communities, human relations with civilians and law enforcement, and provide an entirely new approach to our criminal justice system.

For all the foregoing reasons, I support this bill and ask my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I yield such time as he may consume to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT) to speak about the bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, today I rise in support of my bill, H.R. 498, the Clean Up the Code Act of 2019. I want to thank the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) for his support and his leadership in making this legislation possible.

Back in 2008, the Heritage Foundation published a report estimating that there were nearly 4,500 different Federal crimes in the U.S. Code. Five years later, the Judiciary Committee asked the Congressional Research Service to review the foundation's findings only to be told that it did not have the resources to fulfill our request. This is a clear indication that there are too many criminal laws on the books and the code needs to be cleaned up.

H.R. 498 eliminates nine provisions in Title 18, a good start, that in some instances have never been prosecuted since their enactment. For example, as has already been mentioned, the unauthorized use of the Smokey Bear or Woodsy Owl will no longer be subject to criminal penalty if this bill is enacted.

This bipartisan legislation is aimed at doing exactly what the bill title says—clean up the code. If there were too many criminal laws for the CRS to count back in 2013, let's help them get rid of the easy ones by enacting this

legislation. As I say, it is a good start. It isn't going to solve the whole problem, but it is a good start, and I urge my colleagues to support this legislation.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, may I inquire as to how many additional speakers my friend from Georgia foresees?

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, it appears we have exhausted the supply, so we are ready to close.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, with that in mind, I see that my dear colleague, JIM LANGEVIN, has arrived. He is the sponsor of H.R. 439 which is the Future Farmers of America charter revision bill. He is the sponsor of that bill. He was on his way from the airport. His flight was delayed, but he is here now.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Rhode Island (Mr. LANGEVIN).

Mr. LANGEVIN. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding me time. I hope I won't use all 5 minutes. I first want to say I support the bill under debate right now and certainly support criminal justice reform. One of the best ways, of course, we can prevent people from hopefully going down the path of crimes is to make sure they have a good education, so hence I am here to speak on H.R. 439.

Mr. Speaker, as co-chair of the bipartisan Congressional Career and Technical Education Caucus, I am pleased to rise with my good friend and fellow co-chair, Representative G.T. Thompson, in support of H.R. 439, the National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act. I would like to thank my friend from Pennsylvania for his partnership on this bill which modernizes the FFA congressional charter to better serve the organization's 669,000 student members across the country.

Since 1928 the FFA, formerly known as Future Farmers of America, has been an integral part of our Nation's agricultural education system. Its mission is to prepare the next generation of farmers who form the backbone of our Nation's food supply system. Congress recognized the FFA's importance in 1950 when it granted the organization a Federal charter. But today, nearly 70 years later, that charter is overdue for an update.

Of the 100 nonprofit organizations that have charters with the Federal Government, from the Girl Scouts of America to the National Academy of Sciences, only six require government agencies to appoint members to the NGO's board of directors. Of those six, the FFA is the only federally chartered organization that requires a majority of its board members to be chosen by its partner agency, the Department of Education.

The bill that had been considered this afternoon and that passed brings the role of the Department of Education in line with other congression-

ally chartered organizations while maintaining the long relationship between the department and the FFA. In doing so, it gives the FFA more autonomy to deliver its integrated system of agricultural career and technical education, or CTE, to the 8,000 chapters located across all 50 States, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands.

H.R. 439 allows the FFA to be more independent, but it retains its ability to collaborate with the Department of Education in agriculture. It also allows the FFA to move its headquarters from Washington, D.C. and provide online publications for its chapters around the country. The FFA needs to adapt to the 21st century economy, and modernizing this charter is a necessary step in that process.

Today the FFA helps train more than future farmers. It prepares the next generation of scientists, veterinarians, and business owners through classroom and work-based learning. As a strong advocate for CTE, I am thrilled to support the skills-based education model on behalf of the FFA and its many teachers and students. Our bill aligns the FFA's charter with this focus on CTE, specifically the Agriculture, Food, and Natural Resources Career Cluster which gives students the opportunity to explore exciting careers and be prepared for future challenges.

□ 1630

Our country faces daunting tasks in agricultural policy, from addressing food shortages to containing animal-borne diseases and stopping the pollution of our waterways.

Mr. Speaker, we can count on our Nation's FFA students to not only grow our economy but to become the next community of world leaders, ready to tackle these 21st century challenges.

In my home State of Rhode Island, I am continually impressed by the hard-working, motivated, bright FFA students and the dedicated teachers who instruct them. Through the FFA, these students are developing the academic and technical skills to succeed in agricultural fields and the leadership skills to make a real difference.

This bill, the National FFA Organization's Federal Charter Amendments Act, will allow the FFA to continue its mission with more autonomy.

Mr. Speaker, I thank, again, my colleague G.T. THOMPSON from the great State of Pennsylvania, along with Chairman NADLER and Ranking Member COLLINS, for their support, as well as my esteemed colleague Senator TODD YOUNG of Indiana for leading this bipartisan effort in the Senate.

Mr. Speaker, I thank my colleagues for supporting this bill, and I thank the gentleman from Georgia for yielding.

Mr. COLLINS of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise on H.R. 498. Again, this is a good act. The Clean Up the Code Act is one that I ask everyone to support and vote "yes" on, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, while I do not believe Federal prosecutors are neglecting the pursuit of

serious criminals by bringing charges under Criminal Code provisions that H.R. 498 would repeal, this bill serves as an important reminder that Congress should be careful not to enact new criminal penalties when they are not warranted.

We must resist overcriminalization, which fosters disrespect for the seriousness of the law and leads to collateral consequences for offenders that are often catastrophic to them and their ability to function in and contribute to their communities.

It is my hope that, in this new Congress, we will be able to work on a bipartisan basis to expand our efforts to make our criminal justice system more fair and, thereby, also more effective.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from Georgia (Mr. JOHNSON) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 498.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CAESAR SYRIA CIVILIAN PROTECTION ACT OF 2019

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 31) to require certain additional actions in connection with the national emergency with respect to Syria, and for other purposes, as amended.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 31

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the “Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019”.

TITLE I—ADDITIONAL ACTIONS IN CONNECTION WITH THE NATIONAL EMERGENCY WITH RESPECT TO SYRIA

SEC. 101. MEASURES WITH RESPECT TO CENTRAL BANK OF SYRIA.

(a) DETERMINATION REGARDING CENTRAL BANK OF SYRIA.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary of the Treasury shall determine, under section 5318A of title 31, United States Code, whether reasonable grounds exist for concluding that the Central Bank of Syria is a financial institution of primary money laundering concern.

(b) ENHANCED DUE DILIGENCE AND REPORTING REQUIREMENTS.—If the Secretary of the Treasury determines under subsection (a) that reasonable grounds exist for concluding that the Central Bank of Syria is a financial institution of primary money laundering concern, the Secretary, in consultation with the Federal functional regulators (as defined in section 509 of the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act (15 U.S.C. 6809)), shall impose one or more of the special measures described in section 5318A(b) of title 31, United States Code, with respect to the Central Bank of Syria.

(c) REPORT REQUIRED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 90 days after making a determination under sub-

section (a) as to whether or not the Central Bank of Syria is a financial institution of primary money laundering concern, the Secretary of the Treasury shall submit to the appropriate congressional committees a report that includes the reasons for the determination.

(2) FORM.—A report required by paragraph (1) shall be submitted in unclassified form, but may include a classified annex.

(3) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(A) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(B) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 102. SANCTIONS WITH RESPECT TO FOREIGN PERSONS THAT ENGAGE IN CERTAIN TRANSACTIONS.

(a) IMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—On and after the date that is 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall impose the sanctions described in subsection (b) with respect to a foreign person if the President determines that the foreign person, on or after such date of enactment, knowingly engages in an activity described in paragraph (2).

(2) ACTIVITIES DESCRIBED.—A foreign person engages in an activity described in this paragraph if the foreign person—

(A) knowingly provides significant financial, material, or technological support to, or knowingly engages in a significant transaction with—

(i) the Government of Syria (including any entity owned or controlled by the Government of Syria) or a senior political figure of the Government of Syria;

(ii) a foreign person that is a military contractor, mercenary, or a paramilitary force knowingly operating in a military capacity inside Syria for or on behalf of the Government of Syria, the Government of the Russian Federation, or the Government of Iran; or

(iii) a foreign person subject to sanctions pursuant to the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) with respect to Syria or any other provision of law that imposes sanctions with respect to Syria;

(B) knowingly sells or provides significant goods, services, technology, information, or other support that significantly facilitates the maintenance or expansion of the Government of Syria’s domestic production of natural gas, petroleum, or petroleum products;

(C) knowingly sells or provides aircraft or spare aircraft parts that are used for military purposes in Syria for or on behalf of the Government of Syria to any foreign person operating in an area directly or indirectly controlled by the Government of Syria or foreign forces associated with the Government of Syria;

(D) knowingly provides significant goods or services associated with the operation of aircraft that are used for military purposes in Syria for or on behalf of the Government of Syria to any foreign person operating in an area described in subparagraph (C); or

(E) knowingly, directly or indirectly, provides significant construction or engineering services to the Government of Syria.

(3) SENSE OF CONGRESS.—It is the sense of Congress that, in implementing this section, the President should consider financial support under paragraph (2)(A) to include the provision of loans, credits, or export credits.

(b) SANCTIONS DESCRIBED.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The sanctions to be imposed with respect to a foreign person subject to subsection (a) are the following:

(A) BLOCKING OF PROPERTY.—The President shall exercise all of the powers granted to the President under the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1701 et seq.) to the extent necessary to block and prohibit all transactions in property and interests in property of the foreign person if such property and interests in property are in the United States, come within the United States, or are or come within the possession or control of a United States person.

(B) ALIENS INELIGIBLE FOR VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—

(i) VISAS, ADMISSION, OR PAROLE.—An alien who the Secretary of State or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) knows, or has reason to believe, has knowingly engaged in any activity described in subsection (a)(2) is—

(I) inadmissible to the United States;

(II) ineligible to receive a visa or other documentation to enter the United States; and

(III) otherwise ineligible to be admitted or paroled into the United States or to receive any other benefit under the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1101 et seq.).

(ii) CURRENT VISAS REVOKED.—

(I) IN GENERAL.—The issuing consular officer, the Secretary of State, or the Secretary of Homeland Security (or a designee of one of such Secretaries) shall, in accordance with section 221(i) of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1201(i)), revoke any visa or other entry documentation issued to an alien described in clause (i) regardless of when the visa or other entry documentation is issued.

(II) EFFECT OF REVOCATION.—A revocation under subclause (I)—

(aa) shall take effect immediately; and

(bb) shall automatically cancel any other valid visa or entry documentation that is in the alien’s possession.

(2) PENALTIES.—The penalties provided for in subsections (b) and (c) of section 206 of the International Emergency Economic Powers Act (50 U.S.C. 1705) shall apply to a person that violates, attempts to violate, conspires to violate, or causes a violation of regulations promulgated under section 303 to carry out paragraph (1)(A) to the same extent that such penalties apply to a person that commits an unlawful act described in section 206(a) of that Act.

(3) EXCEPTION TO COMPLY WITH UNITED NATIONS HEADQUARTERS AGREEMENT.—Sanctions under paragraph (1)(B) shall not apply with respect to an alien if admitting or paroling the alien into the United States is necessary to permit the United States to comply with the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States, or other applicable international obligations.

TITLE II—ASSISTANCE FOR THE PEOPLE OF SYRIA

SEC. 201. CODIFICATION OF CERTAIN SERVICES IN SUPPORT OF NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS’ ACTIVITIES AUTHORIZED.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Except as provided in subsection (b), section 542.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations (relating to certain services in support of nongovernmental organizations’ activities authorized), as in effect on the day before the date of the enactment of this Act, shall—

(1) remain in effect on and after such date of enactment; and

(2) in the case of a nongovernmental organization that is authorized to export or reexport services to Syria under such section on

the day before such date of enactment, apply to such organization on and after such date of enactment to the same extent and in the same manner as such section applied to such organization on the day before such date of enactment.

(b) EXCEPTION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Section 542.516 of title 31, Code of Federal Regulations, as codified under subsection (a), shall not apply with respect to a foreign person that has been designated as a foreign terrorist organization under section 219 of the Immigration and Nationality Act (8 U.S.C. 1189), or otherwise designated as a terrorist organization, by the Secretary of State, in consultation with or upon the request of the Attorney General or the Secretary of Homeland Security.

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—Paragraph (1) shall apply with respect to a foreign person on and after the date on which the designation of that person as a terrorist organization is published in the Federal Register.

SEC. 202. BRIEFING ON STRATEGY TO FACILITATE HUMANITARIAN ASSISTANCE.

(a) IN GENERAL.—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the strategy of the President to help facilitate the ability of humanitarian organizations to access financial services to help facilitate the safe and timely delivery of assistance to communities in need in Syria.

(b) CONSIDERATION OF DATA FROM OTHER COUNTRIES AND NONGOVERNMENTAL ORGANIZATIONS.—In preparing the strategy required by subsection (a), the President shall consider credible data already obtained by other countries and nongovernmental organizations, including organizations operating in Syria.

(c) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

TITLE III—GENERAL PROVISIONS

SEC. 301. SUSPENSION OF SANCTIONS.

(a) IN GENERAL.—The President may suspend in whole or in part the imposition of sanctions otherwise required under this Act for periods not to exceed 180 days if the President determines that the following criteria have been met in Syria:

(1) The air space over Syria is no longer being utilized by the Government of Syria or the Government of the Russian Federation to target civilian populations through the use of incendiary devices, including barrel bombs, chemical weapons, and conventional arms, including air-delivered missiles and explosives.

(2) Areas besieged by the Government of Syria, the Government of the Russian Federation, the Government of Iran, or a foreign person described in section 102(a)(2)(A)(ii) are no longer cut off from international aid and have regular access to humanitarian assistance, freedom of travel, and medical care.

(3) The Government of Syria is releasing all political prisoners forcibly held within the prison system of the regime of Bashar al-Assad and the Government of Syria is allowing full access to the same facilities for investigations by appropriate international human rights organizations.

(4) The forces of the Government of Syria, the Government of the Russian Federation, the Government of Iran, and any foreign per-

son described in section 102(a)(2)(A)(ii) are no longer engaged in deliberate targeting of medical facilities, schools, residential areas, and community gathering places, including markets, in violation of international norms.

(5) The Government of Syria is—

(A) taking steps to verifiably fulfill its commitments under the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production, Stockpiling and Use of Chemical Weapons and on their Destruction, done at Geneva September 3, 1992, and entered into force April 29, 1997 (commonly known as the “Chemical Weapons Convention”), and the Treaty on the Non-Proliferation of Nuclear Weapons, done at Washington, London, and Moscow July 1, 1968, and entered into force March 5, 1970 (21 UST 483); and

(B) making tangible progress toward becoming a signatory to the Convention on the Prohibition of the Development, Production and Stockpiling of Bacteriological (Biological) and Toxin Weapons and on their Destruction, done at Washington, London, and Moscow April 10, 1972, and entered into force March 26, 1975 (26 UST 583).

(6) The Government of Syria is permitting the safe, voluntary, and dignified return of Syrians displaced by the conflict.

(7) The Government of Syria is taking verifiable steps to establish meaningful accountability for perpetrators of war crimes in Syria and justice for victims of war crimes committed by the Assad regime, including by participation in a credible and independent truth and reconciliation process.

(b) BRIEFING REQUIRED.—Not later than 30 days after the President makes a determination described in subsection (a), the President shall provide a briefing to the appropriate congressional committees on the determination and the suspension of sanctions pursuant to the determination.

(c) REIMPOSITION OF SANCTIONS.—Any sanctions suspended under subsection (a) shall be reimposed if the President determines that the criteria described in that subsection are no longer being met.

(d) RULE OF CONSTRUCTION.—Nothing in this section shall be construed to limit the authority of the President to terminate the application of sanctions under section 102 with respect to a person that no longer engages in activities described in subsection (a)(2) of that section.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 302. EXEMPTIONS; WAIVERS; EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.

(a) EXEMPTIONS.—The following activities and transactions shall be exempt from sanctions authorized under this Act:

(1) Any activity subject to the reporting requirements under title V of the National Security Act of 1947 (50 U.S.C. 3091 et seq.), or to any authorized law enforcement, national security, or intelligence activities of the United States.

(2) Any transaction necessary to comply with United States obligations under—

(A) the Agreement regarding the Headquarters of the United Nations, signed at Lake Success June 26, 1947, and entered into

force November 21, 1947, between the United Nations and the United States;

(B) the Convention on Consular Relations, done at Vienna April 24, 1963, and entered into force March 19, 1967; or

(C) any other international agreement to which the United States is a party.

(b) WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may, for periods not to exceed 180 days, waive the application of any sanction authorized under this Act with respect to a foreign person if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such a waiver is in the national security interests of the United States.

(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1), and every 180 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the reasons for the waiver.

(c) HUMANITARIAN WAIVER.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The President may waive, for renewable periods not to exceed 2 years, the application of any sanction authorized under this Act with respect to a nongovernmental organization providing humanitarian assistance not covered by the authorization described in section 201 if the President certifies to the appropriate congressional committees that such a waiver is important to address a humanitarian need and is consistent with the national security interests of the United States.

(2) BRIEFING.—Not later than 90 days after the issuance of a waiver under paragraph (1), and every 180 days thereafter while the waiver remains in effect, the President shall brief the appropriate congressional committees on the reasons for the waiver.

(d) EXCEPTION RELATING TO IMPORTATION OF GOODS.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—The authorities and requirements to impose sanctions authorized under this Act shall not include the authority or requirement to impose sanctions on the importation of goods.

(2) GOOD DEFINED.—In this subsection, the term “good” means any article, natural or man-made substance, material, supply or manufactured product, including inspection and test equipment, and excluding technical data.

(e) APPROPRIATE CONGRESSIONAL COMMITTEES DEFINED.—In this section, the term “appropriate congressional committees” means—

(1) the Committee on Foreign Affairs, the Committee on Financial Services, the Committee on Ways and Means, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the House of Representatives; and

(2) the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Committee on Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs, the Committee on the Judiciary, and the Committee on Appropriations of the Senate.

SEC. 303. REGULATORY AUTHORITIES.

The President shall, not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, promulgate regulations as necessary for the implementation of this Act.

SEC. 304. SUNSET.

This Act shall cease to be effective on the date that is 5 years after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members may have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 31, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act, as amended, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, this is the third time I have stood on the House floor to argue in favor of passing this bill, to argue that we need to dial up the pressure on the Assad regime; that we need to crack down on his enablers, namely, Iran and Russia; and that we need to push for a political solution that will end the years of horrific bloodshed.

I made that case in November 2016, when the House unanimously passed a version of this bill. I did it again in May of 2017, and again it passed unanimously, only to languish in the other body for the rest of the Congress, stopped by one single Senator.

In Syria, in the last 26 months that have come since the House first passed this bill, the suffering has continued. Over the last few weeks, in the Rukban refugee camp, 13 babies froze to death, and 50,000 more displaced people in this camp are at grave risk. They have nowhere else to go. Unchecked, the Assad regime will likely move in and massacre these innocent people.

I could go on and on, detailing the horrors the Syrian people have endured at the hands of this butcher, Assad. I could describe the atrocities we saw in photographs smuggled out of Syria by Caesar, the government photographer who defected and after whom this bill is named.

But after years of unremitting bloodshed, it is long past time for more talk about Syria. We need action, and my legislation would be an important step in the right direction.

This bill would slap sanctions on anyone who does business with the Assad regime. It would go after anyone who provides financing or parts for aircraft that are used to bomb civilians or works with the energy or construction sectors controlled by the Syrian Government.

We don't want to do accidental harm with this bill, so we have made sure that it would not affect NGOs providing assistance, and we want the administration to use this tool to create leverage, so sanctions could be waived or suspended if meaningful negotiations were moving forward.

In this respect, this bill encourages diplomacy and a peaceful, sustainable solution to the conflict in Syria.

Some people may be resigned to the idea that Assad is simply going to take over the country. I disagree. The United States should not abandon our options for applying pressure to the re-

gime. Syria with Assad at the helm is a recipe for sustained conflict, not sustainable peace. For me, sustainable peace for the people of Syria has always been the goal.

Let me be very clear: This bill would impose Syria-related sanctions; it would not impose nuclear-related sanctions.

I know many of my colleagues are concerned about our withdrawal from the JCPOA. This legislation is entirely consistent with what President Obama promised us after entering into the Iran nuclear deal, that we would continue to sanction Iran for its destabilizing activities in the region. Sanctions under this bill would not prevent a future President of the United States from returning to the Iranian nuclear agreement.

There is obviously no easy solution for the crisis in Syria. It wouldn't have raged on for years and years if there were a simple path out of it. But this bill represents one tool the administration can use to try to move toward that solution, to break the status quo.

I also want to mention the fact that so many wonderful Syrian American groups have been fighting for this legislation, have been fighting against the Assad regime, and have really worked so hard over these past years. It has really been good working with them, although, obviously, very, very difficult.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON FINANCIAL SERVICES,
Washington, DC, January 5, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: I am writing concerning H.R. 31, the "Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019."

As a result of your having consulted with the Committee on Financial Services concerning provisions in the bill that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction, I agree to forgo action on the bill so that it may proceed expeditiously to the House floor. The Committee on Financial Services takes this action with our mutual understanding that, by foregoing consideration of H.R. 31 at this time, we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and that our Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as this or similar legislation moves forward. Our Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation and request your support for any such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding with respect to H.R. 31 and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2019.

Hon. MAXINE WATERS,
Chairwoman, Committee on Financial Services,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRWOMAN WATERS: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 31, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on Financial Services. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 31 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 31 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

COMMITTEE ON WAYS AND MEANS,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 9, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman, Committee on Foreign Affairs,
Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN ENGEL: I am writing with respect to H.R. 31, the "Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019." As a result of your having consulted with us on provisions on which the Committee on Ways and Means has a jurisdictional interest, I will not request a sequential referral on this measure.

The Committee on Ways and Means takes this action with the mutual understanding that we do not waive any jurisdiction over the subject matter contained in this or similar legislation, and the Committee will be appropriately consulted and involved as the bill or similar legislation moves forward so that we may address any remaining issues within our jurisdiction. The Committee also reserves the right to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees to any House-Senate conference involving this or similar legislation, and requests your support for such request.

Finally, I would appreciate your response to this letter confirming this understanding, and would ask that a copy of our exchange of letters on this matter be included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of H.R. 31.

Sincerely,

RICHARD E. NEAL,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2019.

Hon. RICHARD E. NEAL,
Chairman, Committee on Ways and Means,
House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for consulting with the Foreign Affairs Committee on H.R. 31, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019, and for agreeing to forgo a sequential referral request so that the bill may proceed expeditiously to the House floor.

I agree that your declining to pursue a referral in this case does not diminish or alter the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means, or prejudice its jurisdictional prerogatives on this bill or similar legislation in the future. I would support your effort to seek appointment of an appropriate number of conferees from your Committee over any parts of the bill under the jurisdiction of the Committee on Ways and Means to any House-Senate conference on this legislation.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with

you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 10, 2019.

Hon. JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman, Committee on the Judiciary, House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR CHAIRMAN NADLER: I am writing to you concerning H.R. 31, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019.

I appreciate your willingness to work cooperatively on this legislation. I recognize that the bill contains provisions that fall within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. I acknowledge that your Committee will not formally consider H.R. 31 and agree that the inaction of your Committee with respect to the bill does not waive any future jurisdictional claim over the matters contained in H.R. 31 which fall within your Committee's Rule X jurisdiction.

I will ensure that our exchange of letters is included in the Congressional Record during floor consideration of the bill. I appreciate your cooperation regarding this legislation and look forward to continuing to work with you as this measure moves through the legislative process.

Sincerely,

ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Chairman.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
Washington, DC, January 11, 2019.

Hon. ELIOT L. ENGEL,
Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. CHAIRMAN: This is to advise you that the Committee on the Judiciary has now had an opportunity to review the provisions in H.R. 31, the "Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019," that fall within our Rule X jurisdiction. I appreciate your consulting with us on those provisions. The Judiciary Committee has no objection to your including them in the bill for consideration on the House floor, and to expedite that consideration is willing to waive sequential referral, with the understanding that we do not thereby waive any future jurisdictional claim over those provisions or their subject matters.

In the event a House-Senate conference on this or similar legislation is convened, the Judiciary Committee reserves the right to request an appropriate number of conferees to address any concerns with these or similar provisions that may arise in conference.

Please place this letter into the Congressional Record during consideration of the measure on the House floor. Thank you for the cooperative spirit in which you have worked regarding this matter and others between our committees.

Sincerely,

JERROLD NADLER,
Chairman,
House Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act authored by my good friend Chairman ENGEL.

For nearly 7 years, we have watched the barbaric Assad regime launch countless attacks on the people of Syria. Since the conflict began in 2011, more than 500,000 people have been killed and 14 million have been forced from their homes.

This destabilizing exodus has imposed painful burdens on neighboring

countries. Our committee has heard disturbing testimony directly from Syrians caught up in this horrific nightmare. In fact, I recently met with the brave defector known to the world as Caesar, for whom this bill is named.

His story is gut-wrenching. He told me about the shocking scale of torture and murder being carried out within the prisons of Syria. The photographic evidence he smuggled out and showed to us proves beyond any doubt the brutality of Bashar al-Assad. The images are shocking and indelible.

The bill before us today will increase international pressure on Assad and his backers by targeting their means of support. Foreign companies and banks will have to choose between doing business with Assad or with the United States.

The bill will also sanction anyone who flies weapons or fighters into Syria to support his murderous regime.

This bill is about creating leverage to push the parties to negotiate. It is about finding a way forward, to be determined by the Syrian people, that does not allow Assad to continue to exterminate them or drive them from their homes.

This bill, as the chairman said, has passed the House twice and is long overdue. I am confident it will pass tonight, and I hope that the Senate will take it up promptly in the new Congress.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to join us as we seek to ease the immense suffering of the people of Syria and give them a better hope for the future, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. KILDEE).

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I thank my friend for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of this legislation, H.R. 31, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act of 2019. I am a proud original cosponsor of this legislation.

Over 7 years, nearly half a million Syrians killed, 6 million Syrians driven from their country, over 10 million Syrians displaced and forced from their homes, and countless acts of atrocities from the Assad regime.

Clearly, it is time for this Congress to act, and this bill would do that. It would bring much-needed accountability to the Assad regime, which is responsible for horrific crimes, crimes against its own people. It would do so by allowing sanctions to be imposed on people who contribute to these cold-hearted and merciless acts.

It would require the Treasury Department to determine whether to target Syria's Central Bank with money laundering countermeasures.

Quite simply, I agree with Chairman ENGEL. We need a political solution that ends Assad's crimes, removes him from power, and allows the Syrian people to develop their own future for their own country.

Assad must be held accountable for the massacre of his own people, and this bill will begin to do just that.

Additionally, Russia and Assad must stop standing by and systematically allowing ISIS to attack minority populations in Syria, including the Druze people.

We cannot expect much from these actors, but it is incumbent upon them to protect minority populations in Syria in the territory that they control. Further, it is also the responsibility of the President of the United States and his national security team to speak with one voice regarding our policy in Syria and the region.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman an additional 1 minute.

Mr. KILDEE. The President has, time and time again, illustrated that our allies and our adversaries simply cannot trust what the President says. The administration needs to articulate a cohesive strategy for the region and for Syria, particularly after the President, with no warning to our partners, announced the U.S. withdrawal.

□ 1645

Finally, Mr. Speaker, like Chairman ENGEL, I thank all of those who have advocated for this bill, for their tenacity, for their engagement, and I urge my colleagues to join with them and stand up for them and immediately pass this critical legislation to hold Assad accountable.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Arkansas (Mr. HILL), an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HILL of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member, and I, too, add my thanks to Chairman ENGEL and his predecessor, Chairman Royce, for their intense and passionate work on this important subject.

I was an original cosponsor, and I support the passage of H.R. 31, the Caesar Syria Civilian Protection Act. This legislation imposes new sanctions on Syrian human rights abusers and those who facilitate the regime's atrocities. It also authorizes the State Department to support entities that are collecting and preserving that chain of evidence for eventual prosecution of those who have committed war crimes in Syria since the war began in 2011.

The world has witnessed many examples of butchering and genocide by menaces throughout history: Hitler, Stalin, and Mao. They are joined in the last 8 years by a new name, and that is Assad and his Russian and Iranian collaborators.

Until Mr. Trump's strategic airstrikes, for the prior 8 years, the world has blustered and twiddled while these modern menaces murdered the innocent civilian population in Syria. Systematically, they savagely bombed, bludgeoned, gassed, electrocuted, and tortured their people. I have seen this evidence on full display in Washington's Holocaust museum, and I urge all Americans to look at that exhibit.

I have heard eyewitness testimony from the Syrian Emergency Task Force. Listen to the horrors, Mr. Speaker:

A survivor of a gas attack told *The New York Times* in 2017:

My eyes were burning, my head was throbbing, and my throat was blocked. I was suffocating. I tried to inhale, but all I heard was a horrible rasping sound as my throat closed up. An unbearable pain drummed in my head. The world began to blur. I pounded my chest, but I couldn't breathe. I thought my heart was going to explode.

Does this Congress need any more testimony, Mr. Speaker?

I commend President Trump for hearing these cries and his leadership to carry out airstrikes to block Assad's mass murder, and I call on him again to strengthen his resolve against Assad's barbarous acts and think of these innocent Syrian people who face these terrible atrocities nearly every day.

Finally, I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 31, and I call on the Senate to not twiddle their thumbs any longer and act with expedition and pass this legislation. Let's not waste any more time bringing Assad and his co-conspirators to justice.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, in closing, I once again recognize the work of Chairman ENGEL, his cosponsors, and former Chairman Royce.

Those of us who have talked to eyewitnesses and seen video and photos will never forget the atrocities perpetrated by Bashar al-Assad: the bombing of the hospitals, the torture of prisoners, and the gassing of children who died agonizing deaths in their beds.

For 7 years international diplomats have debated ways to protect civilians in Syria, with no results. Today, we send a strong message that the United States will work to ensure that Assad's war machine is halted.

It is not too late to act, as Mr. HILL eloquently stated. The people of Syria cannot afford further delay. I urge all Members to support it, and I sure hope this time the Senate will be able to pass it.

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

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, let me thank the ranking member, Mr. McCAUL, for his very important words.

The world has failed the Syrian people. Nothing can undo the horrors they have had, and they have had to endure them for nearly 8 years. Nothing can bring back those who have been lost. But the world owes it to the living and the dead to try and bring this crisis to an end.

The role America must play is to push for a political solution that allows the Syrian people to choose their own future. That is what American

leadership looks like. That is what sets us apart from other great powers on the world stage.

We simply cannot look the other way and allow Assad, Russia, and Iran to steamroll over Syria. That would send a terrible message to our allies. It would undermine security across the entire region, and it would cost so many more innocent lives.

My bill would give the administration greater leverage to raise the cost for Assad and crack down on his lifelines. I ask that all Members support this measure.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 31, as amended.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill, as amended, was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

—————

DIRECTING SECRETARY OF STATE TO DEVELOP STRATEGY TO REGAIN OBSERVER STATUS FOR TAIWAN IN WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 353) to direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 353

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION.

(a) FINDINGS.—Congress makes the following findings:

(1) The World Health Organization (WHO) is a specialized agency of the United Nations, charged with coordinating health efforts within the United Nations system. The World Health Assembly (WHA) is the decision-making body of the WHO, which convenes annually in May to set the policies and priorities of the organization. Statehood is not a requirement for attendance at the WHA, and numerous observers, including non-members and non-governmental organizations, attended the most recent WHA in May 2018.

(2) Taiwan began seeking to participate in the WHO as an observer in 1997. In 2009, with strong support from successive United States Administrations, Congress, and like-minded WHO Member States, and during a period of improved Cross-Strait relations, Taiwan received an invitation to attend the WHA as an observer under the name "Chinese Taipei". Taiwan received the same invitation each year until 2016, when following the election of President Tsai-Ing Wen of the Democratic Progressive Party, Taiwan's engagement in the international community began facing increased resistance from the People's Republic of China (PRC). Taiwan's invitation to

the 2016 WHA was received late and included new language conditioning Taiwan's participation on the PRC's "one China principle". In 2017 and 2018, Taiwan did not receive an invitation to the WHA.

(3) Taiwan remains a model contributor to world health, having provided financial and technical assistance to respond to numerous global health challenges. Taiwan has invested over \$6 billion in international medical and humanitarian aid efforts impacting over 80 countries since 1996. In 2014, Taiwan responded to the Ebola crisis by donating \$1 million and providing 100,000 sets of personal protective equipment. Through the Global Cooperation and Training Framework, the United States and Taiwan have jointly conducted training programs for experts to combat MERS, Dengue Fever, and Zika. These diseases know no borders, and Taiwan's needless exclusion from global health cooperation increases the dangers presented by global pandemics.

(4) Taiwan's international engagement has faced increased resistance from the PRC. Taiwan was not invited to the 2016 Assembly of the International Civil Aviation Organization (ICAO), despite participating as a guest at the organization's prior summit in 2013. Taiwan's requests to participate in the General Assembly of the International Criminal Police Organization (INTERPOL) have also been rejected. In May 2017, PRC delegates disrupted a meeting of the Kimberley Process on conflict diamonds held in Perth, Australia, until delegates from Taiwan were asked to leave. Since 2016, the Democratic Republic of São Tomé and Príncipe, the Republic of Panama, the Dominican Republic, Burkina Faso, and the Republic of El Salvador have terminated longstanding diplomatic relationships with Taiwan and granted diplomatic recognition to the PRC.

(5) Congress has established a policy of support for Taiwan's participation in international bodies that address shared transnational challenges, particularly in the WHO. Congress passed H.R. 1794 in the 106th Congress, H.R. 428 in the 107th Congress, and S. 2092 in the 108th Congress to direct the Secretary of State to establish a strategy for, and to report annually to Congress on, efforts to obtain observer status for Taiwan at the WHA. Congress also passed H.R. 1151 in the 113th Congress, directing the Secretary to report on a strategy to gain observer status for Taiwan at the ICAO Assembly, and H.R. 1853 in the 114th Congress, directing the Secretary to report on a strategy to gain observer status for Taiwan at the INTERPOL Assembly. However, since 2016 Taiwan has not received an invitation to attend any of these events as an observer.

(b) AUGMENTATION OF REPORT CONCERNING THE PARTICIPATION OF TAIWAN IN THE WORLD HEALTH ORGANIZATION.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Subsection (c) of section 1 of Public Law 108–235 (118 Stat. 656) is amended by adding at the end the following new paragraph:

“(3) An account of the changes and improvements the Secretary of State has made to the United States plan to endorse and obtain observer status for Taiwan at the World Health Assembly, following any annual meetings of the World Health Assembly at which Taiwan did not obtain observer status.”

(2) EFFECTIVE DATE.—The amendment made by paragraph (1) shall take effect and apply beginning with the first report required under subsection (c) of section 1 of Public Law 108–235 that is submitted after the date of the enactment of this Act.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from

New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 353, a bill to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I will start by thanking Mr. YOHO for his work on this bill. It passed the House last Congress with broad bipartisan support, and I look forward to seeing that happen again today.

Mr. Speaker, we all know too well that disease knows no borders, so it is in the interest of the United States to address global health challenges. Without the ability to consistently monitor threats and rapidly coordinate responses globally, health and lives will be at risk, including those of Americans.

A critical organization in this global public health effort is the World Health Organization's World Health Assembly. This is a summit meeting of countries coming together to address global health challenges.

China is actively lobbying against Taiwan's inclusion in these summit meetings, part of its larger effort to squeeze Taiwan out of the international community. Beijing may believe this serves its own narrow interests in asserting control over Taiwan, but it is to the detriment of the effort to fight disease wherever it strikes.

This bill before us today is a step to rectify this situation. H.R. 353 enhances reporting requirements, which will provide Congress better insight into our administration's efforts to obtain Taiwan's observer status in the annual World Health Assembly meetings.

We need to make every effort to ensure that China does not strong-arm and manipulate these international meetings, which are important opportunities to make significant progress on health issues facing the global community. This progress should not be jeopardized by Beijing's political agenda.

I support this measure. We should continue to stand with our partners in Taiwan, and this resolution does just that. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill to help Taiwan regain observer sta-

tus in the World Health Organization, introduced by my good friend from Florida (Mr. YOHO).

The House passed this bill unanimously last Congress. Because Taiwan has an especially distinguished record of international contributions to global health, Taiwan's exclusion from the WHO is not just unfair, it is also dangerous.

The world is more and more interconnected, and pandemics are a constantly growing threat that can cross borders at the speed of a jetliner. Unfortunately, President Xi and the Communist Party of China continue to jeopardize global health in their campaign to marginalize Taiwan.

Taiwan has been totally excluded from participating at the WHO's World Health Assembly for 2 years running. Ultimately, Taiwan's expulsion from the WHO illustrates a broader trend. Taiwan is a model democracy that makes the world better, while China is a revisionist authoritarian power that places the world at risk.

This year will be significant for U.S.-Taiwan relations as we look forward to the 40th anniversary of the Taiwan Relations Act.

Xi Jinping just delivered a speech, where he reiterated a willingness to use force against Taiwan, and said: "The Taiwan issue will disappear with the rejuvenation of the nation."

I urge my colleagues to start this year on the right foot by supporting Taiwan's WHO participation and telling President Xi that Taiwan will never disappear under our watch.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. CHABOT), a cosponsor of this bill.

Mr. CHABOT. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman from Texas for yielding, and I rise in support of H.R. 353, which would direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to regain observer status for Taiwan in the World Health Organization.

I thank Mr. YOHO for his leadership on this important issue, and I thank Mr. ENGEL as well as my colleague from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) for this as well. They have both been leaders on this for a long time.

As a long-time friend of Taiwan and strong supporter of our bilateral relationship, I believe it is essential that they be allowed to participate in the World Health Organization.

Taiwan has been routinely marginalized and barred from participation in multilateral organizations, despite being a model participant in the global community and routinely contributing to global health advancement.

Between 2008 and 2015, Taiwan was invited to participate as an observer at the annual meeting of the World Health Assembly, the governing body of WHO. Unfortunately, in its efforts to

isolate President Tsai, China has effectively blocked Taipei from receiving an invitation for the past 3 years by erroneously tying Taiwan's participation to the so-called One China policy.

Beijing is playing politics with not only the health of Taiwan's people, but with the health of the entire international community because, as Mr. MCCAUL mentioned, the health of the world is linked, and so the PRC is essentially putting all our health at risk by being belligerent in this particular area.

This is particularly ridiculous because being an observer of WHA is not limited to countries, and so participation does not imply Taiwanese independence.

Furthermore, Taiwan should be allowed to participate on its own merits. It is a de facto country and should be treated as such, and it would be if it weren't for China's bullying. The sooner the world stops participating in Beijing's fiction that Taiwan is part of China, the better.

I urge my colleagues to support H.R. 353.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, diseases and pandemics know no borders. Taiwan is a critical player in the global health and the internationally connected transportation hub. By excluding Taiwan from participation in the WHO, the Communist Party of China is placing the world at risk because of their own insecurities.

I again thank Mr. YOHO and Chairman ENGEL for this bill which deserves our unanimous support.

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

□ 1700

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

We have supported a strong U.S.-Taiwan relationship since we passed the Taiwan Relations Act back in 1979. It is critical that we continue to support our close friend and partner, Taiwan, on the world stage and ensure they maintain a seat at the table when discussing global health challenges.

But China sees it differently, in pursuit of its own narrow political agenda. Beijing is jeopardizing international efforts to improve global health and fight transnational disease outbreaks by redoubling efforts to prevent Taiwan from participating in organizations like the World Health Assembly.

Our response to global health challenges and crises is stronger when more countries are involved in the discussion and prevention. After all, diseases go from border to border and across borders. It is ridiculous to try to keep Taiwan out.

Our response to global health challenges is stronger, again, when more countries are involved in prevention.

There is no reason that the international community should accept a scenario where we allow Beijing to compromise global health as they play the bully with respect to their neighbor. That is another reason why Kosovo should be admitted as well.

I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this measure, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JOHNSON of Texas. Mr. Speaker, many of the members who serve in this chamber, myself included, value the important relationship the United States shares with Taiwan. To this end, The House of Representatives unanimously passed legislation in the 115th Congress similar to the bill that is being debated today. Both bills direct the Secretary of State to develop a strategy to assist Taiwan in regaining observer status at the World Health Organization.

As a cosponsor of H.R. 3320 in the 115th Congress, I commend the gentleman from the great state of Florida for bringing this bill to the floor early in this Congress. Taiwan has been a model member of the global health community, having served as an observer in the World Health Assembly from 2009 until 2016. Taiwan has also contributed in enhancing regional and global disease prevention networks, along with working with other countries to ensure the World Health Organization's vision of health being a fundamental human right is successfully met.

While some outside actors try to prevent Taiwan from contributing to the global health community as an observer at the World Health Organization, it is important for all of us to realize that the best way to address the challenges of today and tomorrow with regards to global health is to work together, rather than exclude parties due to geopolitics. Mr. Speaker, I urge all of my colleagues to support H.R. 353.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 353.

The question was taken; and (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NATO SUPPORT ACT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 676) to reiterate the support of the Congress of the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 676

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "NATO Support Act".

SEC. 2. FINDINGS.

Congress finds that:

(1) The North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO), which came into being through the North Atlantic Treaty, which entered

into force on April 4, 1949, between the United States of America and the other founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, has served as a pillar of international peace and stability, a critical component of United States security, and a deterrent against adversaries and external threats.

(2) The House of Representatives affirmed in H. Res. 397, on June 27, 2017, that—

(A) NATO is one of the most successful military alliances in history, deterring the outbreak of another world war, protecting the territorial integrity of its members, and seeing the Cold War through to a peaceful conclusion;

(B) NATO remains the foundation of United States foreign policy to promote a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace;

(C) the United States is solemnly committed to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization's principle of collective defense as enumerated in Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty; and

(D) the House of Representatives—

(i) strongly supports the decision at the NATO Wales Summit in 2014 that each alliance member would aim to spend at least 2 percent of its nation's gross domestic product on defense by 2024;

(ii) condemns any threat to the sovereignty, territorial integrity, freedom and democracy of any NATO ally; and

(iii) welcomes the Republic of Montenegro as the 29th member of the NATO Alliance.

SEC. 3. SENSE OF CONGRESS.

It is the sense of Congress that—

(1) the President shall not withdraw the United States from NATO; and

(2) the case *Goldwater v. Carter* is not controlling legal precedent with respect to the withdrawal of the United States from a treaty.

SEC. 4. STATEMENT OF POLICY.

It is the policy of the United States—

(1) to remain a member in good standing of NATO;

(2) to reject any efforts to withdraw the United States from NATO, or to indirectly withdraw from NATO by condemning or reducing contributions to NATO structures, activities, or operations, in a manner that creates a de facto withdrawal;

(3) to continue to work with NATO members to meet their 2014 Wales Defense Investment Pledge commitments; and

(4) to support robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.

SEC. 5. PROHIBITION ON THE USE OF FUNDS TO WITHDRAW FROM NATO.

Notwithstanding any other provision of law, no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty, done at Washington, DC on April 4, 1949, between the United States of America and the other founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 676, reit-

erating the support of the Congress of the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, currently under consideration.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking the author of this bill, the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA). I was glad to join him as an original cosponsor, and I am grateful as well to our ranking member, Mr. MCCAUL, for his strong support of this legislation.

Mr. Speaker, for nearly 70 years, the NATO alliance has been the bedrock of transatlantic peace, security, and stability. For seven decades, NATO has been synonymous with Western democracy.

The organization's architects had a tremendous vision, and that vision translated into the most successful political military alliance in history, an alliance that won the Cold War, that brought peace to the Balkans, that fought terrorism in Afghanistan, that today is guarding against Russian aggression in Europe and training forces in Iraq and elsewhere.

Now, Mr. Speaker, we have heard, most notably from the President, that NATO is obsolete, that it is ill-suited to 21st century challenges. That is just plain wrong.

Would we be safer without Article 5, the principle that says an attack on one is an attack on all, an attack on one NATO member is an attack on all NATO members, the commitment that brought our NATO allies to fight at our side after September 11? Would we be better off without 28 other countries that share our values and that know how to fight together effectively? Of course not.

NATO is not a burden, Mr. Speaker. It is a bulwark against aggressive forces that seek to undermine democracy and the rule of law, against strongmen who flout international law and act as though might makes right.

NATO is our greatest strategic advantage, one built over time and at great sacrifice. We simply cannot cede such an advantage. Past and future generations alike would never forgive the squandering of something so precious. We cannot betray our young soldiers, sailors, airmen, and marines by sending them into battle alone, without capable allies to share the burden.

So this bill, again, reiterates Congress' commitment to NATO. It would also prohibit any withdrawal from NATO.

I am glad we are considering it so early in this Congress. It sends a clear message to our allies, to our adversaries, and to the administration that this branch of government fully supports the alliance, the collective defense of our allies, and peace across the North Atlantic region.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today to endorse the NATO Support Act. We are rapidly approaching the 70th anniversary of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, a fitting time for the House to reaffirm the importance of the transatlantic alliance.

NATO was born out of the chaos of World War II and built to fortify European democracies against Soviet totalitarianism. Time and again, the alliance has proven that the free peoples of the world are strongest when they stand together.

From the confrontation with communism during the Cold War, to the defeat of Milosevic in Kosovo, to the battlefields of Afghanistan, American soldiers and those of her NATO allies have fought and bled together to protect our country and to make others free.

This alliance has enhanced our military capability, increased our intelligence collection, and created a bulwark against international terror. NATO is critical to our national security and to the preservation of our military prowess around the world.

It solidifies our friendship with the individual countries in the alliance. But friends also must be honest with each other. That is why I am glad that this bill strongly supports the decision of the Wales Summit in 2014, that each member country should ramp up defense spending to 2 percent of their GDP.

An alliance of mutual defense is only as strong as each country's commitment to its spending goals. While some member countries have made great strides toward this commitment, others are still lagging behind.

Statements of support, like this bill, are important in affirming our relationships around the world. But actions speak louder than words. No statement about the importance of NATO speaks as loudly as the tangible commitment each country makes to ensuring the strength of the alliance.

In the meantime, I am glad to join this effort to reaffirm the continuing importance of NATO, which deserves our full support.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. PANETTA), the author of this legislation who has worked very hard on this legislation.

Mr. PANETTA. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate this opportunity. Obviously, I would like to share my appreciation of Chairman ENGEL for everything that he has done as a leader of all of his constituents in his district and, more importantly, all of our fellow countrymen and -women here in the United States of America; as well as Ranking Member McCAUL; and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), my good friend.

Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 676, the NATO Support Act. This is a bipartisan bill that allows

Congress to assert our Nation's support for NATO; to answer anybody who questions the purpose of this alliance; and to reaffirm the NATO pledge, that an armed attack on one of us is an attack on all of us.

The mutual defense pledge is why NATO has been the most successful military alliance in human history. It is an interdependency that has stood as a sturdy, strong, and sound anchor for peace that has prevented new world wars, fostered Western prosperity, and advanced democratic governance.

It has been the will of our Nation, the United States of America, to lead and to finance the defense of other nations, which has allowed them to develop and prosper economically, and to expand and evolve democratically.

Yet, at the same time, Moscow never went to war with a NATO partner. We got bases and a guarantee that we would not have to fight alone. Europe became our largest trading and investment partner and our chief diplomatic and military companion. And everybody on the European Continent got stability and peace to strengthen their democracies.

Now, all of us agree that we can continue to put pressure on our NATO partners to pay their self-stated goal of 2 percent of their GDP to this alliance. But that doesn't mean that we want to get out of NATO. In fact, doing such would be a historic mistake.

NATO is not—is not—a transactional relationship. Our sole focus can't be just on who pays and who gets what. Being a part of NATO is not like being a part of a country club. Instead, we value our NATO partners, and more importantly, we realize that the power of the NATO partnership is absolutely—absolutely—invaluable. The tangible results prove it, not just what we have seen in the past, but what we are seeing now.

In our enduring fight against terrorism, our NATO partners' will to join that effort was demonstrated just hours after the attack on 9/11, as partner nations volunteered to invoke Article 5.

Now, I served alongside many troops from many NATO countries during my service in Afghanistan from 2007 to 2008. I left that country in 2008, but I can tell you, after 17 years of war, NATO troops are still there, serving alongside our sons and daughters who are serving in uniform.

When it comes to Russia, our NATO partners will continue to play an important role as a deterrent for their aggression, and they will continue to coordinate and collaborate with us as we not only ready for a conventional war but also push back against Russia's use of hybrid warfare.

NATO is instrumental in setting us apart from Russia. Why? We have allies that will stand by us; Russia does not. That is the foundation for our NATO partnership, and that is the foundation for the NATO Support Act, an act that rejects efforts to withdraw from NATO

and prohibits any funds to be used as such.

It supports increased defense spending by NATO partners, as well as the funding of the European Deterrence Initiative to deter against Russian aggression. It reaffirms our unwavering support of NATO, not only as a defense pledge, not only as a partnership, but as a proven core for an international order that favors democracy and peace.

Once again, Mr. Speaker, I thank Chairman ENGEL. I also thank Daniel Silverberg from Majority Leader Hoyer's staff, Jacqueline Ramos from the Foreign Affairs Committee, and Matt Manning and Jay Hernandez from my office.

Mr. Speaker, I respectfully thank and ask all of my colleagues, Republican and Democrat, for their support on H.R. 676, the bipartisan NATO Support Act.

Mr. McCAUL. Mr. Speaker, in the spirit of the bipartisanship behind supporting this bill, I yield 2 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY).

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I do want to take a moment to clarify a conversation we had here on the floor last week on sanctions legislation against Mr. Deripaska, a Russian oligarch. My remarks were passionate and aimed at the administration's proposed policy to lift sanctions on that individual. In no way did my remarks intend to reflect on the integrity of my friend from Texas, who was, in fact, co-managing the bill to oppose that action.

As my friend from Texas knows, I admire him deeply, and I believe that he is a leader of integrity. Nothing I said last week was meant in any way to deflect from that. I wanted to clarify that publicly on the floor.

I thank my good friend for yielding me time, and I look forward to talking about the issue at hand. I, again, thank my good friend from Texas.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. CONNOLLY), a very respected member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. CONNOLLY. Mr. Speaker, I thank my dear friend, the distinguished chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, and I thank my friend, the distinguished ranking member of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, for helping Mr. PANETTA bring this bill to the floor.

I rise today in support of H.R. 676, the NATO Support Act, reiterating congressional support for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization and prohibiting U.S. withdrawal from that organization.

As we mark 70 years of the NATO alliance this year, it is critical we recognize the invaluable role that NATO has played in protecting U.S. national interests and global stability.

NATO remains the foundation of U.S. foreign policy to promote a Europe that is whole, free, and at peace. NATO

has invoked Article 5, the commitment to collective defense, only once in 70 years, and that invocation was on behalf of the United States after we were attacked on 9/11.

As a result, nearly one-third of the fatalities suffered by coalition forces when we fought in Afghanistan to rid that country of al-Qaida and the Taliban—one-third of the casualties—were from non-U.S. NATO member and partner countries.

□ 1715

They put their blood and their flesh on the line on behalf of this country as part of that alliance.

Despite these sacrifices, unfortunately, our President has questioned the value of NATO and falsely claimed that NATO allies owe the United States money.

As head of the United States delegation to the NATO Parliamentary Assembly and rapporteur for the political committee of that assembly, I can attest to the anxiety within NATO regarding this administration's commitment to the alliance.

Case in point: one can't talk about the U.S. commitment to Article 5 in 2019 without mentioning President Trump's failure to embrace it in full view of our NATO allies during his first Presidential trip to Brussels in 2017.

This past summer at NATO's annual summit in Brussels, President Trump injected further discord into the alliance by calling our NATO ally, Germany, a "captive of Russia" and demanding that "delinquent" alliance members increase their defense spending "immediately."

The President's provocative comments undermined the summit's goal of projecting unity in the face of renewed Russian aggression, especially given that they occurred just days before what turned out to be a very difficult, if not disastrous, Helsinki summit with Vladimir Putin.

Meanwhile, Russia continues its forcible and illegal occupation in the Crimea, eastern Ukraine, Abkhazia and South Ossetia in Georgia, and parts of Moldova, and its attack on democracies throughout Europe and even in our own country.

Mr. Speaker, that is why I urge my colleagues to support Mr. PANETTA's bill. This bill affirms the U.S. support for NATO and preempts any attempts to withdraw from the same.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, let me first say to Mr. CONNOLLY, we have a lot of passionate partisan debates on this floor, but I have to say, that was a class act on his part, and I thank him for his comments.

Mr. Speaker, I yield 3 minutes to the gentleman from Texas (Mr. HURD), an original cosponsor of the bill.

Mr. HURD of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am proud to join with my colleagues to introduce this bipartisan bill to reaffirm the commitment of Congress to the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, as we know it. We call it NATO.

For 70 years now, almost 1 billion people from Los Angeles and London, to Tallinn and Thessaloniki have lived in peace and prosperity, in no small part due to the security provided by NATO.

As a CIA officer in Afghanistan, like my friend and colleague from California, I had the opportunity to serve side by side with NATO forces in the fight against al-Qaida and the Taliban. I saw every day the professionalism and dedication of these brave men and women who, like our soldiers, were fighting to protect their nations and way of life.

More than 1,000 NATO soldiers paid the ultimate sacrifice fighting alongside the United States in Afghanistan.

In the global fight against terrorism, NATO allies have stood with us time and time again. As my friend from the Commonwealth of Virginia noted, in NATO's entire history, 9/11 was the first time the alliance invoked Article 5, the commitment that an attack against one ally is an attack against all.

In our darkest hour, every member of NATO answered the call to fight terror at home and abroad.

In Europe, NATO countries continued to deter Russia from threatening our democratic partners. Through military exercises in forward deployments in Eastern Europe, we have demonstrated our shared resolve against the aggressive ambitions of Vladimir Putin. That includes a stronger commitment by our allies to provide for their own defense. They have spent over \$2.8 trillion on defense in the last decade, with spending increasing for the fourth straight year in 2018.

These partners, not Russia, are our true friends, and we must always stand with them.

We face many shared challenges, and the only way we can overcome them is by working together and continuing the strong transatlantic bond that unites our Nations.

Mr. Speaker, I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting this legislation. It is an honor to work alongside my friend from the great State of California, Mr. PANETTA, the chairman, and the ranking member of this important committee.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I have no further speakers. I am prepared to close, and I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, we cannot overstate the critical role that NATO has played in the history of the 20th century, and for 7 decades, it has been the cornerstone of international security and a force for freedom around the world.

I look forward to its continued vitality in defending America and our allies for another 70 years.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me again, in closing, thank my friend from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL); Mr. PANETTA; our majority leader, Mr. HOYER; and all of this bill's sponsors.

As this debate has made perfectly clear, there is no partisan disagreement in this body when it comes to the importance of NATO.

Right now, we are dealing with an adversary in Russia that desires nothing more than to see the western alliance splinter. Vladimir Putin's aim is to undermine democracy, to split us apart from our allies, to drive division in the organizations that have kept Russia in check.

The last thing the United States should do is send mixed signals about our commitment, as this President, unfortunately, has done. It plays right into Putin's hands.

From Congress, you will get no such ambiguity. We hope our allies hear that and we hope Putin hears it as well.

Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to support this bill strongly, I urge Members to do the same, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Ms. JACKSON LEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in strong support of H.R. 676, critical legislation that expresses the unified opposition of Congress to any attempt by the President to withdraw from the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO) and reaffirms that it is the policy of the United States to remain a member in good standing of NATO and its commitment to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty and its principle of collective defense.

In the aftermath of World War II, the greatest conflict in all of human history, the United States, Canada, and their Western Europe allies founded the North American Treaty Organization (NATO) on April 14, 1949 in Washington, D.C.

Founded on the principle of collective defense, Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty states that, "The Parties agree that an armed attack against one or more of them in Europe or North America shall be considered an attack against them all."

In the 69 years since the Treaty's ratification, Article 5 has only been invoked once, following the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001, when NATO members came to the aid of the United States.

NATO sent seven planes with 830 crewmen from 13 countries to protect American skies until May 2002, marking the first time in American history that the continental United States was protected by foreign forces.

NATO allies and partners have stood with the United States in joint operations in the Western Balkans, Afghanistan, Iraq, and elsewhere around the world.

Until the current President took office, every American president since the treaty's signing in 1949—Truman, Eisenhower, Kennedy, Johnson, Nixon, Ford, Carter, Reagan, George H.W. Bush, Clinton, George W. Bush, and Obama—has publicly reaffirmed the American commitment to Article 5.

American presidents have affirmed this nation's commitment to come to the aid of any NATO member that is under attack.

That is the symbolic meaning of the immortal words spoken by President Kennedy in

West Berlin at the Brandenburg Gate in 1963: "Ich bien ein Berliner."

Mr. Speaker, the principle of collective defense is the core of NATO's founding treaty and the NATO alliance has been the backbone of American national security and foreign policy for nearly 70 years.

The strength and solidarity of this western alliance kept Western Europe whole, prosperous, and free and paved the way for the collapse of the Soviet Union and the liberation of the nations of Eastern and Central Europe, many of which have now been integrated into NATO.

The Constitution of the United States grants Congress the sole power to declare war, but Article 5 does not increase the chance of war.

Rather, NATO is a bulwark against the outbreak of war because it deters aggression by any adversary.

As a result, NATO is the most successful military alliance in world history, successfully deterring the outbreak of a third world war, seeing the Cold War to a victorious conclusion, and protecting the principle of territorial integrity.

This is why I strongly support H.R. 676, which reaffirms the commitment of the Congress to Article 5 of the North Atlantic Treaty.

The legislation also expresses support for the agreement reached at the 2014 NATO Wales Summit calling upon each NATO member nation to allocate at least two percent of its gross domestic product to defense by 2024.

The legislation also expresses congressional support for robust United States funding for the European Deterrence Initiative, which increases the ability of the United States and its allies to deter and defend against Russian aggression.

Finally, H.R. 676 provides that no funds are authorized to be appropriated, obligated, or expended to take any action to withdraw the United States from the North Atlantic Treaty signed on April 14, 1949, in Washington, D.C., between the United States of America and the other 15 founding members of the North Atlantic Treaty 16 Organization.

I urge all Members to join me in affirming the commitment of the United States to the North Atlantic Treaty, which has kept the peace on the European continent for nearly 70 years and continues to serve as a bulwark and deterrent to Russian aggression and its long-held strategic objective of splitting the Western Alliance that has done more than any other collective enterprise in history to preserve and maintain international peace.

Mr. KINZINGER. Mr. Speaker, I rise today in support of H.R. 676, the NATO Support Act.

For almost 70 years, the North Atlantic Treaty Organization has formed the cornerstone of national security policy for the post-war world order. Through this alliance, we have successfully defeated communism, halted genocide in the Balkans, defended against threats from terrorism in Afghanistan, and maintained cohesion with our like-minded democratic partners. By forming these relationships, we have successfully defended our values and principles in the face of repression and tyranny. While we no longer face the same existential threat posed by the Soviet Union, NATO's resolve and stability has helped maintain peace in a world drowning with strongmen. That is why I stand in support this bipartisan legislation.

H.R. 676 codifies Congressional support of the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, while calling on our allies to modernize their capabilities and meet the Wales Defense Investment Pledge. Five years ago, NATO members agreed to reverse their declining defense budgets and balance the responsibilities that come with our partnership. While it was an ambitious goal, we have already seen many of our partners increase their commitments to our mutual security by meeting the agreed upon threshold of spending 2 percent of GDP on defense.

As part of our commitment, we must continue to support the European Deterrence Initiative, by maintaining a robust U.S. presence throughout the European theater. Most importantly, this legislation would ensure that no matter which way the political winds blow no administration could use funds to withdraw from this treaty without the consent of the co-equal branch of government in Congress.

NATO is not some outdated relic from past conflicts. We are living in a world where repression is on the rise, and human freedom is increasingly in jeopardy. What our partnership stands for, what NATO defends—it gives hope to the repressed. That is why I urge my colleagues in joining me in passing this legislation.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 676.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

HACK YOUR STATE DEPARTMENT ACT

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I move to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 328) to require the Secretary of State to design and establish a Vulnerability Disclosure Process (VDP) to improve Department of State cybersecurity and a bug bounty program to identify and report vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department of State, and for other purposes.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The text of the bill is as follows:

H.R. 328

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled,

SECTION 1. SHORT TITLE.

This Act may be cited as the "Hack Your State Department Act".

SEC. 2. DEFINITIONS.

In this Act:

(1) **BUG BOUNTY PROGRAM.**—The term "bug bounty program" means a program under which an approved individual, organization, or company is temporarily authorized to identify and report vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department in exchange for compensation.

(2) **DEPARTMENT.**—The term "Department" means the Department of State.

(3) **INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY.**—The term "information technology" has the meaning given such term in section 11101 of title 40, United States Code.

(4) **SECRETARY.**—The term "Secretary" means the Secretary of State.

SEC. 3. DEPARTMENT OF STATE VULNERABILITY DISCLOSURE PROCESS.

(a) **IN GENERAL.**—Not later than 180 days after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall design, establish, and make publicly known a Vulnerability Disclosure Process (VDP) to improve Department cybersecurity by—

(1) providing security researchers with clear guidelines for—

(A) conducting vulnerability discovery activities directed at Department information technology; and

(B) submitting discovered security vulnerabilities to the Department; and

(2) creating Department procedures and infrastructure to receive and fix discovered vulnerabilities.

(b) **REQUIREMENTS.**—In establishing the VDP pursuant to paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(1) identify which Department information technology should be included in the process;

(2) determine whether the process should differentiate among and specify the types of security vulnerabilities that may be targeted;

(3) provide a readily available means of reporting discovered security vulnerabilities and the form in which such vulnerabilities should be reported;

(4) identify which Department offices and positions will be responsible for receiving, prioritizing, and addressing security vulnerability disclosure reports;

(5) consult with the Attorney General regarding how to ensure that individuals, organizations, and companies that comply with the requirements of the process are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, and similar provisions of law for specific activities authorized under the process;

(6) consult with the relevant offices at the Department of Defense that were responsible for launching the 2016 Vulnerability Disclosure Program, "Hack the Pentagon", and subsequent Department of Defense bug bounty programs;

(7) engage qualified interested persons, including nongovernmental sector representatives, about the structure of the process as constructive and to the extent practicable; and

(8) award contracts to entities, as necessary, to manage the process and implement the remediation of discovered security vulnerabilities.

(c) **ANNUAL REPORTS.**—Not later than 180 days after the establishment of the VDP under subsection (a) and annually thereafter for the next six years, the Secretary of State shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives and the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate a report on the VDP, including information relating to the following:

(1) The number and severity, in accordance with the National Vulnerabilities Database of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, of security vulnerabilities reported.

(2) The number of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities remediated as a result.

(3) The current number of outstanding previously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department of State remediation plans.

(4) The average length of time between the reporting of security vulnerabilities and remediation of such vulnerabilities.

(5) The resources, surge staffing, roles, and responsibilities within the Department used to implement the VDP and complete security vulnerability remediation.

(6) Any other information the Secretary determines relevant.

SEC. 4. DEPARTMENT OF STATE BUG BOUNTY PILOT PROGRAM.

(a) ESTABLISHMENT OF PILOT PROGRAM.—

(1) IN GENERAL.—Not later than one year after the date of the enactment of this Act, the Secretary shall establish a bug bounty pilot program to minimize security vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology of the Department.

(2) REQUIREMENTS.—In establishing the pilot program described in paragraph (1), the Secretary shall—

(A) provide compensation for reports of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities within the websites, applications, and other internet-facing information technology of the Department that are accessible to the public;

(B) award contracts to entities, as necessary, to manage such pilot program and for executing the remediation of security vulnerabilities identified pursuant to subparagraph (A);

(C) identify which Department information technology should be included in such pilot program;

(D) consult with the Attorney General on how to ensure that individuals, organizations, or companies that comply with the requirements of such pilot program are protected from prosecution under section 1030 of title 18, United States Code, and similar provisions of law for specific activities authorized under such pilot program;

(E) consult with the relevant offices at the Department of Defense that were responsible for launching the 2016 “Hack the Pentagon” pilot program and subsequent Department of Defense bug bounty programs;

(F) develop a process by which an approved individual, organization, or company can register with the entity referred to in subparagraph (B), submit to a background check as determined by the Department, and receive a determination as to eligibility for participation in such pilot program;

(G) engage qualified interested persons, including nongovernmental sector representatives, about the structure of such pilot program as constructive and to the extent practicable; and

(H) consult with relevant United States Government officials to ensure that such pilot program complements persistent network and vulnerability scans of the Department of State’s internet-accessible systems, such as the scans conducted pursuant to Binding Operational Directive BOD-15-01.

(3) DURATION.—The pilot program established under paragraph (1) should be short-term in duration and not last longer than one year.

(b) REPORT.—Not later than 180 days after the date on which the bug bounty pilot program under subsection (a) is completed, the Secretary shall submit to the Committee on Foreign Relations of the Senate and the Committee on Foreign Affairs of the House of Representatives a report on such pilot program, including information relating to—

(1) the number of approved individuals, organizations, or companies involved in such pilot program, broken down by the number of approved individuals, organizations, or companies that—

(A) registered;

(B) were approved;

(C) submitted security vulnerabilities; and

(D) received compensation;

(2) the number and severity, in accordance with the National Vulnerabilities Database of the National Institute of Standards and Technology, of security vulnerabilities reported as part of such pilot program;

(3) the number of previously unidentified security vulnerabilities remediated as a result of such pilot program;

(4) the current number of outstanding previously unidentified security vulnerabilities and Department remediation plans;

(5) the average length of time between the reporting of security vulnerabilities and remediation of such vulnerabilities;

(6) the types of compensation provided under such pilot program; and

(7) the lessons learned from such pilot program.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to the rule, the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) and the gentleman from Texas (Mr. MCCAUL) each will control 20 minutes.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York.

GENERAL LEAVE

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to revise and extend their remarks and include extraneous material on H.R. 328, the Hack Your State Department Act.

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

There was no objection.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I might consume.

Mr. Speaker, let me start by thanking Representative LIEU, a valued member of the Committee on Foreign Affairs, for his hard work on this bill and on everything else.

This important legislation passed the House in the last Congress with strong bipartisan support, and I certainly support passing it again.

Mr. Speaker, it is critical that we modernize our government to better deal with 21st century challenges. The State Department is under the constant threat of cyberattack from foreign actors bent on stealing our secrets, disrupting our foreign policy, and undermining our security.

Mr. LIEU’s bill will help shore up the State Department against this sort of intrusion.

First, it requires the Secretary of State to get out ahead of this problem. Instead of waiting for the next attack to happen, this bill would mandate a plan for researchers to actively seek out and report vulnerabilities.

Secondly, this bill launches a new initiative, the so-called “bug bounty program.” This seeks to tap the expertise of everyday Americans by rewarding citizens who uncover and report security risks in the Department’s computer system. It will allow security researchers and friendly hackers to find the cracks in the system so that the Department can patch them.

This effort is modeled after a successful program at the Defense Department, which got off the ground in 2016. Since then, 1,400 people have registered to participate, and they have found roughly 140 vulnerabilities.

Our Federal agencies should learn from one another. It is just common sense to put this tested practice to work at the State Department and elsewhere.

Mr. Speaker, I am very glad to support this bill, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself as much time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Hack Your State Department Act, which will help address lingering cybersecurity gaps at the Department of State.

The massive breach of the State Department’s unclassified computer network in 2014 exposed grave weaknesses.

In the years since that attack, problems have continued to mount. The Department’s cybersecurity response program received a “D” rating, the lowest of any agency, on its Federal Information Security Management Act report card in 2017.

Last September, the Department revealed that it recently suffered a breach of its unclassified email system, which exposed the personal information of some of its employees.

The Department needs cost-effective solutions to these IT security challenges.

Today’s legislation directs the Secretary of State to develop and implement a vulnerability disclosure process that will allow threat researchers from the private sector to identify and report cybersecurity flaws.

Currently, there is no legal avenue that allows them to do so. This bill fixes that problem.

The bill will establish a “bug bounty” pilot program to reward ethical hackers for discovering and reporting vulnerabilities at the Department.

These programs have been used successfully by the Defense Department and numerous private companies to improve their cyber defenses at minimal cost. In fact, I remember introducing a similar bill for the Department of Homeland Security.

As a national security agency, the State Department must do more to secure its networks. The Hack Your State Department Act is a small but important step towards cost-effective solutions.

Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the author, Mr. LIEU, for putting his computer science background to work here in the Congress, and he understands, I believe, the nature of the threats that we face in the cyber realm and the importance of a strong cybersecurity partnership between the public and the private sectors.

Mr. Speaker, I urge support, and I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 4 minutes to the gentleman from California (Mr. TED LIEU), the author of this bill and a very honored member of the Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. TED LIEU of California. Mr. Speaker, I thank Ranking Member

MCCAUL for his support of this legislation and I thank Chairman ENGEL for his leadership of the House Foreign Affairs Committee.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of my legislation, H.R. 328, which will strengthen cybersecurity at the State Department. This legislation is known as the Hack Your State Department Act. It is introduced with my colleague, TED YOHO of Florida, and has received strong bipartisan support, and that is because there is no such thing as Republican cybersecurity or Democratic cybersecurity; it is just cybersecurity, and we are behind.

American institutions are under constant attack from criminals, from foreign intelligence services, and from everyday hackers. That is why last term, I was very honored to have introduced legislation known as the Hack DHS Act, along with Senators MAGGIE HASSAN, ROB PORTMAN, KAMALA HARRIS, and Congressman SCOTT TAYLOR. That legislation was signed into law last month.

This legislation focuses on the State Department. It is something that we need to do, because we know that the State Department over the years has faced mounting cybersecurity threats from both criminal enterprises and state-sponsored hackers.

In 2014, for instance, the Department was infiltrated by Russian hackers and had to temporarily shut down its email system.

Last year, the State Department suffered another breach of its email system, exposing the personal information of a number of its employees.

As a recovering computer science major, I recognize there are improvement tools at our disposal to improve cybersecurity that the State Department has not yet adopted, and one such tool is exactly what this bill will do.

□ 1730

This bill does primarily two things. The first is to establish what is called a vulnerability disclosure process, which sets clear rules of the road so, when people outside the Department discover vulnerabilities on Department systems, they can report it in a safe, secure, and legal manner, with the confidence that the State Department will actually fix the problems. We cannot afford to allow vulnerabilities discovered in the wild remain known to hackers but unknown to the Department. This should be an easy fix.

The second step is to actually pay vetted, white hat hackers to find vulnerabilities. The Department of Defense proved the success of the bug bounty program back in 2016. Over a 24-day period, the Pentagon learned of and fixed over 138 vulnerabilities in its systems. The DHS is now also going to start this very same program. Hopefully, the State Department will be able to do this, as well, when this legislation is signed into law.

Let me conclude by saying that, today, with H.R. 328, the House of Rep-

resentatives is taking these recommendations to heart and helping to improve cybersecurity at the Department of State.

Mr. MCCAUL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

In closing, I want to again thank the author, Mr. LIEU, and his primary sponsor, Mr. YOHO, for this creative effort to harness private-sector know-how to improve cyber defenses at the Department of State.

As the gentleman, Mr. LIEU, indicated, I moved this very same legislation when I was chairman of the Homeland Security Committee for the Department of Homeland Security, and I believe it is working very effectively. The Department of Defense has done the same thing. Now it is time for the Department of State to take on this challenge as well.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself such time as I may consume.

Mr. Speaker, I again want to thank Mr. LIEU for this important piece of legislation.

It seems to me, Mr. Speaker, that we have been caught flat-footed before a range of new threats, including cyberattacks. Our agencies haven't done enough to root out vulnerabilities, and, frankly, Congress hasn't done enough to make sure that our government agencies have the tools they need to tackle these challenges.

As we head into the 116th Congress, I will be leading the Foreign Affairs Committee in focusing on this. We will be taking a comprehensive look at cyber threats to make sure the State Department and all our departments and agencies are properly equipped to handle this challenge. For now, this bill is an important step in the right direction.

Mr. Speaker, I urge all Members to support the measure before us, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill, H.R. 328.

The question was taken.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. In the opinion of the Chair, two-thirds being in the affirmative, the ayes have it.

Mr. ENGEL. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

The yeas and nays were ordered.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, further proceedings on this motion will be postponed.

RESIGNATION FROM THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

The SPEAKER pro tempore laid before the House the following resignation from the House of Representatives:

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 17, 2019.

Hon. NANCY PELOSI,
Speaker of the House of Representatives,
Washington, DC.

SPEAKER PELOSI: I write to you to tender my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, 12th District of Pennsylvania, effective 12:01 a.m. Wednesday January 23, 2019.

Sincerely,

TOM MARINO,
Member of Congress.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES,
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, DC, January 17, 2019.

Hon. TOM WOLF,
Governor,
Harrisburg, PA.

GOVERNOR WOLF: I write to you to tender my resignation from the U.S. House of Representatives, 12th District of Pennsylvania, effective 12:01 a.m. Wednesday January 23, 2019.

Sincerely,

TOM MARINO,
Member of Congress.

RECESS

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 12(a) of rule I, the Chair declares the House in recess until approximately 6:30 p.m. today.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 33 minutes p.m.), the House stood in recess.

□ 1830

AFTER RECESS

The recess having expired, the House was called to order by the Speaker pro tempore (Mr. CUELLAR) at 6 o'clock and 30 minutes p.m.

ANNOUNCEMENT BY THE SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Proceedings will resume on questions previously postponed.

Votes will be taken in the following order:

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 676;

Motion to suspend the rules and pass H.R. 328; and

Agreeing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, if ordered.

The first electronic vote will be conducted as a 15-minute vote. Pursuant to clause 9 of rule XX, remaining electronic votes will be conducted as 5-minute votes.

NATO SUPPORT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 676), to reiterate the support of the Congress of the United States for the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by

the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 357, nays 22, not voting 54, as follows:

[Roll No. 44]

YEAS—357

- Adams Deutch Krishnamoorthi
Aderholt Diaz-Balart Kuster (NH)
Aguilar Doggett Kustoff (TN)
Allred Doyle, Michael LaHood
Amodi F. LaMalfa
Armstrong Duncan Lamb
Axne Dunn Langevin
Babin Emmer Larsen (WA)
Bacon Engel Larson (CT)
Balderson Escobar Latta
Banks Eshoo Lawrence
Barragan Espallat Lawson (FL)
Beatty Evans Lee (CA)
Bera Ferguson Lee (NV)
Bergman Finkenauer Lesko
Beyer Fitzpatrick Levin (CA)
Billirakis Fleischmann Levin (MI)
Bishop (GA) Fletcher Lewis
Bishop (UT) Flores Lieu, Ted
Blumenauer Fortenberry Lofgren
Blunt Rochester Foster Long
Bonamici Foxx (NC) Loudermilk
Bost Frankel Lowenthal
Boyle, Brendan Gallagher Lowey
F. Gallego Lucas
Brady Garamendi Luetkemeyer
Brindisi Garcia (IL) Lujan
Brooks (AL) Garcia (TX) Luria
Brooks (IN) Gianforte Lynch
Brown (MD) Golden Malinowski
Brownley (CA) Gomez Maloney,
Buck Gonzalez (OH) Carolyn B.
Bustos Gooden Maloney, Sean
Butterfield Gottheimer Marshall
Byrne Granger Mast
Calvert Graves (GA) Matsui
Carbajal Graves (LA) McAdams
Cárdenas Graves (MO) McBath
Carson (IN) Green (TN) McCarthy
Carter (GA) Green (TX) McCaul
Carter (TX) Grijalva McCollum
Case Grothman McEachin
Casten (IL) Guest McHenry
Castor (FL) Guthrie McKinley
Castro (TX) Haaland Meeks
Chabot Hagedorn Meng
Cheney Hastings Meuser
Chu, Judy Miller Mitchell
Cicilline Heck Moolenaar
Cisneros Hern, Kevin Mooney (WV)
Clark (MA) Herrera Beutler Mooney (WV)
Clarke (NY) Higgins (LA) Moore
Clay Higgins (NY) Morelle
Cleaver Hill (AR) Mucarsel-Powell
Cloud Hill (CA) Mullin
Clyburn Himes Murphy
Cohen Holding Nadler
Cole Horn, Kendra S. Napolitano
Collins (GA) Horsford Neguse
Comer Houlihan Newhouse
Conaway Hoyer Norcross
Connolly Huffman Norman
Cook Huizenga Nunes
Cooper Hunter O'Halleran
Correa Hurd (TX) Ocasio-Cortez
Costa Jackson Lee Olson
Courtney Jayapal Omar
Cox (CA) Jeffries Palazzo
Craig Johnson (GA) Pallone
Crawford Johnson (LA) Palmer
Crenshaw Johnson (OH) Panetta
Crist Johnson (TX) Pappas
Crow Joyce (OH) Pascrell
Cuellar Joyce (PA) Pence
Cummings Kaptur Perlmutter
Cunningham Katko Peters
Curtis Keating Peterson
Davids (KS) Kelly (IL) Phillips
Davidson (OH) Kelly (MS) Pingree
Davis (CA) Kelly (PA) Posey
Davis, Danny K. Kennedy Pressley
Davis, Rodney Khanna Price (NC)
Dean Kildee Quigley
DeGette Kilmer Raskin
DelBene Kim Ratcliffe
Delgado King (IA) Reed
Demings Kinzinger Reschenthaler
DeSaulnier Kirkpatrick Rice (NY)

- Rice (SC) Sires
Richmond Slotkin
Riggleman Smith (MO)
Roby Smith (NE)
Rogers (WA) Smith (NJ)
Roe, David P. Smith (WA)
Rogers (AL) Smucker
Rogers (KY) Soto
Rose (NY) Spanberger
Rouda Spano
Rouzer Speier
Roybal-Allard Stanton
Ruiz Stauber
Ruppersberger Stefanik
Rutherford Ruthenford
Ryan Stevens
Sarbanes Stewart
Scalise Stivers
Scanlon Suozzi
Schiff Takano
Schneider Taylor
Schraeder Thompson (CA)
Schrier Thompson (MS)
Schweikert Thompson (PA)
Scott (VA) Thornberry
Scott, Austin Timmons
Scott, David Tipton
Serrano Titus
Sewell (AL) Tlaib
Shalala Tonko
Sherman Torres (CA)
Sherrill Torres Small
Simpson (NM)

NAYS—22

- Allen Gohmert
Amash Gosar
Biggs Griffith
Burchett Harris
Cline Hice (GA)
Jordan Jordan
Massie Massie
McClintock McClintock

NOT VOTING—54

- Abraham Gibbs
Arrington Gonzalez (TX)
Baird Gardner (CA)
Barr Hartzler
Bass Hollingsworth
Buchanan Hudson
Bucshon Johnson (SD)
Budd Jones
Burgess Kind
Cartwright King (NY)
Collins (NY) Lamborn
DeFazio Lipinski
DeLauro Loebback
Dingell Marchant
Duffy Marino
Estes McGovern
Fudge McNeely
Gabbard Moulton

□ 1900

Mr. WEBER of Texas changed his vote from "yea" to "nay."

Messrs. DAVIDSON of Ohio and BROOKS of Alabama changed their vote from "nay" to "yea."

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

HACK YOUR STATE DEPARTMENT ACT

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the vote on the motion to suspend the rules and pass the bill (H.R. 328) to require the Secretary of State to design and establish a Vulnerability Disclosure Process (VDP) to improve Department of State cybersecurity and a bug bounty program to identify and report vulnerabilities of internet-facing information technology

of the Department of State, and for other purposes, on which the yeas and nays were ordered.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the motion offered by the gentleman from New York (Mr. ENGEL) that the House suspend the rules and pass the bill.

This is a 5-minute vote.

The vote was taken by electronic device, and there were—yeas 377, nays 3, not voting 53, as follows:

[Roll No. 45]

YEAS—377

- Adams Cunningham Houlihan
Aderholt Curtis Hoyer
Aguilar Davids (KS) Huffman
Allen Davidson (OH) Huizenga
Allred Davis (CA) Hunter
Amodi Davis, Danny K. Hurd (TX)
Armstrong Davis, Rodney Jackson Lee
Axne Dean Jayapal
Babin DeGette Jeffries
Bacon DelBene Johnson (GA)
Baird Delgado Johnson (LA)
Balderson Demings Johnson (OH)
Banks DeSaulnier Johnson (SD)
Barragan DesJarlais Johnson (TX)
Beatty Jordan
Bera Diaz-Balart Joyce (OH)
Bergman Doyle, Michael Joyce (PA)
Beyer F. Kaptur
Billirakis Duncan Katko
Bishop (GA) Dunn Keating
Bishop (UT) Emmer Kelly (IL)
Blumenauer Engel Kelly (MS)
Blunt Rochester Escobar Kelly (PA)
Bonamici Eshoo Kennedy
Bost Espallat Khanna
Boyle, Brendan Evans Kildee
F. Ferguson Kilmer
Brady Finkenauer Kim
Brindisi Fitzpatrick King (IA)
Brooks (AL) Fleischmann Kinzinger
Brooks (IN) Fletcher Kirkpatrick
Brown (MD) Flores Krishnamoorthi
Brownley (CA) Fortenberry Kuster (NH)
Buck Foster Kustoff (TN)
Burchett Foxx (NC) LaHood
Butterfield Frankel LaMalfa
Byrne Gaetz Lamb
Calvert Gallagher Langevin
Carbajal Gallego Larson (CT)
Cárdenas Garamendi Latta
Carson (IN) Garcia (IL) Lawrence
Carter (GA) Garcia (TX) Lawson (FL)
Carter (TX) Gianforte Lee (CA)
Case Gohmert Lee (NV)
Casten (IL) Golden Lesko
Castor (FL) Gomez Levin (CA)
Castro (TX) Gonzalez (OH) Levin (MI)
Chabot Gosar Lieu, Ted
Cheney Gottheimer Lofgren
Chu, Judy Granger Long
Cicilline Graves (GA) Loudermilk
Cisneros Herrera Beutler Lowenthal
Clark (MA) Graves (LA) Lowey
Clarke (NY) Graves (MO) Lucas
Clay Green (TN) Luetkemeyer
Cleaver Green (TX) Mullin
Cline Griffith Lujan
Cloud Grijalva Luria
Clyburn Grothman Lynch
Cohen Guest Malinowski
Cole Guthrie Maloney,
Collins (GA) Haaland Carolyn B.
Comer Hagedorn Maloney, Sean
Conaway Harris Marshall
Connolly Hastings Mast
Cook Hayes Matsui
Cooper Heck McAdams
Correa Hern, Kevin McBath
Costa Herrera Beutler McCarthy
Courtney Hice (GA) McCaul
Cox (CA) Higgins (LA) McClintock
Craig Higgins (NY) McCollum
Crawford Hill (AR) McEachin
Crenshaw Hill (CA) McHenry
Crist Himes McKinley
Crow Holding Meadows
Cuellar Horn, Kendra S. Meeks
Cummings Horsford Meng

Meuser	Rogers (AL)	Takano
Miller	Rogers (KY)	Taylor
Mitchell	Rose (NY)	Thompson (CA)
Moolenaar	Rose, John W.	Thompson (MS)
Mooney (WV)	Rouda	Thompson (PA)
Moore	Rouzer	Thornberry
Morelle	Roy	Timmons
Mucarsel-Powell	Roybal-Allard	Tipton
Mullin	Ruiz	Titus
Murphy	Ruppersberger	Tlaib
Nadler	Rutherford	Tonko
Napolitano	Ryan	Torres (CA)
Neguse	Sarbanes	Torres Small (NM)
Newhouse	Scalise	Trahan
Norcross	Scanlon	Trone
Norman	Schiff	Turner
Nunes	Schneider	Underwood
O'Halleran	Schrader	Upton
Ocasio-Cortez	Schrier	Van Drew
Olson	Schweikert	Veasey
Omar	Scott (VA)	Vela
Palazzo	Scott, Austin	Visclosky
Pallone	Scott, David	Wagner
Palmer	Serrano	Walberg
Panetta	Sewell (AL)	Walker
Pappas	Shalala	Walorski
Pascrell	Sherman	Waltz
Pence	Sherrill	Wasserman
Perlmutter	Simpson	Schultz
Perry	Sires	Waters
Peters	Slotkin	Watkins
Peterson	Smith (MO)	Watson Coleman
Phillips	Smith (NE)	Weber (TX)
Phingree	Smith (NJ)	Webster (FL)
Posey	Smith (WA)	Welch
Pressley	Smucker	Wenstrup
Price (NC)	Soto	Westerman
Quigley	Spanberger	Wexton
Raskin	Speier	Wild
Ratcliffe	Stanton	Williams
Reed	Stauber	Wilson (SC)
Reschenthaler	Stefanik	Wittman
Rice (NY)	Steil	Womack
Rice (SC)	Steube	Yarmuth
Richmond	Stevens	Young
Riggleman	Stewart	Zeldin
Roby	Stivers	
Rodgers (WA)	Suozzi	
Roe, David P.		

NAYS—3

Amash	Biggs	Massie
-------	-------	--------

NOT VOTING—53

Abraham	Gibbs	Payne
Arrington	Gonzalez (TX)	Pocan
Barr	Harder (CA)	Porter
Bass	Hartzler	Rooney (FL)
Buchanan	Hollingsworth	Rush
Bucshon	Hudson	Sánchez
Budd	Jones	Schakowsky
Burgess	Kind	Sensenbrenner
Cartwright	King (NY)	Shimkus
Collins (NY)	Lamborn	Swalwell (CA)
DeFazio	Lipinski	Vargas
DeLauro	Loeb sack	Velázquez
Dingell	Marchant	Walden
Doggett	Marino	Wilson (FL)
Duffy	McGovern	Woodall
Estes	McNerney	Wright
Fudge	Moulton	Yoho
Gabbard	Neal	

□ 1910

So (two-thirds being in the affirmative) the rules were suspended and the bill was passed.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. WALDEN. Mr. Speaker, I was unable to be present for votes on January 22nd due to unavoidable travel delays. Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on rollcall No. 44 and "yea" on rollcall No. 45.

THE JOURNAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Pursuant to clause 8 of rule XX, the unfinished business is the question on agree-

ing to the Speaker's approval of the Journal, which the Chair will put de novo.

The question is on the Speaker's approval of the Journal.

Pursuant to clause 1, rule I, the Journal stands approved.

REPORT ON RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.R. 648, CONSOLIDATED APPROPRIATIONS ACT, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF H.J. RES. 31, FURTHER CONTINUING APPROPRIATIONS FOR DEPARTMENT OF HOMELAND SECURITY, 2019; PROVIDING FOR CONSIDERATION OF MOTIONS TO SUSPEND THE RULES; AND WAIVING A REQUIREMENT OF CLAUSE 6(a) OF RULE XIII WITH RESPECT TO CONSIDERATION OF CERTAIN RESOLUTIONS REPORTED FROM THE COMMITTEE ON RULES

Mr. MORELLE, from the Committee on Rules, submitted a privileged report (Rept. No. 116-4) on the resolution (H. Res. 61) providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 648) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 31) making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules, which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed.

□ 1915

TRUMP SHUTDOWN IMPACT ON SNAP RECIPIENTS

(Ms. KAPTUR asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute.)

Ms. KAPTUR. Mr. Speaker, by now, you have seen the images of furloughed public servants lined up at food banks across our beloved country. This is a sight seen in communities everywhere, including throughout northern Ohio.

I rise today to call attention to the misery the Trump shutdown is creating for millions of hardworking Americans who now have to rely on food assistance to get by: working people who have to be degraded in this way.

Federal workers, who rely on SNAP food assistance through the U.S. Department of Agriculture, face daily uncertainty from the Trump shutdown. The early distribution of benefits received last week represents the February SNAP allocation, a sum that they will be asked to stretch to a date not yet determined.

Mr. Speaker, this is unacceptable. President Trump should immediately act to protect SNAP benefits, reopen

the Federal Government, and bring Federal workers back to work with paychecks they have earned.

If you are a furloughed Federal worker and face hunger issues, please do not hesitate to reach out to your local food bank. You can locate your local food bank through "Feeding America" to plan for the uncertain.

200TH ANNIVERSARY OF THE UNIVERSITY OF CINCINNATI

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

Mr. WENSTRUP. Mr. Speaker, I rise to acknowledge the 200th anniversary of the founding of the University of Cincinnati, my alma mater.

University of Cincinnati began as the two original chartered colleges by the State of Ohio. In January of 1819, the two merged into the esteemed university we know today.

Cincinnati is recognized as a Carnegie Research 1 university, with over 300,000 alumni across the Nation, and is the home to top programs in both the liberal arts and the sciences.

In 1969, Cincinnati was the first college to implement a co-op program, setting the stage for universities around the country, enhancing workforce development across America.

It is incredible to see how far this fine institution has come: from two small colleges so long ago, to the home of the Nation's first teaching hospital, to the fourth oldest continuously operating law school, to its glory today.

I know the University of Cincinnati will continue to inspire those who are lucky enough to call her home.

HONORING THE KNIGHTS OF COLUMBUS

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

Mr. RUTHERFORD. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize and honor the Knights of Columbus, a fraternal Catholic organization dedicated to charitable action.

Some of my colleagues have recently made disparaging comments about the mission of the Knights of Columbus, and I want to be clear: As a member of that proud organization, I am very proud of their humanitarian mission.

In 2017 alone, the Knights of Columbus raised \$185 million in charitable contributions and contributed 75 million hours of service worldwide.

The Knights of Columbus stand firmly for protecting life in all its forms, most especially the unborn. They recently donated their one thousandth ultrasound machine to women's pregnancy centers in the U.S. and around the world.

Studies have shown that women who view these ultrasounds of their unborn child are much more likely to carry that child to term.

So on today's anniversary of the Roe v. Wade decision; let's listen to the words of Carl Anderson, leader of the Knights of Columbus, who said:

"What greater legacy can a person have than to save a child's life?"

RECOGNIZING ROGER MOSS

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

Mr. CARTER of Georgia. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to recognize my good friend, Mr. Roger Moss, who is stepping down as director of the Savannah Children's Choir.

Mr. Moss started the Savannah Children's Choir in 2006, with 30 kids, aiming to transform children into confident leaders through music education. Now, the choir is booming. It mentors hundreds of students, and the choir has gone on to award-winning performances throughout Europe.

The choir has brought children of diverse backgrounds together for a common purpose, winning praise from countless parents, who have seen significant improvements in their children's ambitions, demeanor, creativity, and much more.

I thank Mr. Moss for his important work in the Savannah community. However, I understand his work will continue as he is beginning a new school: the Savannah Exploratory Charter Academy. We are, indeed, very fortunate in Savannah that Roger Moss has adopted us as his home and brought his immense talents with him.

Mr. Speaker, I wish Mr. Moss the best of luck with his new project.

HONORING AL TOWNS

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

Mr. OLSON. Mr. Speaker, 10 years and 17 days ago, I was given the honor of working for the people of Texas 22 in Washington, D.C. They are my bosses. And one of my bosses was born on January 30 of 1918. His name is Al Towns.

Al was alive during World War I. Al fought in World War II. He started as a lowly private. Twenty-two years later, he retired as an O-6, a full bird colonel.

Al then joined NASA and helped us go to the Moon in 1969.

At Al's 101st birthday party next week, I am sure he will share pearls of wisdom, like: "If you want to get something done, give it to a woman. She may step on some toes, but she will get it done." Or, the key to living to 101 years old: "Don't think too far ahead."

Mr. Speaker, Texas 22 says to Al, "Roger that. Wilco. Happy birthday."

And that is just the way it is.

NATIONAL SCHOOL CHOICE WEEK

(Mr. LAMALFA asked and was given permission to address the House for 1

minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to express my support for National School Choice Week, because I believe that every family should be able to choose a school that is right for their children's needs.

School choice is important because it gives families the autonomy and freedom to do what is in their own children's best interests. It also creates competition and education, through which we can really begin to achieve excellence and innovation.

There is enough evidence to suggest that competition created by more education options increases college readiness and better prepares many students for life after the classroom.

It opens up balanced opportunities for students and their families, whether that is traditional public schools, public charter schools, public magnet schools, private schools, online academies, or other alternatives. That is because what may be right for one family and their children may not be right for their neighbors' kids.

National School Choice Week recognizes the need for families to make that decision for themselves. Your child only goes each step in their education one time. Let's make the most of each year of a child's education opportunity, not subject them to experiments.

GOVERNMENT SHUTDOWN

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. HORSFORD). 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, it is time for us to, once again, ponder the inevitable: that the government of the United States is important in this world; that the strongest country in the entire world ought to have the strongest operating government; that all across this globe people once looked to America as the symbol of leadership, as the symbol of opportunity, as the country where things got done, and a government that functioned, sort of functioned. We have had our ups and downs, but really the United States was always a symbol that other countries would point to and say: Well, there is a democracy. It has its ups and downs, but it has worked. It has been a place where we could look to for leadership.

We are now 32 days into the shutdown of the government of the most important country in the world.

What in the world is our President thinking? What is going on here? How did we come to this situation?

Before we get into all of the harm that is being done by this government shutdown, let's understand how we got here.

Every January, early February, the administration—the President—puts

forward his proposed budget for the coming year. The House and the Senate take that under submission and begin the process of preparing the appropriations and the laws, the changes to enact, or not enact, the proposals that the President has put forth.

□ 1930

In that submission, President Trump proposed \$1.6 billion for border security. The House looked at it, the Senate looked at it, and, ultimately, the Senate passed an appropriation of \$1.6 billion.

Unfortunately, that appropriation was caught up in other debates and other arguments, and the Department of Homeland Security that was supposed to receive the \$1.6 billion, together with the Department of the Interior, the EPA, Department of Transportation, Department of Justice, and several other agencies, was not funded for the whole year but, rather, funded from October 1 until the following Thanksgiving.

Then an additional CR, continuing resolution, was passed until December 11, and that \$1.6 billion was part of that discussion. On December 10, maybe December 11, the Senate unanimously passed another continuing resolution that had \$1.6 billion in it, and that continuing resolution was to go until February 8.

The next morning, when that bill arrived over here in the House of Representatives to be taken up and to pass through to keep the government open until February, in the intervening 13 hours, something happened. The President changed his mind and said, not \$1.6 billion. He demanded \$5 billion. And in a conference at the White House with the leaders, he said: "If we don't get what we want . . . I am proud to shut down the government . . . I will take the mantle. . . ."

So on that morning of the 11th, the House of Representatives amended the bill and said, nope, it is not \$1.6 billion. It is \$5 billion, because that is what the President wanted, and the government shut down.

I thank the President. At the very last moment, he changed the game: not \$1.6 billion, which we were prepared to accept and keep the government open, but \$5 billion, and the government shut.

In the intervening days, as the debate went on, the \$5 billion grew to \$5.7 billion for a border wall.

Now, don't misunderstand. Changes during the course of a year are common, and it is common for the administration to make a change in its budget. That is called a budget change proposal.

It comes to the Congress, the House and the Senate, with all of the reasons—a big stack of paper—all of the reasons why the change should take place: some new; something happened and we have got to deal with it; or, we need more money for this. And a budget change proposal comes to us with all of the justification.

To this day, 32 days into this shutdown, Congress has not received a formal budget change proposal, nor has Congress received any detail about where the \$5.7 billion wall will be built—somewhere on the Mexican-American border. That is 1,900 miles.

Will it be used to repair fences?

Will it be added in some areas?

What are the reasons why it would be added?

None of that has been provided here. So here we are 32 days into it, and the most important government in this world is shut down.

This border wall is supposed to bring security to America. Wow, wait a minute. You are talking about security? You are talking about safety? You are talking about making the lives of America more secure? How do you do that when the government is shut down?

All of the military is working. Thank God that appropriation passed. But the Department of Homeland Security is not, except for those frontline officers who are considered to be essential. All of the backroom operation isn't operating.

The Coast Guard is out there on the water, in the ports, but those men and women are not being paid, 40,000 of them, a few more, not being paid. Many of them cannot pay for gas to get to their jobs.

TSA is operating, but the rest of that backroom operation is not. Transportation is not operating. The parks are closed. The Smithsonian is closed. The kind of safety that the American public depends upon from its government is not operating.

There were headlines a week ago about the President somehow being compromised by Russia. What would be the best that Putin could ever want?

You go to war to take over a government, to shut down a government. You don't have to go to war to shut down the American Government. You go to the President, who gladly says that he is proud to shut down the American Government.

Putin has to be incredibly happy that his nemesis, America, the government is shut down.

I have got a lot to talk about tonight, and joining me are some of my colleagues who will be talking about the effect of the shutdown in their area.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from California (Mr. COSTA), my colleague and dear friend of many years.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, Congressman GARAMENDI has demonstrated leadership both here in our Nation's capital and when we worked together in Sacramento, and I commend his efforts and thank him for yielding to me.

The government shutdown is simply irresponsible. The American public understands that a Congress debates a budget, the President submits his proposal, and we go through our committee hearing process. We make modifications and changes. You win some

and you lose some. But by October 1, we are supposed to have a budget sent to the President, and he is supposed to sign it into law.

Now, guess what. A budget is among the most important things we do as Members of Congress, and it is the Nation's spending priorities. It is thousands of spending priorities. There are some things we like in the budget, and there are some things that we would change. But our Nation has to have a budget, just like every family has a budget, every business has a budget.

In that family budget or the business budget, there are things you would rather not pay—a house payment, a car payment—but we have obligations and commitments to make and have to be responsible.

This government shutdown, this manufactured crisis orchestrated by the President in which he proudly proclaimed that he would take ownership of it—they can call it the Trump shutdown, as he said so boldly in December—is the Trump shutdown. It is simply irresponsible.

I think the American public, for good reason, regardless of their registration, is frustrated, and I suspect many of them, like myself, are fed up.

I went through the airport security this morning as I did last week, as I did the week before, and I thanked those security officers with TSA for doing their job. They are doing their job. And guess what. They are doing it without pay. That is disgraceful. It is just not what the shining democracy of America is about, leader of the free world.

But it doesn't stop there. There are over 53,000 TSA employees around the country, 54,000 ICE officers, and 42,000 Coast Guard Active-Duty members who are working without pay.

Mr. Speaker, I ask the President, how would it be if he were to suggest to his employees at his hotels and at his golf courses—whom he has to pay every 2 weeks or every month—that he wants them to come to work but he is not going to pay them?

It is immoral, and it is certainly not the American way. We don't expect people to come to work and then not pay them.

This manufactured crisis—and believe me, it is a manufactured crisis—is the real cause for us all to be concerned about national security. I mean, the challenges we have at the border, these Border Patrol agents, these Coast Guard Active-Duty members are protecting our security, and we are saying: Well, but, you know, we don't care if you have a house payment. We don't care if you have a car payment. We don't care if you have other commitments and obligations. We expect you to come to work and to protect our security, and we are not going to do anything to, in fact, take that into account. In a way, that is clearly a dereliction of our duties.

Mr. Speaker, I would say to the President that it is a dereliction of his duty, because he has a responsibility,

just as we do, to ensure that our government is fully functioning. We have passed the President's bills and sent them to him which would fully fund and reopen the government.

Last Friday, Congressman Cox and I had an informal workshop at the Subway sandwich store in the building where my office is, where I work on behalf of the people of the San Joaquin Valley. In that 10-story office building are 1,300 IRS employees. That Subway sandwich store has lost over 50 percent of its business in the last month. The two owners, the man and the wife, are being impacted.

The store in the lobby, it has lost 70 percent of its business. And there is another kabob restaurant in which he is helping, sometimes, the employees who are still hanging around there by giving them sandwiches, but this is his business.

So it is not just the direct impact of over 800,000 government employees across this country, people who work for the USDA, the United States Department of Agriculture, who operate the farm service agencies throughout our constituencies.

Our farmers, our ranchers, and our dairymen can't go to those Farm Service Agency offices and apply for loans and other things that are important with regard to this crazy tariff war that is taking place because, guess what. Those offices are closed.

But it is also the ripple effect for businesses that have contracts with the Federal Government, whether it is with the United States Forest Service or whether it is with other departments and agencies. They are not getting paid.

But guess what. They have got employees, and they have got a contract that they signed with the United States Government that says they were going to get paid every month, and they have commitments to their employees.

This is the President's shutdown, and 32 days into it, none of us should be proud of where we are today. Third-world countries are looking at us and wondering: America doesn't do that.

But we are looking like a third-world country. Countries around the world just don't shut down their government.

Let me close on this note. This is a phenomena that has happened, really, in the last 8 years. We had a government shutdown in the mid-1990s by President Clinton and Speaker Gingrich, and that was not a good thing.

Normally, as Congressman GARAMENDI suggested, you have budget requests. You have debate in committees. You pass segments of the budget, and it comes together in an orderly process. Ultimately, both the House and the Senate pass that budget and send it to the President by October 1.

I think there is another principle here that we need to be very clear about to the American public. I don't care which party it is. We should not allow bad behavior to be rewarded in

this sense. If you don't like something in the budget—and there are a lot of things I don't like in the budget—at the end of the day, you have got to have a budget.

□ 1945

What is happening here is that this is a manufactured crisis that the President is using to hold hostage a campaign promise he made 2 years ago to build this wall.

By the way, Mr. Speaker, wasn't Mexico going to pay for the wall?

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I believe so.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I say to Congressman GARAMENDI, that is what I heard.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Over and over.

Mr. COSTA. I heard it not once, not twice, but more times than I care to remember. Clearly, Mexico is not going to pay for the wall.

Mr. Speaker, Mr. GARAMENDI and I know that there is bipartisan willingness to improve border security. The gentleman and I know, because we are from California, that the majority of the drug trafficking and the other crimes that are occurring are through what we call ports of legal entry. That sounds like a complicated technical term, but it just means it is an open border crossing between the U.S. and Mexico, and thousands of people cross every day at many of these border crossings. That is where the overwhelming majority of the illegal trafficking is taking place, and along the ocean. And no bill, no bright and shiny 30-foot wall, will make a difference.

El Chapo, whom we are holding now in prison, built tunnels to get out of prison. There are tunnels under existing walls that the President was briefed on when he went down to the border last week.

Mr. Speaker, I don't care how the wall is built, because it is not going to improve border security.

Mind you, we have more than 500 miles of existing barriers and fences at the San Ysidro border, and some of the other portions of the U.S.-Mexican border, where it makes sense. Certainly, I am willing to provide support to improve those existing barriers and to provide the sort of equipment, drones, and other technical devices that are cutting edge, that Border Patrol agents and ICE agents say will improve our border security. That is what we should be doing.

But what we should not be doing is holding America hostage because of a political campaign promise that was made 2 years ago. That is wrong. That is simply wrong.

Mr. Speaker, Congressman GARAMENDI is to be commended for taking a leadership role in this effort. We have to do some things here that change the debate and how we produce a budget so that we don't allow groups of either party—our extreme elements—to decide: Well, gee, I am not going to go through the regular proc-

ess. I will hold this Congress and I will hold the American people hostage.

This is impacting our GDP. If the President doesn't believe us, he should ask his own Council of Economic Advisers, because they came out with a report last week. It is not affecting only our economy, but it, therefore, affects the world's economy. That is why we need to reopen government and have a thoughtful debate on how we can, on a bipartisan basis, improve our border security.

Of the \$1.2 billion we allocated in last year's budget for border security, this administration, I am told, has spent around 10 percent of that \$1.2 billion. Now we were going to give him another \$1.6 billion. Then the President—I know we are getting close to the Super Bowl—to use a football analogy, on December 18, when we thought we had an agreement, he decided to move the goalposts. I can't say it any plainer than that.

Mr. Speaker, I ask Congressman GARAMENDI if he can.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, if I might, I say to Mr. COSTA that is exactly what he did. In the negotiations, before inviting the leaders in, agreement had been reached with both Houses. We were going to move forward. The President changed his mind, demanded \$5 billion, and took credit. He said: I will shut the government down, and I will take credit for it.

Indeed, the credit goes to him.

The gentleman said things that are very interesting. The gentleman went back to the Gingrich shutdown. That reminded me, at that time, I was actually at the Department of the Interior. There was nobody in the Department of the Interior except three of us in that entire department who were working.

Then there was the TED CRUZ shutdown, and then there were two other short shutdowns having to do with one or the other of the fiscal cliffs. In every case, our Republican colleagues—Gingrich, TED CRUZ, other leadership, and now the President—have used the American Government as a hostage to get something that they wanted. Senator CRUZ wanted to kill the Affordable Care Act. I don't recall, but I think Gingrich was over some tax issues or some financial issues, fiscal issues. But in every case, they used the government as the hostage.

Now, over in the Senate, Senate Majority Leader MCCONNELL is cobbling together a piece of legislation that would affect the rest of Americans.

Let me just show you some things here. He is taking a piece of legislation that we passed last week—it was the supplemental Disaster Relief Act to provide additional money. In this case, this is Paradise, California, where some 18,000 homes were destroyed and 87 people killed. The President was there, together with Governor Brown and our new Governor, Mr. Newsom. It is a supplemental disaster recovery program that we passed last week. It is over in the Senate.

I understand that Senator MCCONNELL is going to take that bill and literally hold not just Paradise, California, but also Puerto Rico.

Does the gentleman remember the hurricane in Puerto Rico?

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I was in Puerto Rico last weekend, and the recovery funding is a serious matter, as it is in Paradise. It is simply wrong. It is wrong and immoral for us to do this.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, he intends to hold Puerto Rico hostage, along with South Carolina; Houston, Texas; and southern California, the Ventura area, all of which have incurred a natural disaster and, in this case, a dam breaking in Puerto Rico.

In the case of Paradise, California—the great fire that occurred there and the wipeout of a community of 30,000 people—it is now being held hostage for the border wall. So not only do we have the U.S. Government hostage—and the American economy with 800,000 employees who are not getting paid—we are now using the supplemental disaster recovery, some \$12 billion that would go to recover these communities that have been wiped out that are now being held hostage.

So the gentleman said earlier that there is something immoral about this, that to use people's lives and their ability to recover, their ability to sustain their family, to get a paycheck, to work for the American Government to keep this economy moving, to be held hostage somehow is terribly, terribly wrong. But that is what the President is doing. And, apparently, that is what Senator MCCONNELL wants to do with this new bill that he intends to introduce that would hold the disaster recovery program hostage for a \$5.7 billion wall somewhere on the border, undefined. Something is terribly, terribly wrong here.

Now, there is an alternative, and I think Mr. COSTA mentioned it. We passed legislation repeatedly beginning on January 3, the first day of the new Congress, and every day thereafter. I think it is about 8 days now that we passed legislation to open the government. That is, the new Democratic majority has done that to open the government. All of those bills are over on the Senate side.

There is a clean bill that is also open for discussion on the Senate side this week. It is the bill that we passed last week. It would fund the government at the appropriations level that the Senate agreed to, \$1.6 billion for border security and all the other programs all worked out in a great compromise. That bill passed the House last week. It is sitting over in the Senate.

There would be one exception to full funding for the remainder of this year—that is until September 30—and that is the Department of Homeland Security, which controls the border. That would be a temporary continuing resolution until February. I think it is the 28th of February.

Mr. COSTA. Mr. Speaker, I think until the end of February, which would

allow us to debate appropriate border security in a committee process in the House and in the Senate, working together with this administration and the President. There would be give and take. There would be compromises. I think we should get back to doing the people's business in an appropriate fashion, without taking hostages, because it is simply wrong. We should not let the American public think that we have lost sight of what the regular order of the United States Congress is to pass appropriations bills and, ultimately, to pass a budget.

That is where this incredibly egregious activity is taking place in recent years. I think we know that, at some point, there will be a series of compromises, and we will reopen government. So why don't we just do it sooner rather than later and end the pain and anguish of hundreds of thousands of people who are protecting our security—they are hardworking men and women of our country—without paychecks?

All the other independent contractors who do business with the government and who have employees or have small businesses, like that Subway sandwich shop in Fresno or the market or the kabob restaurant, let these people do what they do best—work hard and make a living for themselves and their families, and contribute to our economy—because what we are doing right now is wrong.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, Mr. COSTA mentioned the Subway sandwich shop. When I was back in my district over the weekend, I was contacted by a small company operating in Davis, California, that has technology that the TSA would employ at the airports to keep us all safer. They will go out of business. They have 13 employees. Their contract is sitting, not finished. They are not getting paid for past work that they have done. They just said: We don't know how we will continue here.

It is a good program. It is necessary for security at the airports. That is just one example.

The gentleman mentioned the farmers. I have farmers in my district with the same problem. I have universities with research contracts that are being held up. All of that is being held up.

The reality is that the most important government of the world is not operating. When they say it is just 25 percent, that is 25 percent of the money. It happens to be 80 to 85 percent of the activities of the government.

Mr. COSTA. And the ripple effect.

Mr. GARAMENDI. And the ripple effect all the way through.

Mr. COSTA. To our national parks.

Mr. Speaker, let me close by underlining one comment that Mr. GARAMENDI made earlier. I know, as a member of the Armed Services Committee, the gentleman is one of our leaders as it relates to our Nation's security. And I am engaged with a host of other efforts in our Foreign Affairs

Committee and with our European allies. When the gentleman said that no one could be happier about this series of events than the President of Russia, President Putin, let me underline that, because we are doing to ourselves what the Soviet Union and Russia today have never been able to do to us, which is undermine our security, undermine NATO's security, and undermine the security of the free world.

That is how serious this is. This manufactured crisis has now risen to such a level that we are doing to ourselves what our adversaries have never been able to do to us through decades of Republican and Democratic Presidents and Congresses in which, at the water's edge, we all bind together because it is America's security. I don't know how they celebrate in Moscow, but right now, they must be very pleased this evening, with smiles on their faces, as we look at the 32 days of this government shutdown.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman so very much for joining us and bringing to our attention the issues in his district, as well as his experience.

The final words that he has said ring in my ears, and I am sure they ring in the ears of people around this world who are looking at the United States and saying: What is going on there? What is this all about?

There is much, much more to say. I will go through a couple things very, very quickly here.

There are 800,000 government employees across the Nation—in California, there are 37,542—who are not being paid but still working. They are furloughed, and they are wondering how they will meet their mortgages and how they will meet their bills.

□ 2000

We also know that this shutdown is approaching the 1-month mark. And very, very soon, if we don't act and we don't get this government back up and working, there are 45,714,688 people in the United States who will lose their SNAP benefits—these are the food stamps—in other words, their ability to have food on their tables—45,714,000 people.

The day of reckoning for these people is coming very soon. The exact day is not exactly known, but it is toward the end of this month or the first weeks of February. So let's keep in mind those 45 million people who depend upon food stamps.

In my own district, just upstream from the district is the Oroville Dam, which came close to collapsing and put at risk nearly 200,000 people downstream from it. Part of the disaster recovery is to shore up the levees downstream from the Oroville Dam, but that is now being used as a hostage by Senator MCCONNELL.

It is unconscionable what is going on here in America, and it is not necessary.

Democrats have always supported border security—always supported bor-

der security—and we have supported walls along the border. In 2006, almost 700 miles of border fencing and walls were built. In California, in the Tijuana-San Diego border area, those walls have been there for nearly 30 years, maybe even longer than that.

The point here is border security is more than a wall, and if the President wants a wall, he needs to tell us where and why.

Why is it more important than upgrading the ports of entry, as Mr. COSTA talked about, where we know 80 to 90 percent of the drugs come through the ports of entry, the legal ports of entry? One out of five cars is checked; four are not.

The containers, the trains, the planes, the ships all coming through legal ports of entry, but we don't have the technology to check all of them, nor do we have the operations to be able to check all of the cars, all of the planes, all of the containers. So the drugs come in—even through the post office.

Wouldn't it be wise that we spend money where 80 to 90 percent of the drugs enter the United States? It is not in a bunch of children carrying backpacks who are bringing drugs into the United States. That is not where the problem is. The problem is at the ports of entry.

Mr. President, you have the authority and you have the budget today, the appropriation today, to fill 3,000 positions that have remained unfilled for more than a year, positions at the ports of entry, U.S. Customs and Border Patrol positions—3,000. Why are they not filled? If there is such an emergency, why are you not out hiring?

You were given \$1.2 billion a year ago to enhance the border security. Less than 20 percent of that money has been spent. Why? Why?

If we have a national emergency, why are you not hiring the necessary people who are authorized? Why have you not spent the money that was appropriated previously?

Why did you shut down the American Government for an ill-defined border wall that seems, in the minds of most of us, to simply be a fulfillment of a campaign pledge? What is that all about?

What is going through your mind that you ignore things that we know create security: better devices to observe what is going on, unmanned aerial vehicles to observe what is happening, sensing devices to know what is in those containers, men and women to conduct the inspections, all of those things? Why are you not doing it? Why?

Why, Mr. President, did you say that, unless you get your way, you are going to shut down the American Government; in your own words, you will take the mantle of the shutdown? In so doing, you created a real serious national security threat. Yes, you did.

You shut down the government, and, in doing so, you have created a real—a real—national security threat.

HONORING HARRIS WOFFORD, JR.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, before I terminate this, I want to change subjects.

A very, very dear friend died, and I want to bring to the attention of the House Harris Wofford.

Harris Llewellyn Wofford, Jr., was born in New York City on April 9, 1926. At the age of 11, he had the opportunity to travel around the world with his grandmother, in 1938. He experienced many defining events during that time, including what was going on in Italy with Benito Mussolini and in Germany with Hitler, the Japanese aggression in Shanghai, and Gandhi's movement in India.

His passion for creating change and fighting for progress began in earnest during those years. As the civil rights movement began, Mr. Wofford quickly became a fervent supporter of Reverend Martin Luther King, Jr., whom we remembered yesterday.

He marched alongside Reverend King for civil rights and voting rights in Selma. And during John F. Kennedy's campaign for President, Mr. Wofford played a key role in Kennedy's efforts that freed Reverend King from prison, a move that galvanized the civil rights movement and helped carry President Kennedy to the White House a year later.

Following that election, he served as President Kennedy's special assistant for civil rights and later served as the head of two colleges. And during his time with the Kennedy administration, he helped launch the Peace Corps, which my wife and I joined shortly thereafter; and that inspired Patti and me as we served 2 years in Ethiopia.

In 1991, Mr. Wofford became Pennsylvania's first Democratic Senator in more than 20 years, unseating the former Republican Governor and U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh.

As Senator, he led the effort that established the community service program, AmeriCorps. My wife, Patti, had the opportunity to work with Mr. Wofford as they, together, created the AmeriCorps program in the 1990s.

In 2008, he introduced then-Senator Barack Obama before his defining "A More Perfect Union" speech that is often credited as the origin of Obama's successful campaign for President.

In 1995, Mr. Wofford left the Senate and began serving as the chief executive at AmeriCorps, where my wife was able to work with him.

In a 2005 speech commemorating the work of French philosopher Teilhard de Chardin, Mr. Wofford, in considering the impact of the invention of nuclear weapons during World War II, said this: ". . . the burning question, above all other questions in the political world, is: How do we crack the atom of civic power and start a chain reaction of constructive force to do for peace what man has shown can be done for war? You may say that is the old question that vexed the 20th century in its occasional search for the moral equivalent

of war. For the 21st century, let's accept Teilhard's challenge and set out to discover the moral and political equivalent of fire."

Mr. Speaker, I include in the RECORD all of Mr. Wofford's speech on that day, April 11, 2005.

[From the Woodstock Forum, Apr. 11, 2005]

THE GLOBAL LEGACY OF TEILHARD DE CHARDIN—GEORGETOWN UNIVERSITY

(By Harris Wofford)

It's a special honor to participate in this 50th Anniversary commemoration of Teilhard's death—but really this is much more a celebration of his birth, his new birth that came to pass after his death when his words began to be published and spring to public life.

I would have been here earlier today listening and learning but for our family's memorial service in Philadelphia this morning for my 96-year-old stepmother, who died this week. Phyllis Taylor Wofford was the first woman Minister of the Riverside Church of New York, ordained at age 50 in 1959, just as Teilhard's books were spreading around the world.

Remembering our many discussions in the 43 years since she married my father and reading her sermons and poems this weekend, I know she was a reader of Teilhard—and I think he would have liked one of her most recurring metaphors that she attributes to her mentor, the great preacher Harry Emerson Fosdick: The Sunset of Spirit that people fear as death. "Sunset," she believed, "is only our limited human way of looking at things. Nothing has happened to the sun."

You can say that about Teilhard. The limited human way of looking at his writings led to perhaps the greatest intellectual mistake made by the Church since Galileo. The earth does move around the sun, and the sunlight of Teilhard is still there for us, even if he did not live to see it shine on the world during his lifetime.

Teilhard would have understood what my mother the Congregational minister meant when she said in her ordination statement that her studies at Union Theological Seminary started "an adventure in faith": "Doors which had been closed opened and beyond them were tremendous vistas." She said that "All the little scattered fragments of existence as I know it were at last caught up and knit together in one comprehensible whole."

In the late 1950's that is what seemed to be happening to me, in a more amateur fashion, as my heart leaped up when I first started to read Teilhard. I was ready for Teilhard—for his vision that knit together in one comprehensible whole, not only a view of the world and human destiny but a view of the ever-expanding universe of universes—the existence we are all trying to comprehend. Before there was anything of Teilhard's to read, I had committed my mind and heart to his proposition: "The Age of Nations is past. The task before us now, if we would not perish, is to build the Earth."

At age 12, in the spring of 1938, while Teilhard was in China or briefly back in France, I was looting Shanghai. Literally looting. Except for the international quarter protected by the French and British forces and the United States Marines, Shanghai had been bombed almost out of existence, and then occupied by the Japanese army. They sold looting permits to tourists and my grandmother and I were driven into the deserted Chinese city to the roofless remains of a teahouse. I went in to find some loot. Other tourists came out with china, silver and works of art. To my grandmother's dismay, I emerged with a 4-foot stuffed os-

trich—which later I tossed overboard when we sailed into Yokohama harbor.

That six-month trip around the world on the eve of World War II is no doubt what led to my later readiness for Teilhard. It sparked a lasting love affair with the world—with the Earth, Teilhard would say—and a deep-seated sense that the world is truly our stage and the frame in which all the burning questions of our time must be seen.

I returned to 7th grade as an ardent interventionist; a presumptuous, know-it-all, politically active boy who wanted America to join the war to stop Hitler and the Japanese militarists from conquering the world.

After Pearl Harbor, before entering the Army Air Corps, I started what grew into the nation-wide Student Federalist organization that became an enthusiastic part of the campaign for a union of democracies to win the war and be a nucleus of a post-war world federation with power to keep the peace.

When the United Nations was established without the power to control the atomic bomb we campaigned to strengthen it and to establish nuclear control backed by a world police force. But by then the Cold War was closing in, and the vision without which we thought people would perish became distant and dim.

Then came Teilhard's books, one by one, re-lighting the vision of world unity in the broader context of the Human Phenomenon—and of a Divine Milieu. To our realistic discouragement from the vicious circle of international power politics, he offered a different possibility: "the passionate concern for our common destiny which draws the thinking part of life ever further onward. The only truly natural and real human unity is the spirit of the Earth." This "sense of the Earth", he prophesied, would become "the irresistible pressure which will come at the right moment to unite humanity in a common passion."

And as a scientist, he spoke to the skeptics: "To the common sense of the 'man in the street' and even to a certain philosophy of the world to which nothing is possible save what has always been, perspectives such as these will seem highly improbable. But to a mind become familiar with the fantastic dimensions of the universe they will, on the contrary, seem quite natural, because they are simply proportionate with the astronomical immensities."

One last personal account of Teilhard's impact. In the presidential campaign of 1960 and for years afterward, I had the privilege of working with Sargent Shriver, the most creative social inventor of the 20th century and a lover of the words of Teilhard. A brother-in-law of President Kennedy, Shriver organized the Peace Corps and later led President Johnson's War on Poverty, along the way launching the domestic Peace Corps, the Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), the forerunner of AmeriCorps; the Job Corps; Foster Grandparents, Community Action agencies, and Legal Services for the Poor. On nights when we worked late I often found myself staying in Shriver's suite at the Mayflower Hotel or in some hotel while traveling to other countries. Each night before he turned out the lights he would read in his bed for a while, usually a book of spiritual import. Often it would be Teilhard de Chardin and the next morning he would talk about it on the way to an early mass.

Then in the Presidential campaign of 1972, after George McGovern asked Shriver to become his running mate, I was helping Sarge work on his acceptance address. As we were due to leave and the police motorcade was revving up, he was still unsatisfied with its ending. "I know how to end it," he said. "It's Teilhard de Chardin! I'm going to find the quote on a plaque in a pile upstairs." We

physically tried to stop him but he bounded out and in two minutes, came back with the plaque. He ended the address with these words of Teilhard that brought the delegates to their feet:

"The day will come when, after harnessing the winds, the tides and gravitation, we shall harness for God the energies of Love. And on that day, for the second time in the history of the world, man will have discovered fire."

No one on that day is likely to have forgotten the fire with which Shriver said that word "fire". Teilhard's watchwords became the theme of his Vice Presidential campaign and recurred again when he ran for the Democratic presidential nomination in 1976. And Sargent Shriver practiced what Teilhard preached, as he went on to help his wife Eunice and son Tim spread Special Olympics to the far corners of the world.

Let me note that those and many other words of Teilhard played a significant part in my own little journey from the Anglican Episcopal Church of my father to the wider Catholic Church centered in Rome (as the world well-observed this week of the Pope's funeral)—the church of Teilhard and the Society of Jesus. As an advocate of civil disobedience of the Gandhian and Martin Luther King kind on fundamental matters of conscience I should confess that I find it hard to fathom the faith it took for Teilhard to accept the silencing of his most important thoughts. But we can respect his agonizing decision to choose what he may have viewed as "divine obedience."

What does Teilhard's vision say to politics today—and to the burning questions of our times? To the world-wide poverty, including the poverty of spirit? To the epidemics sweeping Africa and other places that seem to be behind God's back? To the maybe a billion children who are not learning to read and go to sleep hungry at night? To all those suffering violence in the streets or in their homes, from crime or terrorism or war?

Teilhard's vision tells us to do everything in our power to find the ways and means to harness the energies of love in order to end as soon as possible the scandal that such conditions exist anywhere in the world. This requires We the People of this earth to do in the political world what wartime America did with the physical atom; to win the war scientists, backed by all the necessary resources of our society, worked with fierce urgency to produce the quantum leap and chain reaction that put in man's mortal hands the power to end human life on earth.

Therefore, the burning question, above all other questions in the political world, is: How do we crack the atom of civic power and start a chain reaction of constructive force to do for peace what man has shown can be done for war. You may say that is the old question that vexed the 20th century in its occasional search for the moral equivalent of war. For the 21st century, let's accept Teilhard's challenge and set out to discover the moral and political equivalent of fire.

This Woodstock Forum's other question: What is Teilhard's literary legacy? is not a burning one, but it brings to mind Gertrude Stein's explanation for her famous line: "A rose is a rose is a rose." When Gertrude was asked what in the world was the reason for such repetition, she said that for thousands of years poets have been writing about roses, so often and so sentimentally that the rose had lost its redness. Her intent, she said, was to restore redness to the rose.

Teilhard was a far better poet than Gertrude Stein, but as I've been re-reading him after many years, it seems to me that his most repeated metaphor, which he delivered in a hundred different ways, is indeed Fire—the fire that will blaze forth when we do discover how to harness for God and for all

human beings the power of love, and achieve the unity of man that Teilhard foresaw.

The poet in Teilhard, I think, is seeking, in politics as in science, philosophy and religion, to restore to the ancient idea of creative fire the energy, heat and light that our divided world so sorely needs. So we can hope the sparks that Teilhard's words sent out will catch fire in the dry tinder of these times.

"The world is very different now," John Kennedy began in stating the first proposition of his Inaugural Address. "For man holds in his mortal hands the power to abolish all forms of human poverty and all forms of human life." To follow that proposition where it leads, we can do no better than to lift our sights to the perspective and the passionate concern for our common human destiny that pervades the writings of Teilhard de Chardin. But we let's not leave it to hope, to time, or to Teilhard to discover this fire, "knowing," as Kennedy said in closing his summons to a New Frontier, "that here on earth God's work must truly be our own."

Mr. GARAMENDI. Mr. Speaker, it is with considerable sorrow that Patti and I bid farewell to a very dear friend and an incredible leader who spent his life fighting for justice, civil justice, civil rights, and world peace.

Harris Llewellyn Wofford Jr. was born in New York City on April 9, 1926 and grew up in Scarsdale, N.Y. with his 2 younger siblings. Growing up in an upper-middle class family, at age 11 he had the opportunity to travel the world with his grandmother in 1938. During this formative trip, he experienced many of the defining events of that time including Benito Mussolini speaking about the League of Nations, the results of Japanese aggression in Shanghai and the movement of Mohandas Ghandi in India.

His passion for creating change and fighting for progress began in earnest. After his return to the United States, he quickly established the first chapter of the Student Federalists, which would later become a central pillar of what is now Citizens for Global Solutions. After serving in the Army Airforce, he graduated from the University of Chicago in 1948 and married his fellow student Clare Lindgren.

As the civil rights movement began, Mr. Wofford quickly became a fervent supporter of Rev. Martin Luther King Jr. He marched alongside Rev. King for civil and voting rights in Selma and, during John F. Kennedy's campaign for President, Mr. Wofford played a key role in Kennedy's efforts that freed Rev. King from prison—a move that galvanized the civil rights movement and helped to carry President Kennedy to the White House later that year.

Following the election, he served as President Kennedy's special assistant for civil rights and later served as the head of 2 colleges. During his time with the Kennedy administration, he helped to launch the Peace Corp, which helped to inspire me to enter the realm of public service as one of the first Peace Corp officers serving in Ethiopia.

In 1991, Harris became Pennsylvania's first Democratic Senator in more than 20 years, by unseating the former Republican governor and U.S. Attorney General Dick Thornburgh. As Senator he led the effort that established the community service program, AmeriCorp and in 2008 introduce then-Senator Barack Obama before his defining "A More Perfect Union Speech" that is often credited as the origin of Obama's successful campaign for President.

In 1995, he left the Senate and began serving as Chief Executive at AmeriCorp. Harris Wofford, a Democratic Senator from Pennsylvania, a university president and a defining colleague of President John F. Kennedy died yesterday on the Federal Holiday commemorating the work and vision of Martin Luther King, a vision that as a lifelong champion of civil rights he shared. He was 92.

In a 2005 speech commemorating the work of French philosopher Teilhard de Chardin, Mr. Wofford in considering the impact of the invention of nuclear weapons during World War II said this:

". . . the burning question, above all other questions in the political world, is: how do we crack the atom of civic power and start a chain reaction of constructive force to do for peace what man has shown can be done with war. You may say that is the old question that vexed the 20th century in its occasional search for the moral equivalent of war. For the 21st century, let's accept Teilhard's challenge and set out to discover the moral political equivalent of fire."

Mr. Speaker, I thank you for the opportunity to talk about the necessity of reopening our government, and I yield back the balance of my time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to properly yield and reclaim time in debate.

ISSUES OF THE DAY

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

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is an honor to be here tonight, with so much going on, but it seems, other than some people rushing to judgment to beat up on a smiling high school kid with a sweet disposition, people are still concerned about the border.

In talking to some TSA agents, some Border Patrol, some of those who are not getting checks—we are still getting some calls—I am still hearing from people, personally, saying: Look, it is really hurting not to have gotten a check; and if we don't get a check, our next check here in the next week, it is going to hurt. But we also know how many American people are hurting because of an insecure border.

How many people have to die, how many people have to have their homes broken into, how many people have to be hit by drivers that should not be driving without insurance, without a driver's license, without fully understanding the laws?

It shouldn't have to be said, but because there are so many people who are quite dense in the liberal media, we know that everybody who comes into this country illegally is not out to hurt America. But what they don't understand and what some in this country—thank God, literally, that it is a minority—don't understand is that, if you keep the border as open as it is, then this country will continue to be more and more overwhelmed, and we will

lose that great light on the hill that has helped illuminate so much of the world through our being the most generous country in the history of the world, helping others that couldn't help themselves.

But when you do enough damage to a country, this country—the greatest, I would continue to submit, in the history of the world, and that is because of all races, creed, color, gender. I mean, we have blessed the world. God has blessed this world through us.

But as we weaken ourselves by having more and more people without regard to the law and we give more and more of our cities over to being used by the drug cartels in Mexico, and as we continue to use Homeland Security—thank goodness it is to a much, much lesser extent than during the Obama administration. But during the Obama administration, I have said here before, the Border Patrol says: The drug cartels call us at Homeland Security, and also HHS, their logistics. They get people illegally into the country who still owe more money to the drug cartels, and they provide them with a piece of paper with an address, a name sometimes, sometimes a phone number, but mainly that address.

□ 2015

And Homeland Security, sometimes HHS, they ship them where the drug cartels need them to be to help finish out their network through the United States that will continue to poison our young people with drugs, 70,000 or so a year, to their deaths. At some point it has got to stop.

I was fortunate to be on a trip to the border. Actually, we all just met there, down in southern Arizona. I have spent a tremendous amount of time, all hours of the day and night, on our Texas-Mexico border, but I had not spent time, like I should have, on the Arizona border. It was quite eye-opening.

They have areas where they do have some border fence that is making a world of difference. Like Secretary Nielsen testified, when we add a wall barrier, it cuts down illegal immigration by 90 to 95 percent. They have seen it in San Diego, El Paso, and some places in Arizona where there is a massive fence or barrier. So it was interesting.

Here is something we put up down by Douglas, Arizona, and we have got this fence here, and you can see between these big metal poles—and those go deep into the ground. These metal, hollow pipes are filled with concrete. So it is not easy to get through those. And then even if you do, you get over it—and there is some razor wire. But if you get over it, then at least to this point you still have another barrier.

When there are heavy rains, there is water in there, but then you have got that to get over, and then you have a road here that the border patrol drives. They can see—and I was there—you can see for a long way. They can come

zipping up, just like we watched them do near Nogales, Arizona, yesterday.

So it does make a difference. Talking to the border patrolmen that were patrolling this area, they said: Oh, you wouldn't believe what a help this is. It is a huge help.

Here is another area. This barrier, it is hard to tell, it looks solid, but you can see through the wall. Border patrolmen say they actually like to see through the wall or the fence so they can see what is on the other side, and, you know, see what is coming, and it is very helpful. And this is a great fence—a great barrier. You can tell a little better here that, you know, it has got razor wire.

And they were telling us that that is something that the National Guard, that President Trump had sent down—or not National Guard—our military. The military has been sent down. Just in the last 90 days, they put up a tremendous amount of concertina wire that has made it much more difficult for people to get over.

So this has been a terrific barrier until you get up here to the end, and that is the end of the barrier. They say: Well, then we have got this Normandy barrier for vehicles. Well, most of them aren't coming in vehicles into the United States, unless they have real serious drugs. But anyway, this is a major, major problem.

So I now recognize my friend, who was down there on the border with me on this trip that ANDY BIGGS and PAUL GOSAR helped put together. I yield to MORGAN GRIFFITH.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I really want to ask a question. So I guess I should ask if the gentleman would yield for a question.

Because if he would put up that slide where they had the barrier that would stop the vehicles, I wonder if he had time yet—because we just got back to—in fact, I think that might be me in the picture.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it looks like—no, it is him because that is his—nobody else had binoculars that good. I yield to Congressman GRIFFITH.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that. We were able to—maybe not here, but that's fine.

But just on the other side of that, do we have a picture of the rope?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, funny he should ask. Yes, we just happen to have the rope. So here is the end of the barrier right here. It is an impressive barrier till you get to the end, and then you have got the rope he was referring to, and then they have got this barb-wire fence—pretty sad barbwire, four-strand, and it is anything but tight. The only thing that keeps somebody from crossing our border, you have got the massive barrier, the concertina wire, and then you have this little quarter-inch cord here and kind of a slipknot that you can undo, and then pull the gate open and come right through.

That is one of our brave border patrolmen right there. I won't give Art's

full name. But anyway, and the other thing we saw, there is a trail that goes right down there. That trail—and I know Mr. GRIFFITH noticed this—but that trail doesn't come down all the way to the barrier. It leads—and you can follow it all the way through this area for miles. It comes right here to where the cord is instead of where the big barrier is.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, shocking. I mean, you know, it was shocking. And then the trail, if I remember correctly, and Mr. GOHMERT can correct me if I am wrong, but the trail then goes on up into the hills.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it absolutely does.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Where it makes it much harder for the border patrol agents, we heard, to track them down. So where there is a wall, even if they get over it somehow, it slows them down.

The border patrol folks can then spot them, using some of that electronic equipment we have talked about, maybe using their pony patrols, you know, where they are out on horseback, but they can then have a better chance of catching a substantial number of these folks.

But where you don't have that wall/fence barrier, and you just have a rope or a little fence—in fact, I know a picture was taken of it, too—we saw a rancher, who may not want his picture out there—but we saw a rancher who has to be in his seventies, and probably is in his eighties, who had climbed under the fence to show that even he, in his advanced age, could get under the fence. It was just remarkable.

I mean, did you have the same reaction I did that this was just outrageous, and that, clearly, we just have a line that demarks it, so that if you are law-abiding, you know that is where to stop. But the people we are dealing with are not law-abiders, are they, sir?

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it was interesting to hear from the landowners down there that, you know, even up to the 1990s, the people that came were, you know, mainly people looking for jobs, and they would put out food and stuff. The border patrolmen had confirmed this. We were hearing it from the landowners, and we were hearing it from the border patrol. It used to be that when they caught people, it was the first time they had been caught. They probably were just looking for a job in the U.S.

But now, most of the people coming, other than family units, most of them have records, criminal records. Not just in Mexico. Like one that we were being told about is wanted for murder in Mexico, but for all kinds of crimes, including murder in the United States. And that this has become a common event. You catch them, you do the fingerprints, and then here comes this big criminal history, and that that is what they are getting so much of. That used

to be an anomaly, and now it is regular course of business.

I yield to Mr. GRIFFITH.

Mr. GRIFFITH. I would say to the gentleman that one of the things that really struck me that I probably didn't know or hadn't heard stories of—a lot of this was just confirming what I believed might be going on and bringing it visually home.

But one of the things that I was astounded with was the residents in the area who were talking about it—we had a number of residents we met with—that the drug runners are bringing the drugs in, sometimes they are just dropping them off at a GPS site, sometimes they are handing them off and getting cash and bringing the cash back, but they also were looters. So all those properties along the border have to worry about home invasions and burglaries and thieving; because there is nothing to stop them, whatever they can carry, they are carrying out and carrying south as well.

You know, if it was folks, that would be one issue—and I understand that issue is a big part of it—but if it was just folks coming north to look for a better way of life, that would be one thing. But a huge number of these people are coming north with methamphetamine that comes into my district, and probably into Mr. GOHMERT's as well, with fentanyl, with heroin, and with marijuana, and they are coming in with that. They are taking the cash and anything they can steal back with them.

And so it is a two-way street, so to speak. We have got illegal commerce going both ways through a rope as our defense for our country, a mere rope, an inch of cotton thread.

Mr. GOHMERT. It is amazing.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Amazing.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, he brings up a matter that touched a memory of what was being said by my friend—and sometimes people say that sarcastically—JOHN GARAMENDI is a friend. He is a good man.

But there were people talking before us about the drugs and that 90 percent of the drugs are coming through our legal ports of entry.

I have been contending for some time, having spent so much time on the Texas-Mexico border, we cannot know how much drugs is coming where. They are catching more drugs coming through the legal port of entries. But there have been all hours—virtually every night down on that border south of McAllen, southwest there, where the border patrol tell us: We know. They send a group of people across in the middle of the night; they know we have to all come to start processing them, asking the questions, and we know that is when the big drug shipments come across, and they know we are tied up.

And how do we know how much drugs? Nobody can say there is a percentage.

I now yield to my good friend, RALPH NORMAN.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, I was there along with him, and I just wanted to emphasize the statement—I don't think I will ever forget—from an angel mom who said: Congressman NORMAN, a wall won't stop everyone. No wall will stop no one.

And put that picture up right there. What we found on the border was—particularly where the wall ended where Mr. GOHMERT showed the rope was.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, this is a different spot where the wall ended from the one that we are talking about a moment ago.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, right. All along were bottles of water. We walked up on a sleeping bag. We walked up on all types of—

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, he pulled that sleeping bag out, and that was in the area where the wall stopped, was it not?

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, exactly. That is where it stopped. You know, and in talking with these agents, who are drastically understaffed, they can't do—they can't chase down everybody that comes.

I will tell you, every agent we talked with had no hesitation to run after one person or run after a group of 10 or more. And my question to him was: How do you handle that type? That is how dedicated they are. That is how diligent they are. They are sacrificing their safety.

The other thing I would point out that you and I saw to show you how deceptive these drug runners are, they use carpet; they have stitched together a carpet-type that wraps their feet so that you can't tell where they go. You can't track them. And that is all along. You can see where they are going, but you can't see the actual footprint that they are leaving.

The other thing that stuck out to me that I thought was just amazing were to talk to the ranchers. That one rancher had had four home invasions. Now, think about it. How would you like to wake up, as he did, in the middle of the night, with a person dressed in black staring at his wife? How would you like, what the sheriff told us—I am not going to name his name—when his home—a bounty was put on his head. He woke up, because he had surveillance, to see four people coming in to kill him.

□ 2030

How would you like to see the rape trees that you and I saw? Children's underwear, clothing, it really is a humanitarian crisis. It is a crisis, as Congressman GRIFFITH mentioned, the drugs in this country, the photo you showed where the ropes were, 60 percent of the heroin comes in there, 40 to 60 percent.

So anybody, once you go down there—and what was sad is when they said we were some of the few who had. Our nine were some of the few who have ever visited the border.

When you put a face with a situation like we saw with the ranchers, like we

saw with the Border Patrol agents, like we saw with the Angel Moms—and the Angel Mom is the one who made the comment about the wall:

A wall's not going to stop everyone. No wall stops no one.

Her husband or her son was killed.

The other Angel Mom we talked to, an illegal alien came in a store. The illegal asked for cigarettes. He gave it. While he was counting change, he shot him in the face. These are the type of real-life stories.

Anybody who says that this thing isn't real, go down to the border. You look at what we saw and I think you will change your mind. And I think that now, if we don't do it now, it will never happen.

Mr. GOHMERT. If my friend will yield for a question.

Did you go in the Sasabe little store there where we stopped?

Mr. NORMAN. I did, Congressman GOHMERT. And to see what they sell, bullets for the drug-runners to carry out.

Mr. GOHMERT. How were those bullets packaged? I had not seen them in a store like that.

Mr. NORMAN. The bullets were packaged in a small plastic bag.

Mr. GOHMERT. Have you ever seen bullets for sale in a plastic bag like that before?

Mr. NORMAN. I have never seen bullets sold like that, and this is what we are dealing with. This is what we are dealing with.

Mr. GOHMERT. What was the other big thing you don't normally see, but it took up a whole row there?

Mr. NORMAN. The rations, the Army MREs.

Mr. GOHMERT. MREs, Meals, Ready-to-Eat.

Mr. NORMAN. MREs, which was food that would last for weeks.

And I guess the other thing is these are professionals. They are armed. The rations that they carry out, they are planning to stay there for a long time, until they get the drugs over, and then they come back.

It is our duty—we are not doing our duty to not stop this or make the effort to stop it.

So, Congressman, I want to thank you for showing the pictures. What makes it real is to go down there and see it. And there is no way you can make the case that this is not a crisis, this is not a safety issue, this is not a—we are in it for the sovereignty of the country.

Mr. GOHMERT. I hope the gentleman can stick around and we can talk some more.

But we have been joined by our friend from northern California, Congressman DOUG LAMALFA. I know his friends and families have endured quite a tragedy this past year with the fire, but I yield to the gentleman for such comments as he might have about our border.

Mr. LAMALFA. Thank you, Mr. GOHMERT, for leading this tonight and for allowing me and some of my colleagues some time on this.

Yes, coming from California, you know, we feel the brunt, as any border State does, especially. But we know it is pervasive through all 50 States of this Nation.

What are the ideals of this country, its founding? We welcome legal immigration. What is so hard about that concept?

Instead, we get into these euphemisms of just immigration or immigrants or migrants. And that is the disservice that is being done by people out there who are listening and watching what we are arguing about here, that we are somehow all against immigration or against migrants or evacuees or refugees, and that couldn't be further from the truth.

You don't have a sovereign nation if you don't have defined borders that we as a nation set the policy, set what is going to happen with who is going to enter, and so it is chaos.

So, Mr. GOHMERT, we could do DACA after DACA, amnesty after amnesty. Ronald Reagan, in good faith, back in 1986, sat down and hammered something out, and the other side did not adhere to it.

Mr. GOHMERT. What was that something? He signed off on the amnesty. What was it that the other side didn't provide that they had promised in that law?

Mr. LAMALFA. A continued effort at establishing a solid border, a barrier. Mr. NORMAN talked about this as well.

We are not talking about a solid fence for all 2,000 miles. We are talking about a system. We are talking about a system where the fence makes sense, where there would be patrols where you have the type of terrain where you don't need to do a whole lot.

So it is a combination, like any other aspect of—whether it is a sports team, you know, a football offense, you have got linemen, quarterback, running backs, split ends, or even in the military situation.

An Army tank by itself is a good piece of equipment, but you have got to have people in it. You have to have people surrounding it. You have to have air support. It is not that much different an analogy that you have to have an overall system that is tailored to each piece of region there.

So when we have seen our colleagues on the other side of the aisle, in previous years, Bill Clinton, right on this floor, talking about the scourge of illegal immigration in this country—Barack Obama, Senator SCHUMER down the hall here, Senator Hillary Clinton, they have all talked about this, and others that I am not naming, they have all talked about the need to do this.

So the question is: What has changed? What has changed in the last 2 years, 4 years, 5 years, when we, just as recently as 2013, had funding put in place in a bipartisan fashion to put stronger and more border barrier up? What has changed?

Is it merely because of the election of Donald J. Trump, and we are all in for

resistance from here till whenever that Presidency ends, that we have to hold hostage the entire country to this concept of merely resistance instead of doing what is right for the border?

This shouldn't be a partisan issue at all, and, in the past, it has proven not to be partisan. It has proven to be what makes sense for our sovereign border. And it is so sad and maddening, I think, for a lot of American people because here we are right now. The line has been drawn on this, and we need to get this done.

Nobody wants to get the government operations open once again that are closed, that are being hampered right now, but there is a combination of things that need to happen here.

What is so appalling is that this President has put a lot of different ideas on the table: a year ago, the four pillars, and recently, with different ideas, different combinations. He has invited every Member of this body to come down to the White House at one time or another and sit and talk about this.

And when the other side roundly rejects the opportunity to have a conversation, that is what we are supposed to always try and do, have a conversation in this body, in this place, where we are duly elected, to hammer out our differences.

We come from such diverse backgrounds and diverse States and diverse districts. Just California alone, 53 different Members of the House, very diverse viewpoints and ideas and geography. It is our job to hammer this stuff out.

Why are Members of this House and over in the Senate getting away with roundly rejecting a conversation about our sovereign borders here, about the need to have a good steel barrier and the other combination, the other system, parts of the system that make the whole thing work? It is appalling, and we need to do better.

Mr. GOHMERT, you were speaking with Mr. NORMAN and others about your recent visit. I have also spent time on the California border, San Ysidro, and a little bit of time in Arizona as well.

Mr. GOHMERT. Has the gentleman been there where the fence is or where the barrier is, like San Diego?

Mr. LAMALFA. The San Diego portion, yes, but not currently, as additional pieces have been done. I need to go back again and see how the newest design is working and such.

But we have had experience at this, and we see that the stations where people are coming through, we have got an incredible amount of volume being done, an incredible job by our personnel there to vet people and vet their vehicles and make sure that stuff is not getting through that should not get through, whether it is drugs or guns or what have you, and they are doing an incredible job.

But we are also doing them a disservice by making it so overwhelming

for them by not giving them the whole system and the whole amount of funding as the President laid out. He wants to put extra border security personnel, I think 2,750, as well as the facilities for those who are coming to meet that border for medical attention and for speeding up the process for those who are seeking asylum.

What is wrong with this package? Or what is wrong with at least the conversation that could be had about well, if it is a little short in some area, then talk to the President, talk to all of us about what needs to be boosted up in it.

Instead, it is a nonconversation, and that is what is so appalling for the American public who are watching this, who are depending on us to uphold our oath for the security of this Nation and of its people.

Mr. GOHMERT. All three of you, Mr. NORMAN, Mr. LAMALFA, and Mr. GRIFFIN, you guys are caring guys, and the Republicans are often castigated as being hard-hearted and not caring. But the stories we have heard from Angel Families and Angel Moms, I know it has affected you guys. We have talked about it.

How anybody can work so hard to get elected to come to this body and not be deeply moved by these stories of families that are ripped apart because someone came in illegally and killed a family member—and I know it is a serious issue.

We don't normally abide separating children from families, even though it is temporary, but there is a point to make sure that children are not handed over to sex traffickers.

But it broke my heart as a felony judge, and it happens in this country over and over every single day of the year, that someone commits a crime and they are taken away; their children are separated from the parent—the parent goes to jail—because we don't believe in incarcerating the children for the father's sins or illegal activity or the mom's. It happens every day.

So it rings kind of hollow to me when people start screaming about that and yet have no compassion whatsoever. We heard from a lot of Angel Moms, so many of those who are so derogatory about Republicans wanting to secure our borders, but they will not even give these moms who have lost precious children a minute of their time to hear these tragic stories.

One of the stories we heard this weekend was there was a group of people who were being smuggled into the country, and as we have talked about before, nowadays, the drug cartels control every inch of our border from the south side—and, some might argue, from our side as well.

There was a wife who was the only female with the group, and they got to the border and they spent, I believe it was, 7 days where the wife was raped by all the other men; and they would hold the husband hostage while the men, for

several nights in a row, raped his wife, and there was nothing he could do about it.

I mean, how hard-hearted do you have to be to not want to stop the invitations of the drug cartels to contribute to that kind of activity?

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for his comments.

I hope my friend from California won't have to go far because we have got enough microphones for everybody here.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, that was a horrible story. And what was so interesting was that the people who we were talking to in that group, some of them had helped these folks out when they were found and helped them recover as best they could in that situation. It was just a horrible situation, and it was just one of many stories.

My colleague referenced the rape trees. We heard one of the ranchers tell us that he was out on his property and he saw all this women's underwear, and he picked up three trash bags full of women's underwear. That represents somebody, each one of those, somebody who had been raped.

This is a crisis, as you know. It is a crisis, and it is a crisis of so many dimensions that we are not going to be able to talk about all the different aspects.

One of the ranchers said to me: Why isn't anybody talking about the environment?

It was really interesting. He pointed up to the mountains, and he said: Those mountains used to be filled with Douglas firs.

Whether intentionally or unintentionally, whether it was somebody building a campfire and was negligent or whether it was a diversion by the cartels to pull all the first responders to one end of the county while they ran drugs into the other end of the county, he didn't know, but they burned down that mountain, all the trees on the whole range of mountains.

Mr. GOHMERT. It was over 200,000 acres in one of the fires.

Mr. GRIFFITH. It was.

And he said, you know: That wasn't just old growth. That was virgin forest. Where are the folks who normally care about the environment? Why aren't they saying anything?

And what I found really interesting, he talked about some of the other environmental problems with all the trash and so forth.

Well, the next day, we were talking to border security, and the fellow who was in our car started talking about how once they put the wall up and made it more secure, it was amazing. It just took a few years for the wildlife to come back.

□ 2045

Apparently, where they cross on a regular basis and are having lay-bys—that is where they hang out until they move on to the next camp, and they

leave all their trash and stuff there—a lot of the wildlife had just disappeared. But once they started having a fence like this or the ability to have a road into certain areas and they cut that off, all of a sudden, the wildlife started coming back.

He showed me a picture on his phone that he had taken of a bear. He said: That wasn't here 5, 6, 10 years ago. Now they are back. We have big cats. We have bear. It really is amazing.

He didn't know that, the day before, I had been talking to a rancher about similar issues, that it is a real detriment to the environment.

Then the other thing that probably won't get a lot of attention is that, even if we are not able to build the wall everywhere we want, it channels the folks. Just like we saw on the end of each wall, we saw several segments and you could see the paths. What happens is that you are then channeling the illegal immigrants into a particular area, which makes it easier for the electronic devices and the agents to get in there.

If you have the electronic surveillance, you have the walls, or the wall fence, and you have the border agents with the supplies and the equipment, including dogs and horses, et cetera, that they need, then they know where there are pinch points where they can cut off a lot of this. But it will be an ongoing problem that we will have to deal with as a Nation.

This year is just a part of it. As we close in and close off some areas, we will see other areas where they start going in, in greater numbers. But we will start concentrating on where we can catch more of the drugs coming in.

As my colleague said, the lady had said you won't catch them all, but without a wall, you will not catch any of them. I think that those are two important points.

Mr. Speaker, I don't know how the gentleman felt about that, but I would love to hear his opinion on that as well.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I was going to ask Congressman NORMAN if he would reflect. We heard from a lot of landowners. Individually, we talked to a number of folks on a separate basis.

But, yes, we see here the end of that barrier, all you have to do is just go to the end.

Mr. Speaker, after all the folks we talked to in the last few days, I would like to ask Mr. NORMAN his thoughts about what needs to be done. We have some of our friends across the aisle who say we don't need any kind of barrier. We just need the technical equipment, the cameras, the drones. We don't need a wall.

After what he has seen and heard, I would like to hear his thoughts regarding that.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, specifically about the drones, we were talking to one of the agents, and he said: Tell me one drone that has ever run down an illegal alien and put him in handcuffs? Drones don't do that.

Electronic devices alert you. Like the illegals that we saw at the end of the day who were near us, the cameras picked it up. But you have to have a body, somebody like these brave agents, to go catch them. That is what they do.

But it is just words, as far as I can tell, to anybody who ever witnesses this.

To hear the ranchers, we asked about vacations, with all of the crime. When you see their truck chained in the carport, as we saw, because somebody tried to steal it, we asked how they take a vacation. He said: Well, we have to stagger it.

These are older people. They were 70 and up. At this stage of their life, for them to have to worry about their life, worry about their property being destroyed? How many waterlines did we see that were cut? How many fires did he point to on the mountaintops that were set fire?

So these people are trying to make an honest living. Ranchers are some of the most honest, hardworking people I know. It is in their DNA. For them to have to worry about their safety, about their life, as was described when one of the ranchers went up to the person who was hobbling and he got shot and killed, you know, to hear—

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, that was a family member of some of the folks we were with.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, that was his sister, who could talk about him.

So that is why there is urgency to this thing. And, you know, go down there. Like Congressman GRIFFITH mentioned, this is just a start. The \$5.7 billion, it is a start to really get the job done and add enough fence to help these agents. If you do it for nothing else, help these agents so that at least it is quarantined where they come in.

I compare it to a football game. I think I mentioned I had a friend of mine who is deathly opposed to the wall. I knew he went to the Clemson-Alabama game, and I knew he had tickets. I said: Did you have a problem?

He said: With what?

I said: Getting into the game.

He said: Oh, no. I had a ticket.

I said: Did you go in at one place?

He said: Yeah, I went in at one place. We were in line, not for long.

I said: You couldn't just walk in?

Then he got it. He said: That is different.

I said: Well, wait a minute. If you go to a football game and have it walled off where you had to go to a point of entry, you tell me how that is different than what we are talking about on this wall.

He said, and this astounded me: Well, it wasn't a concrete wall.

I said: Okay. It was a combination of metal. It was a combination of posts, concrete. It was a barrier. How would you feel if people had just walked in there and taken your seat and hadn't paid for it? What is the difference?

He couldn't tell me. He could not tell me, because he couldn't.

That is what we are talking about here, but we are talking about human lives.

Back on that story about the husband who watched the rape, what they did to him is stabbed him. They stabbed him in the side as to make a point that he was to bring the drug money back and watch his wife get raped over a 3-day period.

So if anybody can watch that and see these people, I mean, really.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, that is right. It was seven people raping his wife 3 days in a row.

Mr. NORMAN. Three days in a row.

Mr. GOHMERT. Right. That is it.

Mr. NORMAN. Mr. Speaker, it is the right thing to do. Now is the time. I applaud the gentleman for having these pictures. This brings it to life.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, we were all taking pictures down there.

I want to go to a point about the caravans. We all heard about the caravans. We knew that this was a serious invasion coming. The mainstream, or lame stream, media was trying to say it was a manufactured crisis. These were thousands and thousands of people coming to try to invade this country.

From news reports, it sounded like they were originally heading to Texas, but our Governor made it clear he was going to work with the Federal Government and anybody the President would send, and we were going to do all within Texas' power with Federal help and the military that was there, to keep them from coming in. Then we hear they are heading toward California, Congressman LAMALFA's State.

It sounds like this new caravan that is ginned up may be heading to California, too. I would appreciate the Congressman's comments and thoughts about people heading toward California. People elected him. Surely, they can't be thrilled about an invasion coming like that.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, it is interesting that even Mexico is catching on to this, because, yes, it is about twice as many miles to come from those Central American countries just to gain entrance to the U.S. If you are doing it legally at a point of entry, why wouldn't you go to Texas and go through the process?

It is almost double the mileage to come over toward the California border from Central America, because California has a sanctuary-state and a defy-the-Federal-Government-on-this-work attitude, and so it is a magnet for that.

We are seeing, in Tijuana on the Mexican side of the border there, those folks are fed up with what is going on there.

We are doing a disservice. The other side wants to talk about compassion. Where is the compassion when you are basically fooling people into saying: Oh, I guess we have an open door up there. Let's all go do it. Let's all head that way and get an opportunity.

You are teasing people, basically.

When we talk about compassion, as my colleagues mentioned, as a family, we were talking about this over the weekend. Rape trees? Articles of women's clothing there that are basically trophies for these people, showing who is in charge. It is the gangs at the border? Who are we helping?

Then we talk about the individual names. I can name some Californians here. I will go back to Kate Steinle; Jamiel Shaw; and, more recently, a police officer from central California, Ronil Singh, serving honorably, cut down unnecessarily by people who shouldn't be having access to be able to commit crime in our country.

So where are we? There are a lot of things we need to do.

California, being very heavily involved in agriculture, high-value crops that really don't grow anywhere else in this country, we need a labor force. We need a legal labor force. All this goes hand-in-hand here.

You do the workers a much better service by having them come here with legal documentation, with numbers that we decide as a country, and allow them to take part in what we see fit. They have documents; they are safer.

We have so much more we can do by having a comprehensive approach to legally enforcing our borders and who comes across. It is better for the people and better for those who we ask to come in, and not have them break in.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, it is a great point, just a great point.

We have heard from angel moms, angel families here, and they complain that they have tried to talk to our Speaker and others on the other side of the aisle, and they are not given time.

But we heard from additional angel moms and families down in southern Arizona in the last few days. They didn't seem to me to be bitter. They were just heartbroken, seemed like, not only for losing their loved one, but there will continue to be people who were separated from their children forever, not just for the pendency of a hearing, but forever, because we weren't doing our job that we took an oath to do.

Congressman GRIFFITH, what about those meetings struck you?

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I mean, we heard from so many people, and the ones who had lost loved ones really just wanted to try to make a difference. They just wanted to make a difference to make their communities safer, to make it safer for everybody. They are not going to bring back their family member, but they want to make the whole area safer.

They believe that it is a crisis. Every one of them believed it was a crisis.

One night, we were having dinner, and a lady who didn't know we were from the United States Congress walked over because she recognized one of the local officials and said we have to do something on the border—spontaneously. We are just in town having dinner.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, she didn't know who we were.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, she had no idea who we were until she walked over and said that and then was invited to address us: Well, you have some Members of the United States Congress here. Why don't you tell them what you think we need to do?

There wasn't any question. These folks who live right down there on the border, they believe that the wall, fence, whatever you want to call that structure there in your picture, they believe that that helps, that it is not the whole equation, but that it is a big help and that we have to do it.

They were very encouraging to us, to a person, to continue to work hard to try to secure that border, to stop this humanitarian crisis, to stop our security crisis, to stop the environmental crisis.

That one person was adamant that this is devastating. He was an environmentalist person who really was very, very concerned about what had happened to the ecology in his area and to the environment. He attributes that directly to the flood of not a handful of people, but tens of thousands coming across.

One of the ranchers that we talked to, their ranch is looking at 10,000 or more people coming across there every year.

We are not talking about a trickle. We are talking about a flood. We are talking about a crisis.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I know some on the left try to say, oh, this is because you are a xenophobe or afraid of Hispanics. I know this is a generalization, but personally, in my opinion, I think the three things that helped make America the greatest country in history were a love of God, a love of family, and a hard-work ethic.

Generally speaking, when I look at the Hispanic culture, all my friends, they have a love of God, tremendous devotion to family, kind of like a lot of people in my hometown used to have, but don't have.

□ 2100

I think the Hispanic culture can help reinvigorate what made America the greatest country in the world. I want those folks coming. But like Congressman LAMALFA was saying: Legally. I know Congressman LAMALFA has got a lot of agriculture, and it takes a lot of workers who are willing to get out there and sweat. I hear it is harder and harder to find those folks. We know it. Hispanic folks are some of the hardest working folks I have ever been around. But, as Congressman LAMALFA said, it has got to be legal.

Some people are saying: Well, so what is it going to take? Why don't you throw out there on the table so many more visas? And my contention is: We have been through this in '86, again when Clinton was President; how many times do we have to be fooled?

I keep contending: We secure the border and we can work this out. We are

already the most generous country in the history of the world when it comes to legally allowing people to come into this country. Nobody gives a million visas like we do—over a million. But, even then, we can still get the workers we need, we can do what we need.

But as long as that border is porous—it is silly to keep luring more people in with the hope that they will be given amnesty before we secure the border, because then we will see more and more of the human tragedy that both gentlemen have been talking about.

California has had its share of human tragedy at the hands of illegal aliens, but so has the whole country.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to my friend from California (Mr. LAMALFA) one more time, and then I would like to hear from my friend, Congressman GRIFFITH, before we wrap this up.

Mr. LAMALFA. Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman again for yielding.

Mr. Speaker, the bottom line, for our personnel on the border, our Border Patrol folks: this infrastructure helps them to do their job much easier, with much less risk. We are talking about the stadium analogy. Having a focused effort where they don't have to run every mile. They can put one every 10 miles, one officer every 10 miles.

Mr. GOHMERT. By the way, we saw, last week, a big photograph of a massive metal barrier around the perimeter of the 2016 Democratic National Convention. Somebody there knows that walls or fences work when they are combined with security.

I yield to my friend.

Mr. LAMALFA. Of course they do. They have worked for millennia. The argument these days is really very specious on this.

I throw it right back: How is it compassionate to put people at risk with the magnet this country is, the opportunity it is, when we are making people take horrendous risk, whether it is the men in the family, their wives, their children, the separation, and all the things that happen. That is not compassion at all. It, indeed, is a horrendous crime against them, by giving them these mixed signals.

We need to have a legal process for people who want to come here to work, who want to come here for education, whatever it is. I do not see the downside of anything they have argued about here tonight; Mr. GRIFFITH on the environmental side of it, the wildlife and all that. There is no downside to what we are talking about. Once we put this barrier in place and that infrastructure is paid for, it will pay for itself many, many, many times over, not just in tax dollars, but in people's lives, in people's quality of life, in this country and those that would approach it.

There is no negative argument to this, other than the rhetoric out there in this resistance movement that is seeming trying to cash out, I guess, in terms of elections.

When we are talking about the census that is coming up here, the number

of illegal immigrants that are in California is probably untold.

But here is a distortion that happens in California: We may have up to three or more Members of Congress in the State who are representing a population that is not legal here, which is unfair to the other 49 States and their representation because they should be counting citizens and not illegal aliens in this country in that State.

Mr. GOHMERT. So you are going on the record as saying, you believe the question of citizen or noncitizen should be on the census?

Mr. LAMALFA. Absolutely. I think anybody with common sense would look at it that way.

Mr. GOHMERT. Well, that would exclude some of our Federal judges, apparently.

Mr. LAMALFA. I can't speak for everything.

Yeah, the common sense seems to be lost because of this obfuscation, the resistance, and what have you that is a political end.

Normal people sitting around their kitchen table would say: Yeah, that is right, we should count citizens.

We treat people, otherwise, humanely in this country, we help them. We need to help people where they come from. Whether we are talking about the refugee situation, whether it is in the Middle East, or in Central America, help them to thrive where they are, help them to beat back the things that are causing the problems there, whether it is the drug cartel. We shouldn't have the magnet of drug use in this country, but that is a whole other discussion and battle. But let's help them where they are. We are that compassionate country that will do so. We can't be a magnet for, basically, an erased border and think that is going to provide a solution.

Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for the time tonight, and my colleagues for bringing this argument forward. I hope the American people can hear that we care about all human life. We do. But address it in a way that works as a sovereign nation and for other nations as well.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman LAMALFA, and I thank my friend, Congressman NORMAN, who was here earlier, for their comments.

Mr. Speaker, we ought to be able to extend that barrier just a little further. It is too easy to walk around the end. Where it is there, it does a lot of good.

Mr. Speaker, I yield to the gentleman from Virginia (Mr. GRIFFITH) for his comments.

Mr. GRIFFITH. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman BIGGS and Congressman GOSAR for inviting us out there to see this, making the arrangements for us to meet with people who live on the border, people who work on the border, people who are trying to secure America's border and are putting their lives on the line, and they know that. They have had friends and family members

who have died. I appreciate them inviting us down. And I appreciate Congressman GOHMERT for having this time this evening and giving me an opportunity to talk about some of the things I saw. This discussion will continue because there is a crisis on the American border.

I yield back.

Mr. GOHMERT. Mr. Speaker, I thank Congressman GRIFFITH. I appreciate his wisdom. I always have and always will.

I, again, echo the comments he made about thanking Congressman ANDY BIGGS, for arranging this, and PAUL GOSAR for his help. They are both fantastic Members of Congress from Arizona.

I thank Arizona for sending ANDY BIGGS and PAUL GOSAR here. They are invaluable.

I hope we are going to be able to help Arizona finish—look, the President has already backed off of the \$25 billion requested. I thought that was an exceedingly reasonable request when you look at the damage occurring to families all over America, and especially to the families of people who are being lured in here to their death or detriment.

Let's move that fence a little further along. Let's get an agreement done so that we can help out these landowners and the people who are suffering, so no more people will be stabbed, even though they were not American citizens, stabbed and forced to watch your wife be repeatedly raped. I mean, how callous do you have to be to say: No, we don't want to deal with that problem; we are going to allow that to keep going? How callous do you have to be?

As we understand it, the family member—we have talked to his sister—he went out there and always provided water and food to people who were illegally crossing into the United States and were illegally on their property, and yet he ends up being shot dead in the head.

It is time to start doing more to protect Americans. It is time to start doing more out of compassion for the people of Mexico to dry up the tens of billions of dollars every year going to the drug cartels. Let's extend the barriers where we need it. Let's do the humane thing for our friends south of the border, and especially those people to whom we have taken an oath to protect their constitution, including them.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair would remind Members to properly yield and reclaim time in debate.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Mr. KIND (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of weather affecting travel.

Mr. DEFAZIO (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today on account of medical appointment.

ADJOURNMENT

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

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 9 o'clock and 9 minutes p.m.), under its previous order, the House ad-

journed until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 23, 2019, at 10 a.m. for morning-hour debate.

EXPENDITURE REPORTS CONCERNING OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL

Reports concerning the foreign currencies and U.S. dollars utilized for Official Foreign Travel during the fourth quarter of 2018, pursuant to Public Law 95-384, are as follows:

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, COMMITTEE ON ETHICS, U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. SUSAN W. BROOKS, Chairman, Jan. 10, 2019.

REPORT OF EXPENDITURES FOR OFFICIAL FOREIGN TRAVEL, JOINT COMMITTEE ON TAXATION, EXPENDED BETWEEN OCT. 1 AND DEC. 31, 2018

Name of Member or employee	Date		Country	Per diem ¹		Transportation		Other purposes		Total	
	Arrival	Departure		Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²	Foreign currency	U.S. dollar equivalent or U.S. currency ²

HOUSE COMMITTEES

Please Note: If there were no expenditures during the calendar quarter noted above, please check the box at right to so indicate and return.

¹ Per diem constitutes lodging and meals.

² If foreign currency is used, enter U.S. dollar equivalent; if U.S. currency is used, enter amount expended.

HON. KEVIN BRADY, Vice Chairman, Jan. 11, 2019.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

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

55. A letter from the General Counsel, Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, transmitting the Commission's final rule — Elimination of Form 80 and Revision of Regulations on Recreational Opportunities and Development at Licensed Hydropower Projects [Docket No.: RM18-14-000; Order No.: 852] received January 18, 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.

56. A letter from the Senior Counsel, Legal Division, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting the Bureau's final rule — Civil Penalty Inflation Adjustments [Docket No.: CFPB-2018-0034] (RIN: 3170-AA62) received January 15, 2019, pursuant to 5 U.S.C. 801(a)(1)(A); Public Law 104-121, Sec. 251; (110 Stat. 868); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

57. A letter from the Director, Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection, transmitting a legislative proposal that would clarify the Bureau of Consumer Financial Protection's authority to supervise for compliance with the Military Lending Act; jointly to the Committees on Financial Services and Armed Services.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. MORELLE: Committee on Rules. H. Res. 61. A resolution providing for consideration of the bill (H.R. 648) making appropriations for the fiscal year ending September 30, 2019, and for other purposes; providing for

consideration of the joint resolution (H.J. Res. 31) making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; providing for consideration of motions to suspend the rules; and waiving a requirement of clause 6(a) of rule XIII with respect to consideration of certain resolutions reported from the Committee on Rules (Rept. 116-4). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XII, public bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred, as follows:

By Mr. SCHRADER (for himself, Mr. YOHO, Mr. COHEN, Mr. ESTES, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, and Mr. COLLINS of New York):

H.R. 693. A bill to amend the Horse Protection Act to designate additional unlawful acts under the Act, strengthen penalties for violations of the Act, improve Department of Agriculture enforcement of the Act, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KATKO, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 694. A bill to designate the facility of the United States Postal Service located at 40 Fulton Street in Middletown, New York,

as the "Benjamin A. Gilman Post Office Building"; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York (for himself, Mr. KING of New York, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. HIGGINS of New York, Mr. SERRANO, Miss RICE of New York, Mr. MORELLE, Mr. ZELDIN, Ms. MENG, Mr. TONKO, Mr. KATKO, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. ENGEL, Ms. VELÁZQUEZ, Mr. JEFFRIES, Mr. SUOZZI, Mr. ROSE of New York, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. REED, Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ, Mr. COLLINS of New York, Ms. STEFANIK, Mr. MEEKS, Mrs. LOWEY, and Mr. NADLER):

H.R. 695. A bill to redesignate the Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area as the Maurice D. Hinchey Hudson River Valley National Heritage Area, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Natural Resources.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 696. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide for automatic continuing resolutions; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 697. A bill to amend title 38, United States Code, to authorize the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to pay costs relating to the transportation of certain deceased veterans to veterans' cemeteries owned by a State or tribal organization; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 698. A bill to direct the Secretary of Veterans Affairs to report biennially on actions taken to address areas of concern regarding the Department of Veterans Affairs in the High Risk List of the Government Accountability Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Veterans' Affairs.

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 699. A bill to amend the National Housing Act to require the Secretary of Housing and Urban Development to issue

guidance to reduce up-front premiums for FHA-insured mortgages if the capital ratio of the Mutual Mortgage Insurance Fund exceeds the statutory limit, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Financial Services.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 700. A bill to increase the number of operational aircraft carriers of the Navy, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 701. A bill to provide for the transfer of the TARAWA class amphibious ship USS NASSAU (LHA-4) to Japan; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 702. A bill to amend title 28, United States Code, to provide for the jurisdiction of courts of the United States and of the States over certain foreign entities, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 703. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 to make public the names and addresses of foreign persons contributing \$50,000 or more to certain tax-exempt organizations and to require disclosure of foreign campaign contributions; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. CONAWAY (for himself and Mr. RYAN):

H.R. 704. A bill to safeguard certain technology and intellectual property in the United States from export to or influence by the People's Republic of China and to protect United States industry from unfair competition by the People's Republic of China, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means, and in addition to the Committees on Financial Services, the Judiciary, Foreign Affairs, and Oversight and Reform, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mr. KATKO (for himself, Mr. BRINDISI, Mr. VAN DREW, Ms. STEFANIK, and Mr. STIVERS):

H.R. 705. A bill to authorize the Administrator of the Transportation Security Administration to utilize the security service fee to pay Transportation Security officer salaries during a lapse in appropriations for the Transportation Security Administration, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Homeland Security.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California (for himself, Mr. GALLEGOS, Ms. ESHOO, Ms. SANCHEZ, and Mr. CICILLINE):

H.R. 706. A bill to strengthen transparency and accountability within the Federal Government, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform, and in addition to the Committees on the Judiciary, Ways and Means, and House Administration, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York (for herself, Mr. BEYER, Ms. ADAMS, Mr. TAKANO, Mr. MEEKS, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Mr. FOSTER, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mrs. DINGELL, Ms. NORTON, Mr. KHANNA, Mr. VEASEY, Mr. SMITH of Washington, Mr. SWALWELL of California, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. DESAULNIER, and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 707. A bill to require the Bureau of Economic Analysis of the Department of Commerce to provide estimates relating to the distribution of aggregate economic growth across specific percentile groups of

income; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. OLSON (for himself, Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. BANKS, Mr. ROGERS of Alabama, Mr. BIGGS, Mr. COLE, and Mr. POSEY):

H.R. 708. A bill to require States to report information on Medicaid payments to abortion providers; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Mr. POSEY (for himself and Mr. GARAMENDI):

H.R. 709. A bill to amend title 46, United States Code, to provide statutory authority for the Office of Consumer Affairs and Dispute Resolution Services of the Federal Maritime Commission, to increase public awareness and understanding of ocean shipping services agreements and such Office, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Transportation and Infrastructure.

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 710. A bill to amend title 31, United States Code, to provide pay to employees excepted from furlough during a Government shutdown, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. YOUNG (for himself and Mr. LOEBSACK):

H.R. 711. A bill to require the Comptroller General of the United States to conduct a study and submit a report on filing requirements under the Universal Service Fund programs; to the Committee on Energy and Commerce.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.J. Res. 31. A joint resolution making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.J. Res. 32. A joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to give States the authority to repeal Federal rules and regulations when the repeal is agreed to by the legislatures of two-thirds of the several States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania (for himself and Mr. NEAL):

H. Res. 62. A resolution honoring the 100th anniversary of Ireland's First Dáil; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 63. A resolution recognizing the Dominican community's presence and contributions to Hamilton Heights, Washington Heights, and Inwood; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 64. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of a Juan Pablo Duarte Day; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. ESPAILLAT:

H. Res. 65. A resolution supporting the goals and ideals of Dominican Heritage Month; to the Committee on Oversight and Reform.

By Mr. SCOTT of Virginia (for himself and Mr. NADLER):

H. Res. 66. A resolution expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the obligation of the Office for Civil Rights of the Department of Education and the Civil Rights Division of the Department of Justice to enforce title VI of the Civil Rights Act of 1964 and its implementing regulations, and expressing the sense of the House of Representatives regarding the obligation of the Department of Housing and Urban Development to "build inclusive and sustainable communities free from discrimination", and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary, and in addition to the Committee on Education and Labor, for a period to be subsequently determined by the Speaker, in each case for consideration

of such provisions as fall within the jurisdiction of the committee concerned.

CONSTITUTIONAL AUTHORITY STATEMENT

Pursuant to clause 7 of rule XII of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the following statements are submitted regarding the specific powers granted to Congress in the Constitution to enact the accompanying bill or joint resolution.

By Mr. SCHRADER:

H.R. 693.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

U.S. Const. art. 1, §8, cl. 3;

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 694.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8

By Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 695.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Art. I, Section 8

By Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 696.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8 of the U. S. Constitution grants Congress the power to "lay and collect Taxes, Duties, Imposts, and Excises, to pay the Debts and provide for the common defense and general Welfare of the United States."

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 697.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BANKS:

H.R. 698.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution, specifically clause 18 (relating to the power to make all laws necessary and proper for carrying out the powers vested in Congress).

By Mr. BROWN of Maryland:

H.R. 699.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Necessary and Proper Clause (Art. 1, Sec. 8, Cl. 18)

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 700.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 701.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 702.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 703.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. CONAWAY:

H.R. 704.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, section 8

By Mr. KATKO:

H.R. 705.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 1 and Article I, Section 8, Clause 3.

By Mr. TED LIEU of California:

H.R. 706.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I Section VIII

By Mrs. CAROLYN B. MALONEY of New York:

H.R. 707.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8.

To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof.

By Mr. OLSON:

H.R. 708.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8

By Mr. POSEY:

H.R. 709.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 18 of the United States Constitution, which grants Congress the authority "To make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof."

By Mr. WELCH:

H.R. 710.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article 1, Section 8, Clause 18: The Congress shall have Power To . . . make all Laws which shall be necessary and proper for carrying into Execution the foregoing Powers, and all other Powers vested by this Constitution in the Government of the United States, or in any Department or Officer thereof..

By Mr. YOUNG:

H.R. 711.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article I, Section 8, Clause 3

The constitutional authority of Congress to enact this legislation is provided by Article I, section 8 of the United States Constitution (clauses 3), which grants Congress the power to regulate commerce with foreign nations, and among the several states, and with the Indian tribes.

By Ms. ROYBAL-ALLARD:

H.J. Res. 31.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

The principal constitutional authority for this legislation is clause 7 of section 9 of article I of the Constitution of the United States (the appropriation power), which states:

"No money shall be drawn from the Treasury, but in Consequence of Appropriations made by Law) . . ."

In addition, clause 1 of section 8 of article I of the Constitution (the spending power) provides:

"The Congress shall have the Power . . . to pay the Debts and provide for the common

Defence and general Welfare of the United States) . . ."

Together, these specific constitutional provisions establish the congressional power of the purse, granting Congress the authority to appropriate funds, to determine their purpose, amount, and period of availability, and to set forth terms and conditions governing their use.

By Mr. BISHOP of Utah:

H.J. Res. 32.

Congress has the power to enact this legislation pursuant to the following:

Article V of the U.S. Constitution

ADDITIONAL SPONSORS

Under clause 7 of rule XII, sponsors were added to public bills and resolutions, as follows:

H.R. 8: Mr. THOMPSON of Mississippi, Ms. BASS, Ms. DAVIDS of Kansas, and Ms. OCASIO-CORTEZ.

H.R. 24: Mr. CLOUD, Mr. BANKS, Mr. HAGEDORN, Mr. HUDSON, and Mr. WILLIAMS.

H.R. 31: Mrs. LOWEY and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 38: Mr. CALVERT.

H.R. 51: Ms. GABBARD, Mr. ROUDA, and Mr. ROSE of New York.

H.R. 56: Mr. MEADOWS, Mr. SOTO, and Mr. DAVIDSON of Ohio.

H.R. 94: Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. KUSTER of New Hampshire, and Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 95: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. PALAZZO, Mr. CROW, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. RESCENTIALER, and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 96: Mr. KILMER.

H.R. 120: Ms. TLAIB, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, Mr. BLUMENAUER, and Mr. SIRES.

H.R. 125: Ms. WILSON of Florida, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. DESAULNIER, Mr. NADLER, and Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 145: Mr. TIMMONS.

H.R. 151: Mr. GREEN of Tennessee.

H.R. 155: Mr. OLSON and Mr. JORDAN.

H.R. 180: Ms. PLASKETT.

H.R. 186: Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 197: Mr. CISNEROS and Ms. DELAURO.

H.R. 211: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

H.R. 230: Ms. TLAIB.

H.R. 275: Mr. GRIJALVA.

H.R. 280: Mr. HASTINGS and Ms. JOHNSON of Texas.

H.R. 295: Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico.

H.R. 296: Mr. BISHOP of Utah.

H.R. 301: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois and Mr. WALBERG.

H.R. 305: Mr. GOHMERT and Mr. BANKS.

H.R. 310: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 328: Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 339: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 341: Mr. QUIGLEY and Mr. DESAULNIER.

H.R. 350: Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 353: Mr. WILSON of South Carolina and Mr. SHERMAN.

H.R. 360: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. HARDER of California.

H.R. 365: Ms. HAALAND.

H.R. 367: Mr. HARRIS, Mr. SABLAN, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Mr. DESJARLAIS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Ms. NORTON, Mr. MALINOWSKI, Mr. ROUDA, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GALLEGRO, Mr. PAYNE, Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Mr. CARTWRIGHT, Mr. HASTINGS, Mr. DELGADO, Mr. STAUBER, Mr. LAWSON of Florida, and Mr. UPTON.

H.R. 372: Mr. RYAN, Mr. RUIZ, and Ms. WATERS.

H.R. 413: Mr. BROWN of Maryland.

H.R. 415: Mr. SUOZZI and Mr. SEAN PATRICK MALONEY of New York.

H.R. 416: Mr. POSEY.

H.R. 419: Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 421: Ms. HOULAHAN and Mr. AGUILAR.

H.R. 439: Mr. LUCAS and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 453: Mr. MEADOWS.

H.R. 465: Mr. DANNY K. DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 473: Ms. TLAIB and Mr. POCAN.

H.R. 479: Mr. JONES, Mr. BERGMAN, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. GRIFFITH, Mr. GROTHMAN, Mr. GOSAR, Mr. PALMER, and Mr. BUCHANAN.

H.R. 487: Mr. WOMACK.

H.R. 491: Mr. NORMAN.

H.R. 502: Mr. FITZPATRICK.

H.R. 510: Mr. LIPINSKI, Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. WATKINS, Mr. ROUZER, Ms. DEGETTE, Mr. JOHNSON of Ohio, Mr. VELA, and Mrs. WALORSKI.

H.R. 511: Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.R. 535: Mr. KHANNA.

H.R. 540: Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY, Ms. JACKSON LEE, Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia, and Ms. BONAMICI.

H.R. 545: Mr. LOEBSACK, Mr. LIPINSKI, Ms. NORTON, and Mr. VELA.

H.R. 553: Mr. CARTER of Texas, Mr. COOPER, Mr. TIMMONS, Miss GONZÁLEZ-COLÓN of Puerto Rico, Mr. TURNER, Mr. BACON, Mrs. MURPHY, Ms. BLUNT ROCHESTER, Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Mr. BRADY, Mr. HICE of Georgia, Mr. MAST, Mr. MOONEY of West Virginia, Mr. VELA, and Mr. DEFAZIO.

H.R. 555: Mrs. WATSON COLEMAN, Mr. GREEN of Texas, Ms. SHALALA, and Ms. PRESSLEY.

H.R. 557: Mr. GONZALEZ of Texas, Mr. MCGOVERN, and Mr. GALLEGRO.

H.R. 562: Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois.

H.R. 570: Mr. RESCENTIALER.

H.R. 587: Mr. KELLY of Pennsylvania, Mr. EVANS, Mr. RUPPERSBERGER, Mr. COOK, and Mr. JOHNSON of Georgia.

H.R. 592: Mr. JONES.

H.R. 611: Mrs. WAGNER, Mr. RODNEY DAVIS of Illinois, Mr. BANKS, Mr. ROY, and Mr. BABIN.

H.R. 615: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.R. 617: Mr. RESCENTIALER.

H.R. 622: Mr. FORTENBERRY and Mr. KATKO.

H.R. 628: Mr. CURTIS and Mr. ALLEN.

H.R. 647: Mr. TONKO, Mrs. DINGELL, Mr. SOTO, Ms. MATSUI, and Mr. MICHAEL F. DOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H.R. 650: Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ.

H.R. 653: Mrs. HAYES.

H.R. 657: Ms. SCHRIER, Mr. SABLAN, and Ms. NORTON.

H.R. 658: Ms. SPEIER.

H.R. 661: Mr. ROY and Mr. RATCLIFFE.

H.R. 664: Mr. DAVID P. ROE of Tennessee.

H.R. 671: Mr. JORDAN and Mr. CARTER of Georgia.

H.R. 676: Mr. FITZPATRICK, Mr. SCHIFF, Mr. TED LIEU of California, Mr. KEATING, Ms. SPEIER, Mr. COHEN, Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. WILSON of South Carolina, and Mr. TAYLOR.

H.R. 683: Mr. SOTO.

H.J. Res. 2: Ms. HILL of California, Mr. FOSTER, and Ms. SCHAKOWSKY.

H.J. Res. 8: Mr. BLUMENAUER.

H.J. Res. 12: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 16: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H.J. Res. 29: Mr. HOLLINGSWORTH.

H. Res. 23: Mr. THOMPSON of California and Ms. FRANKEL.

H. Res. 33: Mr. LOWENTHAL, Ms. BROWNLEY of California, Ms. FRANKEL, Mr. THOMPSON of California, and Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania.

H. Res. 39: Mrs. TORRES of California.

H. Res. 44: Mr. TIMMONS.

H. Res. 47: Mr. NORMAN and Mr. YOHO.

H. Res. 49: Mr. MCGOVERN and Mr. HUIZENGA.

H. Res. 58: Mr. CICILLINE, Mr. COHEN, Mr. GRIJALVA, Ms. NORTON, Mr. TAKANO, Ms. SHALALA, Mrs. BUSTOS, Mr. PERLMUTTER, Ms. CLARKE of New York, Ms. PRESSLEY, Ms. LEE of California, Ms. WILSON of Florida, Mr.

MCNERNEY, Mr. ESPAILLAT, Mr. SABLAN, Mr. SERRANO, Mr. MCEACHIN, Mr. MOULTON, Mr. BISHOP of Georgia, Mrs. NAPOLITANO, Ms. WASSERMAN SCHULTZ, Mr. DEUTCH, Ms. SCHAKOWSKY, Ms. JAYAPAL, Mr. PANETTA, Mr. NORCROSS, Mr. BRENDAN F. BOYLE of Pennsylvania, Ms. SEWELL of Alabama, Miss RICE of New York, Mrs. DINGELL, and Mr. KRISHNAMOORTHY.

CONGRESSIONAL EARMARKS, LIMITED TAX BENEFITS, OR LIMITED TARIFF BENEFITS

Under clause 9 of rule XXI, lists or statements on congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits were submitted as follows:

OFFERED BY MR. YARMUTH

The provisions that warranted a referral to the Committee on the Budget in H.R. 648 do

not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.

OFFERED BY MS. ROYBAL-ALLARD

H.J. Res. 31, making further continuing appropriations for the Department of Homeland Security for fiscal year 2019, does not contain any congressional earmarks, limited tax benefits, or limited tariff benefits as defined in clause 9 of rule XXI.