

Milk is the official beverage of the Commonwealth of Pennsylvania, and I hope we will soon allow students everywhere the option to drink whole milk with their lunches, should they choose to enjoy it.

ABANDON PLAN FOR ANTI-IMMIGRANT PUBLIC CHARGE RULE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentlewoman from California (Ms. LEE) for 5 minutes.

Ms. LEE of California. Madam Speaker, I rise today to demand that the Trump administration stop its assault on immigrant communities and abandon its plan on public charge.

Now let me be clear: No one should be denied a visa due to their possible, potential need for public assistance, also known as public charge. It is beyond appalling that the Department of Homeland Security is using this criterion to prevent deserving families from coming to the United States.

This heartless and un-American proposed rule also makes it extremely difficult for individuals who are seeking a new life in the United States to receive a green card if they are considered likely to use public benefits in the future.

If this rule is implemented, the Trump administration would expand the list of programs to include SNAP, Medicaid, and housing assistance to determine permanent residency.

Madam Speaker, basic programs are there to help struggling families put food on the table and keep a roof over their heads when they need it. Denying immigrant families green card status with this criterion is just plain wrong.

This anti-immigrant rhetoric is not new, Madam Speaker. For over 100 years, the Federal Government has used the argument of public charge in immigration law for inadmissibility or deportation. Public charge was first created when the 47th Congress passed the Immigration Act of 1882. This restricted certain individuals from migrating to the United States.

This legislation specifically targeted unmarried women who were presumed to be a so-called public charge because employers would not employ them, leading the government to take care of them, which is ridiculous.

But it wasn't just women that this law targeted. It was also immigrants from Asia. As many of us are aware, fear of Chinese laborers was part of the anti-immigrant rhetoric of the time. There was widespread fear of the Chinese influence on the economy and the racist perception that these immigrants would not contribute to American society.

This fear was compounded when Chinese immigrants started to bring their families to America and use public infrastructure, such as schools and hospitals.

One of my constituents, Dr. Elaine Kim, who lives in Berkeley, California, experienced this discrimination first-

hand. In her own words, she said: "I am 76, and I am a child of immigrants who arrived in this country in 1903 and 1926, respectively. My parents were not allowed by law to become naturalized citizens and faced very serious racial discrimination in their lifetimes. But they both worked hard, harder than most native-born Americans, all their lives. They contributed importantly to the United States and never, ever caused any legal, social, or economic problems to anyone in this country.

"At 76, I have also worked hard and consider myself a model U.S. citizen. Putting myself through school at a time when most women, and certainly most women of color, faced many obstacles, I finally finished a Ph.D. degree. I served the public for 44 years until I recently retired.

"When I was an impoverished single mother, I received help from both the Maternity and Infant Care Project and unemployment insurance. Now, after working hard and raising a family of hardworking, well-educated children, I receive a modest Social Security check each month as well as Medicare, though I have kept myself in good enough health as to not need much from this entitlement program."

Dr. Kim and her family came to the United States and contributed greatly to our Nation. They used public benefits when hardships occurred, but they paid it back in many ways when they no longer needed the benefits to help their family get by.

The Trump administration is trying to create discriminatory policies that would restrict families such as Dr. Kim's from even entering the country. This harmful, xenophobic argument evokes fear and scapegoats immigrant communities.

Let's get straight to the facts. This country was built and continues to stand on the strength of immigrants. We know that a little help for our hardworking immigrant families reaps exponential returns to our economy and society.

Immigrants contribute in taxes, and they should be able to use social services when they need it, just like every other person in our Nation who pays taxes. Our immigrant community should not be seen as a drain on America but as an investment in our future. We are one Nation.

In closing, I want to reiterate that it is the constitutional duty of Congress to write our immigration laws and ensure that they are equitable to all individuals, regardless of race, age, or socioeconomic status. That is why, last week, during the Homeland Security appropriations markup, I offered an amendment along with Congressmen PRICE, POCAN, and AGUILAR that would make it clear that no Federal funds can be used to expand public charge.

We must defeat this anti-immigrant and un-American public charge rule. I hope that all of my colleagues will stand up and demand that the administration abandon this plan once and for all.

TANKER ATTACKS DON'T JUSTIFY U.S. MILITARY ACTION AGAINST IRAN

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

Mr. BROOKS of Alabama. Madam Speaker, recent Persian Gulf tanker attacks do not—I repeat, do not—justify unilateral American military action against Iran.

On May 12, 2019, two Saudi Arabian tankers, a United Arab Emirates tanker, and a Norwegian tanker were attacked. According to a Saudi Arabia, United Arab Emirates, and Norway joint report, explosions caused all four vessels to suffer hull breaches.

The report states that limpet mines were "highly likely placed by divers below or at the waterline," and the placement of the mines was "consistent with intention to disable the mobility, but not physically destroy, each vessel."

The report concludes that "these sophisticated attacks were most likely carried out by a state actor." For emphasis, the report does not accuse anyone of conducting the attacks.

On June 13, 2019, a Japanese tanker and Norwegian tanker were attacked with explosive devices that caused considerable fire and hull damage to both tankers.

Who is responsible for these two tanker attacks? There is international disagreement.

America and the United Kingdom blame Iran. Iran denies responsibility. Other nations offer no opinion and caution against a rush to judgment. Perhaps more evidence will persuade the international community that Iran orchestrated these tanker attacks, perhaps not.

Regardless of blame, there are other factors to consider. For example, what is America's national security interest in these six tanker attacks? Not a single attacked tanker is owned by Americans. Rather, they are owned by Saudi Arabia, Norway, the United Arab Emirates, and Japan.

Not a single attacked tanker involved oil produced in America. Rather, all six tankers were shipping Saudi Arabian or United Arab Emirates oil. Neither of the two tankers loaded with cargo was bound for the United States.

Hence, the United States has no national security interest in the six attacked tankers sufficient to trigger an American retaliatory military action against Iran.

There are, however, other nations that do have a national security interest in these tanker attacks. Japan and South Korea import roughly 80 percent of their oil from the Persian Gulf. India imports roughly 60 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf. China imports roughly 50 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf. Western Europe imports almost 20 percent of its oil from the Persian Gulf.

Hence, Japan, South Korea, China, India, Western Europe, and many other