President in the Oval Office now, and one of them is that our friend, DON YOUNG from Alaska, may finally get some help.

President Carter had identified an area that really didn't have any wildlife to speak of. Yes, it was part of the Arctic National Wildlife Refuge, but it was an area that really didn't have wildlife to speak of. As I understand it, there are some caribou that may walk across there from time to time, but they can't stay because there is not enough to sustain them. But President Carter, as anticarbon energy as he was, realized that is an area that we can agree ought to be drilled for the production of oil and gas, and it has been fought over and over.

Who stands to gain?

Well, actually, the American public. But since so much oil has now been found out in my friend MIKE CONAWAY's district in west Texas, up in the Dakotas, we are not as needful of that as we were. But the people who will really benefit are the people of Alaska, and then additional beneficiaries will be the people of the United States and the people who want to get out from under the iron fist of Russia rising. We will be able to help them with that by not only becoming energy independent; but after energy independent, exporting oil and gas to other nations so they don't feel the pinch that nations like China and Russia are putting on them.

I thank my friend, Mr. YOUNG from Alaska, and my friend, the former Governor of South Carolina, Mr. SANFORD.

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

PEOPLE ARE WORRIED

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the Speaker's announced policy of January 3, 2017, the gentleman from California (Mr. GARAMENDI) is recognized for 60 minutes as the designee of the minority leader.

Mr. GARAMENDI. Madam Speaker, today is Tuesday, January 31. It has been 11 days since the inauguration of our new President; and, oh my goodness, has it been an extraordinary 11 days. I just hardly know where to begin.

Normally I come up here, and we talk about how we can grow the American economy, how we can provide jobs, how we can see a return of our manufacturing industries, but I am compelled today to pick up comments on the last 11 days.

I was at a dinner out in California on Friday evening, and a wide variety of people from multiple interest groups were there: some labor unions, some farmers, senior citizens, healthcare folks, teachers. There was an overwhelming sense of concern—deep concern—about the direction this country is going. Some of these friends of mine were Republicans and others were Democrats; some liberal, some conservative.

But to a person, they came up to me and said: Oh, my God, what is happening in Washington? Where is this going? What is he doing? What does it mean to us?

And some of them said: Will they really actually terminate the Affordable Care Act? Is ObamaCare really going to end? What about my insurance policy; will I lose it? I am on Medi-Cal. What will happen to me?

And teachers saying: How does this fit with the effort to improve our schools?

And some that had been in the military looked at some of what was going on and said: But veterans' care, this hiring freeze affects the Department of Veterans Affairs. What does it mean to me? What is happening in Washington?

Some others were concerned about, well, there is going to be this transportation bill, infrastructure bill. How are they going to fund it? Is it really going to happen?

I have been to many events in my years in public office, but I have never been to an event in which there was this overwhelming concern about what's going to happen in Washington.

I have seen changes occur. Jimmy Carter to Ronald Reagan, there was concern, but not the kind of angst, deep emotional concern about where this country is going. I have seen George H.W. Bush to Bill Clinton, and I am sure there were many Republicans concerned about where Bill Clinton would go, and then Clinton to George W. Bush, and then to Obama, but nothing like this.

It is not just last Friday night. Today, in front of my office in Davis, California, 200 people showed up to say: You have got to do something. You have got to make it clear that we can't have these shutting down our borders. You can't let them do that. Davis, California, the University of California, there are 5,000 foreign students and teachers on that campus. There are more than 200 from the countries that are affected by the immigration and by the ban on people coming in from those seven countries. What does it mean, they asked me? And what about the Affordable Care Act?

All across this Nation people are demonstrating. It is now 20 minutes to 7 here in Washington, D.C., and I suppose at 8 tonight the President is supposed to give a nationwide address on his next Supreme Court nominee. I am quite certain that tomorrow morning there will be another eruption of concern by Americans as to what does it mean if the Supreme Court throws out the role of the Federal Government in protecting voter rights? What does it mean if the Federal Government isn't there to assure that a woman's body is her own?

All across this Nation people are going: Oh, what is happening?

Executive order after executive order, starting with the repeal of the Affordable Care Act and instructions to every agency of the Federal Government to stop it, see that it doesn't work. And here in Congress, a budget resolution that calls for the elimination of the financial support for the Affordable Care Act which, if you remove the money, what happens to the subsidies, the tax subsidies that people are able to use to be able to afford healthcare insurance, the additional money that goes to the States for their Medicaid programs?

And, oh, what about the seniors? If that budget resolution actually goes through, the money that is in the Affordable Care Act to provide the seniors the opportunity to have their drug benefit costs reduced, affecting millions of American seniors, the money is gone. Will the drug benefit be gone also? Most assuredly it would unless, of course, you want to just increase the deficit.

And about that free annual visit that is available to seniors that has clearly extended the life of thousands or tens of thousands of seniors because they find out they have high blood pressure. They can take a cheap pill, get that blood pressure down and not have a stroke. Or maybe diabetes, the onset of diabetes. That free annual benefit checkup, will it still be available if the budget resolution and if Mr. Trump's attack on the Affordable Care Act actually happens?

People are worried. People are frightened. And they should be. They should be. Because this goes to the very ability of Americans to carry on their tasks, protections that are necessary to protect Americans from fraud. The House of Representatives today voted to pass a rule that would lead to the elimination of protections that Americans have in their financial services. I don't know how we repeal the Affordable Care Act.

And how are we going to protect America by building a wall? What is it going to cost? 15, 20, 30 billion dollars?

Most people who look at the immigration issue rationally would say it is not going to solve the problem. And besides that, the problem is dramatically reduced as a result of the Mexican economy growing and jobs being available there as a result of the enormous build-up that has already occurred with the Border Patrol and the immigration service. We have seen a dramatic reduction.

I was told today by some people that work in this field in California that the people who are coming into the United States illegally are mothers and children from Central America who are seeking refuge from the horrible gangs and violence in Central America. They are not sneaking over the border. They are presenting themselves at the border as refugees. We will come back to the refugee issue in a few moments.

□ 1845

How proud he looks, signing yet another executive order, this one on a wall. We are going to build a wall, 1,400 miles of wall between the United States and Mexico. So with a look of pride, he wants to spend anywhere

from $15 billion to $30 billion. So tell me what you could do with $15 billion. That is the minimum cost of the wall. Most people say it is probably closer to $30 billion.

What could you do with $15 billion? Well, I suppose you can build part of a wall, or you could start to build a wall. You are certainly not going to finish it. But let's just say you have got $15 billion and that is your down payment on a wall that most everybody says wouldn't work. That is not a joke. If you build a 50-foot-high wall, someone will get a 51-foot-tall ladder.

I am familiar with the universities in California. California State University has 460,000 students. So for $15 billion, you could fund the entire California State University system, provide tuition-free education for 3 years for 460,000 students, and pay all the faculty and the janitors and all the others. That is for $15 billion.

Now, if it is a $30 billion wall, then it is 6 years. So a junior in high school, for $30 billion, could go free, tuition free, all expenses paid. Every professor, every janitor, fully paid for 6 years—460,000 students and thousands upon thousands of professors, teachers, janitors, et cetera.

Or you could replace every pipe in Flint, Michigan, 270 times over. Do you want to solve the problem in Flint, Michigan, the lead pipe problem? 270 times for $15 billion, or that is more than 500 times, 540 times.

Or maybe you are concerned about Alzheimer's. And what American family is not concerned about Alzheimer's? If we were to spend that $15 billion on research, we would undoubtedly be able to develop a treatment—and this is what the scientists and doctors and researchers say. And we did increase the funding from around $500 million to just under $1 billion last year. But if you were able to ramp it up and develop that treatment for Alzheimer's, you could delay the onset of Alzheimer's in your family, or mine, by 5 years. And what does that mean? It means about a $220 billion in savings to the American taxpayers because that is money that will be spent for Medicare and Medicaid.

Or maybe you are just interested in national defense. Do you like submarines, the new Virginia class submarine? Well, let's see. We could build five of them. Or maybe you like aircraft carriers. For $15 billion, you could build one of the new aircraft carriers and an additional submarine.

So President Trump, what is our choice? You don't like these choices, and you want to build a wall that nobody believes will do much good dealing with illegal immigration?

Oh, I like this next one; 27,777 4-year, full-ride scholarships for an undergraduate program at the University of California. That is about the total undergraduate population at the University of California, Davis, which I have the honor of representing.

But we are going to build a wall. We are going to build a wall. For what purpose? 435 of us here and 100 Senators and one President have a task of making choices about what America is all about, choices about how we spend your tax money. You want your tax money spent on a wall?

Oh, excuse me. Mexico is going to pay for it. Do you think so?

The President has started a trade war with Mexico, has created a serious diplomatic crisis with our neighbor and our third largest trading partner, over trying to force Mexico to pay for his wall. Oh, that was really smart. But, hey, he's the President and he thinks he can do what he wants to do. Well, the Mexican President said, no, no, it is not going to be paid for by Mexico.

So who is going to pay for it? I say we have choices. I would much rather us spend our money on education, national defense, Alzheimer's, and on things that actually help Americans in so many different ways. That is just one of the issues that is in play.

Immigration? Oh, we put out a new executive order on immigration, and seven countries around the world cannot have their citizens any longer come to America for some period of time, and refugees from those countries can't come to America. What are those countries? Well, let me see. Among the seven, I believe there is this country called Iraq.

Excuse me, Mr. Trump. Isn't Iraq our ally in fighting ISIS? I think so. It is their troops plus 6,000 of our troops that are now engaged in a bitter fight to reclaim Mosul, to wipe ISIS out of Mosul. And so you are going to put a limitation on Iraqi citizens and refugees coming to the United States? I am sorry. I don't understand what sense that makes, Mr. President. Do you? Do you understand what you just did?

There is a four-star general in Iraq who is responsible for their Special Forces that are leading the fight in Mosul right now. This man's family came to the United States for safety because of the problems that existed there in Iraq. He cannot visit his family. Unless there is some sort of a waiver that has suddenly been developed for four-star Iraqi generals, he cannot go to Central Command in Tampa, Florida, to work on a strategy for the rest of the fight.

Oh, my God. What is going on here? What is happening? What sense does any of this make? Foreign policy experts, national security experts, experts on ISIS, on radical Islam all say the same thing. The ban on people traveling from those seven majority Muslim states will have a negative effect on our ability to deal with ISIS. That is what they say. Not my view, that is the view of security experts all across the spectrum, from the most conservative to the most progressive and liberal and everybody in between. This makes no sense whatsoever, Mr. President.

We sometimes use the word ''half-baked.'' This is not even beginning the process of being baked. This was put together by somebody that didn't know what they were doing. If they had consulted with policy experts outside of that little cabal in the White House, somebody might have said: Time out, time out, time out. Let's think this through. Why Iraq?

What is going to be the second step here? Easy enough, we are going to set the ban. But what does it mean? What does it mean to Muslim countries around the world that suddenly America is seen as shutting the door—or, shall we say, slamming the door—on Muslims? What does it mean here in the United States? It means that we are not safer. It means that our country is not protected, and, in fact, the action taken is counterproductive. That is what it means.

Who did this? Who is the architect of this policy? Was it the State Department? Apparently not. Was it the Justice Department? We know from the midnight firing—well, I guess it was actually 6 o'clock firing—yesterday of the acting Attorney General that it wasn't the Justice Department. They had an opportunity to review and look at the legality of the ban. They didn't involve themselves, and apparently the military didn't involve themselves.

So who was it that dreamed up this ban on men, women, children, refugees coming from seven countries?

None of the residents and refugees from those countries in the last 40 years has been responsible for one terrorist death in the United States. But those countries from which we know the terrorists came, from 9/11, were not included.

Saudi Arabia, not included in the ban. How is that, if we are worried about this problem of refugees who are citizens from those countries coming into the United States to carry out terrorist acts? Why didn't you look at Saudi Arabia? That is where most of the 9/11 folks came from. Or maybe Chechnya or Congo or Nigeria.

So who wrote it? Who is responsible? Well, two names have emerged. One, a Mr. Miller, and another, a Mr. Bannon, a Mr. Bannon who is the architect of the emergence of the alt-right. We are not talking about the conservative right. We are talking about the far right White nationalist movement in this Nation.

Mr. Bannon, who became Mr. Trump's campaign chairman, who is now the key person in the White House, not just on political policy, but on national security policy. He is said to have said, in 2013, that he is a Leninist and his goal is to blow up the system. He says he doesn't remember having said that. Well, I will take him at his word. But I do know that what he did with this ban for these seven countries is to make our Nation less safe. That, we know.

And just to double down on this issue of this superconservative fellow Mr. Bannon and his cohort Mr. Miller, just to make clear where we are headed, there has been a reorganization of the

National Security Council. These are the men and women that, over the years, have been responsible for making certain that our American policy maximizes our security that deals with international issues of great concern: what to do about China in the South China Sea, what to do about North Korea. How do we handle missile defense? How do we deal with Russia in the Ukraine? The National Security Council.

So what happened yesterday? Well, the President, which he has a right to do, reorganized the National Security Council. And two gentlemen, or two people, that have traditionally been on the National Security Council, who seem to know a little bit about national security, were previously in what is called the principles. These are the handful of people that meet with the President, the key national security leaders.

□ 1900

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff is one of them and the Director of the National Intelligence organization—the two of them.

The President says: I don't need you in my little inner circle. Go away. You can be part of the larger thing, and when I want you, I will call you.

The Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the person responsible for the collection of our national intelligence—push him aside.

Who came in to take the place of the two people—the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff and the Director of National Intelligence? Guess who? Mr. Bannon. Is he a national security expert? He spent a few years in the military decades ago, but now he is sitting as one of the principals on our National Security Council. What is his mindset? Read his history. I wouldn't recommend you go to Breitbart—I wouldn't spend a whole lot of time on that—but there is a history here. There is a history, and it is a dangerous history.

This man is now sitting as the principal voice, because he has the President's ear, on the National Security Council—the fellow, together with Mr. Miller, who is responsible for the ban on immigrants, travelers, and refugees from seven countries, which has become a major international, diplomatic crisis. ISIS is already using that ban—it is right here in the newspaper—to recruit in the Middle East, to recruit in Africa, and to encourage homegrown violence and terrorism here in the United States.

Well done, Mr. Miller.

Well done, Mr. Bannon.

And very bad for our country.

We are in the midst of executive orders, one after another—often two a day. My final concern is one that comes up 25 days from now. Five days ago, Trump went over to the Pentagon and signed yet another executive order. He came out of the meeting and said: We are going to have a new war plan. We are going to wipe ISIS from the face of the Earth, and the Pentagon will deliver to me in 30 days a war plan to wipe ISIS off the face of the Earth.

Action. Action. Action.

Go with care. Be slow to war.

We will see what that plan is. My guess is it will cost millions upon millions—if not billions—of dollars. It will put our troops—boots—back on the ground in Iraq and Syria, and we will start the cycle one more time. We will see. We will see what the Pentagon comes up with in a war plan. We have not been told the specific instructions that the Commander in Chief has given to the Pentagon; but I will tell you that this member of the House Armed Services Committee is very concerned. Keep in mind that our effort against ISIS and al Qaeda is based on a 2001 authorization to use military force in Afghanistan against al Qaeda and related entities. It has been stretched.

One of the things that I am quite concerned about coming out of the Obama administration is that that administration stretched the 2001—a 16-year-old—authorization to use force—a declaration of war against al Qaeda—to justify the American military actions in Iraq, Syria, Liberia, Yemen, Somalia, Afghanistan, and Pakistan.

We will see what the war plan is—we will learn soon enough—and I suspect that this Congress will be asked to finance it. We will be asked to pay for the men and women who will be sent into harm's way and for the munitions and the airplanes and the other equipment necessary.

I would hope that all of us take a long, long look at this and that we ask this question: If we do that, then what happens next? We didn't ask that question when we went to war in Afghanistan in 2001 and 2002. We didn't ask that question when we invaded Iraq a couple of years later. I am not sure we have asked that question as we reengage ourselves in the current Iraqi war and Syria; but we should always ask: What is the result of our action? What is likely to happen?

We have choices. We have choices to build a wall or to educate our children or to care for our seniors. We have choices about war or not. We have choices about how we deal with people around this world, choices about what we do with refugees—people who are fleeing persecution, fleeing death—who are doing the very, very best they can to care for their families and children in the most desperate of situations. We have a choice. We can slam the door on them and say ''tough luck,'' or we can do what ought to be the American tradition, and that is to provide comfort, to provide assistance, and to show the good part of America.

Mr. President, you have given us 10 days of the most disruptive chaos I have ever seen in my many years in public life. You have a choice, too, Mr. President. You have a choice to take a deep breath, to not try to carry out every one of your campaign promises, most of which I think were ill-founded. You don't have to do it on day 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10. You can take a deep breath, and you can think, together with Mr. Bannon or with Mr. Miller or with, perhaps, somebody outside of your little inner circle.

Mr. President, you might ask other people what is the effect of what you are doing. Think about the second level of effect, and slow it down, and be aware that there are consequences. For every action, there is going to be another reaction. We are already seeing that. I am sure you have seen the millions of Americans in the streets protesting about which you have thus far done. Continue on, and you will see more because Americans are concerned. They are frightened.

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

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. TAYLOR). Members are reminded to address their remarks to the Chair.

For what purpose does the gentleman from California seek recognition?

Mr. GARAMENDI. I know the courtesy of this House, Mr. Speaker, and we are not supposed to direct our remarks everywhere; so let me amend my remarks.

Mr. Speaker, there are within the White House two individuals who I believe are responsible. So, Mr. Speaker——

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman will suspend.

The gentleman is not recognized for debate.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON APPROPRIATIONS
Washington, DC, January 31, 2017.

Hon. PAUL RYAN,
Speaker of the House of Representatives, Washington, DC.

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a)(2) of House Rule XI, the Committee on Appropriations adopted its rules for the 115th Congress on January 24, 2017, and I submit them now for publication in the Congressional Record.

Sincerely,

RODNEY FRELINGHUYSEN,
Chairman.

Resolved, That the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations, House of Representatives, in the One Hundred Fourteenth Congress, except as otherwise provided hereinafter, shall be and are hereby adopted as the rules and practices of the Committee on Appropriations in the One Hundred Fifteenth Congress.

The foregoing resolution adopts the following rules:

SEC. 1: POWER TO SIT AND ACT

(a) For the purpose of carrying out any of its functions and duties under rules X and XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Committee and each of its subcommittees is authorized:

(1) To sit and act at such times and places within the United States whether the House is in session, has recessed, or has adjourned, and to hold such hearings as it deems necessary; and