

posted on Facebook that she drove down from Oklahoma City to see her dad who she had not seen in 10 years.

You had folks meeting grandchildren they had never seen before, sons or daughters-in-law that they had never seen before, weeping, crying, laughing, hugging, holding, kissing for 3 minutes.

That, to me, is absolutely beautiful. That, to me, is family values. That, to me, shows you the extent to which people will try to be together, to be with each other, to do the things that perhaps you and I, as U.S. citizens, take for granted. And that happened in El Paso, Texas, thanks to the Border Network for Human Rights, thanks also to the men and women in the Border Patrol.

It didn't compromise our security. It didn't add any new immigrants to this country. It was just doing our best under the current conditions.

The other anecdote that I would like to share with you, and which I will close on, involves another outstanding organization in the community that I have the honor to serve, Annunciation House, led by Ruben Garcia, who—when we faced unprecedented numbers of young children and young families, young moms in their teens and twenties, coming up from Honduras and Guatemala and El Salvador, which have become the deadliest countries, not just in Central America, not just in the Western Hemisphere, but in the world, the deadliest countries in the world; kids being murdered and raped and sold into slavery.

Those kids fleeing that horrific brutality and violence, coming up the length of Mexico, sometimes riding on top of a train known as la bestia, or the beast, to come and present themselves at our border, not evade detection, not try and escape, not try to do anything against the law; literally, as the law proscribes, presenting themselves at our points of entry to a Border Patrol agent, or a Customs and Border Protection officer, and asking for help and for shelter, depending on the best traditions inscribed on the Statue of Liberty, counting on the United States in their moment of need.

Well, the Border Patrol were outstanding. The agents themselves, out of their own pockets often, were buying toys and gifts for these young children, taking care of them, having their hearts broken, doing their best to serve them. Agents who work for ICE and immigration were doing their best as well.

As that flow of people, the number of people became too many temporarily for us to hold and to process, they got in touch with Ruben Garcia at Annunciation House, which is a charity operated in El Paso, Texas. And Ruben took those asylum seekers, those refugees, and housed them, clothed them, fed them, insured they had showers and medication and a visit with a doctor, the ability to talk to their families deeper in the interior of the United States and, most importantly, espe-

cially for my colleagues on the other side of the aisle, had a full and complete understanding of their legal obligations under U.S. law, what they were allowed and not allowed to do, what their court expectations were, and that they must appear in court, and that their issue must be adjudicated, and that they may or may not be able to stay in this country.

Annunciation House, Ruben Garcia, the volunteers who work for him, and hundreds of other El Pasoans who contributed did this at not a penny's cost to the Federal taxpayer or to our government.

So \$20 billion to build a wall or Annunciation House taking care of refugees, asylum seekers, little kids who need our help for free?

That is the border. That is the best of us. That is the best of this country. That is what we need to think about. Those are the folks we need to listen to. Those are the facts we need to understand before we even contemplate building a wall, separating ourselves from Mexico, giving in to the nativist sentiment and instinct that was so proudly on display during this Presidential election.

I think if we look at the facts, if we take the best from the border, we are going to get the best policy and the best outcome from the United States.

And after all, isn't that why we were all sent here? Isn't that what we are supposed to do when our voters sent us here to do the work of the American people?

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

CONDITIONS AT THE SOUTHERN BORDER OF THE UNITED STATES

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

Mr. KING of Iowa. Madam Speaker, it is my honor to address you here on the floor of the United States House of Representatives. And I came here to the floor with a bit different topic in mind, but as I listened to the gentleman from Texas, I thought it would be a good idea, while there still was a captive audience on the topic, to refresh some things with perhaps a bit different perspective.

And that would be that, from my time and experience, I have traveled most every mile of the southern border, that would be 2,000, all together. I think it would be true that I have traveled every mile of California and Arizona and New Mexico, and most all the miles in Texas. I have flown a lot of it. I have driven a lot of it. I have been out on the water on some of it. And I have spent some nights down on the border, a number of them in some of the dangerous crossings, like San Miguel's crossing on the Tohono O'odham Reservation. It is one of those without any night vision and without what we would call official security.

So when I hear that the border is as secure as it has ever been and that there is no security threat to the U.S., which is what we have just heard here in this previous hour, Madam Speaker, I absolutely don't agree with that.

And if there is no terrorism that is any factor at all, that there has never been a terrorist attack on the southern border, I would point the gentleman to the five heads that were lined up on the Mexican side of the fence across from the people that were driving to church in New Mexico a few years ago. I think those children that looked out the windows of their cars as they were getting a ride to church were victims of the terror that was created by heads stacked along the side of the highway within feet of our U.S. border.

As I spend time with the Border Patrol agents that have made a career out of protecting our border down there, they tell me that there are murders on the Mexican side of the border, where they just throw the body over the fence on to the U.S. side; and other cases where they identify bodies on the Mexican side of the border, and they will call the Mexican security people, whom they have good relations with, as a rule, and they will see the equivalent of an S-10 pickup pull up and just throw the body in the back of the pickup and drive away, with zero forensics and very little attempt to identify who the perpetrators might be that have committed these murders there so close to the border.

I have made surprise visits down to the border on a number of occasions, and I make it a point to drop in and see what is going on and talk to the people that are there protecting and guarding our border.

I recall one of those visits down to Sasabe, Arizona, at a relatively rural crossing there. I pulled into that port of entry and port of exit for us, and I got out and I decided on the spot that, well, I should let them know who I am for reasons of courtesy, and so I introduced myself.

Madam Speaker, I said: I'm Congressman STEVE KING from Iowa.

That agent immediately said: I can't talk to you. And he turned and walked away.

And so I went to the next agent and I introduced myself: I'm STEVE KING from Iowa.

And he said: I can't talk to you, but talk to Mike. Mike is the supervisor here tonight, and he's ready to retire, and he has terminal cancer. He will talk to you.

And I went and spoke to Mike. The gentleman's name is Mike Crane. It was Mike Crane. He did have terminal cancer. That is verified. And he has since passed away.

But as we were speaking about the difficulties in securing the border and the illegal crossings, both one east and one west of the crossing at Sasabe, he got a phone call, and he said, Excuse me, and stepped away, and he was gone for a couple of minutes outside the circle.

He came back in and he said: There's been a knifing on the Mexican side of the border, and so there will be an ambulance coming through this border and this crossing in a few minutes. And I've called in U.S. ambulances with oxygen on them, and I've called in a helicopter to fly this victim out and to the Tucson University Hospital.

So we waited there for a few minutes. The Mexican ambulance came across the crossing. I did have an EMT with me and I asked him to do what he could to lend a hand to help save this victim's life, so he was in the middle of that process.

In the Mexican ambulance there was only one glove—just one glove—and a roll of gauze and nothing else, no oxygen, no medical equipment. It was an ambulance as far as the shell of it was concerned, and the painting on the outside said "ambulance," but inside, it was just the same thing as an old home bread truck.

So they took him out of that Mexican ambulance. The U.S. ambulances had arrived fairly close to that period of time and they put him on oxygen and stabilized him, and then we loaded him off on to a helicopter and flew him up to Tucson University Hospital.

I went to Tucson that night, and the next morning I went to Tucson University Hospital and, essentially, talked my way in to visit this victim that had been stabbed in the liver with a knife or a shiv that was—I just recall it was 3½ inches wide at the hilt. That was the width of the wound in him.

I went to the room that he was in and they said: Okay, here he is behind this curtain.

It was a two-patient room. When I walked behind the curtain, the individual there who had been knifed the night before was not the one that I had seen and been part of taking care of at Sasabe. It was a different victim that had been wounded under the same circumstances, probably a different location in a different fight and brought into Tucson University Hospital to be stabilized.

As I was, I will say, looking at the situation, the patient whom I knew had been wounded the night before was rolled down the hallway in a wheelchair. He had been stabilized. He looked a lot better. We didn't know if he was going to live.

So then I assessed the situation and, Madam Speaker, I then met with the chief financial officer of the Tucson University Hospital and other leaders there in the hospital and collected a whole series of narratives about the cost of the medical care that has been assumed by the United States, even from people who have injuries in a foreign country.

This cost on this particular incident was \$30,000 to bring the wounded Mexican into the United States—parole him into the United States is the legal term that we use—and then to send him back to Mexico once he was stabilized. And they had to post an agent with

him to guard him during that period of time.

Now, I am not here on the floor tonight taking a position on whether that is right or wrong. From a moral standpoint, it is right. But we should be aware of what is going on. This is not a stable border. It is not a safe border.

I have sat on the border at the other crossing in Tohono O'odham Reservation, San Miguel crossing, and there, throughout the night, I heard vehicles coming through the mesquite brush, and you can listen and hear the doors open. You hear the individuals get out and drop their packs on the ground. They will close the door and you can hear them talking and whispering to each other; pick their packs up and walk off through the brush.

I sat there and tried to count the shadows, and I won't give you those numbers because none of us are sure what we see when it is pitch black out, but I know what I heard. And we counted a good number of people that were delivered down there to that crossing who came through the fence, which it would be rare for that to hold an old cow as they walk a four-barbed wire fence with the barbs pushed down where they have been continually crossing in the path through there, you can easily see.

When the gentleman from El Paso tells us that we are down to the low crossing level of kind of a modern history lowest crossing level of roughly 400,000 people last year, compared to not quite 1.6 million in the year 2000, I would point out that we count those who we can count, those who we see and those who we willingly see.

If we are not looking for them, if we are not guarding the portion of the border that they are pouring through, and we say we have counted 400,000 attempts coming into the United States, that doesn't mean that there are only 400,000 attempts; that only means we counted 400,000.

The same goes with the interdiction of roughly 1.6 million. They were more aggressive then. And I will say that Bill Clinton was successful in interdicting more border crossing attempts than any other President. I don't know that that was his goal or his objective, but I believe that was the statistical results.

To that extent, Madam Speaker, I don't disagree with the gentleman from Texas. And I agree that the border crossings have slowed down. Ten years ago they were greater than they are today, but it is not logical, in fact, it is not rational to assert that the border is as secure as it has ever been. Neither is it logical or rational to say that it is no security threat.

In the times that I have been on the border, I have encountered the incidents of seven different persons of interest from nations of interest. That is our vernacular that we use when we see people that are coming from—I will call them—terrorist-spawning states. If

an Iranian or an Iraqi or a Yemeni shows up at the southern border and they are interdicted by our Border Patrol, they are then placed into the hands of the FBI. At the moment that that happens, it becomes a classified incident.

I doubt if the gentleman from El Paso encounters this. I am down there for the purpose of hearing some of those things, one of the purposes. And I have seven of them that I have logged in my time that I have been down there. And if there have been seven incidents of persons of interest from nations of interest, and I am only going to learn about that in that window between the time they are interdicted and the time that they are taken into the custody of the FBI.

□ 1800

So how many hundreds are there and perhaps more that are terrorists that are crossing into the United States? We know the easiest way to get into the United States illegally is to cross our southern border. So these assertions that we don't have a border security problem and that it is not a security threat are false. Their idea is that we should just simply leave the border open.

I heard hire more agents not to secure the border, but to facilitate crossing through legal crossings. I think there are some things we can and should be doing with facilitating legal crossings to and from the United States of America.

I don't disagree with the full breadth of that statement, Mr. Speaker, but the facts are 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs consumed in America come from or through Mexico—80 to 90 percent. It is more than a \$60 billion annual business pouring into the United States. Out of that \$60 billion worth of drugs, a lot of that is laundered in the United States and brought back into Mexico and points south down toward—and for cocaine, for example, from Colombia. We saw a big bust of Colombian cocaine that was smuggled into the nose of an airplane that was found by the maintenance crew when they diverted the plane for maintenance. But 80 to 90 percent of the illegal drugs come from or through Mexico.

It is an American problem. It is a demand we have on the streets of America for more than \$60 billion of illegal drugs that kill thousands of our citizens. We have seen the addiction. We have seen the heroin addictions that have emerged in the United States and become part of the news in the last few years, but the people who die from overdoses of drugs has accelerated to more than die because of car accidents in the United States.

Now, that is alarming when you consider most all of us travel in cars in this country. Not a very big percentage of us are addicted to drugs, but it is a very high percentage of those who are drug addicted that are dying because of the drugs they are getting and the

overdoses and the bad drugs that they are getting, and we need to shut that down and shut that off.

It isn't a final solution, I would agree, because, Mr. Speaker, there are two sides to this equation. One of them is that we need to address the supply of drugs, the transport of illegal drugs into the United States and the delivery of them in the United States to their retail destination. But the other side is we need to shut down the demand on those illegal drugs. That is a topic that this Congress has not taken up in the time that I have been here. I have stood here on this floor a number of times and discussed the need for us to shut down the demand for illegal drugs.

Mr. Speaker, I will set that component aside for a moment and acknowledge that part of this problem is the United States' demand for illegal drugs. The deaths in the United States aren't solely the responsibility of the drug dealers. It also is the responsibility of our society to restigmatize illegal drug use and abuse and to clean up our society using a number of tools that we haven't yet developed: the will in our society to address the drug consumption problem in America.

Nonetheless, we have developed the will, I believe, especially with the election of Donald Trump, to address the illegal drug supply coming into America and to shut off the smuggling of drugs into the United States.

So when I hear from the gentleman from El Paso that he wants open borders and he thinks walls and fences insult people and they damage the relationships between us and Mexico, what about 100,000 dead Mexicans that die in the drug wars? Doesn't that damage our relationship between the United States and Mexico far more than the size of a wall that would probably save tens of thousands of Mexican lives by drawing a line, creating a barrier, and keeping the illegal drugs on the south side of that border away from the \$60 billion-plus demand in the United States? I think that damages our relationship a lot more if we continue to allow that to happen.

The flow of illegal drugs flows this way into the United States. This is from the Drug Enforcement Agency. I said to them that I want to know about the drug distribution in America, who controls it. I know the answer, but I asked the question so I have got their response.

It is the Mexican drug cartels that control almost all of the illegal drug distribution in the United States of America. They are the cartels that operate in every major city, that control the illegal drug supply in nearly every major city; and if there is a significant exception, it is the southern tip of Florida—Miami—where more of those drugs come out of South America, across, through Haiti, and are smuggled into the United States. A lot by boat come through the Caribbean and into Miami and points along Key West. That is more a Haitian connection,

South American connection, and to some degree a Cuban connection. But the balance of illegal drugs distributed in America are done so by the Mexican drug cartels.

I asked the Drug Enforcement Agency, I said to them: What would be the result of the illegal drug distribution chains in America if, magically, everyone who is illegally in America woke up in their home country tomorrow morning, what would that do to the illegal drug distribution system in the country? Their answer is: It would sever at least one link in every distribution chain of illegal drugs in America, at least one, and in many cases every link of that chain of distribution of illegal drugs.

In other words, for a brief time, if that magical miracle thing happened that everybody woke up in their home country, say, tomorrow morning, there would be an instantaneous suspension of the transfer of illegal drugs through that chain into America and into the hands of the users, where tens of thousands are dying because of the drug abuse that they are committing. That is how bad this drug stream is in America.

I cannot be convinced that it is not a national security problem. I can't be convinced that it is not a social problem, a law enforcement problem, a criminal problem, and an economic problem. We are allowing these crimes against the humanity of the United States and turning a deaf ear—a deaf ear—because we don't want to speak about how bad this is because somebody over on that side will start calling names again. Well, I don't think I ever got up in the morning without a bunch of them calling me names before I ever got up—no matter how early—and I am immune to that, but I think we need to speak the truth.

With regard to the offensiveness of fences and walls, and having traveled almost all of this border and examined it for the prospects of the need to build a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border, I would recount, Mr. Speaker, to you what I saw from the helicopter over El Paso.

The gentleman spoke and said that El Paso is the safest city in America. I have to check the data on that, but I do recall that El Paso is unusually safe in comparison to the other border cities between Texas and Mexico or even between New Mexico, Arizona, California and Mexico. Why would El Paso be an unusually safe city if it sits on the border in the fashion that it does? And it does.

The gentleman from El Paso recounted that it is because they get along with each other and because they have 25 percent immigrants in his constituent population, and somehow they have reached this balance of comity that they get along and so they don't commit crimes against each other. I didn't hear him address the drug problem at all. He may have and I missed it.

But I will submit that is not the reason why the crime rate is low in El Paso. Anybody who would like to fly over the border and take a look at that in El Paso can see why the crime rate is low. I recall President Obama going down there and standing within about a mile of the border a few years ago and making remarks. He said that some people want to build a wall on the border, some want to build a fence, some want to build a moat, and some want to put alligators in it. That was President Obama's statement. He was standing there, by the way, facing north with his back to the border. Not very far away is a fence, a canal, another fence, a security road, the Rio Grande river, another fence, another security road, and another fence.

So if you have to get through all those fences and two bodies of water that were flowing—when I looked at it—at a pretty brisk pace, and I know it slows down during the low season, that would be the reason they don't have a lot of illegal activity in El Paso because they have probably the best security structures that we have between us and Mexico. It is a testimony to why we need to build a fence, a wall, and a fence. It is not a testimony as to why we don't, but a testimony as to why we do.

If anybody wanted to look, and look at this objectively, perhaps the gentleman from El Paso would show us the crime data on what the crimes were in El Paso before they built the fence, the canal, the road, the fence, the river, the road, and the fence. It is pretty hard to get through that. You have got to be able to climb, swim, and maybe burrow underneath one or two, and then you have got the traffic, the security traffic that travels inside of that. The Border Patrol has that traveled with their white with green striped vehicles there.

This is a secure barrier between El Paso and Mexico, and it has kept El Paso safer than other border cities. I believe you will find, if you look at the years before the security was built, that the crime rate was higher than it is today in El Paso.

So if we want to really do this from an analytical perspective, perhaps we could extrapolate some of those numbers and project that kind of security to, oh, Laredo, for example, McAllen, Brownsville, and maybe San Diego, which already has better crime rates now after they built their barriers across Smuggler's Gulch. Everybody who has a fence admits they are safer than before they had one.

There is another tragedy, Mr. Speaker, that I recall the gentleman speaking to. He said that we should tear down the 600 miles of barrier that we have. Well, it is the opposite. We need to build them up. But, in any case, he said that those who study walls say they don't deter illegal traffic coming across them. Indeed.

I wonder if the gentleman studied what was going on in Israel, the fencing that they built in Israel, and if he

happened to even notice the tweet that came out from Prime Minister Netanyahu just a couple days ago. He said that they built a barrier to protect them in Israel, and it is nearly 100 percent effective. Their lives depend upon it. So they built an effective barrier, Mr. Speaker. Anyone who is watching history knows this.

I hear the other side refer to a wall that we will build on the Mexican border as they compare it to the Berlin Wall. I wonder if they know enough about history to relate any other walls that have been built in history.

Not quite a year ago, we had Victor Davis Hanson, one of my top two favorite authors in the country and one of the deepest, most thoughtful, well-read, and prolific writers of history that goes far back to the Greek Peloponnesian era and beyond. He has a terrific understanding of the history of the globe and how it unfolded, especially to Western civilization and came to us. I said: Mr. Hanson, I would like to know, I can think of the Berlin Wall as a wall that was built to keep people in. It was built by Communists to keep people in. Can you think of another wall in history that was built to keep people in?

I look across the history that I know, the rest of the walls were built to keep people out. Victor Davis Hanson thought for a little while. He said: Well, one could note the wall, the fence, the barrier between North and South Korea is at least in part built to keep people in North Korea.

I don't disagree with that. It is just another case where Communists had to lock their people up to keep them from freedom.

So I would challenge anyone who is listening, Mr. Speaker, dig through your history books, Google this to the end of the Earth if you like. I would like to know if there is another example of a fence or a wall that has been built by a nation-state on its borders that is built for the purpose of keeping people in—other than Berlin and the barrier between North and South Korea.

In both cases, it was keeping Communists locked in a Communist nation and keeping them from accessing the God-given liberty and freedom that we enjoy here in this country. The rest of the walls throughout history, including the Great Wall of China, were built to keep people out.

The examples of that, in the Great Wall of China, would be that the segments of the Great Wall of China were built by different emperors. In fact, they were not a unified China during those years. I am going back several hundred years before Christ. Different emperors built different segments of the wall. They built them because they concluded the Mongols were coming down from the north and were raiding the Chinese. The Chinese decided they didn't want to be the subject of those raids any longer.

When you are not defended like that, you have a couple of choices. One, of

course, is to submit and be killed, and that is not an option for the survivors at least. Another is you can run raids up into the Mongolian area and provide them a punishing deterrent to ever coming back into China again. A third alternative was to build the Great Wall of China.

They built it in segments. It had gaps in between it. By about 245 B.C., the first emperor of China, the unifier of China, Qin Shi Huang, decided to connect all of these segments of the Great Wall of China, so we have got one continuous wall. You could pull a chariot on top of it, it was so big and so well built. That wall—we believed up until the last few years—was 5,500 miles long, at least 2½ times as long as we need to build on the Mexican border.

He connected that together. I am sure he had cheap labor. I don't have any doubt about that. They may have worked for free and board and room, but they connected the great walls of China. Their emperor, Qin Shi Huang, established the continuity of that wall that now, by satellite, Chinese scientists have identified it as it really was—13,000 miles long.

□ 1815

That is 13,000 miles. We need to build a dinky, little 2,000-mile wall here—a fence, a wall, and a fence—and people say it is too expensive. It doesn't cash flow. We can't possibly do that. It is too hard. There are mountains on the border. There are complications. There are little toads that need to jump across the border. There are long-nosed bats that get confused if they have to fly over the top of it. There are these little species out here that we should worry about. And we have got an Indian reservation that spans both sides of that border. That is Tohono O'Odham.

All of these complications right away would be too expensive. The woe-is-me people come out. They have been manufacturing all these reasons why it doesn't make sense to build a fence, a wall, and a fence on the southern border, creating every kind of difficulty that you can imagine.

I will just tell you, Mr. Speaker, in my lifetime, I started a construction company in 1975. We are in the business of earthmoving and structural concrete work. We do underground utilities of all kinds. We know pretty well what it takes to do a job.

We bid jobs nearly every week, and we are out there with, let's say, two underground utility crews, a farm drainage crew, and an earthmoving crew, mix and match, according to the needs of the job we are doing.

Throughout the last more than 10 years, I have drawn up a design that I think is the most effective way to build a wall on the southern border, one that is cheap and effective and that will stand and last a long time with very low and very little maintenance. I will just briefly describe that for the RECORD, Mr. Speaker.

We have an ability to slip formed concrete. A lot of the curbs and gutters that you see around on our streets aren't forms that are set up and poured any longer with a concrete worker with a board pulling that up on the edge of that 2-by-12 on the back. Instead, it is slip form, where you simply drive the machine along, it scrapes the concrete off, and you pour it with a low enough slump that it will stand in the mold that you leave it in.

I propose that we go in and trench that 5 or 6 feet deep, and as we do so with the trencher, we pull the slip form along with that. Pour the trench full of concrete, 5 to 6 feet deep, so it is hard to dig under it, and it also becomes a wall that stabilizes the vertical sections that will go up above the Earth, and leave a slot in there so we can drop in precast panels.

When that is done, you have got a footing that is 3 to 4 feet wide. It has got a notch in it that drops down a foot or 18 inches that has a 6- or 7-inch gap to receive the precast concrete panels.

The precast concrete panels are poured pretty much on site, where they don't have to be moved very much. As you do that, you move along and pour the concrete panels. When they are cured, you just take a crane or an excavator and pick them up one at a time to drop them into the slot. Drop the next one into a slot.

They are tongue and groove. You lay that all out along the border. And yes, you have to tie it in so that it doesn't tip on you vertically. You have to engineer it. The strongest force on that wall isn't going to be people trying to get through or over it, it is the wind force on the full face of the wall that you have to design for.

We can do all of that, and it is simple. Then, with that kind of a pace, even the crews that we have today in our little, old construction company—and I will say for the record, Mr. Speaker, I am not proposing that King Construction build this, but I am asserting that it is not expensive, it is not complicated, and many companies in America have the full capability of building a good wall on the border that will stand for a long time. But, in any case, we slip form that footing foundation with the open slot in it, and then we drop the precast panels in. They can be whatever height the President of the United States would like. If he wants a 12-foot wall, we can build that, and I can price that out and put an estimate in place.

As I mentioned to the Secretary the other day, we are not proposing that we build it for the price I put into his hands, but if you call my bluff, we will. His answer was: Well, will you build 10 miles? I said: No, we want a thousand miles.

That is how good I think my estimate is. Our word would be good. But we will find cheaper bids out there if we put this together right. So we can put this together for substantially less

than I am hearing from this gentleman. I don't know where he is getting his numbers. Mine are real. We cranked them out in the sophisticated software bidding package that King Construction uses for multiple jobs that are going on. Every week, we are bidding some kind of jobs.

When I stood on the floor here 10 years ago and said that we will build a wall with a 5-foot foundation in it, a slot in it, and precast panels, a functional 12-foot height, 6-inch wide concrete with wire on top, and we can do that for \$1.3 million a mile. That is for the foundation, the wall only. That is not for right-of-way acquisition, that is not for maintenance roads, that is not for all the bells and whistles that we need, or for the fence on either side that I believe we need, but that is what the wall would cost—roughly in the area of \$1.3 million a mile.

If that doesn't sound plausible, Mr. Speaker, I will put this in a perspective for everybody that is listening here. We are just finishing up, and will here, I guess, a year from this fall, almost 300 miles of highway across the middle of Iowa through expensive cornfields. It is interstate-equivalent. It is four lanes. It is all built with the medians and the ditches.

When you look at an interstate highway, first, you have to by the right-of-way. Then you have to do the environmental and archeological tests. Then you do the engineering. Then you have the contracts. Then you have to do the clearing and grubbing. You strip the topsoil, stockpile it, move the Earth, and then when that is done, you go in and put in any subgrade that you have got.

Then you pave, then you shoulder it. Then you seed it. While all this is going on, then you paint the stripes on it, put the signs up, and you put a fence on either side of that. Then you cut the ribbon, and it is open to traffic. You are hearing people talk about a \$20 or \$30 billion project to build a 2,000-mile wall on the southern border.

I will submit, Mr. Speaker, this: we built that highway through the center of Iowa for roughly 300 miles for an average cost of something slightly less than \$4 million a mile. That is buying the right-of-way going through Iowa cornfields, not the desert, and that is all of the engineering, the earthmoving, the paving for our highway strength structure.

Can anybody think that, at \$4 million a mile to build an interstate, you can't build a fence for about \$1.3? I will tell you that, in the \$2 million a mile category, we will have a fence, a wall, and a fence on 80 percent of that southern border.

And there will be maybe 20 percent of that, and probably not more than 20 percent of that, that is tougher than that, and that is rock and it is mountain. Some of it is semivertical. What I have long said is: Let's build that fence, the wall, and the fence until they stop going around the end.

You don't have to commit to a thousand-mile barrier right away and build it out into the Gulf at the Rio Grande and the Gulf of Mexico where the Rio Grande dumps in or run it into the Pacific Ocean in San Diego, although those are probably good places to have it. You build it until they stop going around the end.

If you build it into the mountain and the stone and they decide it is too hard to travel all that way and climb those mountains, you don't need to build it any further. But when they start going around the end, then you build it.

We can build right over the top of the mountains, if we need to. We can put that foundation in there and drop the panels in right up nearly vertical face, if we need to. It is a lot more design and is expensive. Or, we can build the wall around the base of the mountain, where it makes more sense to do that.

In some places, we probably won't need to build one for a long time, if ever, but let's build it where it's cheap and fast and where there is a lot of traffic. Let's shut it all off, Mr. Speaker, and let's do so for a cheap and economic price of a good concrete wall that will last for a century or more standing there with very little maintenance.

And yes, I think we should have vibration sensors, and I think we ought to have infrared where we need it. I think we ought to have cameras where it makes sense. We need people to patrol that. That all goes with the package.

I will say, as I said to President Trump more than a month ago, we build the wall until they stop going around the end. This is the centerpiece of our border security. And then all of the other things we do with sensors and lights and sensing wire on top of the wall, all of that are accessories to the centerpiece, which is the concrete wall.

Donald Trump never said a fence. I am going to build you a fence. He said wall. Some of his people, usually it is the ones that come from more to the left of the Republican center than those who come from the right of the Republican center, will say: Well, he really meant virtual. He didn't really mean that we are going to build a wall. It might be a fence, or there might be places where we don't really need to do anything. You will hear all of that. They are saying that because they never believed in border security.

If you remember, Mr. Speaker, there was a document that was put out shortly after the election in 2012, in November of 2012, called the autopsy report. That autopsy report gave an assignment to Republicans that said you have to do outreach to certain groups of people, and you have to play identity politics. Don't be caught pandering, but play identity politics, and we shouldn't be securing the border because that offends people that want to cross it legally.

That was the message that was driven out of there. It wasn't based on poll-

ing and data and statistics—at least not the data that I watched. Instead, it was a product of the party itself.

I bring this up not to turn any heat up on anyone but to illustrate that the very election of Donald Trump as President of the United States refutes that autopsy report received in 2012. It says that all people want to live in a lawful society, except for the people who are breaking the law.

We want to live in a lawful society. We want a peaceful society. We don't want violence. We don't want drugs. We don't want heads lined up on the border. We don't want to have the kind of slaughter over drug wars in the United States that has been taking place in Mexico far too many years.

When they report 100,000 people killed over the last decade or so in the drug wars in Mexico, and, by the way, the \$60-plus billion of drugs a year that come into America, there is also that same amount of money that is wired back to Mexico. That is either laundered drug money or the fruit of the wages of people who are working in America sending their wages out of the United States.

That is not necessarily an economic boon for us when you see \$60 billion worth of drugs ruining the lives of American drug addicts and \$60 billion worth of wages or drug money going back to funnel into and fuel the economy of Mexico. That is stupid for the United States of America to accept that kind of transfer of a massive transfer of wealth and that destruction of our own people.

As bad as it is, 100,000 Mexicans killed in the drugs wars over the last decade or perhaps a little less than that, many more Americans have died because of drug overdoses in that period of time. And do we shed a tear for them? We should. And there are others we should shed a tear for, Mr. Speaker.

There are others like Kate Steinle, a beautiful brown-haired, blue-eyed, 32-year-old lady out with her father along the wharf in San Francisco. If I can remember his name—Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez is his name—was deported at least five times from the United States for committing felonies.

And what did he do? He came back into the United States, and he went to a sanctuary city, San Francisco, that had put out the beacon in the advertisement that said: Come to our city. We will protect you. We will not let Federal immigration officials disturb your life here. We have hearts for people who are criminals, who are felons violating American laws with impunity being deported and coming back into America.

So he is living in a sanctuary city in San Francisco. He shot Kate Steinle in the back, and she fell and died in her father's arms, this beautiful young lady. When I saw that story, when it came up on my Twitter account that day, I looked at that and re-tweeted the story with a quote that said: This will make you cry, too.

Just sitting alone, reading my email, when I saw that story, it made me cry. Mr. Speaker, because I know that Kate Steinle is not 1 of the 124 who her father, Jim Steinle, spoke of when he so courageously testified before the House Judiciary Committee. I give him great credit for having the courage to do so, and to commemorate his daughter's life. She is not 1 of 124, which were essentially undocumented who were documented to be released who committed homicide after they had been released by our previous administration.

That number is not 124. Mr. Speaker, that number is in the thousands. It is in the thousands—the Americans who died at the hands of criminal aliens who are in the United States illegally committing crimes against. And I call them Americans. Sometimes they are green card holders, lawful permanent residents.

□ 1830

Sometimes they are here on a visa. They are legally in the United States. Sometimes they are illegal aliens that also crept into America that die at the hands of those who should not be here.

Now, from where I stand, every life that has been sacrificed, that has been taken at the hand of someone who is unlawfully present in the United States of America, every life could have been saved. Every crime is a preventable crime, and I have lived that and believed that for a long time, Mr. Speaker.

As I came to this Congress some 14 years ago, I listened to the witnesses before the Immigration Subcommittee, and the witnesses would continually testify about how many lives were lost in the Arizona desert as people were trying to sneak into America. Having snuck across the border and they are trying to creep through the desert, often the heat will affect them, and they will be without water and they will die of exposure or exhaustion. The numbers went from roughly 200 a year in the Arizona desert, I recall them going up to as high as 450. That testimony would come almost every hearing, someone would come in and testify to the number of lives lost on an annual basis in the Arizona desert.

I began to wonder, as I would hear the news stories in the United States of the Kate Steinles and the Jamiel Shaws—Jamiel Shaw's son, Jas Shaw, a 17-year-old high school football star who was killed on the streets in southern California at the hand of a Mexican drug gang member who had been given the assignment to go out and kill a Black person. Jas, the son, had just spoken to his father on the cell phone and said: I will be home in just a few minutes, Dad.

But he never came home because he was shot in the head and killed up the street a block or two from his home because he was Black, because the assignment to his murderer was to go kill a Black person. Jamiel Shaw will never, never forget those days. Neither will

Jas's mother, who was serving in the military and, I believe, deployed at the time. Both of them have testified here in the United States Congress.

There are others. Sarah Root from Modale, Iowa, a perfect 4.0 grade point average, studying criminal investigation at Bellevue University in Omaha. I believe the date that she graduated would have been January 30, 2016. The next day she was run over and brutally killed by a drag racing, illegal alien, Mejia—Eswin, I believe his first name was, Mejia—who had 2½ times the legal blood alcohol content. He was drag racing, and he ran Sarah Root, this perfect young woman with the beginning of her adult life set up perfectly in front of her, the only daughter of her father, Scott, and her mother, Michelle. She had a brother, Scotty. Sarah's parents have both testified also before the House Committee on the Judiciary.

This is personal, Mr. Speaker. It is personal to these families that have lost a loved one that they know would be alive today if the administrations had enforced existing immigration laws.

When I read the very, very sad story in Cottonwood, Minnesota, southwest Minnesota, not very far from my district, several years ago where a schoolbus full of kids was taking kids home from school, from after school, and an illegal alien who had twice encountered law enforcement and twice been released on the streets because the local law enforcement decided “it is not my job,” ran the schoolbus off the road and into the ditch, and the bus rolled over. Four grade-school children were killed up by Cottonwood, Minnesota: a brother and a sister, and then separate children from two other families. Three families grieving at the tragic, horrible death of their grade-school children.

If we had enforced our immigration laws, those children would be alive today. They would be living, laughing, loving, studying, maybe teaching. They would be falling in love and doing all of the things that we want them to do as Americans, but their lives were snuffed out because we had an administration that refuses to enforce the law.

Others would say: Well, Congressman KING, you cannot assert that it is because of illegal activity or illegal aliens in America that brought about the death of those four children in Cottonwood, Minnesota, or the death of Sarah Root from Modale, Iowa, or the death of Kate Steinle in San Francisco, or Jas Shaw, or Brandon Mendoza, or Dominic Durden.

All of their lives and thousands more have been lost because we refused to enforce immigration law.

They tell me: No, crimes will be committed, bad things will happen; it has got nothing to do with not enforcing immigration law.

My answer to them is, Mr. Speaker: Then you go tell those parents in Cottonwood, Minnesota, that their chil-

dren would still be dead if we had deported the perpetrator who killed them. You go tell the parents of Kate Steinle that she would still be dead if Juan Francisco Lopez-Sanchez had been effectively deported or locked up for a mandatory 5-year sentence, as we have written into Kate's law, that Kate would still be dead if we had enforced such a law on Sanchez. Or go tell the mother of Brandon Mendoza that her fine and proud law enforcement son would still be dead if we had deported the illegal who ran him down that day. Or tell Jamiel Shaw that his son, Jas, would still be dead if we had deported the illegal alien who murdered his son on the street in his neighborhood.

We know better, Mr. Speaker.

This is personal. It is personal in the lives of thousands of families in America who are suffering thousands of incidents of their grief that will be part of their lives. For generations, they will look back, and they will grieve for those lost family members who will not be there on Easter or on Christmas or on Thanksgiving, and they will grieve for the grandchildren who were never born, and they will call upon their surviving brothers and sisters: Now you are responsible to be the parents of the grandchildren for the parents who lost their daughter or lost their son.

That is what is at stake here, Mr. Speaker.

We are a nation of laws, but we are, today, a nation of not yet fully enforced laws, and we have had a President in the past who seemed to want to bring in the maximum number of illegal aliens and leave them here and keep them here. He never demonstrated a desire to enforce the law as he opened up the borders of America to people who are coming from terrorist-spawning countries. Now, thankfully, we have Donald Trump, who has stepped up to close those borders back down again and get a handle on this migration so that the American people can be safer. But we will be a lot safer with a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border.

By the way, at this point now, the United States is spending, annually, \$13.4 billion a year—that is billion with a B—to secure our southern border, and we are getting perhaps 25 percent enforcement efficiency in that southern border—25 percent. That, by the way, is the testimony of the Border Patrol before the Committee on the Judiciary. It is not a number that is brought up from someone who wants to be critical of them.

I salute the Border Patrol. They have got a tough job. But their operation has not been managed for the purpose of securing our border and achieving border security. They have tried to redefine it as to something else.

Oh, \$13.4 billion a year spent on our 2,000-mile southern border. Now, somebody out there, Mr. Speaker, has done the math on that and divided 2,000 miles into \$13.4 billion. That comes to \$6.7 million a mile to secure our southern border, \$6.7 million a mile for every

mile every year, day and night—\$6.7 million.

I would just ask people, contemplate that cost, that heavy cost, \$6.7 million a mile. What can you buy for that?

Well, you can buy an interstate highway, and you can have \$2.7 million left over and change per mile. We can take one annual budget of our southern border—if we do what Mr. O'ROURKE wants to do and open the border, we can lay the Border Patrol off for a year, take that \$6.7 million a mile, the \$13.4 billion, and we can build an interstate highway the full length of that and have \$2.7 million a mile left over. That is how much money is being spent on the southern border to get 25 percent efficiency.

You cannot convince me that if we spend \$1.3 million a mile for the wall—if we dial that up to 2 or a little more than \$2 million a mile so we can cover a fence on either side of that wall and access roads that would be built out of necessity to build it and to maintain it and to patrol it—a couple million dollars a mile on that, wouldn't give us something pretty close to Israeli-level border security. That is nearly 100 percent. That is up into the 99 percentile and beyond that into the efficiency of the security of our border. Of course we could get that kind of security on our border.

It doesn't mean we just build it and walk away. People on that side would like to have you think that, that somehow we would just build a wall and walk away and we leave the ladders put up on the south side of the border. No, we would maintain that. We would patrol it. We would fly it. We would patrol it with vehicles. We would have vibration sensors. We would put wire on top, and that wire on top would signal to us if anybody grounded that wire, tried to breach that, touch that wire, brought it to the ground. It would tell us in the control centers exactly where that breach was attempted to take place. We would zero our enforcement in on them and we would enforce it, and we would maintain it so that it functions 100 percent all the time.

I see the fence we have got on the border now, and sometimes they will come on the other side, take a set of wire cutters, cut themselves a gate through a chain-link fence. I believe I saw this in Lukeville, Arizona. There they take a chain and thread it through the chain-link fence, put a padlock on it, and it is their personal gate to come and go into America whenever they see fit, with a great, big huge brown mastiff on a bigger chain yet laying there by that gate with a growl under his throat waiting for anybody who might decide they want to walk through that gate in the fence.

We can do a lot better. We will do a lot better, \$6.7 million a mile. Let me pose this another way for people who have a different way of putting images in their head.

For me, I live out in the country in Iowa. We have gravel roads every mile,

in the flat country at least. From where I live, my west road runs a mile out there to the intersection where it goes on in four directions, gravel road.

So let's just say that General Kelly, Secretary Kelly, came to me and he said: STEVE, I want you to guard your west mile, and I want you to secure that border so that 25 percent of the people that are trying to get across there will be interdicted and won't be able to get across that border. So what would you take to give me that level of security for a mile of road and, say, a mile, the west gravel road from my house?

He said: I have got a bid. I will give you \$6.7 million—that is the average going rate for a mile—and you will get that every year. By the way, we do our budgets on a 10-year contract, so I will give you \$67 million to secure 1 mile of Iowa gravel road.

Do you think I could secure that border for \$67 million for 10 years? And do you think that I would hire a lot of people to sit there in their humvees and talk back and forth on the radio and let people walk around them coming across that border if my job was to secure it? No. I would build a fence, a wall, and a fence on that mile. I would spend less than \$2 million for that mile.

Yes, I would hire a border patrol, and I would put the bells and whistles, the accessories on that wall so that we had the warning signals that are there. I would minimize the labor; I would maximize the technology. But I would put the resources there to get the job done 100 percent, not 25 percent, and I could do it for, you know, a lot less than \$6.7 million per mile per year. It wouldn't take a \$67 million contract for a 10-year contract to secure that border. Infrastructure does its job. You build the wall.

Remember President Obama, he said he had prosecutorial discretion, and so he created these great classes of people and violated the Constitution and granted a waiver for the application of our criminal laws against people who had come into the United States illegally. And he said: Well, we are doing this on a case-by-case basis.

Janet Napolitano wrote the memo. We have got the ICE memo or the Napolitano memo that lays out the exemptions to the law. Seven times in there she wrote, "on an individual basis only." That is in there because she knows that the court case turns on prosecutorial discretion, which can only be applied if you are not going to enforce the law, the prosecutors do have discretion. If it is not practical to do so, if you don't have the resources, they should use the resources to their best advantage. You can do that on an individual basis and be within the law and be constitutional.

But once you have a President Obama creating huge classes of people that number in the hundreds of thousands—in fact, in the millions—then what you have, Mr. Speaker, is a violation

of the law and the Constitution, and it is the executive branch, the President of the United States making up law as he goes along and violating the separation of powers.

□ 1845

Well, through that, when the President says: I have prosecutorial discretion, and anybody who walks across the border is not going to be troubled. We will meet them with the welcome wagon and fly them to any State in the Union they choose—that happens, Mr. Speaker—it is real. That is not a fabrication or an embellishment. It is even worse than that.

But what benefit does a wall have? In addition to, it provides security of the United States of America. A wall doesn't have prosecutorial discretion. We make up its mind when we build the wall. And if they can't get across there, and we maintain and protect it, then we get the effectiveness of it, regardless of who the President is. And if we get a President in the future who doesn't secure and maintain and enforce the wall, then we have a serious cause that we can point to rather than a vague legal argument manufactured by a former adjunct professor who taught constitutional law at the University of Chicago.

And so, Mr. Speaker, building a fence, a wall, and a fence on our southern border is a wise and prudent thing to do. It will pay for itself before we can even get it built. It will dramatically slow down the illegal drugs that are coming into America that come from or through Mexico. Remember, 80 to 90 percent of them. Dramatically slow them down. The illegal traffic that is coming in, it will shut off most all of that. I would agree with the gentleman from El Paso that we should then beef up our ports of entry so we can facilitate a faster flow of legal traffic in and out of America.

But the American people need to decide who is coming into America and who is leaving America. We should not have an immigration policy that is established by the people who live anywhere but America or by the people who are anything but citizens of the United States. The citizens of America should make this decision through their elected representatives by exercising the enumerated power in the Constitution that Congress has to establish immigration laws.

Internally, our domestic laws need to be enforced. And we need to recruit local law enforcement by expanding the 287(g) program and the Secure Communities program. We need to incorporate the city police, the county sheriff and deputy force, and the highway patrol, or Division of Criminal Investigation—Department of Public Safety officers, as Texas has—all to work with our Federal officers, so it is a seamless network working together to provide secure communities in America, restore the respect for the rule of law, shut down the flow of drugs

into the United States, shut off the illegal traffic into America, shut off the terrorists who are sneaking into America because the easiest and most reliable way for them to get here is across our southern border. If we do all of that, there will be respect for both countries that will be established.

And I would say this to President Trump. And that is, he is a builder, I am a builder. I don't have any doubt about how to build that wall or to build the fences on the south and north side of that so that we have two no-man's lands to patrol. I don't know that he has any doubt about it either. He has said that he will build a big, beautiful wall.

Well, I am looking for the architect's ideas on beauty. That is not my forte. But the structural functionality and the efficiency of its construction is my forte. And I encourage that we draw up the plans and designs for this and let contracts to those contractors who can effectively and efficiently do this in a competitive low-bid fashion with a proper inspection, and we will build that barrier that can stand for a long time, designed to keep people and contraband out, as every other wall in the history of the world, including the Great Wall of China and the walls that were built in northern England and those across northern Germany. The Romans built walls there to protect themselves as well.

Each wall, with the exception of those designed by communists to keep their subjects in, has been designed to keep people out. There is a huge moral difference between a wall to keep people in and a wall to keep criminals, terrorists, and also decent people, and contraband out. It is a simple equation.

Mr. Speaker, I appreciate your attention here this evening on this topic. I look forward to the construction of the fence, the wall, and the fence on our southern border, and the restoration of the respect for the rule of law.

I yield back the balance of my time.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted to:

Ms. CLARK of Massachusetts (at the request of Ms. PELOSI) for today and the balance of the week on account of family emergency.

PUBLICATION OF COMMITTEE RULES

RULES OF THE COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY FOR THE 115TH CONGRESS
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
COMMITTEE ON HOMELAND SECURITY,
Washington, DC, February 1, 2017.

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

DEAR MR. SPEAKER: Pursuant to clause 2(a) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, I submit the Rules of the Committee on Homeland Security for the 115th Congress for publication in the Congressional Record. On February 1, 2017, the Com-

mittee on Homeland Security met in open session and adopted these Committee Rules by a recorded vote of 18 yeas and 10 nays, a quorum being present.

Sincerely,

MICHAEL T. McCaul,
Chairman.

Enclosure.

(Adopted February 1, 2017)

RULE I.—GENERAL PROVISIONS

(A) *Applicability of the Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives.*—The Rules of the U.S. House of Representatives (the “House”) are the rules of the Committee on Homeland Security (the “Committee”) and its subcommittees insofar as applicable.

(B) *Applicability to Subcommittees.*—Except where the terms “Full Committee” and “subcommittee” are specifically mentioned, the following rules shall apply to the Committee’s subcommittees and their respective Chairmen and Ranking Minority Members to the same extent as they apply to the Full Committee and its Chairman and Ranking Minority Member.

(C) *Appointments by the Chairman.*—Clause 2(d) of Rule XI of the House shall govern the designation of a Vice Chairman of the Full Committee.

(D) *Conferences.*—The Chairman is authorized to offer a motion under clause 1 of Rule XXII of the Rules of the House whenever the Chairman considers it appropriate.

(E) *Committee Website.*—The Chairman shall maintain an official Committee web site for the purposes of furthering the Committee’s legislative and oversight responsibilities, including communicating information about the Committee’s activities to Committee Members, other Members, and the public at large. The Ranking Minority Member may maintain a similar web site for the same purposes. The official Committee web site shall display a link on its home page to the web site maintained by the Ranking Minority Member.

(F) *Activity Report.*—The Committee shall submit a report to the House on the activities of the Committee in accordance with House rule XI 1(d).

RULE II.—SUBCOMMITTEES

(A) *Generally.*—The Full Committee shall be organized into the following six standing subcommittees and each shall have specific responsibility for such measures or matters as the Chairman refers to it:

(1) Subcommittee on Counterterrorism and Intelligence;

(2) Subcommittee on Border and Maritime Security;

(3) Subcommittee on Cybersecurity and Infrastructure Protection;

(4) Subcommittee on Oversight and Management Efficiency;

(5) Subcommittee on Transportation and Protective Security; and

(6) Subcommittee on Emergency Preparedness, Response and Communications.

(B) *Selection and Ratio of Subcommittee Members.*—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall select their respective Members of each subcommittee. The ratio of Majority to Minority Members shall be comparable to the Full Committee, consistent with the party ratios established by the Majority party, except that each subcommittee shall have at least two more Majority Members than Minority Members.

(C) *Ex Officio Members.*—The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall be ex officio members of each subcommittee but are not authorized to vote on matters that arise before each subcommittee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee shall

only be counted to satisfy the quorum requirement for the purpose of taking testimony and receiving evidence.

(D) *Powers and Duties of Subcommittees.*—Except as otherwise directed by the Chairman of the Full Committee, each subcommittee is authorized to meet, hold hearings, receive testimony, mark up legislation, and report to the Full Committee on all matters within its purview. Subcommittee Chairmen shall set hearing and meeting dates only with the approval of the Chairman of the Full Committee. To the greatest extent practicable, no more than one meeting and hearing should be scheduled for a given time.

RULE III.—SPECIAL COMMITTEE PANELS

(A) *Designation.*—The Chairman of the Full Committee may designate a special panel of the Committee consisting of Members of the Committee to inquire into and take testimony on a matter or matters that warrant enhanced consideration, and to report to the Committee.

(B) *Party Ratios and Appointment.*—The chairman of a special panel shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Full Committee. The Ranking Minority Member of the Full Committee may select a ranking minority member for a special panel and may appoint additional minority members, consistent with the ratio of the full committee. The Chairman and Ranking Minority Member may serve as ex officio members.

(C) *Duration.*—No special panel shall continue in existence for more than six months.

(D) *Jurisdiction.*—No panel shall have legislative jurisdiction.

RULE IV.—REGULAR MEETINGS

(A) *Regular Meeting Date.*—The regular meeting date and time for the transaction of business of the Full Committee shall be at 10:00 a.m. on the first Wednesday that the House is in Session each month, unless otherwise directed by the Chairman.

(B) *Additional Meetings.*—At the discretion of the Chairman, additional meetings of the Committee may be scheduled for the consideration of any legislation or other matters pending before the Committee, or to conduct other Committee business. The Committee shall meet for such purposes pursuant to the call of the Chairman.

(C) *Consideration.*—Except in the case of a special meeting held under clause 2(c)(2) of House Rule XI, the determination of the business to be considered at each meeting of the Committee shall be made by the Chairman.

RULE V.—NOTICE AND PUBLICATION

(A) *Notice.*—

(1) *Hearings.*—(a) Pursuant to clause 2(g)(3) of rule XI of the Rules of the House of Representatives, the Chairman of the Committee shall make public announcement of the date, place, and subject matter of any hearing before the Full Committee or subcommittee, which may not commence earlier than one week after such notice.

(b) However, a hearing may begin sooner than specified in (a) if the Chairman of the Committee, with the concurrence of the Ranking Minority Member, determines that there is good cause to begin such hearing sooner, or if the Committee so determines by majority vote, a quorum being present for the transaction of business. If such a determination is made, the Chairman shall make the announcement required under (a) at the earliest possible date. To the extent practicable, the names of all witnesses scheduled to appear at such hearing shall be provided to Members no later than 48 hours prior to the commencement of such hearing.

(2) *Meetings.*—The Chair shall announce the date, time, place and subject matter of