

Mr. Speaker, I speak not just for African Americans. The majority of the ones who are utilizing this program are non-African American, and the majority are Anglo Americans. So Congress should be working together to strengthen the program so that it fulfills its original goal: ensuring that all Americans, regardless of ethnic origin or status, have the dignity of a day's work and a day's worth of food.

Mr. Speaker, many districts' voices have been muted through the intentional gerrymandering so that they don't have to address the poorest people.

Mr. Speaker, it is time for us to address all of the American people.

HAPPY SESQUICENTENNIAL TO RENO, NEVADA

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

Mr. AMODEI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today with birthday wishes for the premier municipality in the Nation—not the Big Apple, not the Windy City, not the City by the Bay, or the Big Easy.

I am talking about the Biggest Little City in the World, Reno, Nevada. Reno turns 150, celebrating its sesquicentennial.

Congratulations to you Mayor Hillary Schieve and the city council.

Happy birthday, Reno, Nevada.

CONGRATULATING MONSIGNOR GEORGE FARLAND

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

Mr. NEAL. Mr. Speaker, I come to the floor of the House this morning to pay tribute to a close friend of mine, Monsignor George Farland, who is celebrating the 50th anniversary of his ordination as a Catholic priest.

On May 4, 1968, Monsignor Farland received his ministerial orders at Cathedral of St. Michael the Archangel in my hometown of Springfield, Massachusetts. I know because I was the CYO basketball coach at Sacred Heart upon his arrival.

For the next half century, he has been a source of inspiration and comfort to his faithful parishioners at Sacred Heart Church in Springfield. Every Sunday, he provides a strong spiritual message, frequently laced with a special grace and a sense of irony and good humor, but always a powerful message. We have watched and witnessed as he has rebuilt and sustained a vibrant parish in the life of its members.

Sacred Heart Church was built by immigrants, and to this day, it welcomes immigrants, as he frequently says in the opening phrases of his powerful homilies: "No matter what your status or station in life, you are welcome in this church."

He has found time to serve as a police chaplain for the Springfield Police De-

partment and also a hospital chaplain in the Sisters of Providence Health System in Mercy Medical Center. He has surely reinvigorated the life of the church, and is a son of Hungry Hill, a graduate of Cathedral High School and Saint Anselm College.

His spiritual leadership in western Massachusetts has become, in fact, legendary. He has a well-deserved reputation for compassion, humility, and kindness. Again, the welcoming message of his inclusivity continues to deeply resonate with those who worship at Sacred Heart Church.

He leads his parishioners up and down that middle aisle, oftentimes in joy and happiness or in grief of the funeral, but he always does it with a special tolerance and grace.

Mr. Speaker, on behalf of the United States, I want to congratulate Monsignor George Farland for reaching this important milestone in his life, thank him for his decades of thoughtful ministry, and acknowledge the remarkable contributions he has made to the people of all walks of faith in the Diocese of Springfield in western Massachusetts.

RAW DEAL VERSUS BETTER DEAL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from New York (Mr. JEFFRIES) for 5 minutes.

Mr. JEFFRIES. Mr. Speaker, in this country, our democratic republic, we have a brilliant system of government of the people, by the people, and for the people.

It is a system that consists of two predominant parties with a contrast of ideas. And nowhere in this country is that contrast more prominent than here in the House of Representatives where we have got a vision of the country on the Democratic side of the aisle that wants to move America forward, while the folks on the other side of the aisle want to turn back the clock.

We want to bring people together. They are tearing us apart. We believe in an economy that works for everybody. They are all about an economy for the wealthy and the well-off. They have a raw deal. We have a better deal.

They want to take away healthcare for more than 20 million Americans, impose a draconian age tax on people between 50 and 64, and take away existing protections for preexisting conditions. We want to strengthen the Affordable Care Act and dramatically lower the cost of prescription drugs for every American. Raw deal versus better deal.

They have a fake infrastructure plan that would do nothing to fix our Nation's crumbling bridges, roads, and tunnels. We have a real infrastructure plan that would invest \$1 trillion and create 16 million good-paying jobs. Raw deal versus better deal.

They support a budget that would cut more than \$2 trillion from Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid. We support a budget that would strengthen

Social Security, Medicare, and Medicaid for working families, middle class folks, and senior citizens all across this country.

They recklessly jammed a tax scam down the throats of the American people where 83 percent of the benefits go to the wealthiest 1 percent of this country—tax cuts for millionaires, billionaires, corporations, and big donors to subsidize the lifestyles of the rich and shameless. Raw deal.

We support tax cuts for working families and middle class folks that are made permanent and that meaningfully put money back into the pockets of everyday Americans. That is a better deal.

□ 1015

They are all about chaos, crisis, confusion, and special interests.

We are about the people's interests: better jobs, better wages, and a better future for the American people. We believe the American people deserve a better deal.

SYRIAN CIVIL WAR

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

Mr. BROWN of Maryland. Mr. Speaker, there is a civil war in Syria and a humanitarian crisis that the United States simply cannot and should not ignore.

Today there are some 2,000 U.S. soldiers and marines on the ground in Syria who have spent the past several years engaged in the fight to defeat ISIS. That fight has been largely successful, yet troops remain in Syria to prevent a resurgence of ISIS. U.S. forces are engaged in hostilities against ISIS, not in the Syrian civil war.

Congress was informed in 2015 that our forces are in Syria pursuant to the AUMF enacted in 2001, in response to the attacks on 9/11.

Although U.S. ground forces aren't engaged in the Syrian civil war, our forces have engaged Syrian forces and its regime. Last year, a U.S. Navy F-18 shot down a Syrian war plane in the collective self-defense of our coalition partners. The use of force in self-defense is unquestionably authorized, however risky that may be in potentially drawing the U.S. into armed conflict with Syria or into the Syrian civil war.

In the fall of 2016, U.S. forces mistakenly and unintentionally killed Syrian troops in an air strike that was intended for ISIS fighters. Last year, the Syrian regime launched an aerial bombing with sarin, causing the deaths of nearly 100 civilians.

In response to Assad carrying out these war crimes, the United States military, at the direction of President Trump, fired 59 cruise missiles against a Syrian air base. It was the air base from which the aircraft were launched to drop nerve gas on innocent women, children, men, and civilians.

But that didn't stop Assad. Just 11 days ago, less than 10 days after President Trump instructed military leaders to withdraw U.S. troops from Syria as soon as possible, Assad again launched a chemical attack on more than 500 people.

In response, and without meaningful discussion with Congress, President Trump, once again, ordered air strikes against Syrian targets associated with the Syrian chemical weapons program.

Mr. Speaker, notwithstanding the U.S. presence on the ground and our air engagements in Syria since 2015, this Congress has never openly and formally debated the question of authorization for the use of military force in Syria.

It is time for us to do our job. Assad is a barbaric, genocidal dictator. The use of chemical weapons is heinous, and the use of conventional weapons against civilians, which he is also guilty of doing, is equally heinous.

Syria is a humanitarian disaster. 400,000 Syrians, most of whom are innocent civilians, are dead. These facts are not disputed. For more than 70 years, the United States has been an anchor of international security, and I believe we cannot look away when a dictator brazenly and repeatedly violates international law.

The debate that is long overdue in Congress should not be limited to if, when, and how the United States should respond to the next chemical attack. Congress abdicated that responsibility in 2013 and in 2017, and I fear we are on course to do so again this year.

Deliberations over how and when to retaliate against the next chemical weapons attack must be part of the larger debate that we must have about our country's goals, policies, and strategy in Syria and whether another solitary military strike would be effective.

We should recognize that another military response will be hollow if not accompanied by a more robust, whole-of-government approach. We need to agree on a strategy that will permanently deter Assad from using chemical weapons, send a message to Moscow and Tehran, and push Assad to the negotiation table to achieve a lasting political solution to the civil war and humanitarian crisis.

Will this approach require greater support of the secular opposition in Syria? Will we have to work with our NATO allies to intervene more purposefully to contain Assad? These are the things—the issues—that every Member of Congress must grapple with as we weigh the use of military force. The President cannot act unilaterally.

I believe our ideals and principles, as well as our national security, are at stake in Syria, along with our leadership of an international system where we seek to ensure that weapons of mass destruction are never used.

I believe our democracy is stronger when the President acts with the support of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, let's debate and vote on the authorization to use military force in Syria now.

ENSURING U.S. MARITIME JOBS

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

Mr. LARSEN of Washington. Mr. Speaker, today I rise to express my continued support of American maritime jobs through enforcement of the Jones Act.

The Merchant Marine Act of 1920, more commonly known as the Jones Act, was named for its primary sponsor at the time, Senator Wesley Jones, of my home State, Washington State.

The Jones Act exists for good reason. It sustains and protects a strong domestic maritime and shipbuilding industry. It creates jobs for U.S. mariners, many of whom are veterans. It underpins U.S. maritime defense policy and is essential to preserving national security interests at home and abroad. The Jones Act requires the use of American-owned and -operated vessels to move all waterborne cargo between points in the U.S.

I have long maintained that the Jones Act ensures that domestic industries can remain vibrant contributors in the global shipping industry.

At its core, the Jones Act is a critical labor standard that helps put U.S. seafarers to work and maintains important workplace rights. In Washington State, approximately 60 percent of the State's ferries employees working on vessels are Jones Act compliant.

In 2012, I called on the then-administration to protect American jobs by adhering to the Jones Act in response to rising gas prices and the proposed release of oil from the Strategic Petroleum Reserve.

Last year, I spoke up to support the Jones Act fleet in its heroic response to the natural disaster that hit Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands.

As a member of the Coast Guard and Maritime Transportation Subcommittee, I am committed to working with my colleagues to uphold the longstanding tenets of the Jones Act to safeguard the important role maritime industries play in our economy.

The Jones Act exists for good reason. We should use it to good effect.

EXTENDING CONDOLENCES AND SYMPATHY TO THE BUSH FAMILY

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Texas (Mr. AL GREEN) for 5 minutes.

Mr. AL GREEN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, once again, I rise to speak from the well of the House of Representatives.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I would call to our attention the fact that there is a time when we should put all politics aside. This is such an occasion, Mr. Speaker.

I rise today to extend my condolences and sympathies to the Bush family. I rise today, Mr. Speaker, because I want the world to know that I have great respect for the family.

Politics aside, Mr. Speaker, Ms. Barbara Bush, the First Lady—not currently, but in my world, once a First Lady, always a First Lady. I rise because this First Lady demonstrated something that this country can be proud of.

She was a person who has left a legacy of respectability as it relates to being a First Lady of the United States of America. She respected herself. She had standards. She had principles. She had boundaries. There were certain things that she wouldn't do and would not allow to be done while she was in the White House. Respectability: she respected others which engendered respect for her.

I rise because she will be missed. I rise because she has left this legacy of respectability.

I also rise because, as a neophyte newly elected to Congress, I received an indication that her husband wanted to speak to me. I went over to speak to him. I had no idea as to why he would ask for an opportunity to visit with me, but I did visit with him. I thought it would be a 5-minute meeting. It went much longer than 5 minutes.

He obviously was in one party and I in another. We did not know each other, but we spoke at length. The thing that I remember as we were bringing our meeting to closure, I remember his calling to my attention that one of my greatest challenges in Congress would be to develop an agenda for myself.

There are many people who will have agendas for you. The great challenge in Congress is to develop your own agenda. So on my agenda, I want my record to show that I stood in the well of the Congress of the United States of America to thank the First Lady, Ms. Barbara Bush, for her service to her family, to her country, and indeed to the world.

GOP'S WAR ON THE POOR

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

Ms. MOORE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to proudly represent all of the welfare queens in the United States of America, all those women who get up every day and struggle as mothers, often caretakers for elderly parents, who are juggling two and three minimum wage jobs, \$7.25-an-hour jobs a day, and then being told that they are welfare cheats because they need food stamps, SNAP, Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program, in order to meet the basic food needs of their children.

I rise, Mr. Speaker, to decry your, Mr. Speaker, agenda and the agenda of the majority party to beat up on these poor, hard-working people because they are poor, people who find themselves in the predicament of having more month than money and need just a little bit of assistance to meet those basic nutritional needs.

We are sick and tired of people exaggerating and claiming that people are